

Near-Optimal Approximations for Bayesian Inference in Function Space

Veit D. Wild

Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, UK

VEIT.WILD@STATS.OX.AC.UK

James Wu

*Department of Computer Science, University College London, UK;
Gridmatic Inc., Cupertino, CA 95014, USA*

JSWU18@GMAIL.COM

Dino Sejdinovic

School of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, University of Adelaide, AUS

DINO.SEJDINOVIC@ADELAIDE.EDU.AU

Jeremias Knoblauch

Department of Statistical Sciences, University College London, UK

J.KNOBLAUCH@UCL.AC.UK

Abstract

We propose a scalable inference algorithm for Bayes posteriors defined on a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). Given a likelihood function and a Gaussian random element representing the prior, the corresponding Bayes posterior measure Π_B can be obtained as the stationary distribution of an RKHS-valued Langevin diffusion. We approximate the infinite-dimensional Langevin diffusion via a projection onto the first M components of the Kosambi–Karhunen–Loève expansion. Exploiting the thus obtained approximate posterior for these M components, we perform inference for Π_B by relying on the law of total probability and a sufficiency assumption. The resulting method scales as $O(M^3 + JM^2)$, where J is the number of samples produced from the posterior measure Π_B . Interestingly, the algorithm recovers the posterior arising from the sparse variational Gaussian process (SVGP) (Titsias, 2009) as a special case—owed to the fact that the sufficiency assumption underlies both methods. However, whereas the SVGP is parametrically constrained to be a Gaussian process, our method is based on a non-parametric variational family $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^M)$ consisting of all probability measures on \mathbb{R}^M . As a result, our method is provably close to the optimal M -dimensional variational approximation of the Bayes posterior Π_B in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^M)$ for convex and Lipschitz continuous negative log likelihoods, and coincides with SVGP for the special case of a Gaussian error likelihood.

1 Introduction

Bayesian inference in function spaces crucially relies on the construction of a prior distributions on an infinite-dimensional function space. Gaussian processes (GPs) are the standard tool deployed for this purpose, and have proven a valuable framework for principled uncertainty quantification over the past few decades (Rasmussen, 2003). A notable shortcoming of GPs is their cubic computational cost with respect to data size, and their intractability for the case of non-Gaussian likelihoods. Numerous approaches have been proposed to overcome these challenges (see e.g. Gneiting, 2002; Quiñonero-Candela and Rasmussen, 2005; Chalupka et al., 2013; Wilson and Nickisch, 2015; Gardner et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020). Amongst them, sparse variational Gaussian processes (SVGPs) (Titsias, 2009) arguably are considered to be the gold standard for scalable GP approximations.

SVGPs rely on the introduction of inducing features that are assumed to follow a Gaussian distribution with learnable variational parameters, and which can be interpreted as an approximate low-dimensional summary of the posterior GP. To learn these variational parameters, one then typically performs gradient based maximisation of the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) (see e.g. Hensman et al., 2013, 2015a).

While SVGPs often perform surprisingly well in practice, their approximation quality is inadequate whenever the Gaussianity imposed upon the inducing points is too restrictive. In the hope of overcoming this shortcoming, this paper explores the possibility of performing Bayesian inference by using a version of gradient descent *directly* in the space of probability measures—rather than on variational parameters indexing the family of approximating measures (see Wild et al., 2023). We achieve this in three steps:

1. In Section 3, we derive the required Wasserstein Gradient Flow (WGF) (Otto, 2001; Ambrosio et al., 2005) as a natural analogue for gradient descent over the space of probability measures;
2. We augment the resulting infinite-dimensional diffusion via an M -dimensional projection operation in Section 4 to make it computationally tractable;
3. We study the consequences of this projection in Section 5, and find that relative to the theoretically optimal approximation (see Theorem 1), the proposed algorithm is close in Kullback-Leibler divergence (Theorem 2), with a discrepancy that vanishes at least as $\mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$, and even as $\mathcal{O}(\exp(-M))$ for certain special cases of interest (Theorem 3).

Before we state the results in full detail, Section 2 elaborates on the setting studied in this paper, and Section 2.3 provides a high-level summary of our results.

2 Bayesian Inference in Function Space

Throughout, we will be concerned with Bayesian inference in a function space. To this end, we have to assign a prior distribution over an unknown function f . This function f acts as the infinite-dimensional parameter of the likelihood function $p(y_{1:N}|f)$ which we use to describe the distribution of N observations $y_{1:N} = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

2.1 Computation for GP Regression

Generally speaking, Bayesian inference in function spaces is computationally challenging. As a result, the most widely studied special case of this setting is Gaussian process (GP) regression (Rasmussen, 2003), which leads to comparatively tractable inference algorithms. As indicated by its name, GP regression is characterised by placing a GP prior over the function f . Most commonly, the likelihood in GP regression is also Gaussian, resulting in the log likelihood

$$\log p(y_{1:N}|f) = \sum_{n=1}^N \log \mathcal{N}(y_n; f(x_n), \sigma^2).$$

Here, $\sigma^2 > 0$ denotes the variance in the observation noise, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$ are known input features, and $\mathcal{N}(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes a Gaussian density with mean μ and variance σ^2 evaluated at y . Given the GP prior on f and a likelihood such as the above, GP regression finds the Bayes posterior over f given $y_{1:N}$.

For the special case of Gaussian likelihoods, the Bayes posterior is available in closed form, and computable via basic linear algebra operations. While everything would seem to be fine in this setting, there is an important complication: even in this best case scenario, the computational burden of obtaining the exact GP posterior is of order $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$, and thus prohibitive for even moderately large sample sizes. As a result, the Bayes posterior will almost always have to be approximated in practice—even if closed forms are available. Arguably the most common way of doing this is via sparse variational GPs (SVGPs) first proposed by Titsias (2009). SVGPs provide a low-level stochastic summary of the GP using so-called *inducing features*. These features are assumed to follow a Gaussian distribution with finite-dimensional variational parameters that are typically learnt via gradient-based variational inference techniques (see e.g. Hensman et al., 2013, 2015a). While SVGPs can perform well in practice, they also often lead to subpar performance. One of the main reason is that the Gaussianity assumed for the inducing features is too restrictive, and leads to poor approximations. More generally speaking, SVGPs do not provide universal guarantees for their approximation quality, and are really only appropriate if the exact posterior is itself a Gaussian process or close to it.

2.2 Beyond GPs and SVGPs

GP regression and its sparse variational approximations are computationally viable but restrictive. In this paper, we aim at building a more general framework for function space inference. To this end, we apply the Wasserstein Gradient Flow (WGF) for a variational reformulation of Bayesian inference (see Section 3.2), resulting in an infinite-dimensional version of gradient descent over the space of probability measures on the desired function space H . Like SVGP, this is a variational method. But unlike SVGP, it is *not* parametrically constrained to be a Gaussian process. As a result, one may hope that the resulting algorithms can provide superior approximation quality—a suspicion we will verify in Section 5. Applying the WGF will enforce an important distinction to a GP-centred view on function space inference: to construct it, we require explicit knowledge of the function space H over which the prior and posterior measures are defined.¹ This is in stark contrast to Bayesian inference schemes with GPs, which only rely on evaluating f at a finite set of points (Rasmussen, 2003), and therefore are agnostic to the exact function space H which draws from the GP realise in. Consequently, the family of distributions we consider throughout will be Gaussian Random Elements (see Van Neerven, 2008): unlike for GPs, the function space on which draws from a Gaussian Random Element (GRE) realise are explicitly part of their definition.

While GREs and GPs are different families of measures over function spaces, they have important connections—and we use these to link a sub-class of GREs to GPs in Section 3.5.2.

1. The necessary calculations exploit various concepts from infinite-dimensional analysis such as Fréchet derivatives or the integration by parts for Gaussian measures on Hilbert spaces (cf. Appendix B), and thus necessitate precise understanding of the underlying function space H .

Importantly, our inference algorithm does *not* rely on this connection: it can be employed for Bayesian computation of a class of GP posteriors, but is applicable to more general GRE posteriors *beyond* GPs. Thus, we mainly provide the connection to GPs to make prior specification easier and posterior inferences more interpretable. Additionally, this will allow us a natural way for comparing our (more general) approach with existing (more narrowly defined) function space inference algorithms such as SVGPs. This special case is particularly interesting because it leads to a set of optimality results for our method in Section 5. In the language of SVGPs, the optimality results show that amongst all possible posteriors that condition on the chosen inducing features, our procedure targets the one that is closest to the exact posterior in Kullback-Leibler divergence up to a vanishingly small error.

2.3 Contributions

The paper is organised in three sections, each of which relates to three interrelated contributions: Section 3 studies the WGF, which is used in Section 4 to derive a new tractable algorithm for function space inference that we study in Section 5. We provide a high-level overview of each of these below.

- First, we derive the **WGF** for the optimisation-centric reformulation of Bayesian **function space inference**, which is discussed in Section 3. To implement the WGF numerically and allow for a practicable implementation, we require certain Fréchet derivatives to exist, which—perhaps surprisingly—implies that the function space H in which draws from the posterior are realised is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) H_k associated to some kernel k . At first glance, this may seem to suggest that it would be natural to specify priors and posteriors to be GPs associated to the kernel k , but this is a misconception: Driscoll’s Theorem (Driscoll, 1973) shows that samples from GPs associated to k will realise *outside* of H_k with probability one, whenever H_k is infinite-dimensional (see also Steinwart, 2024). Therefore, we consider GREs in H_k instead—a class of priors in function spaces that have traditionally been underexplored for Bayesian inference; albeit with notable exceptions (Stuart, 2010; Wild and Wynne, 2022; Wild et al., 2023). With this in place, we finally obtain a diffusion on H_k whose stationary distribution is the targeted Bayes posterior Π_B .
- Second, we perform **Bayesian computation by projection** based on the infinite-dimensional Langevin stochastic differential equation (SDE) that implements the dynamics arising from the WGF. In particular, as elements of H_k can generally not be represented numerically without approximation, Section 4 provides a projected M -dimensional representation of this infinite-dimensional diffusion and uses it to construct an inference algorithm that scales as $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$. Specifically, we orthogonally project onto the first M coefficients of the Kosambi-Karhunen-Loève expansion of our function, which corresponds to representing the infinite-dimensional object through an M -dimensional subspace. While various other subspaces might be considered, orthogonal projection is not only a natural choice, but also turns out to result in near-optimal posterior approximations (see Section 5). We call the resulting inference algorithm Projected Langevin Sampling (PLS). PLS consists of first simulating from this projected finite-dimensional diffusion on \mathbb{R}^M , and then probabilistically mapping back into the infinite-dimensional H_k via the law of total probability.

- Third, we derive **theoretical guarantees** of PLS, and shed light on its **relationship with SVGPs** in Section 5. To start with, we can show that PLS provides near-optimal variational approximations. Next—and despite being a sampling algorithm—PLS is also a variational inference scheme. Notably, PLS approximately samples from a non-parametric variational posterior that is strictly more expressive than the corresponding parametrically constrained Gaussian variational posterior of SVGPs. This allows PLS to target a strictly better posterior approximation than SVGPs, except for the special case of Gaussian likelihoods, for which PLS and SVGPs target the same (Gaussian) approximation. Unlike SVGPs, PLS can also be used for arbitrary likelihoods without requiring that their integrals with respect to variationally parameterised Gaussian measures are tractable or easy to approximate.

3 Wasserstein Gradient Flow (WGF) for Functional Inference

The first step in building our new inference algorithm is the application of the Wasserstein Gradient Flow (WGF) to an optimisation problem that fully characterises a functional Bayes posterior. To this end, we first define prerequisite notations and concepts in Section 3.1, and the optimisation problem to which the WGF is applied in Section 3.2. Next, we draw instructive parallels between the WGF and gradient descent on measure spaces in Section 3.3, and state the SDE obtained as a limiting case of this gradient descent scheme in Section 3.4. While all developments to this point apply for function space inference on arbitrary Hilbert spaces H , Section 3.5 explains why computational feasibility demands that one should choose an RKHS $H = H_k$ based on a kernel k , and explains how to specify GRE priors on such spaces.

3.1 Preliminaries & Notations

On a technical level, a GRE F is simply a random variable with realisations on a function space H . What makes GREs attractive is their Gaussianity: they are fully specified through a mean function $m \in H$ and a covariance operator $C : H \rightarrow H$ (a positive, self-adjoint, trace-class operator). Similarly to commonly employed notation for GPs, we thus write $F \sim \mathcal{N}(m, C)$ to indicate that F is a GRE with mean function m and covariance operator $C : H \rightarrow H$ (cf. Appendix A for a brief introduction to GREs in Hilbert spaces).

By definition, it is clear that GREs have a finite second moment. Further, and as we prove in Appendix C, Bayes posteriors depending on GRE priors are also guaranteed to have finite second moment. To rigorously define the larger set of all measures with finite second moment on H , we let $\mathcal{B}(H)$ be the Borel σ -algebra on H , and then define the set of Borel probability measures on H with finite second moment as

$$\mathcal{P}_2(H) := \left\{ \mu : \mathcal{B}(H) \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \mu(H) = 1, \int_H \|u\|^2 d\mu(u) < \infty \right\}.$$

For the application of the WGF, this set of measures is crucial: we can metrize it with the 2-Wasserstein metric distance, which for $\Pi, Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ is defined as

$$W_2(\Pi, Q)^2 := \inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\Pi, Q)} \int_{H \times H} \|h - h'\|^2 d\gamma(h, h'),$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\Pi, Q) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H \times H)$ is the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(H \times H)$ whose marginals are Π and Q , so that $\gamma(A \times H) = \Pi(A)$ and $\gamma(H \times B) = Q(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ (cf. Ambrosio et al., 2005, Chapter 6).

3.2 Optimisation-centric perspectives on Bayesian inference

It is well-known that the Bayes posterior is the solution to a particular optimisation problem, both for the parametric and the non-parametric case (e.g., Theorem 1 in Knoblauch et al., 2019; Wild et al., 2022, Appendix A.1). Our WGF-based algorithmic perspective builds on this. In particular, the WGF implements a form of gradient descent on the objective underlying this optimisation problem. To state the objective under study, let $\Pi := \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ be a GRE prior on the function space H , and $\ell(f) := -\log p(y_{1:N}|f)$ an arbitrary negative log likelihood function.² With this, one obtains the Bayes posterior Π_B as

$$\Pi_B = \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)} \underbrace{\int \ell(f) dQ(f) + \text{KL}(Q, \Pi)}_{=: L(Q)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{KL}(Q, \Pi)$ denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the measures Q and Π .³

This optimisation-centric perspective has many methodological and theoretical uses. For example, it shows that conventional variational inference relates to full Bayesian inference like constrained to unconstrained optimisation (see Theorem 2 in Knoblauch et al., 2019). To see this, simply note that conventional variational inference consists in choosing a family of measures $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}(H)$ that has a finite-dimensional Euclidean parameterisation, and then computing the variational Bayes posterior as $\hat{Q} = \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} L(Q)$ through stochastic gradient descent (e.g. Titsias and Lázaro-Gredilla, 2014) or other optimisation techniques. In the specific context of Gaussian processes (GPs), such variational Bayesian approaches were pioneered by Titsias (2009), further developed in Matthews et al. (2016), and adapted to Gaussian Random Elements (GREs) in Banach spaces by Wild and Wynne (2022).

The current paper also develops variationally Bayesian methodology, but refrains from the conventional approach: instead of choosing a parameterised family of distributions \mathcal{Q} and performing gradient descent on its finite-dimensional parameters, gradient descent is performed *directly* on the infinite-dimensional space $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$. Unlike parameterised families \mathcal{Q} , this allows for nonparametric variational posteriors, and results in much greater flexibility. On a technical level, our methodology amounts to a computationally efficient implementation of the WGF for $L(Q)$, and transfers the insights of Wild et al. (2023) to inference on measures over functions $f \in H$. While we do not explore the case where the Kullback-Leibler divergence in (1) is replaced with other regularisers, this setting was explored for finite-dimensional parameter spaces in Wild et al. (2023), and the results therein could be extended to function spaces.

2. Here, $p(y_{1:N}|f)$ is called a likelihood function if $(y_{1:N}, f) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times H \rightarrow p(y_{1:N}|f) \in [0, \infty)$ is product-measurable, and if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} p(y_{1:N}|f) d\mu(y_{1:N}) = 1$ for all fixed $f \in H$, and for μ a base measure on \mathbb{R}^N —such as the counting measure or Lebesgue measure.

3. This optimisation problem is more commonly stated over the space of *all* Borel probability measures on H , often denoted $\mathcal{P}(H)$. As we show in Appendix C however, the GRE prior guarantees that even over this larger space, the solution always lies in $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$.

3.3 Gradient descent in $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$

The intuition behind our application of the WGF is to use the functional $Q \mapsto L(Q)$ in (1) to find the minimiser Π_B by performing a type of gradient descent over $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$. In particular and as outlined in Chapter 2 of Ambrosio et al. (2005), we can pick a starting point $Q_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$, and then iteratively update according to

$$Q_{k+1} := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)} \left\{ L(Q) + \frac{1}{2\eta} W_2(Q, Q_k)^2 \right\},$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta > 0$ a sufficiently small step-size.⁴ If L is sufficiently regular and we let $\eta \rightarrow 0$, the continuously indexed family $(Q_{\lfloor t/\eta \rfloor})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to the limit $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ with $Q(0) = Q_0$ (Ambrosio et al., 2005, Chapter 11.1.3). This limiting evolution of measures $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is called the Wasserstein gradient flow (WGF) for L starting at Q_0 . It has obvious parallels with gradient descent, and is directly interpretable as its infinite-dimensional analogue on $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$: at every infinitesimally small step forward in time t , $Q(t)$ moves in the direction amounting to the biggest decrease in the value for $Q \mapsto L(Q)$, and we would hope that the optimum is recovered in the limit so that $\Pi_B = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q(t)$.

3.4 Following the WGF via the Langevin SDE in Hilbert space

Following Theorem 8.3.1 in Ambrosio et al. (2005), the WGF $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0}$ for functional $Q \mapsto L(Q)$ in (1) satisfies for all test functions⁵ $\varphi : [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the equation

$$\int_0^T \int_H \partial_t \varphi(t, f) - \langle \nabla_W L[Q(t)](f), D\varphi(t, f) \rangle_H dQ(t)(f) dt = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $D\varphi(t, f)$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of φ with respect to f , and $\nabla_W L[Q] : H \rightarrow H$ is the so-called *Wasserstein gradient* of L evaluated at $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$. Obtaining an explicit form for this Wasserstein gradient is essential in deriving the dynamics governing $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0}$, and we derive it in Theorem 7 (cf. Appendix B) via the set of equations given by the characterisation of $(Q(t))_{t \geq 0}$ in (2). In so doing, we find that for (1), we get

$$\nabla_W L[Q](f) = D\ell(f) + D(\log q)(f) = D\ell(f) + \frac{Dq(f)}{q(f)}, \quad (3)$$

where $q := dQ/d\Pi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of Q with respect to the prior measure Π . Plugging (3) into (2), we can identify the law of a stochastic process $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ with $F(t) \in H$ for which $F(t) \sim Q(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ (cf. Theorem 6 in Appendix B). In particular, we find that $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the solution to the infinite-dimensional version of the Langevin Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) given by

$$dF(t) = - (D\ell(F(t)) + C^{-1}F(t)) dt + \sqrt{2}dW(t). \quad (4)$$

4. This is similar to gradient descent in Euclidean spaces: for a fixed and sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ and a function ℓ to be minimised, we can rewrite the $(k+1)$ -th iterate of ordinary gradient descent as $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \eta \nabla \ell(\theta_k) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ \ell(\theta) + \frac{1}{2\eta} \|\theta - \theta_k\|_2^2 \right\}$.

5. More precisely, the relevant class of test functions are the smooth cylindrical functions, denoted $\text{Cyl}((H \times [0, T]))$ (Ambrosio et al., 2005, Definition 5.1.11). By definition, $\varphi \in \text{Cyl}((H \times [0, T]))$ if and only if there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and orthonormal vectors $v_1, \dots, v_N \in H$ such that $\varphi(f) = \psi(\langle f, v_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle f, v_N \rangle, t)$ where $\psi : \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with compact support.

Here, $(W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a cylindrical Brownian motion in H and $C^{-1} : \text{Im}(C) \subset H \rightarrow H$ is the inverse of C .⁶ This SDE was first introduced in Hairer et al. (2005), and the existence, uniqueness and ergodic properties of its solution are discussed in Hairer et al. (2007). Hairer et al. (2011) provides a more accessible treatment on the subject, and Da Prato and Zabczyk (2014) provides a more general discussion of SDEs in Hilbert spaces.

For our purposes, we can thankfully gloss over many of the technical aspects of dealing with this infinite-dimensional SDE. Instead, our main reason for introducing (4) will be its use as the driving engine for our methodology. To this end, it is instructive to note the parallels with the finite-dimensional case: if we consider (1) for $H = \mathbb{R}^J$, we recover a Bayes posterior defined on a finite-dimensional parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^J$. Writing the associated likelihood function as $p(y_{1:N}|\theta)$, and the corresponding Gaussian prior density as $p(\theta) = \mathcal{N}(\theta; 0, \Sigma)$, the resulting WGF—now defined on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^J)$ —yields a measure evolution that corresponds to the well-known finite-dimensional Langevin SDE

$$d\theta(t) = -(\nabla \ell_N(\theta(t)) + \Sigma^{-1}\theta(t)) dt + \sqrt{2}d\beta(t), \quad (5)$$

where $\ell_N(\theta) := -\log p(y_{1:N}|\theta)$ and $(\beta(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the standard Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^J (Jordan et al., 1998; Otto, 2001). This finite-dimensional Langevin SDE is the basis of many classical algorithms for Bayesian computation since its stationary distribution for $\theta(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ recovers the Bayes posterior (see e.g. Roberts and Tweedie, 1996; Welling and Teh, 2011). In other words, and exactly as for the infinite-dimensional case, one way of motivating *why* this diffusion recovers the Bayes posterior is by interpreting it as the natural analogue of gradient descent on (1) for the special case of $H = \mathbb{R}^J$.

Just as (5) is the inspiration for many seminal algorithms for computing Bayes posteriors over finite-dimensional parameters, (4) can be used to generate samples from the posterior measure Π_B that solves the optimisation problem (1) with infinite-dimensional function spaces H . However, the infinite dimensionality of H introduces an additional complication: the Langevin SDE in (4) generally cannot be represented on a computer. Fortunately, we can overcome this with parsimonious numerical approximations (cf. Section 4).

3.5 Choosing Function Space H and Prior Π

So far, our developments are valid for likelihoods and GREs on general Hilbert spaces. In particular, the Langevin SDE in (4) in principle may produce posterior inferences over general function spaces H as long as they are Hilbert spaces. As we will explain next however, the seemingly innocuous requirement that ℓ be Fréchet differentiable will necessitate the assumption that H is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) for virtually all likelihood functions of practical interest (cf. Appendix A.1 for basic properties of an RKHS).

3.5.1 THE INEVITABILITY OF THE RKHS

Implementing the Langevin SDE in (4) requires calculation of the Wasserstein gradient in (3), and therefore of the Fréchet derivative $D\ell(f)$ of $\ell : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For simplicity, consider

6. The operator C^{-1} is unbounded and given by $C^{-1}f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^{-1} \langle f, e_n \rangle e_n$ where $\{\lambda_n, e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are the eigenvalue-eigenvector pairs obtained from the spectral decomposition of the self-adjoint trace class covariance operator C .

negative log-likelihood functions which for a cost function $c : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ can be written as

$$\ell(f) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n)) + \text{constant}, \quad (6)$$

where $c(y_n, f(x_n))$ measures the discrepancy between an observation y_n and the prediction $f(x_n)$ for y_n , and where the constant does not depend on f . For example, the Gaussian likelihood corresponds to $c(y_n, f(x_n)) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(y_n - f(x_n))^2$. Another example is the Bernoulli likelihood for binary classification, which is

$$p(y_n|f) = \phi(f(x_n))^{y_n} \cdot (1 - \phi(f(x_n)))^{1-y_n}. \quad (7)$$

In this case, $y_n \in \{0, 1\}$, so that the associated negative log likelihood $\ell(f)$ is of the form (6) with $c(y_n, f(x_n)) = -y_n \log \phi(f(x_n)) - (1 - y_n) \log(1 - \phi(f(x_n)))$. Here, $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a mapping that transforms latent functional outputs into probabilities such as the the logistic function $\phi_{\text{logistic}}(f(x_n)) = (1 + \exp(-f(x_n)))^{-1}$.

For any negative log likelihood of form (6), we can apply the chain rule and obtain the corresponding Fréchet derivative as

$$D\ell(f) = \sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, f(x_n)) D(s_n)(f), \quad (8)$$

where we have written $s_n(f) := f(x_n)$ as the point-wise evaluation functional for $f \in H$ at x_n , $\partial_2 c$ as the derivative of c with respect to its second component, and $D(s_n)$ as the Fréchet derivative of s_n . Inspecting the expression, it is now clear that we need to assume that all s_n are Fréchet differentiable and therefore continuous. However, demanding continuity of all pointwise evaluation functionals $s_n(f)$ for all $f \in H$ is in fact equivalent to H being an RKHS (Berlinet and Thomas-Agnan, 2004, Theorem 1).

In summary, even when attention is restricted to the simple sub-class of likelihood functions based on pointwise evaluations of f as in (6), the Wasserstein gradient in (3) needed to evolve the infinite-dimensional Langevin SDE in (4) will *only* have the Fréchet derivatives necessary for implementing it numerically if H is an RKHS. Throughout the remainder of the paper, we therefore take H to be an RKHS H_k associated with the reproducing kernel function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Thanks to the widely celebrated reproducing property of RKHS functions, this implies that $s_n(f) = \langle f, k_n \rangle$ for $k_n = k(x_n, \cdot) \in H_k$, so that the required Fréchet derivative in (8) is $D(s_n) = k_n$, and $D\ell(f) = \sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, f(x_n)) k_n$.

3.5.2 COVARIANCE OPERATORS AND GAUSSIAN PROCESSES

While choosing GRE priors may seem like an intractably difficult proposition, one can draw clear analogies and parallels to the design of Gaussian process (GP) priors. We will leverage these connections to design our GRE priors in the current paper. To this end, note that the GRE prior $\Pi := \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ is specified by a covariance operator $C : H_k \rightarrow H_k$ that encodes prior knowledge about the unknown function. In this paper, we specify C through a kernel function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ as

$$Cf = \int k(\cdot, x') f(x') d\nu(x') \quad (9)$$

for all $f \in H_k$. In Appendix D, we show that constructing C in this way indeed leads to a valid covariance operator on H_k under mild assumptions on ν and k .⁷ Every GRE $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ on H_k naturally induces a GP through the definition $F_{\text{GP}}(x) := \langle F, k(x, \cdot) \rangle$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. F_{GP} resulting from this construction is endowed with kernel r (cf. Lemma 11 in Appendix D) given by

$$r(x, x') := \int k(x, \xi)k(\xi, x') d\nu(\xi) \quad (10)$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. This connection is practically useful, since it is well-understood how to specify interpretable GP function priors (see e.g. Rasmussen, 2003; Duvenaud, 2014). Therefore, one can specify interpretable GRE priors via the GP induced by r .⁸ The correspondence between C and r also elucidates the role of ν : the similarity between two points x and x' is measured by the product of their pairwise similarities with a third point ξ as $k(x, \xi)k(\xi, x')$, and this product is averaged by ν over ξ . This construction has appeared in the literature before (see e.g. Dance et al., 2024), and can lead to poor function priors if ν is very different from the data generating process $\text{Law}[X_1]$ of x_1, \dots, x_N (see Appendix E for a more extensive discussion). To this end, we take $\nu = \text{Law}[X_1]$,⁹ which is generally unavailable to us, so that we need to estimate it. The easiest way to do this—and the approach we use in our experiments of Section 6—is through the empirical measure $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$ depending on the N available data points. In practice, this has the immediate effect of making us operate on an N -dimensional (rather than an infinite-dimensional) space, but neither compromises the general developments in the remainder—all of which are spelt out in largest generality and for the infinite-dimensional case—nor affects the practicality of the M -dimensional posterior approximations for $M \ll N$ that we develop.

4 Projected Diffusions for Tractable Posterior Inference

Having laid out how the GRE prior should be designed, we are ready to deploy the infinite-dimensional Langevin SDE in (4) to produce samples from Bayes posteriors over H_k that are specified via (1) and rely on GRE priors. But without any further numerical approximation, this cannot be done: $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is defined on an RKHS H_k , so there is no numerically exact way of representing its evolution, even after time-discretisation. To deal with this, we introduce a sequence of approximations to Π_{B} that are summarised in Table 1, and which culminate in a tractable sampling procedure.

4.1 Projected GREs

A natural first step for approximating the intractable diffusion $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ relates to the representation of $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ via its Kosambi–Karhunen–Loève representation. Following

7. A GRE $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ exists if and only if C is a positive, self adjoint, trace-class operator (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Section 2.3.1).

8. Note that the GP prior $F \sim \text{GP}(0, k)$ does *not* define a prior on H_k : by Dricoll’s Theorem (Dricoll, 1973), the sample paths of such a GP would be almost surely not be contained in H_k .

9. Using the data-generating distribution of x_1, \dots, x_N as our choice for ν has the interesting effect of making the kernel choice r data-dependent. This is akin to the logic of empirical Bayes, and fine-tunes the GRE prior F to the data at hand.

Table 1: Meaning of and relationships between different approximating measures.

	explanation	diffusion	approximation	space
Π	GRE prior on H_k			H_k
Π_B	Bayes posterior $F \mid y_{1:N}$	$F(t)$		H_k
$\Pi_B^{1:M}$	Bayes posterior $F^{1:M} \mid y_{1:N}$ so that $\Pi_B = \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid F^{1:M} = u) d\Pi_B^{1:M}(u)$	$F^{1:M}(t)$		\mathbb{R}^M
$\hat{\Pi}_B^{1:M}$	Bayes posterior $\hat{F}^{1:M} \mid y_{1:N}$ so that $\Pi_B = \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid \hat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\hat{\Pi}_B^{1:M}(u)$			\mathbb{R}^M
$\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$	Limiting measure of projected diffusion	$\tilde{F}^{1:M}(t)$	$\Pi_\infty^{1:M} \approx \Pi_B^{1:M}$	\mathbb{R}^M
$\hat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$	Limiting measure of projected and estimated diffusion	$\hat{F}^{1:M}(t)$	$\hat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M} \approx \hat{\Pi}_B^{1:M}$	\mathbb{R}^M
Π_∞	$\Pi_\infty := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid F^{1:M} = u) d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}(u)$		$\Pi_\infty \approx \Pi_B$	H_k
$\hat{\Pi}_\infty$	$\hat{\Pi}_\infty := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid \hat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\hat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}(u)$		$\hat{\Pi}_\infty \approx \Pi_B$	H_k

Proposition 2.18 in Da Prato and Zabczyk (2014), if C is defined as in (9), this is equivalent to the well-studied Mercer decomposition of k , and given as

$$F(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle F, e_m \rangle e_m(x),$$

where $F^m := \langle F, e_m \rangle \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_m)$ independently with $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty} \subset [0, \infty) \times H_k$ the eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots$ obtained from the spectral decomposition of the covariance operator C in (9). Based on this representation, F can be approximated via its orthogonal projection onto the span of the first M eigenfunctions given by

$$\text{Proj}[F] := \sum_{m=1}^M F^m e_m. \quad (11)$$

Denoting $\text{Proj}[H_k]$ as the M -dimensional subspace of H_k induced by this projection, and $\mathcal{P}(\text{Proj}[H_k])$ as the set of measures on this subspace, Figure 1 illustrates our construction.

Since C is a trace-class operator, this approximation through orthogonal projection is well-motivated: universally, the eigenvalues decay *at least* at speed $\lambda_m = o(m^{-1})$.¹⁰ This bound is extremely conservative, and λ_m typically decays at much faster rates if the functions in H_k are sufficiently smooth. As Table 2 illustrates, the decay is even often exponential, which means that roughly speaking, the projection in (11) converges to $F(t)$ exponentially fast as $M \rightarrow \infty$. As we shall see later, this decay translates directly into the approximation quality of our posteriors (see Theorem 3). This further motivates choosing the M -dimensional subspace obtained through projection to approximately represent randomness on H_k : unlike more commonly chosen subspaces—like those obtained through pointwise evaluations in the inducing point framework of Titsias (2009)—our projection leads to subspaces that are in some sense optimal. On a technical level, this happens because they represent the subspace of H_k where the prior F concentrates the most.

10. This holds since by definition of trace-class operators with spectral decomposition, we have $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m < \infty$; so since $\lambda_m \geq 0$, it must hold that $\lambda_m = o(m^{-1})$.

Table 2: Spectral decay for different kernels k and input distributions $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^D)$; taken from Burt et al. (2019) and containing results from Ritter et al. (1995).

kernel	input distribution ν	decay of λ_m
Squared Exponential	compact support	$\mathcal{O}(\exp(-\alpha \frac{m}{D} \log \frac{m}{D}))$
Squared Exponential	Gaussian	$\mathcal{O}(\exp(-\alpha \frac{m}{D}))$
Matérn $l + 1/2$	Uniform on interval	$\mathcal{O}(m^{-2l-2} \log(m)^{2(D-1)(l+1)})$

4.2 Finite-Dimensional Projection of the WGF in Hilbert space

From a practical standpoint, the projection in (11) allows us to study and simulate the M -dimensional SDE $(F^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ instead of $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$. As we will show in the remainder, the limiting distribution of this projected SDE allows us to exactly sample from the Bayes posterior Π_B when $M = N$, or to tractably approximate it with provable guarantees when $M \ll N$ (cf. Theorem 2). Intriguingly, the resulting posterior approximation coincides with SVGPs for Gaussian likelihoods (cf. Theorem 4), but is *not* constrained to a Gaussian variational family—and thus is generally non-Gaussian for non-Gaussian likelihoods.

To power this approximation algorithm, we first study the time evolution for $F^{1:M}(t) = (F^1(t), F^2(t), \dots, F^M(t))^\top$ with $F^m(t) := \langle F(t), e_m \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$. Using Itó's Rule, we find

$$dF^m(t) = -\left(\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, F(t)(x_n)) e_m(x) + \frac{F^m(t)}{\lambda_m}\right) dt + \sqrt{2} dB^m(t), \quad (12)$$

where $B^m(t) := \langle W(t), e_m \rangle$ are stochastically independent Brownian motions in \mathbb{R} . While this diffusion is simpler than (4), access to the M largest eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ would still not suffice to make it tractable due to its dependence on $F(t)$, for which we do not have an exact representation. To rectify this, we therefore replace $F(t)$ with its *exact* projection $\text{Proj}[F(t)]$. This yields the new SDE

$$d\tilde{F}^m(t) = -\left(\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, \text{Proj}[F(t)](x_n)) e_m(x) + \frac{\tilde{F}^m(t)}{\lambda_m}\right) dt + \sqrt{2} dB^m(t), \quad (13)$$




Figure 1: To represent a GRE F on an infinite-dimensional space H_k , we orthogonally project it onto the first M terms of its Kosambi-Karhunen-Loève representation via (11). Importantly, the projected random variable $\text{Proj}[F]$ can be exactly represented using its first M coefficients F^1, F^2, \dots, F^M , which are jointly distributed as a fully factorised M -dimensional zero-mean Gaussian with variances $\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2, \dots, \lambda_M^2$.




Figure 2: In an ideal world, we would directly evolve the SDE $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H}_k . Since this is numerically infeasible however, we instead use the projection in (11). To evolve the resulting SDE, we rely on its representation via M components $\tilde{F}^{1:M}$, which we can evolve according to (13). In its exact form, this SDE depends on unknown quantities. We therefore have to estimate the unknown eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$, resulting in our final target SDE $(\hat{F}^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ that we can approximate via (15) by applying Euler-Maruyama discretisation and forward simulation.

where $\text{Proj}[F(t)] = \sum_{m=1}^M \tilde{F}^m(t) e_m$ and $\tilde{F}_m = \langle F(t), e_m \rangle$. Further, the limiting measure of this diffusion is defined as $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ so that $\Pi_\infty^{1:M} \sim \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}^{1:M}(t)$

Even this approximation is not computationally feasible however: since the exact values of $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ are unknown in practice, $\text{Proj}[F(t)]$ cannot be computed exactly and needs to be estimated. To this end, we use the Nyström method to estimate the M largest eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs $\{\hat{\lambda}_m, \hat{e}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ (cf. Appendix G). Given $\{\hat{\lambda}_m, \hat{e}_m\}_{m=1}^M$, a natural estimate for $F(t)(x_n)$ then follows from the *estimated* projection

$$\widehat{\text{Proj}}[F(t)] := \sum_{m=1}^M \underbrace{\langle F(t), \hat{e}_m \rangle}_{=: \hat{F}^m(t)} \hat{e}_m \quad (14)$$

and its evaluations $\widehat{\text{Proj}}[F(t)](x_n) = \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{F}^m(t) \hat{e}_m(x_n)$. Substituting this into (13) leads to the tractable SDE $\hat{F}^{1:M}(t)$ whose components evolve as

$$d\hat{F}^m(t) = - \left(\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, \widehat{\text{Proj}}[F_t](x_n)) \hat{e}_m(x) + \frac{\hat{F}^m(t)}{\hat{\lambda}_m} \right) dt + \sqrt{2} dB^m(t). \quad (15)$$

This M -dimensional diffusion $\hat{F}^{1:M}(t) = (\hat{F}^1(t), \dots, \hat{F}^M(t))^\top$ can be forward-simulated via Euler-Maruyama discretisation. We visually summarise the steps that take us from the infeasible diffusion $(F(t))_{t \geq 0}$ to the computationally tractable $(\hat{F}^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ in Figure 2.

Before moving on, it is useful to point out that while all computations and algorithmic proposals will be based on the limiting measure $\hat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ of (15), the theory we develop in Section 5 will instead rely on the limiting measure $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ of (13) for its analysis. This means that while the computational algorithm we propose relies on the Nyström approximation, the theory we derive ignores the associated estimation error. This decision is chiefly guided by the difficulty associated to the mathematical analysis of (15), but our empirical results in Section 6 additionally legitimise this, and suggest that the conclusions we draw from (13) are broadly applicable to (15). This is perhaps unsurprising: for the special case where $M = N$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$, it can be shown that the Nyström approximation is exact so that (15) and $\hat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ are identical to (13) and $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$.

4.3 Posteriors on Infinite-Dimensional Spaces via Projection

Having developed the tractable projected diffusion $(\widehat{F}^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, we now seek to use this projection for approximation of the Bayes posterior Π_B . To this end, first note that we can characterise the Bayes posterior via $\Pi_B \in \mathcal{P}(H_k)$ given by $\Pi_B \sim \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t)$. It might thus appear reasonable to expect that the limiting distribution $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^M)$ given by $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M} \sim \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{F}^{1:M}(t)$ evolved via (15) can approximate an M -dimensional summary of Π_B . Specifically, we might expect the limiting distribution of $\widehat{\text{Proj}}[F(t)]$ in (11) constructed using components \widehat{F}^m sampled from $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ to follow a distribution that is roughly equal to Π_B . But a construction like this would restrict posterior uncertainty to an M -dimensional subspace of H_k , and lead to miscalibrated representations of uncertainty. In particular, if we wanted to quantify the posterior uncertainty of functions in H_k that are far outside of the M -dimensional subspace given by $\text{span}\{\widehat{e}_m : 1 \leq m \leq M\}$, their uncertainty would degenerate to zero. Clearly, this is undesirable: these are *precisely* the types of functions in H_k for which we have the highest degree of uncertainty.

Fortunately, we can construct a much smarter approximation that rectifies this issue and which we illustrate in Figure 3. The key insight is that to provide uncertainty on the remaining dimensions of H_k , we have to push the finite-dimensional randomness from $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ into the infinite-dimensional space H_k . The algorithm we propose implements this pushforward approximately, using the same logic that underlies SVGPs: In particular, we consider for a particular choice of $\tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)$ the measure

$$\widehat{\Pi}_\tau := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\tau(u), \quad (16)$$

which can be understood as a member of the non-parametric variational family given by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_M := \left\{ \widehat{\Pi}_\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M) \right\} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H_k). \quad (17)$$

While a classic variational method would seek to find an optimal value of τ through some optimisation routine, our approach is different. Rather than attempting to solve a difficult optimisation problem like this over a non-parametric variational family, we instead *hand-select* a τ which we know how to sample from relatively cheaply, and which we hypothesise provides a nearly-optimal variational approximation—a hypothesis that we prove to be true in Section 5. In particular, we advocate for choosing

$$\tau = \widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M},$$

which is the limiting measure of (15), and motivate why this is sensible. The next section provides this motivation from an intuitive and practical standpoint, while Section 5 does so from a theoretical vantage point.

4.4 Approximate Inference via Sufficiency

Before explaining our approximation, we have to introduce a number of relevant objects. First, we define $\widehat{\Pi}_B^{1:M} = \widehat{\phi}^{1:M} \# \Pi_B$, where $\#$ denotes the pushforward operator, and $\widehat{\phi}^{1:M}(f) := \langle f, \widehat{e}^{1:M} \rangle = (\langle f, \widehat{e}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle f, \widehat{e}_M \rangle)^\top$ denotes the function $\widehat{\phi}^{1:M} : H_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ that maps $f \in H_k$ into the M largest *estimated* components $\widehat{F}^1, \widehat{F}^2, \dots, \widehat{F}^M$ used in (11). In other words,

$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:M}$ is really the Bayes posterior corresponding to the conditional distribution given by $\widehat{F}^{1:M} \mid y_{1:N}$, so that $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:M}(A') = \mathbb{P}(\widehat{F}^{1:M} \in A' \mid y_{1:N})$ for all measurable subsets $A' \subset \mathbb{R}^M$. Since our ultimate goal is to approximate the predictive distribution of $F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \mid y_{1:N}$ for $F \mid y_{1:N} \sim \Pi_{\mathbb{B}}$ and new test points $x_{1:N_*}^* \in \mathcal{X}^{N_*}$, we additionally define the point-wise evaluation functional $\text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*](f) := f(x_{1:N_*}^*)$ for $f \in H_k$. As the law of total probability implies that $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}(B) = \int \mathbb{P}(F \in B \mid y_{1:N}, \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:M}(u)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(H_k)$, we thus obtain for all measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{N_*}$ the exact target predictive distribution as

$$(\text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*] \# \Pi_{\mathbb{B}})(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^M} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in A \mid y_{1:N}, \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u)}_{\text{(I)}} d \underbrace{\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:M}(u)}_{\text{(II)}}, \quad (18)$$

which depends on two generally intractable components (I) and (II) that we approximate.

We provide a tractable approximation via the relation $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}} \approx \widehat{\Pi}_{\tau}$ as defined in (16), so that (I) and (II) are approximated with $\mathbb{P}(F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in A \mid \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u)$ and $\tau = \widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M}$, respectively. Here, the approximation of (II) relies on the reasonable assumption that

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M} \approx \widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:M}, \quad (19)$$

which is motivated by the developments of Section 4.2. The approximation of (I) in turn is motivated by the idea that conditioning on $\widehat{F}^{1:M}$ is approximately *sufficient*, so that the additional conditioning on $y_{1:N}$ is not required, motivating

$$\mathbb{P}(F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in A \mid y_{1:N}, \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) \approx \mathbb{P}(F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in A \mid \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (20)$$

This approximation is intimately related to one of the key ingredients of SVGPs, whose variational approximation similarly suppress dependence on $y_{1:N}$, and only condition on $M \ll N$ so-called inducing points (see Titsias, 2009).

Plugging (20) into (18) now gives rise to our final approximation $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty} \in \mathcal{P}_2(H_k)$ of $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}$, which for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(H_k)$ is defined as

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}(B) := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in B \mid \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M}(u). \quad (21)$$

Based on $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}$, we can approximate the posterior at test points $x_{1:N_*}^*$ in (18) via

$$(\text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*] \# \widehat{\Pi}_{\infty})(A) = \int \mathbb{P}(F(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in A \mid \widehat{F}^{1:M} = u) d\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M}(u), \quad (22)$$

which can be sampled from by following the algorithm described in Section 4.5.

In summary, to move from $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}$ to $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}$, we used a sequence of steps illustrated in Figure 3. This relied on two key ingredients: the approximation of the pushforward by estimated projection in (19), and the sufficiency condition in (20). Generally, these two approximations do *not* hold with equality. The one notable exception to this is the setting where both $M = N$, and $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$. For this special case, $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M} = \widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:N}$ and therefore $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty} = \Pi_{\mathbb{B}}$, so that the method proposed in Section 4.5 is an exact sampling algorithm for $\Pi_{\mathbb{B}}$.¹¹

11. The fact that $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M} \neq \widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:N}$ can be understood by decomposing $\widehat{\Pi}_{\infty}^{1:M}$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathbb{B}}^{1:N}$ into their likelihood and prior components. When $M < N$, the likelihoods differ. For $M = N$, the likelihoods match, and the only difference comes from the prior, and specifically the estimated eigenvalues. If $M = N$ and we choose $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$ for the covariance operator C , this difference also vanishes (cf. Appendix H).




Figure 3: Projected Langevin Sampling (PLS) implements an approximate sampling procedure for targeting the Bayes posterior Π_B . In particular, an M -dimensional Langevin SDE $(\widehat{F}^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is obtained by projection and estimation and approximated using Euler-Maruyama discretisation. Based on the approximation $\widehat{F}^{1:M}(T) \approx \widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ for large enough T , this allows us to approximate Π_B as $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty$ via Matheron's Rule, which implements the integration in (22).

4.5 Projected Langevin Sampling (PLS)

Whether we choose to conduct inference with $M = N$ or $M \ll N$, the algorithm we propose is the same. Drawing samples that are distributed according to $\text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*] \# \Pi_\infty$ is straightforward and proceeds in two steps: first, we evolve J independent SDEs as in (15) to obtain draws $\widehat{F}_1^{1:M}, \widehat{F}_2^{1:M}, \dots, \widehat{F}_J^{1:M}$ from the distribution $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$. Second, we then use Matheron's Rule (see e.g. Journal and Huijbregts, 1976; Wilson et al., 2020) to convert them

into samples from $\text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*]\#\widehat{\Pi}_\infty$ via the conditional distributions on the righthand side of Equation (20). As F is a GRE and $\widehat{F}^{1:M}$ is linear in F , these distributions are themselves conditionally Gaussian, so that computation scales as $\mathcal{O}(M^3 + JM^2)$ (cf. Appendix I). In other words, we obtain samples by

1. Sampling the initial conditions of our J prerequisite SDEs as $\widehat{F}_j^{1:M}(0) \sim \rho$ where $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^M)$ is a user-chosen initial distribution and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$;
2. Using the Euler-Maruyama discretisation to simulate SDEs with initial condition $\widehat{F}_j^{1:M}(0)$ forward until time T according to (15), thereby obtaining J approximate¹² samples $\widehat{F}_j^{1:M}(T) \sim \widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$;
3. Applying Matheron’s rule (Journel and Huijbregts, 1976; Wilson et al., 2020) to implement the integration on the right of (1) for any arbitrary set of inputs $x_{1:N_*}^* \in \mathcal{X}^{N_*}$. In particular, we obtain the J approximate posterior samples $F_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) \sim \text{eval}[x_{1:N_*}^*]\#\Pi_\infty$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ as

$$F_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) = G_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) + \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}^*)^\top \left(\widehat{F}_j^{1:M}(T) - \langle G_j, \widehat{e}^{1:M} \rangle \right),$$

where $\widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N_*}$ is the matrix whose entry at (m, n) is $\widehat{e}_m(x_n^*)$, $\widehat{\Lambda}_M := \text{diag}(\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_M$, and where $G_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) = (G_j(x_1^*), \dots, G_j(x_{N_*}^*))^\top$, and $\langle G_j, \widehat{e}^{1:M} \rangle = (\langle G_j, \widehat{e}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle G_j, \widehat{e}_M \rangle)^\top$ are random variables sampled as $(G_j(x_{1:N_*}^*), \langle G_j, \widehat{e}^{1:M} \rangle)^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R_{N_*, M})$ with covariance matrix $R_{N_*, M}$ defined as

$$R_{N_*, M} := \begin{bmatrix} r(x_{1:N_*}, x_{1:N_*}) & \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*})^\top \widehat{\Lambda}_M \\ \widehat{\Lambda}_M \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}) & \widehat{\Lambda}_M \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_*+M) \times (N_*+M)}.$$

Note that since each SDE in the first two steps above can be evolved without interaction, the entire sampling algorithm is embarrassingly parallel over the number of samples J . Thus, while a naive implementation would scale as $\mathcal{O}(M^3 + JM^2)$, parallelisation speeds things up significantly. For example, we found that the differences in computation time between $J = 1$ and $J = 100$ in our parallelised implementation were negligible—something we demonstrate numerically in Section 6 and particularly in Figure 4.

A more detailed version of the algorithm can be found in Appendix N, which also includes further implementation details. Since the underlying inferential engine is the projection of the infinite-dimensional Langevin SDE in (4) into a finite-dimensional presentation as in (15), we will refer to this algorithm as *projected Langevin sampling* (PLS) throughout the remainder of the paper.

5 Theoretical Analysis and Connections to Previous Methods

So far, the motivation for our algorithm was guided heuristically through two approximations (I) and (II) given by (19) and (20). In the remainder, we demonstrate that these approximations are sound, and that the resulting method can be rigorously justified.

¹² This approximation is due to the finite amount of time T and the discretisation error of the SDE, and vanishes the finer the discretisation gets and the larger T becomes.

To do so, we first study the theoretically optimal approximation Π_M^* for Π_B for the class of approximations mapping the first M components of the orthogonal projection in (11) back to Π_B (cf. Theorem 1). Perhaps surprisingly, we obtain an exact expression for this theoretically optimal approximation Π_M^* , and use it to assess the quality of Π_∞ (cf. Theorem 2). The result is an explicit bound on this difference in terms of the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m\}_{m>M}$ corresponding to the terms that were left out in the projection of (11), illustrating that the error depends on spectral decay of the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ associated to the covariance operator C . In Lemma 3, we quantify this error precisely and show that measured by the Kullback-Leibler divergence, the discrepancy between Π_∞ and Π_M^* decays rapidly as M increases. Further, we show that for the special case of Gaussian likelihoods, the approximation Π_∞ , the measure Π_M^* , and SVGP posteriors all coincide (Lemma 4).

5.1 Assumptions and Notations

For the remainder, we will assume that we can rewrite $-\log p(y_{1:N}|f) =: \ell_N(f(x_{1:N}))$ for an appropriately defined function $\ell_N : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is allowed to depend on $y_{1:N}$. This is strictly more general than the form assumed for the derivation of the WGF in (6)¹³, and more notationally convenient.

Throughout our theoretical developments, we further assume that we have access to the M largest eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ of the covariance operator C . In other words, our theory relates to the limiting measure of the SDE in (13) given by $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$. More specifically, for $F^m = \langle F, e_m \rangle$ for $m = 1, \dots, M$ and $F^{1:M} = (F^1, \dots, F^M)^\top$, our theoretical developments study the distribution given by

$$\Pi_\infty(B) = \int \mathbb{P}(F \in B \mid F^{1:M} = u) d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}(u), \quad (23)$$

for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(H_k)$. This will allow us to ignore the estimation error of $\{\widehat{\lambda}_m, \widehat{e}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and simplify the already challenging mathematical arguments. For certain choices of k and ν , the decomposition $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ is known exactly (Zhu et al., 1997). However, in practice, using Nyström’s method to estimate it induces some estimation error. Nevertheless, this error is generally considered negligible – especially for the M largest eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs (see for instance Section 4.3.2 in Rasmussen (2003) and Koltchinskii and Giné (2000)). While the differences between $\{\widehat{\lambda}_m, \widehat{e}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^M$ mean that our theory leaves the approximation $\Pi_\infty^{1:M} \approx \widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$ unaccounted for, the resulting analysis is still meaningful for the PLS algorithm proposed in Section 4. Notably, when $N = M$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$, this estimation error vanishes completely, so that $\widehat{\Pi}_B^{1:M} = \Pi_\infty^{1:M} = \widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:M}$.

5.2 Characterising Optimal Approximations

In Theorem 2, we will show that Π_∞ is nearly optimal amongst a class of nonparametric variational posteriors. To define this class, we re-interpret $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ in (23) as a parameter that takes values on $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)$ and which indexes our variational approximation. To make this logic explicit, we define for each $\tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)$ the measure

$$\Pi_\tau := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in \cdot \mid F^{1:M} = u) d\tau(u). \quad (24)$$

13. If $-\log p(y_{1:N}|f) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n))$, we can always take $\ell_N(f(x_{1:N})) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n))$.

For each choice of M , the collection of all measures like this defines the non-parametric variational family conditioning on the *unapproximated* components $F^{1:M}$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_M := \{\Pi_\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H_k). \quad (25)$$

Notice also that as previously remarked upon in the discussion of (22), we know that $\Pi_B \in \mathcal{Q}_N$ for the special case where ν is chosen to be the empirical distribution on the data, since the Nyström approximation is exact in this case so that $\widehat{F}^{1:M} = F^{1:M}$ (cf. Appendix H). More generally and perhaps more surprisingly, we can even give a closed form for the optimal variational approximation to Π_B in \mathcal{Q}_M —even when $M < N$ and $\Pi_B \notin \mathcal{Q}_M$. The next result derives this optimal variational approximation.

Theorem 1 *For the optimal variational approximation Π_M^* of Π_B over \mathcal{Q}_M given by*

$$\Pi_M^* := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_M} \text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B),$$

we have that $\Pi_M^ = \Pi_{\tau^*}$ with probability measure $\tau^*(u) \propto \exp(-V^*(u))$, where*

$$V^*(u) := -\log \frac{d\tau^*}{du}(u) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi) \right] + u^T \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_M^{-1} u \quad (26)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Here, $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$, $\Lambda_M := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$, and for $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_u(x_{1:N}) &:= u^T e^{1:M}(x_{1:N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \Sigma(x_{1:N}) &:= r(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) - e^{1:M}(x_{1:N})^T \Lambda_M e^{1:M}(x_{1:N}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $e^{1:M}(x_{1:N}) := (e^m(x_n))_{m,n=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$.

Intriguingly, for the special case of Gaussian likelihood functions, V^* in the above result is quadratic, so that τ^* is a Gaussian measure. This allows us to relate our findings to SVGPs, which variationally approximate GP posteriors using a version of (24) that forces τ to be a Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^M . In light of this, an implication of Theorem 1 is that an SVGP using $F^{1:M}$ as its inducing features is optimal *only* under Gaussian likelihoods. In contrast, outside of the Gaussian likelihood setting, the Gaussianity enforced upon τ implies that SVGPs are increasingly poor approximations the more non-Gaussian the measure τ^* .

5.3 Optimal Approximations and PLS

Having established the optimal approximation Π_M^* over (25) in Theorem 1, our next result shows that the approximation Π_∞ targeted by PLS is provably close to Π_M^* under standard regularity assumptions on the negative log likelihood ℓ_N . To do this, we first derive the explicit form for the limiting measure $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ featuring in Π_∞ as per (23). In particular, we can show (cf. Appendix J) that $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}(u) \propto \exp(-V_\infty(u))$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and

$$V_\infty(u) := \ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N})) + \frac{1}{2} u^T \Lambda_M^{-1} u,$$

where we use $\mu_u(x_{1:N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as defined in (27). To arrive at this result, simply recognise that the SDE in (15) is a finite-dimensional Langevin diffusion, and that V_∞ is the potential associated to this diffusion.

In a similar vein, V^* defined in Theorem 1 can be interpreted as the potential of a Langevin diffusion with stationary distribution τ^* . This raises an immediate question: given that τ^* parameterises the optimal variational measure Π_M^* , what stops us from constructing a conventional Langevin sampler based directly on V^* ? The answer is simple: V^* depends on an intractable M -dimensional integral. In contrast, V_∞ is tractable, so that constructing PLS as the Langevin diffusion that draws approximate samples from τ_∞ is computationally feasible.

While V_∞ and V^* are very different in terms of the computational effort required to evaluate them, there is reason to hope that their numerical differences are relatively small. Specifically, a close inspection reveals that V_∞ is a simple approximation to V^* : instead of evaluating the intractable integral by averaging over $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$ as in V^* , the potential V_∞ uses a somewhat coarse approximation, and evaluates the integrand only at the mode for $\xi = 0$. While crude, this is not a bad approximation strategy for sufficiently large M . In fact, the next result quantifies the resulting error between Π_∞ and Π_M^* in KL divergence, and shows it to be negligible whenever the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_m\}_{m>M}$ decay sufficiently quickly and the negative log likelihood is both Lipschitz continuous and convex.

Theorem 2 *Assume that for some $\kappa > 0$, $\ell_N : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a κ -Lipschitz continuous and convex function. Then for any fixed $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\text{KL}(\Pi_\infty, \Pi_M^*) \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})] = \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m \sum_{n=1}^N (e_m(x_n))^2. \quad (28)$$

Further, if $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{X}$ are independently and identically distributed according to ν , then

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{1:N}} \left[\text{KL}(\Pi_\infty, \Pi_M^*) \right] \leq \frac{N\kappa^2}{2} \cdot R_M \quad (29)$$

for the remainder term $R_M = \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2$.

If the remainder term R_M in (29) decays sufficiently fast, the above result provides a strong performance guarantee. Fortunately, the next result shows that R_M does indeed decay at sufficient speeds even under no further assumption—and the decay is substantially faster at the expense of a variety of mild assumptions. Its proof is in Appendix L.2.

Lemma 3 *For the remainder term $R_M = \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2$ in (29), it holds that*

- $R_M = \mathcal{O}(M^{-1})$ regardless of k and ν ;
- $R_M = \mathcal{O}(\exp(-cM))$ for Gaussian kernels and ν being a Gaussian measure or a measure with compact support;
- $R_M = \mathcal{O}(M^{-3(l+1)})$ for Matérn kernels of order $l+1/2$ and ν being a uniform measure with compact support.

According to the asymptotic decay of the remainder R_M derived in Lemma 3, a constant, non-vanishing error persists in (29) for the most general case. However, for commonly chosen smoother kernels k and ν endowed with mild regularity conditions, the message is far more

hopeful: for these situations, $M = \mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{1+\epsilon})$ and $M = \mathcal{O}(N^{1/(3l+3)+\epsilon})$ are sufficient to ensure that this error vanishes for any arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Since Gaussian and Matérn kernels are often the default choice for various kernel-based methods in machine learning, we can therefore expect substantial computational savings without deterioration in approximation quality for a large class of practically relevant settings.

The above two results show that under Lipschitz continuity and convexity for ℓ_N , the measure Π_∞ targeted by PLS is therefore not only computationally efficient, but also guaranteed to be very close to the optimum Π_M^* . Note that these conditions are satisfied in a variety of settings of interest, for instance for the binary classification losses with logistic link functions as in (7). For a comprehensive overview of other losses satisfying these conditions, see Steinwart and Christmann (2008).

It is also important to note that assuming Lipschitz continuity and convexity for ℓ_N is sufficient, but definitely not necessary. In line with this, we find that empirically, Π_∞ continues to be an excellent posterior approximation even when these conditions are violated. Lipschitz continuity and convexity should therefore be understood as technical requirements that are likely far too strict. In fact, the negative log Gaussian likelihood $\ell_N(f(x_{1:N})) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|y_{1:N} - f(x_{1:N})\|^2$ is a simple example demonstrating that targeting Π_∞ can be justified without the prerequisite regularity conditions on ℓ_N . Specifically, even though the Gaussian likelihood is not Lipschitz continuous, Π_∞ is in fact *equal* to Π_M^* .

Lemma 4 *If $\ell_N(f(x_{1:N})) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|y_{1:N} - f(x_{1:N})\|^2$, then $\Pi_\infty^{1:M} = \tau^*$ and $\Pi_\infty = \Pi_M^*$, so that both $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ and Π_∞ are Gaussian measures.*

Both Theorem 2 and Lemma 4 only consider the discrepancy between Π_∞ and Π_M^* , and not that between Π_∞ and the full Bayes posterior Π_B . For the Gaussian likelihoods to which this result applies however, this latter discrepancy has been studied thoroughly in Burt et al. (2019), which showed that for Gaussian likelihoods, the KL divergence between Π_B and Π_M^* can be upper bounded similarly to (28) and (29). Since $\Pi_\infty = \Pi_M^*$ for this setting by Lemma 4, the results in Burt et al. (2019) thus transfer to the target measure Π_∞ of PLS. While similar bounds for non-Gaussian likelihoods are *not* known, the fact that $M = N$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$ implies $\Pi_B \in \mathcal{Q}_N$ combined with the typically rapid decay of $\{\lambda_m\}_{m>M}$ should make us hopeful that for large enough M we will have $\Pi_M^* \approx \Pi_B$.

5.4 Related Approaches

Continuing the comparison with SVGPs (Titsias, 2009), Lemma 4 tells us that the measure Π_∞ targeted by PLS is not only equal to the optimal variational measure Π_M^* , but also to the SVGP approximation in the case of a Gaussian likelihood.¹⁴ Unlike the SVGP, the measure Π_∞ targeted by PLS does not force τ in (25) to be Gaussian, and is therefore close to the optimal variational measure Π_M^* for non-Gaussian likelihoods, too (cf. Theorem 2).

Beyond SVGPs, Hensman et al. (2015b) propose a Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) sampler reliant on the sufficiency condition of SVGP to perform joint posterior inference over kernel hyperparameters and inducing features. Their method can be recast as performing HMC on potential V^* in (26), where the integral is approximated using Gauss-Hermite

14. If the GP is specified via kernel r , and the inducing features are chosen as $U_m = \langle F, e_m \rangle$




Figure 4: **Left:** Our results show that while the increase in computation time for PLS with J is roughly linear, it is negligible relative to the dominant $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$ term. **Middle:** The computational complexity of PLS in N is linear, but thanks to parallelisation this effect is barely noticeable in practice. **Right:** The dominant term for computation is $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$ for both PLS and SVGP, but parallelisation and a much smaller constant factor obscured by the \mathcal{O} -notation make PLS substantively faster, even for large M .

quadrature, and where Bayesian inference is extended to the kernel hyperparameters. Importantly, this prior work has to propose several heuristics to handle the additional intractabilities due to hyperparameter inference, and does *not* show that the proposed HMC sampler can target an approximation of suitable quality. In contrast, Theorem 2 proves that PLS is close to the KL-optimal M -dimensional approximation Π_M^* .

6 Numerical illustrations

In the remainder of the paper, we illustrate the performance and behaviour of PLS by comparing it to SVGP with inducing features $U_m := F(z_m)$, $m = 1, \dots, M$. Notice that PLS relies implicitly on inducing points $z_{1:M}$, since the estimation of the M largest eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs via the Nyström method is based on the kernel matrix $\frac{1}{M}k(z_{1:M}, z_{1:M})$ (see also Appendix G). Thus, to make comparisons fair, we use $M = \sqrt{N}$ inducing points for both methods, and rely on the same techniques to choose kernel hyper-parameters and inducing points $z_{1:M}$ (see Appendix N for details). For all experiments conducted, implementations are available at <https://github.com/jswu18/projected-langevin-sampling>.

Computational complexity. In Appendix N.4, we show that the computational complexity of PLS is of order $\mathcal{O}(M^3 + JNM)$, where J denotes the number of samples drawn. The $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$ term is due to the spectral decomposition of $\frac{1}{M}k(z_{1:M}, z_{1:M})$, which only has to be computed *once* at the start of the algorithm. Since the algorithm is embarrassingly parallel in J , this means that the size of M is the main limiting factor in its scalability. Our implementation exploits this, and results are obtained after parallelising over the 8 CPU cores of a MacBook Pro with an M1 Pro chip and 16GB of memory, and comparing against the standard SVGP implementation in `GPYTORCH` (Gardner et al., 2018). Hyperparameters are fixed across both methods, and we did not batch SVGP to ensure fair comparisons. Figure 4 compares the clock times for PLS and SVGP across 10 replications of fitting a simple 1-dimensional regression with $f(x) = 2 \sin(0.35\pi x^2)$ uniformly sampled on $x \in [-3, 3]$ and injected with independent Gaussian noise distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.2)$. Here, the default settings we consider are $N = 100$, $M = 10$, and $J = 100$. To investigate their effects on computation time, we vary these three different parameters one after the other in our plots.

Regression. Table 4 compares SVGP to PLS for regression tasks on various benchmark data sets. Since the regression likelihood is Gaussian, we know both SVGP and PLS target the optimal M -dimensional approximation Π_M^* (cf. Lemma 4). Unsurprisingly, we obtain similar behaviour, although PLS seems to have an edge overall. This is perhaps not surprising: since we construct the covariance operators in Section 3.5.2 by taking ν to be the empirical measure over the covariates, the kernel r that is implicitly used within PLS is effectively data-adaptive.

Binary Classification. Complementing the regression results, Table 3 compares PLS and SVGP on a binary classification task. Similarly to the regression loss, the classification loss satisfies the necessary requirements for the optimality result in Theorem 15 to apply.¹⁵ In contrast, SVGP is parametrically constrained to a Gaussian variational distribution, and will therefore introduce an approximation error whose magnitude cannot be controlled. Fortunately, the Bernoulli likelihood is still convex, so that the optimal M -dimensional posterior characterised in Theorem 15 will be *unimodal*—and therefore usually close enough to a Gaussian distribution for SVGP to still perform well. Unsurprisingly then, both methods perform relatively similar. While the Table seems to suggest that PLS outperform SVGP, this is an intellectually lazy reading of the numbers: the differences between both methods are not statistically significant.

Poisson Regression. In Figure 5, we consider a Poisson regression with an unknown rate function modeled as $\lambda(x) = f(x)^2$ using simulated data. Doing so corresponds to the likelihood function $p(y_n|f) = (y_n!)^{-1}(f(x_n))^{2y_n} \exp(-(f(x_n))^2)$ for $y_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Importantly, this likelihood function is symmetric with $p(y_n | f) = p(y_n | -f)$, and therefore non-convex in f . As a consequence, Theorem 2 does not apply and we do not have guarantees for PLS. Despite this, PLS still performs remarkably well: it perfectly models the bimodal nature of the posterior, which manifests in the symmetry of the posterior uncertainty around the x-

15. In particular, the classification loss is convex and Lipschitz continuous.

Table 3: Comparison between PLS and SVGP on various classification benchmark data sets. For each data set, results are obtained for five different train/test splits, and we report both mean as well as standard deviation (in brackets). **Fat text** denotes better performance, and * / ** denotes statistical significance at a 95% / 99% level using a 2-sample t -test.

Bernoulli Likelihood				
	PLS	SVGP	PLS	SVGP
	<i>Area Under the Curve</i>		<i>Accuracy</i>	
Breast	98.37 (0.90)	98.44 (0.81)	94.74 (1.48)	94.74 (0.83)
Diabetes	83.38 (2.93)	82.95 (2.59)	76.56 (4.33)	76.46 (4.44)
Heart	91.34 (0.75)	91.21 (0.98)	83.35 (1.83)	83.11 (1.41)
Ionosphere	90.94 (2.85)	92.94 (1.71)	85.91 (4.47)	87.27 (5.35)
Mushrooms	81.77 (2.09)	81.76 (1.95)	75.64 (1.64)	74.83 (2.85)
Rice	94.65 (1.54)	94.04 (1.40)	88.96 (1.14)	88.46 (0.56)
Wine (colour)	94.95 (1.67)	94.99 (1.34)	93.98 (0.63)**	85.98 (3.34)
Yeast	69.16 (2.39)	67.23 (1.03)	64.93 (2.20)	64.13 (1.30)

axis in Figure 5. This is in stark contrast with SVGP, whose unimodal Gaussian variational posterior would prevent it from taking any multimodal shape.

Multimodal Regression with presence of an unknown shift. While the previous examples served to illustrate quantitative and qualitative differences in the inferences between PLS and SVGP, we now give an illustration that demonstrates the capability of our method to efficiently sample from complex and exotic posterior distributions with relative ease. In particular, we will show that as long as c and $\partial_2 c$ as defined in Section 3.5.1 are tractable, then PLS can be applied without any further model-specific adjustments. To do this, we posit the following relationship between the observations y_n and the input features x_n , given for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ by

$$y_n = f(x_n) + s \cdot b + \epsilon_n,$$

where $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is a shift parameter of known magnitude, $b \sim \text{Ber}(\alpha)$ is a Bernoulli random variable with success probability $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $\epsilon_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ represents Gaussian noise.

Table 4: Comparison between PLS and SVGP on various regression benchmark data sets. For each data set, results are obtained for five different train/test splits, and we report both mean as well as standard deviation (in brackets). **Boldface** denotes better performance, and * / ** denotes statistical significance at a 95% / 99% level using a 2-sample t -test. As expected, SVGP and PLS perform similarly, though PLS performs better overall.

	Gaussian Likelihood		Student-T Likelihood	
	PLS	SVGP	PLS	SVGP
<i>Negative Log Likelihood</i>				
Boston	1.075 (0.427)	1.026 (0.267)	1.359 (0.819)	1.174 (0.384)
Concrete	1.182 (0.112)**	1.296 (0.096)	1.277 (0.099)**	1.289 (0.081)
Energy (cooling)	0.769 (0.073)**	1.289 (0.032)	0.948 (0.091)**	1.299 (0.045)
Energy (heating)	0.407 (0.145)	0.253 (0.113)**	0.425 (0.159)	0.287 (0.128)**
Kin8Nm	0.839 (0.027)**	0.914 (0.022)	0.908 (0.032)**	0.915 (0.025)
Wine (quality)	1.345 (0.079)**	1.361 (0.073)	1.353 (0.081)**	1.391 (0.088)
<i>Mean Absolute Error</i>				
Boston	0.360 (0.067)**	0.403 (0.084)	0.368 (0.058)**	0.385 (0.081)
Concrete	0.620 (0.072)**	0.707 (0.072)	0.669 (0.059)**	0.686 (0.057)
Energy (cooling)	0.413 (0.019)**	0.777 (0.031)	0.484 (0.029)**	0.765 (0.033)
Energy (heating)	0.237 (0.020)	0.235 (0.023)**	0.255 (0.031)	0.238 (0.026)**
Kin8Nm	0.423 (0.012)**	0.473 (0.009)	0.441 (0.012)**	0.468 (0.011)
Wine (quality)	0.766 (0.037)**	0.782 (0.034)	0.774 (0.040)**	0.787 (0.036)
<i>Average Interval Width</i>				
Boston	2.30 (0.35)*	2.48 (0.57)	2.584 (0.548)	2.539 (0.758)*
Concrete	3.54 (0.70)	3.58 (0.68)	3.794 (0.840)**	3.805 (0.809)
Energy (cooling)	2.11 (0.30)**	3.17 (0.26)	2.471 (0.300)	3.451 (0.393)
Energy (heating)	1.62 (0.24)	1.39 (0.17)**	1.487 (0.187)	1.398 (0.248)**
Kin8Nm	2.21 (0.05)**	2.39 (0.11)	2.369 (0.109)**	2.386 (0.125)
Wine (quality)	3.62 (0.32)	3.62 (0.36)	3.653 (0.329)	3.644 (0.289)**




Figure 5: Posterior inference for a Poisson regression with rate function $\lambda(x) = f(x)^2$. **Left:** Displayed are $J = 100$ posterior sample draws from PLS. Due to the symmetry of the associated likelihood function around $f = 0$, we observe symmetry around the x-axis. **Right:** Depicted is a histogram displaying the location of the posterior draws from PLS on the left at $x = -0.55$. The shape of the histogram reflects the observed bimodality, and is decidedly non-Gaussian.

Including a Bernoulli random variable that ‘switches on’ the shift results in a multimodal likelihood model, as the unknown function f can only be identified up to the constant shift s (for details, see Appendix N). This model is related to the classical fixed effects approach, a class of models popular in econometrics (Wooldridge, 2010). Intuitively, it describes a setting where we are uncertain whether a measurements y_n has been shifted by a constant s prior to observation. As shown in Figure 6, PLS accurately captures the uncertainty we have about whether or not our data points were shifted prior to observation by generating posterior samples that correspond to both scenarios. As a result, it produces a bimodal distribution whose modes are apart by a distance of almost exactly s .




Figure 6: Posterior inference for a model with possible constant shift $s \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The underlying data was simulated using $f(x) = 2 \sin(1.5\pi x)$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $s = 20$, and $\sigma^2 = 1$. **Left:** Displayed are $J = 50$ posterior sample draws from PLS over $x \in [-3, 3]$ with a vertical line indicating $x = -2.35$. Due to the nature of the model, we observe two different groups of draws: one at the top and one of the bottom. Unsurprisingly, the two groups of draws are separated by a distance of about s . **Right:** Depicted is a histogram displaying the location of posterior draws from PLS on the left at $x = -2.35$. The histogram reflects the observed bimodality and non-Gaussianity.

7 Conclusion

To summarise, we derived the Wasserstein gradient flow for Bayesian inference with a Gaussian random element prior distribution, and for arbitrary likelihood functions. We demonstrated that the WGF can be efficiently implemented by a projection of the Langevin equation from a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) into Euclidean spaces, which led to a new method we call projected Langevin sampling (PLS). Our results show that the posterior targeted by this projected sampler coincides with the optimal M -dimensional posterior approximation for Gaussian likelihoods. Beyond that, we showed that it is the first method to be provably close to the optimal M -dimensional posterior approximation for non-Gaussian likelihoods under mild convexity and Lipschitz assumptions. We concluded by exploring the performance of PLS on several regression and classification tasks, compared it to Sparse variational GPs (SVGPs), and provided demonstrations for some of its capabilities for inference in multi-modal posteriors that are impossible to achieve with SVGPs.

Throughout this development, we made a key observation that motivated much of the paper’s focus: in Section 3.5, we discovered that in order to implement a WGF-powered functional inference scheme, the functions of interest *needed* to lie in an RKHS. It is worth reflecting upon this: we did not choose RKHS spaces *directly*. Rather, they emerged as a consequence of assuming that the relevant function space is a Hilbert space, and that the negative log likelihood is Fréchet differentiable. Although it is not obvious how these assumptions could be relaxed while ensuring that the WGF derived in Section 3.4 can be tractably evolved on a computer, it raises the fundamental question if weaker assumptions could be found to generalise our algorithm to functional inference such as more general Hilbert spaces or Banach spaces. While we believe that these questions could establish an exciting new frontier for functional inference, the underlying mathematics would have to fundamentally depart from the results we derived here.

Turning attention to the methodological gains made in our paper, it is noteworthy that PLS can compete with SVGPs along several dimensions. On top of its ability to make substantive computational savings by being run in parallel, one advantage of our approach seemed to be the ability to accommodate multi-modal posterior distributions. While our illustrations provided evidence that PLS can in principle perform multi-modal inference in fortuitous circumstances, it is worth noting that PLS is essentially a Langevin sampler—a class of algorithms well-known to struggle with multi-modal inference. An important future direction of research on using the WGF to derive functional inference algorithms would be the derivation of a different class of algorithms that is more naturally suited to multi-modal posteriors. Doing so would require a fundamentally new approach: the theoretical guarantees we derived for PLS depended on convexity of the negative log likelihood function—but multi-modality emerges mostly when they are non-identifiable and non-convex. Though the multi-modal setting would require a completely different mathematical toolkit from the one developed in the current paper and is beyond the scope of what we studied here, it poses intriguing questions for further research into functional inference based on WGFs.

Acknowledgements

VW was supported by the Scatchered scholarship and EPSRC grant EP/W005859/1. JK was supported by EPSRC grants EP/W005859/1 and EP/Y011805/1.

Appendix A. Technical background

A.1 Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

Let \mathcal{X} be non-empty set and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ be the set containing all functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ with $H \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ is called Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) if and only if the pointwise evaluation functionals $\pi_x : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f \mapsto f(x)$ are continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. A function $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called kernel, if the kernel matrix $k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) := (k(x_n, x_{n'}))_{n, n'=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is positive semi-definite for all $x_{1:N} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Moore-Aronszajn theorem (Aronszajn, 1950) states that, for every RKHS H , there exists a kernel $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the property that $k(x, \cdot) \in H$ and $\pi_x(f) = \langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The functions $k(x, \cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are called canonical feature maps and the property $f(x) = \langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle$ is called reproducing property.

Conversely, for any kernel k , we can construct a Hilbert space $H \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{R})$ as closure of H_0 defined as

$$H_0 := \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n k(x_n, \cdot) \mid \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}, x_n \in \mathcal{X}, N \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \quad (30)$$

with respect to norm induced by the inner product $\langle \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n k(x_n, \cdot), \sum_{n=1}^N \beta_n k(\hat{x}_n, \cdot) \rangle := \sum_{n, n'=1}^N \alpha_n \beta_n k(x_n, \hat{x}_{n'})$ for all $\alpha_n, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}, x_n, \hat{x}_n \in \mathcal{X}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. The Hilbert space constructed in this way is an RKHS with kernel k (Wendland, 2004, Theorem 10.10).

Additional details about RKHS can be found in Berlinet and Thomas-Agnan (2004), Wendland (2004) and Steinwart and Christmann (2008). Furthermore Schölkopf and Smola (2002) and Hofmann et al. (2008) describe how the theory of RKHS can be used in the context of machine learning.

A.2 Gaussian Random Elements and Gaussian Measures

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be the underlying physical probability space and $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ a (separable) Hilbert space.

The measurable mapping $F : \Omega \rightarrow H$ is called Gaussian Random Element (GRE) in H if $\langle F, h \rangle : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Gaussian random variable for all $h \in H$ ¹⁶ (Van Neerven, 2008, Definition 4.1). If F is a GRE then $\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2] < \infty$ (Van Neerven, 2008, Theorem 4.3) and we can define the mean element $\mathbb{E}[F] \in H$ and the covariance operator $\mathbb{C}[F] : H \rightarrow H$ via

$$\mathbb{E}[F] := \int F(\omega) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbb{C}[F]h := \int F(\omega) \langle F, h \rangle d\mathbb{P}(\omega) - \langle m, h \rangle m \quad (32)$$

for $g \in H$, where the integrals are understood as Bochner integrals. By standard rules for Bochner integrals, one obtains $\langle \mathbb{E}[F], h \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\langle F, h \rangle]$, $\langle \mathbb{C}[F]h, g \rangle = \mathbb{C}[\langle F, h \rangle, \langle F, g \rangle]$ and consequently $\langle F, h \rangle \sim \mathcal{N}(\langle \mathbb{E}[F], h \rangle, \langle \mathbb{C}[F]h, h \rangle)$. The covariance operator $\mathbb{C}[F] : H \rightarrow H$ is a positive, symmetric, trace class operator (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Proposition

¹⁶ In this context a Gaussian random variable $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, 0)$ is defined as Dirac measure at μ

2.16). Conversely, for a given mean element $m \in H$ and given positive, symmetric, trace class operator $C : H \rightarrow H$ there exists a GRE $F : \Omega \rightarrow H$ such that $\mathbb{E}[F] = m$ and $\mathbb{C}[F] = C$ (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Proposition 2.18). We write $F \sim \mathcal{N}(m, C)$ for a GRE with mean element m and covariance operator C .

A probability measure P defined on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(H)$ is called Gaussian measure if and only if the push-forward measure $T\#P : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $B \mapsto T\#P(B) := P(T^{-1}(B))$ is a Gaussian measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ for all bounded, linear functionals $T : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Notice that by Riesz representation theorem every bounded, linear functional T is of the form $T = \langle \cdot, h \rangle$ for a $h \in H$. Hence, by definition, if $F : \Omega \rightarrow H$ is a GRE then the push-forward measure $F\#\mathbb{P}$ is a GM. Consequently, the statements about GREs outlined above carry over to GMs *mutatis mutandis*.

Bogachev (1998) is the authoritative source on Gaussian measures and discusses their properties on general Fréchet spaces. Gaussian measures on Banach and Hilbert spaces are described in Da Prato and Zabczyk (2014). Van Neerven (2008) discusses Banach space valued Gaussian random elements.

Appendix B. Wasserstein gradient flow in $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$

Let $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ be a separable Hilbert space and

$$\mathcal{P}_2(H) := \left\{ \mu : \mathcal{B}(H) \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \mu(H) = 1, \int_H \|u\|^2 d\mu(u) < \infty \right\} \quad (33)$$

be the space of Borel probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(H)$ with finite second moment. Here $\mathcal{B}(H)$ denotes the Borel σ -algebra on H . Define further for $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ the Bochner spaces

$$L^2(Q) := \left\{ f : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \int (f(u))^2 dQ(u) < \infty \right\} \quad (34)$$

$$L^2(Q; H) := \left\{ f : H \rightarrow H \mid \int \langle f(u), f(u) \rangle dQ(u) < \infty \right\} \quad (35)$$

where functions are identified Q -almost everywhere.

We are interested in calculating the Wasserstein gradient flow for

$$L(Q) = \int_H \ell(u) dQ(u) + \text{KL}(Q, \Pi), \quad (36)$$

where $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ and $\ell : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Fréchet differentiable function, $\Pi = \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ is a Gaussian measure on H with covariance operator $C : H \rightarrow H$ (cf. Appendix A.2) and KL the Kullback-Leibler divergence defined as

$$\text{KL}(Q, \Pi) := \int \log \left(\frac{dQ}{d\Pi} \right) (u) dQ(u) \quad (37)$$

for Q dominated by Π where $dQ/d\Pi$ denotes the corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative and $\text{KL}(Q, \Pi) = \infty$ otherwise.

The first step in deriving the Wasserstein gradient flow is to calculate the Wasserstein gradient. We present a definition for the Wasserstein gradient below which is taken from Figalli and Glaudo (2021, Definition 4.2.2) adjusted to the Hilbert space case. A more general definition can be found in Chapter 11.1 of Ambrosio et al. (2005).

Definition 5 Let $L : \mathcal{P}_2(H) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a functional. The Wasserstein gradient at Q is the unique element $\phi \in L^2(Q; H)$ (if it exists) such that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} L(Q(t)) = \int \langle \phi(u), v(u) \rangle dQ(u) \quad (38)$$

for all smooth curves $(Q(t))_{t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ with $Q(0) = Q$ and tangent vector (explanation below) $v \in L^2(Q; H)$ at $t = 0$. We write $\nabla_W L[Q] : H \rightarrow H$ for the Wasserstein gradient ϕ at Q if it exists.

We will now discuss how to construct a curve $(Q(t))_{t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ at Q with tangent vector v . Let $u(t; u_0) \in H$ be the solution to the ODE

$$u(0) = u_0 \quad (39)$$

$$u'(t) = v(u(t)) \quad (40)$$

for $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ with given initial value $u_0 \in H$. We assume that $v \in L^2(Q; H)$ is sufficiently regular so that a solution exists for small enough $\epsilon > 0$. Then $(Q(t))_{t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)} \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ with $Q(t) := u(t; \cdot) \# Q$ is a smooth curve in $L^2(H)$ with tangent vector v at $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$.

Indeed, it suffices to show that (38) holds for all curves constructed via (39) and (40) (Ambrosio et al., 2005, Theorem 8.3.1).

Theorem 6 The Wasserstein gradient for L in (36) is given as

$$\nabla_W L[Q](u) = D\ell(u) + D \log(dQ/d\Pi)(u) \quad (41)$$

for all $u \in H$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ dominated by $\Pi = \mathcal{N}(0, C)$. Notice that $L(Q) = \infty$ whenever Q is not dominated by Π and in this case the Wasserstein gradient is undefined.

Proof Let $(Q(t))$ be the curve constructed in (39) and (40). We denote by $q(t) := dQ(t)/d\Pi$ the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $Q(t)$ with respect to Π which exists for regular enough v in a small enough neighbourhood around $t = 0$.

We start the proof by deriving an equation for the time evolution of $q(t)$. The Hilbert space version of the Fokker-Planck equation (FPE) (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Section 14.2.2) states that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \varphi(u) dQ_t(u) = \int \langle v(u), D\varphi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (42)$$

for all $\varphi \in C_b^2(H)$. For the LHS of the FPE we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \varphi(u) dQ_t(u) = \int \varphi(u) \partial_t q(t, u) d\Pi(u) \quad (43)$$

and for the RHS of the FPE we obtain

$$\int \langle v(u), D\varphi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) = \int \langle v(u), D\varphi(u) \rangle q(t, u) d\Pi(u) \quad (44)$$

$$= \int \langle v(u)q(t, u), D\varphi(u) \rangle d\Pi(u) \quad (45)$$

$$= \int -\text{Tr} (D[v(u)q(t, u)]) \varphi(u) d\Pi(u) \quad (46)$$

$$+ \int \langle C^{-1}u, v(u)q(t, u) \rangle \varphi(u) d\Pi(u) \quad (47)$$

where the last equality holds due to the integration by parts (IBP) formula for Gaussian measures on Hilbert spaces (Da Prato, 2006, Lemma 10.1 and Section 10.4) for regular enough v . Here Tr denotes the trace operator and all Fréchet derivatives are with respect to the u -variable. Technically speaking D is the Friedrichs operator introduced in Section 10 of Da Prato (2006). However, we will always assume Fréchet differentiability of all quantities involved and in this case D coincides with the Fréchet derivative. Combining both calculation gives the equality

$$\int \varphi(u) \partial_t q(t, u) d\Pi(u) \quad (48)$$

$$= \int -\text{Tr} (D[v(u)q(t, u)]) \varphi(u) d\Pi(u) + \int \langle C^{-1}u, v(u)q(t, u) \rangle \varphi(u) d\Pi(u) \quad (49)$$

for all regular enough test functions $\varphi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and consequently

$$\partial_t q(t, u) = -\text{Tr} (D[v(u)q(t, u)]) + \langle C^{-1}u, v(u)q(t, u) \rangle \quad (50)$$

holds for all $u \in H$ and all t in a small enough interval around $t = 0$. Also note that $q(0, \cdot) = q := dQ/d\Pi$ by construction.

We will now calculate the Wasserstein gradient for L at Q . By standard rules for Radon-Nikodym derivatives we obtain

$$L(Q(t)) = \underbrace{\int \ell(u)q(t, u) d\Pi(u)}_{(a)} + \underbrace{\int \log q_t(u)q_t(u) d\Pi(u)}_{(b)}. \quad (51)$$

We calculate for (a)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \ell(u)q(t, u) d\Pi(u) = \int \ell(u) \partial_t q(t, u) d\Pi(u) \quad (52)$$

$$= \int \ell(u) (-\text{Tr} (D[v(u)q(t, u)]) + \langle C^{-1}u, v(u)q(t, u) \rangle) d\Pi(u) \quad (53)$$

$$= \int \langle D\ell(u), v(u)q(t, u) \rangle d\Pi(u) \quad (54)$$

$$= \int \langle D\ell(u), v(u) \rangle dQ_t(u), \quad (55)$$

where the second equality follows from (50) and the third equality from IBP. For (b) we calculate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \log q_t(u) q_t(u) d\Pi(u) \quad (56)$$

$$= \int \partial_t q(t, u) (1 + \log q_t(u)) d\Pi(u) \quad (57)$$

$$= \int (-\text{Tr} (D[v(u)q(t, u)]) + \langle C^{-1}u, v(u)q(t, u) \rangle) (1 + \log q_t(u)) d\Pi(u) \quad (58)$$

$$= \int \langle D(1 + \log q_t(u)), v(u)q(t, u) \rangle d\Pi(u) \quad (59)$$

$$= \int \langle D(\log q_t(u)), v(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (60)$$

where we again use (50) and IBP. We put the calculation for (a) and (b) together and obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} L(Q(t)) = \int \langle D\ell(u) + D \log q_t(u), v(u) \rangle d\Pi(u). \quad (61)$$

We evaluate the RHS of (61) for $t = 0$ and see that the Wasserstein gradient at Q is given as

$$\nabla_W L[Q](u) = D\ell(u) + D \log q(u) \quad (62)$$

for $u \in H$ with $q = dQ/d\Pi$. Note that this is precisely what we would expect from the finite-dimensional case. \blacksquare

The next step is to identify a suitable stochastic process $(F(t))$ with $F(t) : \Omega \rightarrow H$ such that $\text{Law}[F(t)] = Q(t)$ where $Q(t)$ is the WGF at time t .

Theorem 7 *Let $(F(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ be the solution (which we assume exists, see Hairer et al. (2007) or Da Prato and Zabczyk (2014) for conditions) to*

$$F(0) \sim Q_0 \quad (63)$$

$$dF(t) = - (D\ell(F(t)) + C^{-1}F(t)) dt + \sqrt{2}dW(t) \quad (64)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ where $Q_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ is given, C^{-1} is the inverse of the covariance operator C and $(W(t))$ a cylindrical Wiener process. Then $Q(t) := \text{Law}[F(t)]$ follows the Wasserstein gradient flow for L in (38) and starts at Q_0 .

Proof Recall that the loss L in (38) for all Q dominated by Π can be written as

$$L(Q) = \text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B) + \text{const.} \quad (65)$$

where Π_B is the Bayesian posterior (Wild and Wynne, 2022). Recall further that by Bayes theorem

$$\frac{d\Pi_B}{d\Pi}(u) = \frac{p(y|u)}{p(y)} \quad (66)$$

for all $u \in H$ where $p(y|u)$ is the likelihood function, $p(y) = \int p(y|u) d\Pi(u)$ the marginal likelihood and $\ell(u) := -\log p(y|u)$ as introduced in the main text. Note that Π_B is log-concave in the sense of Definition 9.4.9 in Ambrosio et al. (2005) as long as $\ell(u)$ is convex (Ambrosio et al., 2005, Theorem 9.4.11). We will assume ℓ to be convex from now on which is typically true for functional losses. Theorem 11.2.12 in Ambrosio et al. (2005) implies that the Wasserstein gradient flow $(Q(t))$ for L exists and further that the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $Q(t)$ with respect to Π_B exists and that $\rho_t := dQ(t)/d\Pi_B$ satisfies

$$\int_0^T \int_H \partial_t \varphi(t, u) - \langle D \log \rho_t(u), D\varphi(t, u) \rangle dQ_t(u) dt = 0 \quad (67)$$

for all test functions $\varphi : [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We want to rewrite this equation in terms of $q(t) := dQ(t)/d\Pi$. First note that $q(t)$ exists since Π and Π_B are equivalent in our case (Ghosal and Van der Vaart, 2017, Section 1.3). We further have by the chain-rule for Radon-Nikodym densities

$$\log \rho_t(u) = \log(dQ(t)/d\Pi_B)(u) \quad (68)$$

$$= \log q_t(u) + \log(d\Pi/d\Pi_B)(u) \quad (69)$$

$$= \log q_t(u) - \log(d\Pi_B/d\Pi)(u) \quad (70)$$

$$= \log q_t(u) - \log p(y|u) + \log p(y) \quad (71)$$

$$= \log q_t(u) + \ell(u) + \log p(y). \quad (72)$$

We plug this into (67) and obtain the dynamics for $q(t)$ as

$$\int_0^T \int_H \partial_t \varphi(t, u) - \langle D \log q_t(u) + D\ell(u), D\varphi(t, u) \rangle dQ_t(u) dt = 0. \quad (73)$$

Since $D \log q_t + D\ell = \nabla_W L[Q(t)]$ (cf. Theorem 6) we conclude that $q(t)$ indeed satisfies (2) and therefore follows the WGF.

However note that every solution to (73) satisfies (differentiate w.r.t. to time)¹⁷

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \psi(u) dQ_t(u) = - \int_H \langle D \log q_t(u) + D\ell(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (74)$$

for all t and all test functions $\psi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The RHS of (74) is equal to

$$- \int_H \langle D \log q_t(u) + D\ell(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (75)$$

$$= - \int \langle D\ell(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) - \int_H \langle D \log q_t(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (76)$$

$$= - \int \langle D\ell(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) - \int_H \langle Dq_t(u), D\psi(u) \rangle d\Pi(u) \quad (77)$$

$$= - \int \langle D\ell(u), D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) + \int \text{Tr}[D^2\psi(u)] dQ_t(u) - \int \langle C^{-1}u, D\psi(u) \rangle dQ_t(u) \quad (78)$$

17. The reverse may be easier: Multiply both sides of (74) with a test function and then integrate with respect to time. This gives (73).

where the last equality follows from integration by parts for Gaussian measures on Hilbert spaces (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2002, Lemma 11.1.9). We combine (74) and (78) to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \psi(u) dQ_t(u) = \int \mathcal{A}_t \psi(u) dQ_t(u) \quad (79)$$

where \mathcal{A}_t is the Kolmogorov operator defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_t \psi(u) = \text{Tr}[D^2 \psi(u)] + \langle -D\ell(u) - C^{-1}u, D\psi(u) \rangle. \quad (80)$$

We recognise (79) as the Fokker-Planck equation (FPE) associated with the solution to (64) (see Chapter 14.2.2 of Da Prato and Zabczyk (2014) or Bogachev et al. (2008, 2010) for earlier references). Note that any solution $(Q(t))$ to the FPE solves (73) by reversing the above argument. As a consequence $(Q(t))$ satisfies the WGF if and only if it is a solution to the FPE. We can therefore simulate the SDE (64) in order to follow the WGF. ■

Appendix C. The moments of the posterior measure

Our Bayesian model consist of:

- A prior measure $\Pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$
- A likelihood function $p : \mathbb{R}^N \times H \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, i.e. p is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H)$ - $\mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$ measurable and there exists a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\int p(y|f) d\mu(y) = 1. \quad (81)$$

According to Bayes' theorem, the posterior Π_B exists and has a Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to the prior Π given as

$$\frac{d\Pi_B}{d\Pi}(f) = \frac{p(y|f)}{p(y)}, \quad (82)$$

where $p(y) := \int p(y|f) d\Pi(f)$. By definition of the likelihood function, we know that $\gamma(A) := \int_A p(y) d\mu(y)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, is a probability measure. We can now state the theorem.

Theorem 8 *The Bayesian posterior satisfies $\Pi_B \in \mathcal{P}_2(H)$ for γ -almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Proof Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be an (sufficiently large) underlying probability space and $F : \Omega \rightarrow H$, $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ two measurable mappings such that $F \# \mathbb{P} = \Pi$, $Y \# \mathbb{P} \sim \gamma$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \in A | F = f) = \int_A p(y|f) d\mu(y) \quad (83)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $f \in H$. By the above construction, the claim of Theorem 8 holds if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2 | Y = y] < \infty \quad (84)$$

for γ -almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. However, we know by the tower-property of expected values, that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2] = \int \mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2 | Y = y] d\gamma(y). \quad (85)$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2] < \infty$ by Fernique's theorem (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Theorem 2.7), we can immediately conclude that $\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^2 | Y = y] < \infty$ for γ -almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. \blacksquare

Remark 9 *The proof above is identical for finite-dimensional parameters. However, we felt that including an infinite-dimensional version may still provide some additional benefit.*

Furthermore, the result can easily be generalised to arbitrary moments, in the sense that, for a fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^l] < \infty$ implies $\mathbb{E}[\|F\|^l | Y = y] < \infty$ for γ -almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Appendix D. Gaussian random elements with values in the RKHS

In this section we prove the existence of a GRE $F : \Omega \rightarrow H_k$ with covariance operator $C : H_k \rightarrow H_k$ defined in (9). This allows us to effectively parameterise RKHS valued GREs via the kernel k from the RKHS $H = H_k$.

Lemma 10 *Let $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive, symmetric and continuous kernel on a compact metric space \mathcal{X} and $H = H_k$ the associated RKHS. Let further $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be a Borel probability measure with full support and assume that $\int k(x, x) d\nu(x) < \infty$. Then there exists a Gaussian random element $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ in H with covariance operator $C : H \rightarrow H$ given as*

$$Cf = \int k(\cdot, x') f(x') d\nu(x'). \quad (86)$$

Proof Let

$$L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R}) := \left\{ f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \int (f(x))^2 d\nu(x) < \infty \right\} \quad (87)$$

be the space of equivalence classes of ν -almost everywhere identical square-integrable functions with inner product denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$. Define $T_k : L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$ as $T_k f = \int k(\cdot, x') f(x') d\nu(x')$. Note that T_k and C have the same functional form but are defined on different spaces.

Under the assumptions on k we know that T_k is self-adjoint, compact operator and therefore the spectral theorem guarantees the existence of an orthonormal basis $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$ and eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$T_k f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle f, b_n \rangle_2 b_n \quad (88)$$

where the sum converges in $L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$. We can now define $S : \mathcal{L}^2(\nu, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_k$ via

$$Sf = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_n} \langle f, b_n \rangle_2 b_n. \quad (89)$$

It is well-known that S an isometric isomorphism between $L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$ and H_k (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008, Theorem 4.5.1). In particular this means

$$\langle Sf, Sg \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle_2 \quad (90)$$

for all $f, g \in L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$.

According to Theorem 1 in Wild et al. (2022), there exists a GRE G in $L^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$ with $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, T_k)$. Our goal is now to show that $F := S_k \circ G$ is a Gaussian random element in H_k with covariance operator C .

Lemma 5.6 in Kukush (2020) implies that F is a GRE in H_k with covariance operator $ST_k S^*$ where S^* is the adjoint operator of S . It remains to show that $C = ST_k S^*$.

First, note that $S^* : H_k \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\nu, \mathbb{R})$ is characterised by satisfying

$$\langle Sb_i, b_j \rangle = \langle b_i, S^* b_j \rangle_2 \quad (91)$$

for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ since $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal system in H_k . By construction, we know that $Sb_j = \sqrt{\lambda_j} b_j$ and therefore

$$\langle Sb_i, b_j \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \langle Sb_i, Sb_j \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle_2 \quad (92)$$

where the last equality follows from the isometry property of S . Combining (91) and (92) leads to

$$\langle b_i, S^* b_j \rangle_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle_2 \quad (93)$$

for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and therefore $S^* b_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} b_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. It now follows immediately that

$$(ST_k S^*) b_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} ST_k b_j = \lambda_j b_j. \quad (94)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$Cb_j = T_k b_j = \lambda_j b_j \quad (95)$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ by the spectral theorem and therefore $C = ST_k S^*$ by density of $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in H_k as claimed. \blacksquare

We show that F naturally induces a Gaussian process G albeit with a new kernel r which is a smoothed version of k .

Lemma 11 *Let $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ be the GRE in the RKHS $H = H_k$ with covariance operator C defined in (86) (cf. Lemma 10). Define $G(x) := \langle F, k(x, \cdot) \rangle$ and $G := \{G(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Then G is a Gaussian process with kernel r given by*

$$r(x, x') = \int k(x, z)k(z, x') d\nu(z) \quad (96)$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.

Proof The process G is a GP with kernel r if and only if $G(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, r(X, X))$ for all $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. The later is by definition equivalent to

$$\alpha^T G(X) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \alpha^T r(X, X) \alpha). \quad (97)$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$ which we will prove hereafter. Let now $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$ arbitrary. We then have

$$\alpha^T G(X) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n \langle G, k(x_n, \cdot) \rangle \quad (98)$$

$$= \left\langle G, \underbrace{\sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n k(x_n, \cdot)}_{=:h} \right\rangle \quad (99)$$

where the first equality follows from the reproducing property and the second by bilinearity of the scalar product. By definition of GREs (cf. Appendix A.2), we infer from (99) that $\alpha^T G(X)$ is Gaussian random variable and it's variance is given as

$$\mathbb{V}[\alpha^T G(X)] = \langle Ch, h \rangle = \sum_{n, n'=1}^N \alpha_n \alpha_{n'} \langle Ck(x_n, \cdot), k(x_{n'}, \cdot) \rangle. \quad (100)$$

By standard rules for Bochner integrals, we further obtain

$$\langle Ck(x_n, \cdot), k(x_{n'}, \cdot) \rangle = \left\langle \int k(\cdot, z)k(z, x_n) d\nu(z), k(x_{n'}, \cdot) \right\rangle \quad (101)$$

$$= \int \langle k(\cdot, z), k(x_{n'}, \cdot) \rangle k(z, x_n) d\nu(z) \quad (102)$$

$$= \int k(z, x_{n'})k(z, x_n) d\nu(z) \quad (103)$$

$$= r(x_n, x_{n'}) \quad (104)$$

for all $n, n' = 1, \dots, N$ which proves the claim ■

Remark 12 *This kernel r was already proposed in in Section 3.1 of Flaxman et al. (2016) in an effort to construct a Gaussian processes with sample paths that lie in the RKHS $H = H_k$. Our derivation gives a natural interpretation of the corresponding GP as being derived from a GP with sample paths in $L^2(\nu)$ which is equipped with additional smoothness by virtue of the isometric isomorphism S in (89).*

Appendix E. The influence of the measure ν

The Gaussian process G constructed in Lemma 11 has kernel r given as

$$r(x, x') = \int k(x, s)k(s, x') d\nu(s) \quad (105)$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. In principle any Borel measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ ¹⁸ which satisfies the conditions in Lemma 10 leads to a valid GRE in H_k .

One idea is therefore to choose a combination of k and ν such that r can be calculated analytically. This strategy was proposed in Flaxman et al. (2016) and can be very effective. However, it severely restricts the class of available kernels k since few kernel exists that lead to a tractable expression in (105).

Alternatively, we can choose a probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ from which which it is easy to generate samples $\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_{N_S} \sim \nu$ where $N_S \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of samples. This leads to the Monte Carlo estimator

$$r(x, x') \approx \frac{1}{N_S} k(x, \widehat{X}) k(\widehat{X}, x') := \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{n=1}^{N_S} k(x, \widehat{x}_n) k(\widehat{x}_n, x') \quad (106)$$

for r where $\widehat{X} := (\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_{N_S})$.

We now want to illustrate that the kernel effectively becomes useless, if the input data distribution, i.e. the law of X_1, \dots, X_N deviates strongly from ν . To this end, assume that we use a squared exponential kernel k with

$$k(x, x') = \exp(-|x - x'|^2) \quad (107)$$

for $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume further that the data is given as $X_1, \dots, X_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. We now choose $\nu = \mathcal{N}(10, 1)$ and generate samples $\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_{N_S} \sim \nu$. Take now two points x, x' which are in a high-density region of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, e.g. $x = 0$ and $x' = 0.5$, then

$$r(x, x') = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\exp(-|\xi|^2 - |0.5 - \xi|^2) \right] \approx 1.3 \cdot 10^{-43} \quad (108)$$

where $\xi \sim \nu = \mathcal{N}(10, 1)$. Put differently, a kernel matrix based on r would be extremely uninformative. This is why we choose $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$ or an approximation based on sub-samples of x_1, \dots, x_N in all our experiments.

Appendix F. Langevin SDE in ONB representation

The time evolution of the SDE in H is given as (cf. Theorem 7)

$$dF(t) = - (D\ell(F(t)) + C^{-1}F(t)) dt + \sqrt{2}dW(t) \quad (109)$$

for $t \in (0, T]$ and $F(0) = F_0$ with $F_0 \in H$ given. Define now $F^m(t) := \langle F(t), e_m \rangle$ where $\{\lambda_m, e_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is the spectral decomposition of the covariance operator C in (9). Define $\phi : H_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\phi(f) := \langle f, e_m \rangle$ and by linearity it's Fréchet derivatives are given as

¹⁸. In fact ν is only required to be finite and does not need to be a probability measure.

$D\phi(f) = e_m$ and $D^2\phi = 0$ and consequently by Ito's rule (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Chapter 4.4) we obtain

$$dF^m(t) = d\phi(F(t)) \quad (110)$$

$$= -\langle D\ell(F(t)) + C^{-1}F(t), e_m \rangle dt + \sqrt{2}d\langle W(t), e_m \rangle \quad (111)$$

$$= -\langle D\ell(F(t)), e_m \rangle dt - \langle C^{-1}F(t), e_m \rangle dt + \sqrt{2}d\langle W(t), e_m \rangle. \quad (112)$$

Recall, that our loss ℓ is of the form (6) and we therefore can simplify further as

$$dF^m(t) = -\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, F_t(x_n)) \langle k(x_n, \cdot), e_m \rangle dt - \langle F(t), C^{-1}e_m \rangle dt + \sqrt{2}d\langle W(t), e_m \rangle \quad (113)$$

$$= -\left(\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_2 c)(y_n, F_t(x_n)) e_m(x_n) + \frac{F^m(t)}{\lambda_m} \right) dt + \sqrt{2}dB^m(t), \quad (114)$$

where we used the reproducing property and that C^{-1} is self adjoint. Note that $B^m(t) := \langle W(t), e_m \rangle$ ($m = 1, \dots, M$) are stochastically independent Brownian motions by standard properties of the cylindrical Wiener process (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Chapter 4.1.2).

Appendix G. The Nyström method

The Nyström method (Williams and Seeger, 2001) is designed to approximate eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs $\{\lambda_n, b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of the kernel integral operator $T_k : \mathcal{L}_2(\nu; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\nu; \mathbb{R})$ defined as

$$T_k f := \int k(\cdot, x') f(x') d\nu(x') \quad (115)$$

which we introduced in Appendix D. For X_1, \dots, X_N independent samples from ν , the Nyström method calculates the spectral decomposition of $\frac{1}{N}k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) := \frac{1}{N}(k(x_n, x_{n'}))_{n, n'=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as

$$\frac{1}{N}k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) = V\hat{\Lambda}V^T \quad (116)$$

where $V = (v_1 | \dots | v_N)$ and $\hat{\Lambda} := \text{diag}(\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_N)$. Then

$$\hat{b}_n(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\hat{\lambda}_n}} v_n^T k(X, x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\hat{\lambda}_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{nj} k(x_j, x)$$

approximates $b_n(x)$ and $\hat{\lambda}_m$ approximates λ_m .

However, C has the same eigenvalues as T_k and the eigenfunctions are related (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008, Theorem 4.51) with $e_n = \sqrt{\lambda_n} b_n$. We can therefore use

$$\hat{e}_n(x) := \sqrt{\hat{\lambda}_n} \hat{b}_n(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\hat{\lambda}_n}} v_n^T k(X, x) \quad (117)$$

as approximation for e_n .

In many cases, using all available data X_1, \dots, X_N would be computationally prohibitive since the spectral decomposition in (116) costs $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$. However, for typical kernels, such as the squared exponential, the eigenvalues decay very rapidly and only the first few eigenvalues contribute meaningfully to explain the data. We can therefore chose a subsample z_1, \dots, z_M of x_1, \dots, x_N and apply the Nyström method for $z_{1:M} := (z_1, \dots, z_M)$ where $M \ll N$ which leads to $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$ costs. We describe a heuristic in Appendix N for choosing $z_{1:M}$.

Appendix H. Sufficiency of Nyström projections

Lemma 13 *Let $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ be a GRE and $Y_{1:N} \sim \gamma$ be two random mappings such that (cf. Appendix C for a construction)*

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{1:N} \in A | F = f) = \int_A p(y_{1:N} | f) d\mu(y_{1:N}). \quad (118)$$

We assume that the negative log-likelihood is of the form

$$-\log p(y_{1:N} | f) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n)) + \text{const}. \quad (119)$$

We define $\psi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\psi(f(x_{1:N})) := \exp\left(-\sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n)) - \text{const}\right)$. Then it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(F(x^*) \in B | y_{1:N}, \widehat{F}^{1:N}) = \mathbb{P}(F(x^*) \in B | \widehat{F}^{1:N}) \quad (120)$$

for all $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^{N^*}$ and Borel sets $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{N^*}$. Furthermore, if $\nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$, then we have

$$\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:N} = \Pi_\infty^{1:N} = \widehat{\Pi}_B^{1:N} = \Pi_B^{1:N} = \frac{1}{Z} \int \exp(-\widehat{V}_\infty(u)) du \quad (121)$$

where $Z := \int \exp(-\widehat{V}_\infty(u)) du$ and $\widehat{V}_\infty : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given as

$$\widehat{V}_\infty(u) := \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, \sum_{m=1}^N \widehat{e}_m(x_n) u_m) + \frac{1}{2} u^T \widehat{\Lambda}^{-1} u. \quad (122)$$

with $\widehat{\Lambda}$ as defined in Appendix G.

Proof Recall that $\widehat{F}^{1:N} := (\langle F, \widehat{e}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle F, \widehat{e}_N \rangle)^T$ with

$$\widehat{e}_n(x) = \widehat{v}_n^T k_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{v}_{ni} k(x, x_i), \quad (123)$$

where $\widehat{v}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\widehat{\lambda}_n}} v_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (cf. Appendix G). We now want to show that the orthogonal projection $\widehat{\text{Proj}}[f] = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle f, \widehat{e}_n \rangle \widehat{e}_n$ is exact for all data points x_1, \dots, x_N which were used

in the Nyström method, i.e $\widehat{\text{Proj}}[f](x_n) = f(x_n)$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N$. To this end, we define $k_X(\cdot) = (k(x_1, \cdot), \dots, k(x_N, \cdot))^T$ and calculate

$$\widehat{\text{Proj}}[f](x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle f, \widehat{e}_i \rangle \widehat{e}_i(x_n) \quad (124)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{v}_i^T f(x_{1:N}) \widehat{v}_i^T k_X(x_n) \quad (125)$$

$$= f(x_{1:N})^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{v}_i \widehat{v}_i^T \right) k_X(x_n) \quad (126)$$

$$= f(x_{1:N})^T \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\lambda_i} v_i v_i^T \right) k_X(x_n) \quad (127)$$

$$= f(x_{1:N})^T k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N})^{-1} k_X(x_n) \quad (128)$$

$$= f(x_n), \quad (129)$$

for all $n = 1, \dots, N$. This can equivalently be expressed as

$$f(x_{1:N}) = \widehat{\text{Proj}}[f](x_{1:N}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \underbrace{\langle f, \widehat{e}_i \rangle}_{=: \widehat{f}^i} \widehat{e}_i(x_{1:N}) \quad (130)$$

for all $f \in H_k$. Consequently, we have

$$p(y_{1:N}|f) = \psi \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{f}^i \widehat{e}_i(x_{1:N}) \right) \quad (131)$$

and conclude that the conditional density of $Y_{1:N}$ given $F = f$ is a measurable function of $\widehat{f}^{1:N}$. We now write $p(f(x^*)|\widehat{f}^{1:N}, y_{1:N})$ for the pdf of $F(x^*)$ given $(\widehat{F}^{1:N}, Y_{1:N}) = (\widehat{f}^{1:N}, y_{1:N})$ and similarly for other marginal and conditional distributions involved and obtain

$$p(f(x^*)|\widehat{f}^{1:N}, y) = \frac{p(f(x^*), \widehat{f}^{1:N}, y_{1:N})}{p(\widehat{f}^{1:N}, y)} \quad (132)$$

$$= \frac{p(y_{1:N}|f(x^*), \widehat{f}^{1:N}) p(f(x^*)|\widehat{f}^{1:N}) p(\widehat{f}^{1:N})}{p(y_{1:N}|\widehat{f}^{1:N}) p(\widehat{f}^{1:N})}. \quad (133)$$

Here, we notice that $p(y_{1:N}|f(x^*), \widehat{f}^{1:N}) = p(y_{1:N}|\widehat{f}^{1:N})$ because $p(y_{1:N}|f)$ is a measurable function of $\widehat{f}^{1:N}$ and consequently we obtain

$$p(f(x^*)|\widehat{f}^{1:N}, y_{1:N}) = p(f(x^*)|\widehat{f}^{1:N}) \quad (134)$$

which shows (120). It remains to show (121). However, analogous to what we do in in Appendix J, it is easy to show that (15) is a Langevin diffusion with potential

$$\widehat{V}_\infty(u) := \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, \sum_{m=1}^N \widehat{e}_m(x_n) u_m) + \frac{1}{2} u^T \widehat{\Lambda}^{-1} u. \quad (135)$$

Consequently, we immediately infer that $\widehat{\Pi}_\infty^{1:N} \propto \exp(-\widehat{V}_\infty)$ which proves the second equality in (121). Furthermore, it follows from (131) that

$$-\log p(y|\widehat{f}^{1:N}) = -\log \psi\left(\sum_{m=1}^N \widehat{f}^m \widehat{e}_m(x_{1:N})\right) \quad (136)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, \sum_{m=1}^N \widehat{e}_m(x_n) \widehat{f}^m) \quad (137)$$

and for the prior we know that $\widehat{F}^{1:N} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, (\langle C\widehat{e}_m, \widehat{e}_{m'} \rangle)_{m,m'=1}^N\right)$ by definition of a GRE. By definition, v_m is the eigenvector of $\frac{1}{N}k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N})$ with eigenvalue $\widehat{\lambda}_m$ and further $r(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) = \frac{1}{N}k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N})^2$ due to $\nu = \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x_n}$ which leads to

$$\langle C\widehat{e}_m, \widehat{e}_{m'} \rangle = \widehat{v}_m^T r(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) \widehat{v}_{m'} \quad (138)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \widehat{v}_m^T (k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}))^2 \widehat{v}_{m'} \quad (139)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{\lambda}_m \widehat{\lambda}_{m'}}} v_m^T \left(\frac{1}{N}k(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N})\right)^2 v_{m'} \quad (140)$$

$$= \widehat{\lambda}_m \delta_{m,m'}, \quad (141)$$

where $\delta_{m,m'}$ denotes the Kronecker delta. As a result, we have by Bayes theorem

$$p_{\widehat{F}^{1:N}|Y_{1:N}}(u|y_{1:N}) \propto \exp\left(\log p(y_{1:N}|\widehat{F}^{1:N} = u) + \log p_{\widehat{F}^{1:N}}(u)\right) \quad (142)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, \sum_{m=1}^N \widehat{e}_m(x_n) u_m) - \frac{1}{2} u^T \widehat{\Lambda}^{-1} u\right) \quad (143)$$

which proves the claim. ■

Appendix I. Matheron's Rule for Gaussian Random Elements

Matheron's rule (Journel and Huijbregts, 1976; Wilson et al., 2020) is a simple trick to sample a conditional Gaussian. Let $(U, V) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with

$$\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_U \\ \mu_V \end{pmatrix} \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{UU} & \Sigma_{UV} \\ \Sigma_{VU} & \Sigma_{VV} \end{pmatrix} \quad (144)$$

Then $U|V = v \sim \widetilde{U} + \Sigma_{UV} \Sigma_{VV}^{-1} (v - \widetilde{V})$ where $(\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{U}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ is independent from (U, V) . In other words: We can transform a sample from the joint distribution of (U, V) into a sample of the conditional distribution $U|V = v$.

We want to use Matheron's rule to generate samples from $F(X^*)|F^{1:M} = u$ where $X^* \in \mathcal{X}^{N^*}$ is a set of input locations. Since $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ is a GRE, we know that $(F(X^*), F^{1:M})$ is jointly Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix

$$R := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{C}[F(X^*), F(X^*)] & \mathbb{C}[F(X^*), F^{1:M}] \\ \mathbb{C}[F^{1:M}, F(X^*)] & \mathbb{C}[F^{1:M}, F^{1:M}] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (145)$$

We calculate the relevant covariance matrices as

$$\mathbb{C}[F(X^*), F(X^*)] = r(X^*, X^*) \quad \mathbb{C}[F^{1:M}, F^{1:M}] = \Lambda \quad (146)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$ and r is the kernel defined in (10). Further, we have

$$\mathbb{C}[F^m, F(x_n^*)] = \langle Ce_m, k_{x_n^*}(\cdot) \rangle = \lambda_m \langle e_m, k_{x_n^*}(\cdot) \rangle = \lambda_m e_m(x_n^*) \quad (147)$$

for all $m = 1, \dots, M$, $n = 1, \dots, N^*$ and consequently

$$\mathbb{C}[F^{1:M}, F(X^*)] = \Lambda e^{1:M}(X^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N^*}, \quad (148)$$

where $(e^{1:M}(X^*))_{m,n} := e_m(x_n^*)$. Matheron's rule therefore takes the form

$$F(X^*)|F^{1:M} = v \sim U + e^{1:M}(X^*)^T(v - V) \quad (149)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $(U, V) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R)$. Naturally, we do not have access to $e^{1:M}(X^*)$, Λ and R . We therefore use the corresponding approximations

$$\widehat{R} := \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{r}(X^*, X^*) & \widehat{e}^{1:M}(X^*)^T \widehat{\Lambda} \\ \widehat{\Lambda} \widehat{e}^{1:M}(X^*) & \widehat{\Lambda} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (150)$$

where $\widehat{\Lambda}$ and $(\widehat{e}^{1:M}(X^*))_{m,n} := \widehat{e}_m(x_n^*)$ ($m = 1, \dots, M$, $n = 1, \dots, N^*$) are obtained from the Nyström approximation based on the samples $Z := z_{1:M}$ (cf. Appendix G). The kernel matrix is approximated via

$$\widehat{r}(X^*, X^*) := \frac{1}{N^* + M} k(X^*, \widehat{X}) k(\widehat{X}, X^*) \quad (151)$$

with $\widehat{X} := (X^*, Z) \in \mathcal{X}^{N^*+M}$. Notice that inclusion of X^* in \widehat{X} leads to $\widehat{r}(X^*, X^*)$ having full rank N^* .

Appendix J. Asymptotic Analysis of Projected Langevin Sampling

Lemma 14 *Let $F \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ be a GRE and assume that $-\log p(y|f) = \ell_N(f(x_{1:N}))$ for a function $\ell_N : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let further $(\widetilde{F}^{1:M}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the solution to the SDE whose components are given as*

$$d\widetilde{F}^m(t) = - \left(\sum_{n=1}^N (\partial_n \ell_N) \left(\text{Proj}[F(t)](x_{1:N}) \right) e_m(x_n) + \frac{\widetilde{F}^m(t)}{\lambda_m} \right) dt + \sqrt{2} dB^m(t), \quad (152)$$

where $\text{Proj}[F(t)] = \sum_{m=1}^M \widetilde{F}^m(t) e_m$. Notice, that for $\ell_N(f(x_{1:N})) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, f(x_n))$ we recover (15). We want to show that

$$\widetilde{F}^{1:M}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \Pi_\infty^{1:M} \quad (153)$$

for $t \rightarrow \infty$ where $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ has the potential

$$V_\infty(u) = \ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N})) + \frac{1}{2} u^T \Lambda_M^{-1} u + \text{const.} \quad (154)$$

for $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ where $\mu_u(x_{1:N}) = u^T e^{1:M}(x_{1:N})$ and $\Lambda_M = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$.

Proof Let V_∞ be the potential above and note that, by the chain-rule, we have

$$\partial_m V_\infty(u) = \sum_{n=1}^N \partial_n \ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N})) e_m(x_n) + \frac{u_m}{\lambda_m} \quad (155)$$

where ∂_m denotes the derivative with respect to m -th coordinate. Let further $\nabla V_\infty = (\partial_1 V_\infty, \dots, \partial_M V_\infty)^T$ be the gradient of V_∞ . We now immediately recognise (152) as Langevin diffusion for the potential V , since it holds that

$$d\tilde{F}^m(t) = -\partial_m V(\tilde{F}^{1:M}(t)) + \sqrt{2} dB^m(t). \quad (156)$$

It is well established (Roberts and Tweedie, 1996) that—under mild assumption on V —the limiting distribution of (156) is given as $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$. \blacksquare

Appendix K. Optimal Variational Approximation

We prove a slightly more general result. Indeed, we can derive the optimal variational distribution for arbitrary inducing features U with $U := (\langle F, h_m \rangle)_{m=1}^M \in \mathbb{R}^M$ for set of functions $\{h_1, \dots, h_M\} \subset H_k$. Theorem 1 follows for the choice $h_m = e_m$, $m = 1, \dots, M$. Define now for $\tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the measure

$$Q_\tau(A) := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in A | U = u) d\tau(u), \quad (157)$$

for $A \in \mathcal{B}(H_k)$ and the set $\mathcal{Q}_M := \{Q_\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)\} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(H_k)$. We can find a closed form expression for the best posterior approximation in \mathcal{Q}_M .

K.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Below, we derive Theorem 15 below without relying on the decomposition into eigenvalues and eigenvectors, since doing so will allow us to more easily draw upon the result in subsequent analysis. The required steps to translate the results of Theorem 15 into the more intuitively appealing form stated in Theorem 1 are trivial.

Theorem 15 Define Π_M^* as

$$\Pi_M^* := \arg \min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_M} \text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B) \quad (158)$$

where Π_B is the Bayesian posterior. Then Π_M^* satisfies (157) with $\tau^* \propto \exp(-V^*(u))$ with

$$V^*(u) := \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})} \xi) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle Ch, h \rangle \right)^{-1} \quad (159)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Here, $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$, and we define

$$\mu_u(x_{1:N}) := \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), U] \mathbb{C}[U, U]^{-1} u \quad (160)$$

$$\Sigma(x_{1:N}) := \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), F(x_{1:N})] - \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), U] \mathbb{C}[U, U]^{-1} \mathbb{C}[U, F(x_{1:N})] \quad (161)$$

$$\langle Ch, h \rangle := \left(\langle Ch_m, h_{m'} \rangle \right)_{m, m'=1}^M \quad (162)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Notice that by standard properties of the GRE these covariance terms can be expressed in terms of the covariance operator C .

Proof Let $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_M$ be of the form (157) with probability measure τ . By Theorem 4 in Wild and Wynne (2022), we know that

$$\text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B) = \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\ell_N(f(x_{1:N})) \right] + \text{KL}(\tau, \Pi_U) + \log p(y) \quad (163)$$

where Π_U is the prior law of U given as $\mathcal{N}(0, \langle Ch, h \rangle)$. Furthermore, we know that $F(X)|U$ is Gaussian for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_M$ by definition \mathcal{Q}_M . We therefore know by standard properties of Gaussians that

$$F(x_{1:N})|U = u \sim \mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi \quad (164)$$

for fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and a $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$. We can therefore condition on $U = u$ and use the tower property of expected values to obtain

$$\text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^M} \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi) \right] d\tau(u) + \text{KL}(\tau, \Pi_U) + \log p(y). \quad (165)$$

We now define $L(\tau) := \int \phi(u) d\tau + \text{KL}(\tau, \Pi_U)$ with $\phi(u) := \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi) \right]$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)$. From the above calculations, it then immediately follows that

$$\min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \text{KL}(Q, \Pi_B) = \min_{\tau} L(\tau) + \log p(y). \quad (166)$$

However, the global minimiser of L is well-known and given as $\tau^* \propto \exp(-V^*(u))$ (Knoblauch et al., 2019, Theorem 1) with potential

$$V^*(u) = \phi(u) - \log \frac{d\Pi_U}{du}(u) = \phi(u) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle Ch, h \rangle \right)^{-1}. \quad (167)$$

This proves our claim. ■

Appendix L. Optimality of Projected Langevin Sampling

Let $\{\lambda_n, e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be the eigenvalue-eigenfunction pairs of the covariance operator C with $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots$ and define $F^m := \langle F, e_m \rangle$, $m = 1, \dots, M$ and $F^{1:M} := (F^1, \dots, F^M)^T$. We simulate according to the PLS algorithm and obtain $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ with potential V_∞ as derived in Appendix J. The PLS approximation to the posterior is defined as

$$\Pi_\infty(A) := \int \mathbb{P}(F \in A \mid F^{1:M} = u) d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}(u) \quad (168)$$

for $A \in \mathcal{B}(H_k)$. By construction, clearly $\Pi_\infty \in \mathcal{Q}_M$ and so it is natural to compare Π_∞ to the optimal measure Π_M^* of Theorem 15.

L.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof Let Π the Gaussian prior measure. Define the map $\Phi : H_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ as $\Phi(f) := \langle f, e^{1:M} \rangle := (\langle f, e_m \rangle)_{m=1}^M$. The by construction we have

$$\Phi \# \Pi_\infty = \Pi_\infty^{1:M} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \# \Pi_M^* = \tau^*. \quad (169)$$

Furthermore $\Pi_\infty \in \mathcal{Q}$ means that Π_∞ is dominated by the prior measure Π and of the form (Matthews et al., 2016; Wild et al., 2023)

$$\frac{d\Pi_\infty}{d\Pi}(f) = \frac{d(\Phi \# \hat{\Pi})}{d(\Phi \# \Pi)}(\phi(f)) = \frac{d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}}{d(\mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_M))}(\phi(f)) \quad (170)$$

and similarly for Π_M^*

$$\frac{d\Pi_M^*}{d\Pi}(f) = \frac{d(\Phi \# \Pi_M^*)}{d(\Phi \# \Pi)}(\phi(f)) = \frac{d\tau^*}{d(\mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_M))}(\phi(f)) \quad (171)$$

for all $f \in H_k$. Here $\Lambda_M := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$, Consequently, we have by standard rules for Radon-Nikodym derivatives that

$$\frac{d\Pi_\infty}{d\Pi_M^*}(f) = \frac{d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}}{d\tau^*}(\phi(f)) \quad (172)$$

for all $f \in H_k$. We can now calculate the KL-divergence as

$$\text{KL}(\Pi_\infty, \Pi_M^*) = \int_H \log \left(\frac{d\Pi_\infty}{d\Pi_M^*} \right) (f) d\Pi_\infty(f) \quad (173)$$

$$= \int_H \log \left(\frac{d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}}{d\tau^*} \right) (\phi(f)) d\Pi_\infty(f) \quad (174)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^M} \log \frac{d\Pi_\infty^{1:M}}{d\tau^*}(u) d\tau_\infty(u) \quad (175)$$

$$= \text{KL}(\Pi_\infty^{1:M}, \tau^*) \quad (176)$$

where we applied the change of measure formula. It remains to find an upper bound for the KL-divergence between the two probability measures $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}, \tau^* \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^M)$.

By Theorem 15, we know that τ^* has potential given as

$$V^*(u) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})} \xi) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle Ch, h \rangle \right)^{-1} \quad (177)$$

where $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$. For $h_m = e_m$ the mean vector and covariance matrix can be calculated as

$$\mu_u(x_{1:N}) := \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), U] \mathbb{C}[U, U]^{-1} u \quad (178)$$

$$= \langle Ck_{x_{1:N}}(\cdot), e^{1:M} \rangle (\langle Ce^{1:M}, e^{1:M} \rangle)^{-1} u \quad (179)$$

$$= e^{1:M} (x_{1:N})^T \Lambda_M (\Lambda_M)^{-1} u \quad (180)$$

$$= e^{1:M} (x_{1:N})^T u \quad (181)$$

and further

$$\Sigma(x_{1:N}) := \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), F(x_{1:N})] - \mathbb{C}[F(x_{1:N}), U]\mathbb{C}[U, U]^{-1}\mathbb{C}[U, F(x_{1:N})] \quad (182)$$

$$= r(x_{1:N}, x_{1:N}) - e^{1:M}(x_{1:N})^T \Lambda_M e^{1:M}(x_{1:N}) \quad (183)$$

where $e^{1:M}(x_{1:N}) := (e^m(x_n))_{m,n=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$.

Further, the potential of $\Pi_\infty^{1:M}$ is given as (cf. Appendix J)

$$V_\infty(u) = \ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N})) + \frac{1}{2}u^T \Lambda_M^{-1}u \quad (184)$$

where the second equality follows from the definition of ℓ_N and the calculations for $\mu_u(X)$. Due to the convexity of ℓ_N , we obtain from Jensen's inequality

$$V^*(u) = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi) \right] + \frac{1}{2}u^T \Lambda_M^{-1}u \quad (185)$$

$$\geq \ell_N \left(\mathbb{E}_\xi [\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})}\xi] \right) + \frac{1}{2}u^T \Lambda_M^{-1}u \quad (186)$$

$$= V_\infty(u). \quad (187)$$

By Lemma 3 in Dalalyan (2017) this implies that

$$\text{KL}(\Pi_\infty^{1:M}, \tau^*) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_U \left[|V^*(U) - V_\infty(U)|^2 \right] \quad (188)$$

where $U \sim \Pi_\infty^{1:M}$. We now calculate

$$\mathbb{E}_U \left[|V^*(U) - V_\infty(U)|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_U \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [\ell_N(\mu_U(x_{1:N})) - \ell_N(\mu_U(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma}\xi)] \right|^2 \right] \quad (189)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_U \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\left| \ell_N(\mu_U(x_{1:N})) - \ell_N(\mu_U(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma}\xi) \right|^2 \right] \quad (190)$$

$$\leq \kappa^2 \mathbb{E}_U \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\left| \sqrt{\Sigma}(x_{1:N})\xi \right|^2 \right] \quad (191)$$

$$= \kappa^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{\Sigma}(x_{1:N})\xi \right|^2 \right] \quad (192)$$

$$= \kappa^2 \text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})], \quad (193)$$

where the first inequality is due to Jensen's inequality and the second inequality uses the Lipschitz continuity of ℓ_N .

We combine the results to obtain

$$\text{KL}(\Pi_\infty, \Pi_M^*) = \text{KL}(\Pi_\infty^{1:M}, \tau^*) \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})]. \quad (194)$$

Furthermore, the trace can be simplified to

$$\text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})] = \sum_{n=1}^N r(x_n, x_n) - \sum_{n=1}^M \lambda_n \text{tr}[e_n(x_{1:N})^T e_n(x_{1:N})] \quad (195)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^N r(x_n, x_n) - \sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m \sum_{n=1}^N (e_m(x_n))^2. \quad (196)$$

Furthermore note that

$$r(x, x') = \langle Ck_x(\cdot), k_{x'}(\cdot) \rangle \quad (197)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m \langle k_x, e_m \rangle \langle k_{x'}, e_m \rangle \quad (198)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m e_m(x) e_m(x') \quad (199)$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. We plug this expression back into (196) and obtain

$$\text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})] = \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m \sum_{n=1}^N (e_m(x_n))^2. \quad (200)$$

Furthermore we know that for $X_n \sim \nu$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[(e_m(X_n))^2] = \int (e_m(s))^2 d\nu(s) \quad (201)$$

$$= \lambda_m, \quad (202)$$

due to the isometric isomorphism S introduced in Appendix D. See also Steinwart and Christmann (2008, Theorem 4.51). We combine all calculations and obtain for fixed x_1, \dots, x_N the inequality

$$\text{KL}(\Pi_{\infty}, \Pi_M^*) \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m \sum_{n=1}^N (e_m(x_n))^2 \quad (203)$$

and further for $X_1, \dots, X_N \sim \nu$

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_{1:N}} \left[\text{KL}(\Pi_{\infty}, \Pi_M^*) \right] \leq \frac{N\kappa^2}{2} \sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2 \quad (204)$$

which proves the claim. \blacksquare

The assumptions that ℓ_N is Lipschitz continuous and convex is indeed often satisfied in practice. For example, the binary classification loss with logistic link function introduced in Section 3.5.1 is both convex and Lipschitz continuous (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008). Unfortunately, the squared loss does not satisfy Lipschitz continuity (even though it is convex), but in this case the PLS measure Π_{∞} actually coincides with Π_M^* .

L.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof First, consider the Gaussian kernel. Following the findings of Ritter et al. (1995) summarised in Table 2 and by virtue of the big- \mathcal{O} definition, we can always find M so that for all $m \geq M$, $\lambda_m^2 \leq \lambda_m \leq \exp\{-(\alpha/D)x\}$. Further, we can always choose M large enough so that the function $x \mapsto \exp\{-(\alpha/D)x\}$ is monotonically decreasing for all $x \geq M$. Thus,

$$\sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2 \leq \int_M^{\infty} \exp\{-(\alpha/D)x\} dx = \frac{D}{\alpha} \exp\{-(\alpha/D)M\}.$$

Using similar arguments, in the case of Matérn kernels with uniformly supported distributions on intervals, we can choose M so that for all $m \geq M$, it also holds that we have $\lambda_m^2 \leq m^{-4(l+1)} (\log(m)^{2(D-1)(l+1)})^2 \leq m^{-4l-3}$. Since $x \mapsto x^{-4l-3}$ is monotonically decreasing, it therefore holds that

$$\sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2 \leq \int_M^{\infty} x^{-4l-3} dx = \frac{1}{3(l+3)} M^{-3(l+1)}.$$

For the general case, we follow the same arguments after noting that $\lambda_m = o(m^{-1})$ due to the definition of trace-class operators with spectral decomposition, for which both $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m < \infty$ and $\lambda_m \geq 0$, so that $\lambda_m = o(m^{-1})$. Hence, $\lambda_m^2 = o(m^{-2})$ so that for some M and all $m \geq M$ it holds that

$$\sum_{m=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^2 \leq \int_M^{\infty} x^{-2} dx = M^{-1},$$

which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

L.3 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof According to Theorem 15 the potential of τ^* is given as ($h_m = e_m$)

$$V^*(u) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\ell_N(\mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})} \xi) \right] + \frac{1}{2} u^T \left(\langle Ch, h \rangle \right)^{-1} u \quad (205)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\|Y_{1:N} - \mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})} \xi\|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} u^T \Lambda_M^{-1} u \quad (206)$$

where $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$ and $\Lambda_M = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$. Note that

$$Y_{1:N} - \mu_u(x_{1:N}) + \sqrt{\Sigma(x_{1:N})} \xi \sim \mathcal{N}(y_{1:N} - \mu_u(x_{1:N}), \Sigma(x_{1:N})) \quad (207)$$

and so by Equation 378 in Petersen et al. (2008) we obtain

$$V^*(u) = \text{tr}[\Sigma(x_{1:N})] + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|Y_{1:N} - \mu_u(x_{1:N})\|^2 + u^T \Lambda_M^{-1} u \quad (208)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|Y_{1:N} - \mu_u(x_{1:N})\|^2 + u^T \Lambda_M^{-1} u + \text{const.} \quad (209)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{n=1}^N (y_n - \mu_u(x_n))^2 + u^T \Lambda_m^{-1} u + \text{const.} \quad (210)$$

$$= V_{\infty}(u) + \text{const.}, \quad (211)$$

where the last equality follows from $\mu_u(x_{1:N}) = e^{1:M}(X)^T u$ which we calculated in (181). We therefore conclude that V^* and V_{∞} are the same up to an additive constant in dependent of u which implies that $\tau^* = \Pi_{\infty}^{1:M}$. Since both Π_M^* and Π_{∞} are contained in \mathcal{Q}_M and are parameterised by τ^* and $\Pi_{\infty}^{1:M}$, respectively, this immediately implies that $\Pi_{\infty} = \Pi_M^*$. \blacksquare

Appendix M. Projected Langevin Sampling for other inducing functions

The idea of PLS can be generalised to inducing functions other than $\widehat{e}^{1:M}$. To this end, let now $P : H_k \rightarrow H_M$ be the orthogonal projection onto $H_M := \text{span}(\{h_1, \dots, h_M\}) \subset H_k$, $h = (h_1, \dots, h_M)$ given as

$$Pf = h(\cdot)^T \langle h, h \rangle^{-1} \langle f, h \rangle, \quad (212)$$

where $(\langle h, h \rangle)_{m,m'} = \langle h_m, h_{m'} \rangle$ and $(\langle f, h \rangle)_m = \langle f, h_m \rangle$ for all $m = 1, \dots, M$. We first prove that P is indeed given by expression (212).

Lemma 16 *The orthogonal operator $P : H_k \rightarrow H_M$ is given by expression (212).*

Proof By definition of the orthogonal projection P onto H_M satisfies

$$\|f - P(f)\|_k = \arg \min_{g \in H_M} \|f - g\|_k, \quad (213)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_k$ is the norm induced by the RKHS inner product. Every element in $g \in H_M$ can, by definition, be written as

$$g(x) = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m h_m(x) \quad (214)$$

for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M) \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Exploiting this fact leads to an finite-dimensional optimisation problem for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with solution

$$\alpha^* = \langle h, h \rangle^{-1} \langle f, h \rangle. \quad (215)$$

and hence $P(f) = h(\cdot)^T \alpha^*$. ■

The next step is to derive an evolution equation for the inducing features $U := (U_1, \dots, U_M)^T$ with $U_m := \langle F, h_m \rangle$ ($m = 1, \dots, M$) from the projected Langevin SDE which is given as

$$dF(t) = - (D\ell(P(F(t))) + C^{-1}F(t)) dt + \sqrt{2}dW(t). \quad (216)$$

Theorem 17 *Define $U(t) := \langle F(t), h_m \rangle$ then $U(t)$ satisfies the SDE in \mathbb{R}^M given as*

$$dU(t) = - h(X)(\partial_2 c)(Y, P[F_t](X))dt - \langle C^{-1}F(t), h \rangle dt + \sqrt{2\langle h, h \rangle} dB(t).$$

Here, we denote $h(X) := (h_m(x_n))_{m,n=1}^{M,N} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $(\partial_2(Y, P[F_t](X)))_n := \partial_2 c(y_n, (P[F_t](X))_n)$, $P[F_t](X) = h(X)^T \langle h, h \rangle^{-1} U(t)$, $(\langle C^{-1}F(t), h \rangle)_m = \langle C^{-1}F(t), h_m \rangle$ for $m = 1, \dots, M$, $n = 1, \dots, N$. Furthermore $B(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^M and $\sqrt{\langle h, h \rangle}$ the square-root of the matrix $\langle h, h \rangle$.

Proof We apply Ito's Rule to (216) (Da Prato and Zabczyk, 2014, Chapter 4.4) with $\phi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ defined as $\phi(f) := \langle f, h \rangle$ which gives the dynamics

$$dU(t) = d\phi(F(t)) \quad (217)$$

$$= - \left(\left\langle D\ell(P[F(t)]), h \right\rangle + \langle C^{-1}F(t), h \rangle \right) dt + \sqrt{2\langle h, h \rangle} dB(t). \quad (218)$$

For a loss ℓ of the form (6), we can simplify further by applying the chain-rule for Fréchet derivatives

$$\left\langle D\ell(P[F(t)]), h \right\rangle = h(X)^T (\partial_2 c)(Y, (P[F_t])(X)) \quad (219)$$

which concludes the proof. ■

The SDE for $U(t)$ in Theorem (17) can not be simulated, since we do not have access to $\langle C^{-1}F(t), h \rangle$. However, for the specific choice $h_m = k(z_m, \cdot)$ where $Z = (z_1, \dots, z_M)$ are samples from ν , we can find an approximation for this term.

Lemma 18 *Let z_1, \dots, z_m be iid samples from ν , $h = k_Z(\cdot)$ and let C be the covariance operator defined in (9). Then*

$$\langle C^{-1}f, k_Z \rangle \approx Mk(Z, Z)^{-1}f(Z) \quad (220)$$

for all $f \in H_k$.

Proof Let now $h_m = k(z_m, \cdot)$ and hence $h = k_Z(\cdot)$. By reproducing property we have

$$\langle C^{-1}f, h \rangle = C^{-1}f(Z). \quad (221)$$

We now use a standard Monte Carlo approach by assuming that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \delta_{z_m} \approx \nu. \quad (222)$$

Consequently, we approximate $C : H \rightarrow H$ via for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ via

$$Cf(x) = \int k(x, x')f(x') d\nu(x') \quad (223)$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M k(x, z_m)f(z_m) \quad (224)$$

$$=: \frac{1}{M} k(x, Z)f(Z) \quad (225)$$

which leads to $Cf(Z) \approx \frac{1}{M}k(Z, Z)f(Z)$ and ultimately to

$$(C^{-1}f)(Z) \approx Mk(Z, Z)^{-1}f(Z). \quad (226)$$

This concludes the proof. ■

The combination of Theorem 17 and Lemma 18 leads to a (approximate) SDE for $U(t)$ given as

$$\begin{aligned} dU(t) = & -k(Z, X)(\partial_2 c)(Y, k(X, Z)k(Z, Z)^{-1}U(t))dt \\ & - Mk(Z, Z)^{-1}U(t)dt + \sqrt{2k(Z, Z)}dB(t) \end{aligned} \quad (227)$$

which can be simulated in \mathbb{R}^M . For large $t > 0$ we hope that $U(t) \approx U|Y$. Furthermore, by Matheron's Rule, we can transform the samples from U into posterior samples (cf. Appendix I). The covariance matrices are given as

$$\mathbb{C}(\langle F, k_{x^*} \rangle, \langle F, k_{x^*} \rangle) = r(x^*, x^*), \quad \mathbb{C}(\langle F, k_{x^*} \rangle, U) = r(x^*, Z) \quad \mathbb{C}[U, U] = r(Z, Z), \quad (228)$$

since $G(x) := \langle F, k(x, \cdot) \rangle$ is a GP with kernel r (cf. Lemma 11).

Furthermore, we can also obtain the asymptotic distribution of the SDE $U(t)$ in closed form, since it is a preconditioned Langevin equation.

Theorem 19 *Let $(U(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the solution to the SDE in (227) with $U(0) = U_0$ for a given initial value $U_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Then $U(t) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \widehat{Q}_U$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$ where $\widehat{Q}_U(du) = \widehat{q}_U(u)du$ with*

$$\widehat{q}_U(u) \propto \exp\left(-\sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, k_Z(x_n))^T k(Z, Z)^{-1}u - \frac{M}{2}u^T k(Z, Z)^{-2}u\right), \quad (229)$$

for $u \in \mathbb{R}^M$.

Proof First, define $A := k(Z, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$. Then the SDE in (227) can be rewritten as

$$dU(t) = -A\left(A^{-1}k_Z(X)\partial_2(Y, k_Z(x_n))^T A^{-1}U(t) + MA^{-1}k(Z, Z)^{-1}U(t)\right)dt + \sqrt{2Ad}\beta(t), \quad (230)$$

Further, we define the potential $V : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$V(u) = \sum_{n=1}^N c(y_n, k_Z(x_n))^T A^{-1}u + \frac{M}{2}u^T A^{-2}u \quad (231)$$

and calculate the gradient ∇V as

$$\nabla V(u) = A^{-1}k(Z, X)(\partial_2 c)(Y, k(X, Z)A^{-1}u) + MA^{-2}u. \quad (232)$$

The SDE (227) can therefore be rewritten as

$$dU(t) = -A\nabla V(U(t))dt + \sqrt{2Ad}\beta(t) \quad (233)$$

which is the preconditioned Langevin diffusion with potential V . It is known (Bhattacharya and Jiang, 2023) that

$$U(t) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\kappa} \exp(-V(u)) \quad (234)$$

for $t \rightarrow \infty$ where $\kappa := \int \exp(-V(u)) du$ is the normalising constant. ■

Appendix N. Implementation Details

N.1 Hyperparameter selection

For fair comparison, we shared the same hyperparameters for r across PLS and SVGP. We used an ARD kernel for k when constructing r , tuning the hyperparameters of k . For data sets with $N \leq 2000$ observations (or $N \leq 1000$ for classification), we learned the hyperparameters of k by maximising the exact marginal log-likelihood of a GP with k and a mean zero prior. For a data set with more than 2000 (or 1000 for classification) observations we use the following heuristic taken from Lin et al. (2024):

1. Randomly select a centroid uniformly at random the training data.
2. Select a subset of size 2000 (or 1000 for classification) with the smallest Euclidean distance to the centroid.
3. Learn kernel hyperparameters on the data through regression GP marginal likelihood with kernel k and mean zero prior for this subset.

Repeat the above procedure 10 (or 5 for classification) and average the learned hyperparameters

The inducing points $z_1, \dots, z_M \in \mathcal{X}$ used for the Nyström method in Appendix G were selected following the greedy variance selection method in Burt et al. (2020) and Chen et al. (2018).

N.2 Projected Langevin Sampling Algorithm

Let $\eta > 0$ be the step-size and $T > 0$ be the the end time of our simulation. Define now $U(t) := \widehat{F}^{1:M}(t)$ where $\widehat{F}^{1:M}(t)$ is the solution to the SDE (152) and $t_i := i\eta$ for $i = 0, \dots, I$ with $I = \lfloor T/\eta \rfloor$ and further

$$\widehat{U}(0) \sim Q_0 \tag{235}$$

$$\widehat{U}(t_{i+1}) := \widehat{U}(t_i) - \eta \widehat{e}^{1:M}(X) (\partial_2 c)(Y, \widehat{e}^{1:M}(X)^T \widehat{U}(t_i)) - \eta \widehat{\Lambda}^{-1} \widehat{U}(t_i) + \sqrt{2\eta} \xi_i, \tag{236}$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the step size and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^I$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, I_M)$. Here, we define

$$(\partial_2 c)(Y, \widehat{Y}) := \left(\partial_2 c(y_n, \widehat{y}_n) \right)_{n=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad \widehat{e}^{1:M}(X) := \left(\widehat{e}^m(x_n) \right)_{m,n=1}^{M,N} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \tag{237}$$

for all $Y, \widehat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$.

Notice that (236) is the Euler-Maruyama discretisation of the SDE (152) and therefore $\widehat{U}(t_i) \approx U(t_i) = \widehat{F}^{1:M}(t_i)$ for small enough η .

N.3 Likelihood functions

Regression As discussed in Section 3.5 the Gaussian likelihood $p(y|f) = \mathcal{N}(f(X), \sigma^2 I_N)$ corresponds to the choice $c : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $c(y, \widehat{y}) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (y - \widehat{y})^2$ and consequently

$$\partial_2 c(y, \widehat{y}) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (\widehat{y} - y). \tag{238}$$

Classification In binary classification, we assume a Bernoulli data, i.e.

$$Y_n|F = f \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\phi(f(x_n))). \quad (239)$$

This gives rise to the cost $c : \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$c(y, \hat{y}) = -\log p(y|f) = -y \log \phi(\hat{y}) - (1 - y) \log (1 - \phi(\hat{y})), \quad (240)$$

where $\hat{y} = f(x)$. For our experiments we use the logistic function $\phi(\hat{y}) = (1 + \exp(-\hat{y}))^{-1}$. Due to the well-known property $\phi'(\hat{y}) = \phi(\hat{y})(1 - \phi(\hat{y}))$ we obtain

$$\partial_2 c(y, \hat{y}) = -y(1 - \phi(\hat{y})) + (1 - y)\phi(\hat{y}) \quad (241)$$

for $y \in \{0, 1\}$, $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Poisson Model We choose a Poisson regression model where we assume

$$Y_n|F = f \sim \text{Poisson}((f(x_n))^2). \quad (242)$$

This gives rise to the cost

$$c(y_n, f(x_n)) = -2y_n \log |f(x_n)| + (f(x_n))^2 \quad (243)$$

$$\partial_2 c(y_n, f(x_n)) = -2y_n \frac{\text{sign}(f(x_n))}{|f(x_n)|} + 2f(x_n) \quad (244)$$

$$= -\frac{2y_n}{f(x_n)} + 2f(x_n) \quad (245)$$

for $y_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $f(x_n) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Multimodal Regression with unknown shift Assume that the data Y is generated as

$$Y_n|F = f \sim f(x_n) + Z \cdot c + \sigma \epsilon$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $Z \sim B(\alpha)$, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\sigma > 0$. Essentially, there is a latent variable Z which is unobserved that causes an offset c . This leads to a mixture likelihood for Y given as

$$p(y_n|f(x_n)) = \alpha \mathcal{N}(y_n|f(x_n) + c, \sigma^2) + (1 - \alpha) \mathcal{N}(y_n|f(x_n), \sigma^2)$$

Consequently, we obtain the cost

$$c(y_n, f(x_n)) = -\log p(y_n|f(x_n)) = -\log \left(\alpha \mathcal{N}(y_n|f(x_n) + c, \sigma^2) + (1 - \alpha) \mathcal{N}(y_n|f(x_n), \sigma^2) \right).$$

and the partial derivative with respect to second component is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_2 c(y_n, f(x_n)) = & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^3 p(y_n|f(x_n))} \left(\alpha (y_n - f(x_n) - c) \exp \left(-\frac{(y_n - f(x_n) - c)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + (1 - \alpha) (y_n - f(x_n)) \exp \left(-\frac{(y_n - f(x_n))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1: Projected Langevin Sampling

Input: input data $x_{1:N}$, targets $y_{1:N}$, kernel k , inducing points $z_{1:M}$, step size $\eta > 0$, time horizon T , initialisation prob. measure $Q_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, number of samples J , new points $x_{1:N_*}$

Result: Samples $F_1(x_{1:N_*}), \dots, F_J(x_{1:N_*}) \approx F(x_{1:N_*})|y_{1:N}$

for $j = 1, \dots, J$ **do**

 Initialise $\widehat{U}_j(t_0) \sim Q_0$

for $i = 0, \dots, T/\eta$ **do**

 Generate $\widehat{U}_j(t_{i+1})$ from $\widehat{U}_j(t_i)$ according to the update rule in (236)

 Sample $(G_j(X^*), \langle G_j, h \rangle) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, R_{N_*, M})$ with

$$R_{N_*, M} := \begin{bmatrix} r(x_{1:N_*}, x_{1:N_*}) & \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*})^T \widehat{\Lambda}_M \\ \widehat{\Lambda}_M \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}) & \widehat{\Lambda}_M \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_*+M) \times (N_*+M)} \quad (246)$$

 Calculate

$$F_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) = G_j(x_{1:N_*}^*) + \widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}^*)^\top \left(\widehat{F}_j^{1:M}(T) - \langle G_j, \widehat{e}^{1:M} \rangle \right)$$

 Here, $\widehat{e}^{1:M}(x_{1:N_*}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N_*}$ is the matrix whose entry at (m, n) is $\widehat{e}_m(x_n^*)$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}_M := \text{diag}(\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_M$ (see Appendix G for a definition).

N.4 Time and Space Complexity

This section discusses the time and space complexity requirements of producing $J \in \mathbb{N}$ posterior samples from $F|Y$ with our method.

Training We calculate the spectral decomposition of $\frac{1}{M}k(z_{1:M}, z_{1:M})$ and store the result which can be done in $\mathcal{O}(M^3)$. The update in (236) requires only matrix multiplications which are each dominated by $\mathcal{O}(NM)$.

The total costs therefore are $\mathcal{O}(M^3 + JNM)$. These costs could be reduced further by batch-approximations of the gradient. However, the data set considered in this paper serve illustration purposes only and a batch-approximation was not required.

Prediction Let $x_{1:N_*} \in \mathcal{X}^{N_*}$ be a set of input points for which we want to generate posterior samples, i.e. $F_j(x_{1:N_*}) \approx F(x_{1:N_*})|y_{1:N}$. Generating one sample in (246) requires jointly sampling $(G_j(X^*), \langle G_j, h \rangle)$ from a multivariate Gaussian which is $\mathcal{O}((N_* + M)^3)$ for calculating the Cholesky (or the spectral) decomposition once and then $\mathcal{O}((N_* + M)^2)$ for generating samples. The matrix multiplication is $\mathcal{O}(N_*M)$. Hence we pay $\mathcal{O}((N_* + M)^3)$ upfront for the Cholesky decomposition and then $\mathcal{O}(J(N_* + M)^2)$.

For special kernels, this could be further improved by using the exploiting the ideas discussed in Wilson et al. (2020).

Space Complexity Space complexity in our implementation is $\mathcal{O}(NM + M^2)$ to store the $k(z_{1:M}, x_{1:N})$ and $k(z_{1:M}, z_{1:M})$ matrix.

References

- Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- Nachman Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 68(3):337–404, 1950.
- Alain Berlinet and Christine Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Springer US, 2004.
- Riddhiman Bhattacharya and Tiefeng Jiang. Fast sampling and inference via preconditioned langevin dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07542*, 2023.
- Vladimir Bogachev. *Gaussian Measures*. American Mathematical Society, 1998.
- Vladimir Bogachev, Giuseppe Da Prato, and Michael Röckner. Existence and uniqueness of solutions for fokker–planck equations on hilbert spaces. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 10:487–509, 2010.
- Vladimir I Bogachev, Giuseppe Da Prato, and Michael Röckner. Parabolic equations for measures on infinite-dimensional spaces. In *Dokl. Math*, volume 78, pages 544–549, 2008.
- David Burt, Carl Edward Rasmussen, and Mark Van Der Wilk. Rates of convergence for sparse variational gaussian process regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 862–871. PMLR, 2019.
- David R. Burt, Carl Edward Rasmussen, and Mark van der Wilk. Convergence of sparse variational inference in gaussian processes regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(131):1–63, 2020. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/19-1015.html>.
- Krzysztof Chalupka, Christopher KI Williams, and Iain Murray. A framework for evaluating approximation methods for gaussian process regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14:333–350, 2013.
- Laming Chen, Guoxin Zhang, and Eric Zhou. Fast greedy map inference for determinantal point process to improve recommendation diversity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Giuseppe Da Prato. *An introduction to infinite-dimensional analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. *Second order partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces*, volume 293. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- Arnak S Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(3):651–676, 2017.

- Hugh Dance, Peter Orbanz, and Arthur Gretton. Spectral representations for accurate causal uncertainty quantification with gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14483*, 2024.
- Michael F Driscoll. The reproducing kernel hilbert space structure of the sample paths of a gaussian process. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 1973.
- David Duvenaud. The kernel cookbook: Advice on covariance functions. URL <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/duvenaud/cookbook>, 2014.
- Alessio Figalli and Federico Glaudo. *An invitation to optimal transport, Wasserstein distances, and gradient flows*. European Mathematical Society, 2021.
- Seth Flaxman, Dino Sejdinovic, John P. Cunningham, and Sarah Filippi. Bayesian learning of kernel embeddings. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2016.
- Jacob Gardner, Geoff Pleiss, Kilian Q Weinberger, David Bindel, and Andrew G Wilson. GPytorch: Blackbox matrix-matrix Gaussian process inference with GPU acceleration. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Subhashis Ghosal and Aad Van der Vaart. *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*, volume 44. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Tilmann Gneiting. Compactly supported correlation functions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 83(2):493–508, 2002.
- Martin Hairer, Andrew M Stuart, Jochen Voss, and Petter Wiberg. Analysis of spdes arising in path sampling. part i: The gaussian case. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 3(4):587–603, 2005.
- Martin Hairer, Andrew M Stuart, and Jochen Voss. Analysis of spdes arising in path sampling part ii: The nonlinear case. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 2007.
- Martin Hairer, Andrew M Stuart, and Jochen Voss. Signal processing problems on function space: Bayesian formulation, stochastic pdes and effective mcmc methods, 2011.
- James Hensman, Nicolo Fusi, and Neil D Lawrence. Gaussian processes for big data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.6835*, 2013.
- James Hensman, Alexander Matthews, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Scalable variational gaussian process classification. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 351–360. PMLR, 2015a.
- James Hensman, Alexander G Matthews, Maurizio Filippone, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Mcmc for variationally sparse gaussian processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015b.
- Thomas Hofmann, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander J Smola. Kernel methods in machine learning. *Annals of Statistics*, 36(3):1171–1220, 2008.

- Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the fokker–planck equation. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- Andre G Journel and Charles J Huijbregts. *Mining geostatistics*. The Blackburn Press, 1976.
- Jeremias Knoblauch, Jack Jewson, and Theodoros Damoulas. Generalized variational inference: Three arguments for deriving new posteriors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02063*, 2019.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii and Evarist Giné. Random matrix approximation of spectra of integral operators. *Bernoulli*, pages 113–167, 2000.
- Alexander Kukush. *Gaussian measures in Hilbert space: construction and properties*. John Wiley & Sons, 2020.
- Jihao Andreas Lin, Javier Antorán, Shreyas Padhy, David Janz, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, and Alexander Terenin. Sampling from gaussian process posteriors using stochastic gradient descent, 2024.
- Haitao Liu, Yew-Soon Ong, Xiaobo Shen, and Jianfei Cai. When gaussian process meets big data: A review of scalable gps. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(11):4405–4423, 2020.
- Alexander G de G Matthews, James Hensman, Richard Turner, and Zoubin Ghahramani. On sparse variational methods and the kullback-leibler divergence between stochastic processes. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 231–239. PMLR, 2016.
- Felix Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Communications in partial differential equations*, 2001.
- Kaare Brandt Petersen, Michael Syskind Pedersen, et al. The matrix cookbook. *Technical University of Denmark*, 7(15):510, 2008.
- Joaquin Quiñonero-Candela and Carl Edward Rasmussen. A unifying view of sparse approximate Gaussian process regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:1939–1959, 2005.
- Carl Edward Rasmussen. Gaussian processes in machine learning. In *Summer school on machine learning*, pages 63–71. Springer, 2003.
- Klaus Ritter, Grzegorz W Wasilkowski, and Henryk Woźniakowski. Multivariate integration and approximation for random fields satisfying sacks-ylvisaker conditions. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 518–540, 1995.
- Gareth O Roberts and Richard L Tweedie. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, pages 341–363, 1996.
- Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J Smola. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. MIT press, 2002.

- I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer, 2008.
- Ingo Steinwart. When does a gaussian process have its paths in a reproducing kernel hilbert space? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11898*, 2024.
- A. M. Stuart. Inverse problems: A bayesian perspective. *Acta Numerica*, 19:451–559, 2010.
- Michalis Titsias. Variational learning of inducing variables in sparse gaussian processes. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 567–574. PMLR, 2009.
- Michalis Titsias and Miguel Lázaro-Gredilla. Doubly stochastic variational bayes for non-conjugate inference. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1971–1979. PMLR, 2014.
- JMAM Van Neerven. Stochastic evolution equations. *ISEM lecture notes*, 2008.
- Ke Wang, Geoff Pleiss, Jacob Gardner, Stephen Tyree, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Exact gaussian processes on a million data points. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:14648–14659, 2019.
- Max Welling and Yee W Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 681–688, 2011.
- Holger Wendland. *Scattered data approximation*, volume 17. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- Veit Wild and George Wynne. Variational gaussian processes: A functional analysis view. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4955–4971. PMLR, 2022.
- Veit David Wild, Robert Hu, and Dino Sejdinovic. Generalized variational inference in function spaces: Gaussian measures meet bayesian deep learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3716–3730, 2022.
- Veit David Wild, Sahra Ghalebikesabi, Dino Sejdinovic, and Jeremias Knoblauch. A rigorous link between deep ensembles and (variational) bayesian methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Christopher Williams and Matthias Seeger. Using the nyström method to speed up kernel machines. In *Proceedings of the 14th annual conference on neural information processing systems*, pages 682–688, 2001.
- Andrew Wilson and Hannes Nickisch. Kernel interpolation for scalable structured gaussian processes (kiss-gp). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1775–1784. PMLR, 2015.
- James Wilson, Viacheslav Borovitskiy, Alexander Terenin, Peter Mostowsky, and Marc Deisenroth. Efficiently sampling functions from gaussian process posteriors. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10292–10302. PMLR, 2020.

Jeffrey M Wooldridge. *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*. MIT press, 2010.

Huaiyu Zhu, Christopher KI Williams, Richard Rohwer, and Michal Morciniec. Gaussian regression and optimal finite dimensional linear models. Technical report, Aston University, 1997.