

Continuous optimization

Xiaopeng Luo,^{1,2,*} Xin Xu^{1,2*}

¹School of Management and Engineering, Nanjing University,
Nanjing, JS 210008, China

²Department of Chemistry, Princeton University,
Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

Sufficient conditions for the existence of efficient algorithms are established by introducing the concept of contractility for continuous optimization. Then all the possible continuous problems are divided into three categories: contractile in logarithmic time, contractile in polynomial time, or noncontractile. For the first two, we propose an efficient contracting algorithm to find the set of all global minimizers with a theoretical guarantee of linear convergence; for the last one, we discuss possible troubles caused by using the proposed algorithm.

For a fairly general class of problems, it is often impossible to find a universal method that performs well on all possible situations, which is the important connotation of the no free lunch theorems (1–3). This is not due to some kind of curse, but a lack of common features. Actually, a certain commonality is the premise of efficiency. When there is no such a premise, it is always wise to find a subclass that has enough in common and maintains a proper level of generality. And the consequent loss of generality is what we have to pay. Unfortunately, however, we have not found a reasonable payment yet for continuous optimization.

Specifically, global optimization algorithms (4–7), especially model-based methods (8–9) which has gained a wide range of applications (10–13), often attempt to trade-off exploration and exploitation (14) because the sufficient exploration is a guarantee of convergence while the exploitation of limited knowledge seems to be the key to improve efficiency (15,16). But in fact any exploitation based on insufficient information may reduce efficiency or even cause trouble. Therefore, it is necessary to impose some certain restrictions on the problems to ensure the existence of efficient optimization algorithms (1,2). Or in other words, we need to consider what problems can be effectively predicted by using a priori information reasonably.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: luo.permanent@gmail.com (X.L.), xu.permanent@gmail.com (X.X.).

For this purpose we introduce the recently proposed minima distribution (MD) theory (17) as an underlying mathematical “skeleton” of continuous optimization. For an arbitrary continuous function f on a compact set Ω in n -dimensional Euclidean Space \mathcal{R}^n with the global minima f^* and the set of all global minimizers X^* in Ω , the MD $m = m_{f,\Omega}$ could be thought of as a probability density function on Ω such that $\int_{\Omega} f(x)m(x)dx = f^*$. Let $\mu(S) = \int_S dt$ denote the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of $S \subset \mathcal{R}^n$, if $\mu(X^*) > 0$ then $m(x) = 1/\mu(X^*)$ for $x \in X^*$ while $m(x) = 0$ for $x \in \Omega - X^*$. Generally, it should be strictly defined as the weak limit of a certain sequence of nascent MD functions $\{m^{(k)}\}$.

There are different types of the nascent MD functions. Let $m^{(k)}(x) = e^{-kf(x)} / \int_{\Omega} e^{-kf(t)} dt$, then $\int_{\Omega} f(x)m^{(k)}(x)dx$ monotonically decreases to f^* as $k \rightarrow \infty$ if f is not a constant on Ω , implying $\Omega \supset D^{(k)} \supset D^{(k+\Delta k)} \supset X^*$ for every $\Delta k > 0$, where $D^{(k)} = \{x \in \Omega : f(x) \leq \int_{\Omega} f(t)m^{(k)}(t)dt\}$. The density $m^{(k)}$ gradually evolves from a uniform distribution on Ω to the Dirac delta function $\delta(x - x^*)$ when $X^* = x^*$ is a single point set (Fig. 1); but its construction is not related to the point x^* . Moreover, $m^{(k)}$ can also be defined by uniform distributions. For nonnegative integer k , one can obtain a sequence of sets $\{D^{(k)}\}$ by setting $D^{(0)} = \Omega$ and recursively defining $D^{(k+1)} = \{x \in D^{(k)} : f(x) \leq \int_{D^{(k)}} f(t)dt/\mu(D^{(k)})\}$, then $m^{(k)}$ can be given by the probability density function of the uniform distribution on $D^{(k)}$.




Figure 1: Two illustrations of the nascent MD functions. (A to D) The 1D objective function $f_1 = \cos(x^2) + x/5 + 1, x \in [0, 6]$ is visible as line in red and the relevant nascent MD functions $m_1^{(k)}$ with $k = 0, 1, 3$ and 9 are visible as lines in blue; respectively. (E) The 2D objective function $f_2(x) = \cos(x_1^2) + \cos(x_2^2) + x_1/5 + x_2/5 + 2, x = (x_1, x_2) \in [0, 4]^2$. (F to H) The relevant nascent MD functions $m_2^{(k)}$ with $k = 1, 3$ and 9 .

Inspired by the contractility associated with the nascent MD function sequence (see (17) for more details), we expect to design a class of algorithms for finding an approximate solution set containing all global minimizers. Central to the contracting algorithms is a very intuitional strategy that establishes a contracting sequence of closed sets covering X^* . For any nonnegative

integer k , the sequence $\{D^{(k)}\}$ are defined recursively by $D^{(0)} = \Omega$ and

$$D^{(k+1)} = \left\{ x \in D^{(k)} : \mathcal{A}^{(k)} f(x) \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* + u^{(k)} \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\chi^{(k)} = \{\chi_i^{(k)}\}$ are uniformly distributed over $D^{(k)}$ with the sample size $N^{(k)}$, the relevant data values $f_{\chi^{(k)}} = \{f(\chi_i^{(k)})\}$ with the current $f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* = \min(f_{\chi^{(k)}})$ and $f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} = \max(f_{\chi^{(k)}})$, and $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ is an approximation of f w.r.t. the data pairs $(\chi^{(k)}, f_{\chi^{(k)}})$ such that the upper bound

$$\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f(x) - f(x)| \leq u^{(k)} < f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*. \quad (2)$$

And for any possible choice of $u^{(k)}$, we showed the monotonic convergence in Section S2: if f is not a constant on Ω , then $\Omega \supseteq D^{(k)} \supset D^{(k+1)} \supset X^*$ for every $k \geq 0$.

We say the ratio $\lambda^{(k+1)} = \mu(D^{(k+1)})/\mu(D^{(k)})$ is the $(k+1)$ th contraction factor and expect that the upper bound $u^{(k)}$ is not too close to the range $f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$, otherwise it will cause the contraction factor $\lambda^{(k+1)}$ to be close to 1. The possible choices of $u^{(k)}$ often include the median-type $\text{Median} f_{\chi^{(k)}} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$, the mean-type $\text{Mean} f_{\chi^{(k)}} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$ and the middle-type $(f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*)/2$. In the following, we focus on the median-type algorithm which often leads to a stable $\lambda^{(k+1)}$.

The sampling procedure on $D^{(k)}$ embodies the exploration of unknown information and the approximation $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f$ reflects the exploitation of prior information, while Eq. 2 is the key for ensuring a sufficient exploration and issuing a judgment on the conversion of exploration to exploitation. Assume that the residual $\varepsilon^{(k)} = \mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f - f$ follows an independent, identically distributed Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ and standard deviation $\sigma_\varepsilon^{(k)}$, then $\mu_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ and $\sigma_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ can be estimated by the cross-validation (CV) (I8,I9) estimations $\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^{(k)}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^{(k)}$, and a bound for the residual $\varepsilon^{(k)}$ on $D^{(k)}$ is given by $P(|\varepsilon^{(k)}| \leq |\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^{(k)}| + t\sigma_\varepsilon^{(k)}) = 2\Phi(t) - 1$ in a probabilistic sense, where Φ is the standard normal distribution function; in particular, for $t = 3$ it follows that the three-sigma rule of thumb $P(|\varepsilon^{(k)}| \leq |\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^{(k)}| + 3\sigma_\varepsilon^{(k)}) = 0.9973$. Even without the Gaussian assumption, there exists the Chebyshev's inequality $P(|\varepsilon^{(k)}| \leq |\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^{(k)}| + t\sigma_\varepsilon^{(k)}) \geq 1 - 1/t^2$, although it should be regarded as a theoretical tool rather than a practical estimation.

Sometimes an underfit model $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f$ might result in a very rough estimate of the residual bound and eventually lead to convergence failure. To reduce this possibility, we should impose an additional constraint on the global approximation behavior of $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f$, which also ensures the effectiveness of subsequent sampling. Let $r^{(k)}$ be the percentage of $\chi^{(k)}$ falling into $D^{(k+1)}$ and $r_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}$ be the percentage of samples uniformly distributed over $D^{(k)}$ falling into $D^{(k+1)}$, then it is reasonable to require that the difference between $r^{(k)}$ and $r_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}$ is less than a given threshold. Therefore, for example, one could accept the current model $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f$ for creating $D^{(k+1)}$ when $3\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^{(k)} < \text{Median} f_{\chi^{(k)}} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$ and $|r^{(k)} - r_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}| < 1/4$ are satisfied; see Figs. 2 and 3 for examples to illustrate how the contracting algorithm is performed (see Section S1 for technical details).

The efficiency of the contractions can be guaranteed if one can quickly sketch out the overall landscape of the valley in each step and the relevant deviation will not be large enough to dig




Figure 2: Two-dimensional illustration of the performance of the median-type algorithm. (A to F) The first six contractions. The objective function $f(x_1, x_2) = (x_2 - \frac{5.1}{4\pi^2}x_1^2 + \frac{5}{\pi}x_1 - 6)^2 + 10(1 - \frac{1}{8\pi})\cos(x_1) + 10$, $x_1 \in [-5, 10]$, $x_2 \in [0, 15]$ is shown by contour lines with some suitable level marks. The multiple global minima are located at $(-\pi, 12.275)$, $(\pi, 2.275)$ and $(3\pi, 2.475)$ with $f^* = 0.397887358$. For each $0 \leq k \leq 5$, $\chi^{(k)} \in D^{(k)}$, which is used to build the model $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}}f$, is visible as dots in black, the test points used to verify $D^{(k+1)}$ by the current model $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}}f$ is visible as circledots in blue. (G) The trace $\cup_{k=0}^5 \chi^{(k)}$, including 246 points totally, is visible as dots in black. (H) The semilog plots of the error $\text{ERR}(N) = f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* - f^*$ and upper bound $\text{UB}(N) = \max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - f^*|$, where N is the size of $\cup_{i=0}^k \chi^{(i)}$ and the starting point is given by $(0, f_{\chi^{(0)}}^{**} - f^*)$; and after six contractions, the current best solution is $x_{\chi^{(6)}}^* = (9.42466, 2.47526)$ with $f_{\chi^{(6)}}^* = 0.397887367$, $\text{ERR}(246) = 1.03 \times 10^{-8}$ and $\text{UB}(246) = 9.45 \times 10^{-4}$. (I) The numbers of samples, $\{N^{(k)}\}$, are used for the models $\{\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}}f\}_{k=0}^5$. Note that the contractility greatly controls the complexity of models. And one can use this series of models to determine the current approximate solution set $D^{(6)}$ covering all three minimizers, as shown in (F). See Data S1 for technical details.




Figure 3: Lennard-Jones (LJ) conformations of a cluster of n identical neutral atoms (interacting pairwise via the LJ potential). A conformation is a point in the $3n$ -dimensional Euclidean space of coordinates of atomic centers. For a single pair of atoms, the LJ potential in reduced units is given by $u(r) = r^{-12} - 2r^{-6}$, where r is the Euclidean interatomic distance; then the total potential energy $U_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n u(r_{ij})$, where r_{ij} is the distance between atoms i and j in reduced units. (A to C) The global minima conformations for $n = 4, 5$ and 6 , respectively. (D to F) The plots of the current minima $U_n^*(N)$ for $n = 4, 5$ and 6 , respectively, where N is the size of $\cup_{i=0}^k \mathcal{X}^{(i)}$. And the putative global minima are $U_4^* = -6$, $U_5^* = -9.103852$, $U_6^* = -12.712062$, see (20) for details. (G to I) The numbers of samples $\{N^{(k)}\}$ are used in the model $\{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}^{(k)}} U_n\}$ for $n = 4, 5$ and 6 , respectively; and this clearly demonstrates the importance of contractivity for efficiency again. See Data S1 for technical details.

any deep enough hole in the highlands. This requires that the low frequency components of f always play a dominant role on every subset $D^{(k)}$. This meaningful observation prompted us to impose a certain restriction on the Fourier transform of f .

In fact, in order to categorise continuous optimization problems, we need the following three conditions. First, suppose \hat{f} is the Fourier transform of f , then we say that f is a (p, ρ) -type hierarchical low frequency dominant function if there exist a $p > 0$ and a small $\rho > 0$ such that for any $j = 1, 2, \dots$, it holds that

$$\int_{\|\omega\|_{\infty} > 2^{\frac{j-1}{n}} \rho} |\hat{f}(\omega)| d\omega < (1+p) \int_{2^{\frac{j-1}{n}} \rho < \|\omega\|_{\infty} \leq 2^{\frac{j}{n}} \rho} |\hat{f}(\omega)| d\omega. \quad (3)$$

For such a function there exist a class of approximations (i.e., the so-called prolate spheroidal series (21-25)) such that the corresponding error bounds are reduced by a factor of $p/(1+p)$ every time the number of function evaluations doubles, see Section S3 for details. This feature actually implies contractility. And it is worth noting that Eq. 3 does not require \hat{f} to decay very quickly; as a univariate instance, for all $\delta > 0$, $\omega^{-1-\delta}$ satisfies this condition with arbitrary $\rho > 0$ and $p = 1/(2^{\delta} - 1)$. This shows a very important fact that a hierarchical low frequency dominant function is not necessarily differentiable. Second, we say that f is a p -type tempered function on Ω if for every $k \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\text{prctile}(f(\xi), 2^{-(k+1)} \cdot 100\%) > \frac{p}{1+p} \text{prctile}(f(\xi), 2^{-k} \cdot 100\%), \quad (4)$$

where ξ is a uniformly distributed random variable on Ω . It limits the distribution of function values to match the dominant condition Eq. 3. Third, we say that f is a critical regular function on Ω if the set of all critical points of f has a zero n -dimensional Lebesgue measure, where a critical point is a $x \in \Omega$ where the gradient is undefined or is equal to zero. It guarantees that the contraction factor is asymptotically equal to $1/2$ for the median-type algorithm.

Now all the possible continuous problems can be divided into the following three categories. First, f is *contractile in logarithmic time* if there exist $p, \rho > 0$ such that f is not only a (p, ρ) -type hierarchical low frequency dominant function but also a p -type tempered and critical regular function on Ω . For such a function and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $N_{\Omega, f} \geq 1$ and $K \geq 1$ such that after K median-type contractions, it holds that the upper bound $\max_{x \in D^{(K)}} |f(x) - f^*| < \epsilon$, the total number of function evaluations is $\mathcal{O}(N_{\Omega, f} \cdot \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon)$, and the linear convergence rate

$$\frac{\max_{x \in D^{(k+1)}} |f(x) - f^*|}{\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - f^*|} < \frac{p}{1+p}. \quad (5)$$

The contracting algorithm is very suitable for this type of problems because there exists a fixed upper bound $C N_{\Omega, f}$ for every $N^{(k)}$, where the constant C is slightly larger than one (26,27). This is very important because the computational complexity of $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ is closely related to $N^{(k)}$, such as commonly used Gaussian processes (28) or random forests (29). Let this complexity is $\mathcal{O}((N^{(k)})^a)$ hereafter, then we can determine that the time complexity of the median-type algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(N_{\Omega, f}^a \cdot \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon)$. See Section S4 for details.

Second, f is *contractile in polynomial time* if f is a (p, ρ) -type hierarchical low frequency dominant function. For such a function and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $N_{\Omega, f}$, $K \geq 1$ and $l > 1$ such that after K contractions, it holds that the upper bound $\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - f^*| < \epsilon$, the total number of function evaluations is less than $\mathcal{O}(N_{\Omega, f} \cdot 2^{\log \frac{p}{1+p} \epsilon})$, and the convergence rate

$$\frac{\max_{x \in D^{(k+1)}} |f(x) - f^*|}{\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - f^*|} < \left(\frac{p}{1+p} \right)^l. \quad (6)$$

And at this time, the algorithm is not limited to the median-type and these results above hold in the sense of probability. Actually, there is no fixed upper bound for $N^{(k)}$; however, it can often be controlled by $C 2^{kl} N_{\Omega, f}$ since there always exists a weaker version of Eq. 4 that holds with a large probability. So the contracting algorithm is still effective for this type of problems because the contraction of $D^{(k)}$ can greatly reduce the computational cost of the model $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$; similarly, the time complexity of the contracting algorithms is less than $\mathcal{O}(N_{\Omega, f}^a \cdot 2^{a \log \frac{p}{1+p} \epsilon})$. See Section S5 for details.

Third, f is *noncontractile* if (i) f is not a hierarchical low frequency dominant function, for example, a function like noise as shown in Fig. 4A; or (ii) f is a hierarchical low frequency dominant function but the residual bounds of probability are not satisfied in practice so that the contracting condition cannot be met, typical small probability event as shown in Fig. 4D. Theoretically, the contracting algorithm should remain in the state of $k = 0$ because any use of prior information may cause trouble; however, for a function similar to that shown in Fig. 4D, the contractions will still be carried out with a large probability due to the failure of the residual bound estimations, and eventually lead to convergence failure.

For a noncontractile function f , the contracting algorithm is degraded into a model-based approach without any contraction. For a sufficient smooth function $f \in C^s(\Omega)$ with $s > n/2$ on a bounded domain Ω , such as that shown in Fig. 4D, the algorithm can also be done in polynomial time $\mathcal{O}(2^{\frac{na}{(s-n/2)(1-\delta)} \log \frac{1}{2} \epsilon})$, where $0 < \delta \ll 1$; moreover, if f satisfies a α -Hölder condition, i.e., there exist $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that $|f(x') - f(x'')| < C \|x' - x''\|^\alpha$, then the algorithm can be done in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\frac{na}{\alpha(1-\delta)} \log \frac{1}{2} \epsilon})$. But, if f does not satisfy any Hölder condition, then the algorithm shall not be done in polynomial time, for example, if $|f(x') - f(x'')| < C \log(1 + \|x' - x''\|)$, then the time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{na}{1-\delta} \log \epsilon})$. See Section S6 for details.

Finally, we recall the question raised at the beginning of this article: what problems can be effectively predicted by using a priori information reasonably? And the answers are either the sufficient smooth problems or the contractile problems. For the latter, one can use a priori information to continuously reduce the scales of the problem until the required accuracy is met.

References and Notes

1. D. H. Wolpert, W. G. Macready, *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* **1**, 67-82 (1997). doi: 10.1109/4235.585893
2. W. G. Macready, D. H. Wolpert, *Complexity* **1**, 40-46 (1996). doi: 10.1002/cplx.6130010511
3. D. H. Wolpert, *Neural Comput.* **8**, 1341-1390 (1996). doi: 10.1162/neco.1996.8.7.1341




Figure 4: Two examples for noncontractile functions. (A) Gaussian noise function f_1 . (B) Histogram of function value distribution for f_1 . (C) Discrete cosine transform of f_1 . (D) Non-contractile function $f_2(x) = x^2 + e^{-10000*(x+0.7)^2}$. (E) Histogram of function value distribution for f_2 . (F) Discrete cosine transform of f_2 . For details see Data S1.

4. I. Rechenberg, *Evolutions strategie: Optimierung technischer Systeme nach Prinzipien der biologischen Evolution* (Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart, 1973)
5. S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, M. P. Vecchi, *Science* **220**, 671-680 (1983). doi: 10.1126/science.220.4598.67
6. M. Mitchell, *An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996).
7. R. Storn, K. Price, *J. Global Optim.* **11**, 341-359 (1997). doi: 10.1023/A:1008202821328
8. D. R. Jones, M. Schonlau, W. J. Welch, *J. Global Optim.* **13**, 455-492 (1998). doi: 10.1023/A:10083064311
9. B. Shahriari, K. Swersky, Z. Wang, R. P. Adams, N. de Freitas, *Proceedings of the IEEE* **104**, 148-175 (2016). doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2015.2494218
10. A. Seko, A. Togo, H. Hayashi, K. Tsuda, L. Chaput, I. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 205901 (2015). doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.205901
11. S. Kiyohara, H. Oda, K. Tsuda, T. Mizoguchi, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* **55**, 045502 (2016). doi: 10.7567/JJAP.55.045502
12. S. Ju, T. Shiga, L. Feng, Z. Hou, K. Tsuda, J. Shiomi, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 021024 (2017). doi: 10.1103/PhysRevX.7.021024

13. M. Yamawaki¹, M. Ohnishi, S. Ju, J. Shiomi, *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaar4192 (2018). doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aar4192
14. J. Mockus, V. Tiesis, A. Zilinskas, *Toward Global Optimization* **2**, 117-129 (1978). doi: 10.1007/3-540-071
15. A. D. Bull, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **12**, 2879-2904 (2011).
16. J. P. C. Kleijnen, W. van Beers, I. van Nieuwenhuysse, *J. Global Optim.* **54**, 59-73 (2012). doi: 10.1007/s10898-011-9741-y
17. X. Luo, Minima distribution for global optimization. (2018). arXiv: 1812.03457
18. S. Geisser, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **70**, 320-328 (1975). doi: 10.1080/01621459.1975.10479865
19. S. Arlot, A. Celisse, *Statist. Surv.* **4**, 40-79 (2010). doi: 10.1214/09-SS054
20. R. H. Leary,, *J. Global Optim.* **11**, 35-53 (1997). doi: 10.1023/A:1008276425464
21. D. Slepian, H. O. Pollak, *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **40**, 43-64 (1961). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03976.x
22. H. J. Landau, H. O. Pollak, *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **40**, 65-84 (1961). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03977
23. H. J. Landau, H. O. Pollak, *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **41**, 1295-1336 (1962). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1962.tb0
24. D. Slepian, *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **43**, 3009-3057 (1964). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1964.tb01037.x
25. D. Slepian, *Proc. IEEE* **64**, 292-300 (1976). doi: 10.1109/PROC.1976.10110
26. J. P. Boyd, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **25**, 168-176 (2003). doi: 10.1016/S1063-5203(03)00048-4
27. A. Bonamia, A. Karoui, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **42**, 1-20 (2017). doi: 10.1016/j.acha.2015.05.003
28. C. E. Rasmussen, C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006).
29. L. Breiman, *Machine Learning* **45**, 5-32 (2001). doi: 10.1023/A:1010933404324

Acknowledgments

Author contributions: X.L. performed the theoretical analysis and designed the algorithm, X.X. implemented the program, ran experiments, and produced all the plots; X.L. wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed and commented on the experiments and the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Supplementary materials

Section S1. Method
 Section S2. Monotonic convergence
 Section S3. Hierarchical low frequency dominant functions
 Section S4. Category I: contractile in logarithmic time
 Section S5. Category II: contractile in polynomial time
 Section S6. Category III: noncontractile
 Fig. S1
 References
 Data S1

Section S1. Method

For the median-type contracting algorithm, the contracting sequence of length $K+1$, $\{D^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^K$, is established as follows: define $D^{(0)} = \Omega$ and

$$D^{(k+1)} = \{x \in D^{(k)} : \mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f(x) \leq \text{Median} f_{\chi^{(k)}}\}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq K-1, \quad (\text{S1})$$

where $\chi^{(k)} = \{\chi_i^{(k)}\}$ are uniformly distributed over $D^{(k)}$ with the sample size $N^{(k)}$, the relevant data values $f_{\chi^{(k)}} = \{f(\chi_i^{(k)})\}$ with the current $f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* = \min(f_{\chi^{(k)}})$ and $f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} = \max(f_{\chi^{(k)}})$, and $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ is an approximation of f w.r.t. the data pairs $(\chi^{(k)}, f_{\chi^{(k)}})$ such that

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f(x) - f(x)| \leq \text{Median} f_{\chi^{(k)}} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* \quad \text{and} \quad |r^{(k)} - r_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}| < b_r, \quad (\text{S2})$$

here, $b_r < 1/2$ is a given threshold, $r^{(k)}$ is the percentage of $\chi^{(k)}$ falling into $D^{(k+1)}$, and $r_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k)}$ is the percentage of samples uniformly distributed over $D^{(k)}$ falling into $D^{(k+1)}$.

Two key parts of the algorithm are (i) the method for constructing a model to fit the given data on $D^{(k)}$, and (ii) the sampling strategy for further generating uniform samples over $D^{(k)}$ according to some known interior points. In this work, we use Gaussian process (GP) regression for constructing a model to fit the data pairs $(\chi^{(k)}, f_{\chi^{(k)}})$. It has merit in the flexible expressivity because its hyperparameters are automatically tuned with the likelihood maximization. See Data S1 for technical details and (I) for more.

Now consider the sampling strategy. Suppose $\chi = \{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^N \in D^{(k)}$ are N given points and T is a union of N sample sets $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^N$, where T_i contains M samples from a normal distribution with mean χ_i and variance σ_i^2 (sufficiently large to cover $D^{(k)}$). Further, let $T^{(k)} = T \cap D^{(k)}$. Now we are going to add a new point t from $T^{(k)}$ to χ and t should preferably fill in the gaps in the distribution of χ . Actually, this subsequent point t could be determined as

$$t = \arg \max_{t \in T^{(k)}} \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|t - \chi_i\|_2 \right). \quad (\text{S3})$$

One can generate uniform samples in $D^{(k)}$ by using the above step recursively, see Fig. S1 for an example to illustrate how the method is performed. This recursive algorithm is closely related to the Voronoi diagrams (2), because the added point will be always in the largest Voronoi cell of χ if the size of $T^{(k)}$ is large enough.




Figure S1: Two-dimensional illustration of the performance of the recursive algorithm given in Eq. S3. (A) The domain $D = \{(x_1, x_2) \in [0, 1]^2 : (x_1 - 0.5)^2 + (x_2 - 0.5)^2 \leq 0.25^2\}$ is shown as the interior of the circle, the uniform samples in $[0, 1]^2$, that is, the first 50 points of the 2-dimensional halton sequence, are visible as dots in blue, and those samples falling into D , denoted by χ , are shown as asterisks in black. (B) The candidate set T , which is a union of sample sets from a normal distribution centered on each χ_i , is visible as circledots. (C) Samples added recursively from $T \cap D$ is visible as circledots in blue, so successive points at any stage “know” how to fill in the gaps in the previously generated distribution. See Data S1 for technical details.

Section S2. Monotonic convergence

In this section we explain the monotonic convergence: if f is not a constant on Ω and the sequence $\{D^{(k)}\}$ is generated by Eqs. 1 and 2 (not limited to the median-type algorithm), then $\Omega \supseteq D^{(k)} \supset D^{(k+1)} \supset X^*$ for every $k \geq 0$.

The monotonic convergence proceeds by induction on k . First, $\Omega = D^{(0)} \supset X^*$ is trivial since f is not a constant on Ω . Assume that $D^{(k)} \supset X^*$, then $D^{(k)} \supset S^{(k)} \supset X^*$, where

$$S^{(k)} = \left\{ x \in D^{(k)} : f(x) \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* \right\}; \quad (\text{S4})$$

now we will show that $D^{(k)} \supset D^{(k+1)} \supset S^{(k)}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f(x) = f(x) + \varepsilon^{(k)}(x)$, then it follows from Eq. S2 that $|\varepsilon^{(k)}(x)| \leq u^{(k)} < f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$. Hence, for any $x' \in S^{(k)}$, we have $f(x') \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$ and it can be further rewritten as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f(x') - \varepsilon^{(k)}(x') \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*, \quad (\text{S5})$$

and equivalently,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\chi^{(k)}} f(x') \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* + \varepsilon^{(k)}(x') \leq f_{\chi^{(k)}}^* + u^{(k)}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

thus, $x' \in D^{(k+1)}$, that is, $D^{(k+1)} \supset S^{(k)}$; meanwhile, $D^{(k)} \supset D^{(k+1)}$ since $u^{(k)} < f_{\chi^{(k)}}^{**} - f_{\chi^{(k)}}^*$.

Section S3. Hierarchical low frequency dominant functions

Without loss of generality, assume that $f^* = 0$ on Ω hereafter. We show that if f is a (p, ρ) -type hierarchical low frequency dominant function, then there exist a class of approximations such that the corresponding error bounds are reduced by a factor of $p/(1+p)$ every time the number of function evaluations doubles.

For any nonnegative integer j and $\rho > 0$, we define the j th ρ -bandlimited function by

$$f_\rho^{(j)}(x) = \int_{\|\omega\|_\infty \leq 2^{\frac{j}{n}} \rho} \hat{f}(\omega) e^{2\pi i x \cdot \omega} d\omega, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where $x \cdot \omega = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \omega_i$ is the inner product of x and ω ; then according to the Nyquist-Shannon sampling theorem, $f_\rho^{(j)}$ can be reconstructed by its samples corresponding to a sampling density of $2^j \rho^n / \pi^n$. Further, let $R_\rho^{(j)} = \sum_{i=j}^\infty I_\rho^{(i)}$, where $I_\rho^{(0)} = \int_{\|\omega\|_\infty \leq \rho} |\hat{f}(\omega)| d\omega$ and

$$I_\rho^{(j)} = \int_{2^{\frac{j-1}{n}} \rho < \|\omega\|_\infty \leq 2^{\frac{j}{n}} \rho} |\hat{f}(\omega)| d\omega, \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots; \quad (\text{S8})$$

then $\|f - f_\rho^{(j)}\|_\infty \leq R_\rho^{(j+1)}$ and the condition Eq. 3 can be rewritten as

$$R_\rho^{(j)} < (1+p)I_\rho^{(j)}, \text{ or equivalently, } R_\rho^{(j+1)} < pI_\rho^{(j)}. \quad (\text{S9})$$

So it follows that

$$\frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{R_\rho^{(j)}} = \frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{I_\rho^{(j)} + R_\rho^{(j+1)}} < \frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{R_\rho^{(j+1)}/p + R_\rho^{(j+1)}} = \frac{p}{1+p}, \quad (\text{S10})$$

so the error bounds $\{R_\rho^{(j)}\}_j$ are reduced by a factor of $p/(1+p)$ every time the number of function evaluations doubles, that is, the corresponding sampling density is increased from $2^{j-1} \rho^n / \pi^n$ to $2^j \rho^n / \pi^n$. Furthermore, by noting that

$$\frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{\|\hat{f}\|_1} = \frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{I_\rho^{(0)} + R_\rho^{(1)}} \leq \frac{R_\rho^{(2)}}{R_\rho^{(1)}} \frac{R_\rho^{(3)}}{R_\rho^{(2)}} \dots \frac{R_\rho^{(j+1)}}{R_\rho^{(j)}} < \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^j, \quad (\text{S11})$$

the error bound can also be rewritten as

$$\|f - f_\rho^{(j)}\|_\infty \leq R_\rho^{(j+1)} < \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^j \|\hat{f}\|_1. \quad (\text{S12})$$

So the error bounds are reduced by a factor of $p/(1+p)$ every time the sampling density doubles. In the next section we will further consider the number of samples on the compact sets.

Section S4. Category I: contractile in logarithmic time

For functions in category I, the key to gaining logarithmic time efficiency comes from two reasons: (i) the median of f on $D^{(k)}$ is reduced by a factor of $p/(1+p)$ as k increases and (ii) there is an upper bound on the number of function evaluations on every $D^{(k)}$ such that a certain approximation $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}f$ can be constructed by these samples and the error bound $\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |\mathcal{A}^{(k)}f(x) - f(x)|$ is less than or equal to the median of f on $D^{(k)}$.

Assume that the sequence $\{D^{(k)}\}$ are defined recursively by $D^{(0)} = \Omega$ and

$$D^{(k+1)} = \{x \in D^{(k)} : f_\rho^{(k+1)}(x) \leq \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)})\}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \quad (\text{S13})$$

where $\xi^{(k)}$ is a uniformly distributed random variable over $D^{(k)}$ and $s \geq 1$ is the unique integer such that

$$\left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^s \|\hat{f}\|_1 < \text{Median}f(\xi^{(0)}) \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{s-1} \|\hat{f}\|_1. \quad (\text{S14})$$

Then it is clear that

$$\text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}) = \text{prtile}(f(\xi), 2^{-(k+1)} \cdot 100\%), \quad (\text{S15})$$

moreover, since f is a p -type tempered function on Ω ,

$$\left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^k \text{Median}f(\xi^{(0)}) < \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}). \quad (\text{S16})$$

Further, note that f is a (p, ρ) -type hierarchical low frequency dominant function, it follows that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\|f - f_\rho^{(k+s)}\|_\infty \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{k+s} \|\hat{f}\|_1 < \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^k \text{Median}f(\xi^{(0)}) < \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}), \quad (\text{S17})$$

then according to the convergence shown in section 3, X^* is contained in every $D^{(k)}$; in addition, $\mu(D^{(k)}) = 2^{-k}\mu(\Omega)$ since f is a critical regular function on Ω , and the Fourier approximation $f_\rho^{(k+s)}$ can be reconstructed by its samples corresponding to a sampling density of $2^{k+s}\rho^n/\pi^n$.

The restriction of $f_\rho^{(k+s)}$ to $D^{(k)}$, denoted by $f_\rho^{(k+s)}|_{D^{(k)}}$, is closely related to the threshold value $N_{\Omega, f} = 2^s\mu(\Omega)\rho^n/\pi^n$ and the prolate spheroidal functions $\psi_j(x) = \psi_j(x; 2^{\frac{k+s}{n}}\rho, D^{(k)})$ which are the eigenfunctions of the time and frequency limiting operator $Q = Q(2^{\frac{k+s}{n}}\rho, D^{(k)})$ (3-7). More specifically, if we denote a prolate series up to and including the $N^{(k)}$ th term by

$$\mathcal{S}_{N^{(k)}}f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N^{(k)}} \psi_j(x) \int_{D^{(k)}} f(x)\psi_j(x)dx, \quad (\text{S18})$$

then $\mathcal{S}_{N^{(k)}}f(x) = \mathcal{S}_{N^{(k)}}f_\rho^{(k+s)}(x)$ follows by noting that ψ_j has a Fourier transform supported in $\{\omega \in \mathcal{R}^n : \|\omega\|_\infty \leq 2^{\frac{j}{n}}\rho\}$. Moreover, it is important to mention that a super-exponential

decay rate of the error bound $\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f_\rho^{(k+s)}(x) - \mathcal{S}_{N^{(k)}} f_\rho^{(k+s)}(x)|$ as soon as $N^{(k)}$ reaches or goes beyond the plunge region around the threshold value $N_{\Omega, f}$ (8-9).

Therefore, for every k there exist $C > 1$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ could be constructed by $N^{(k)} = CN_{\Omega, f}$ samples of f over $D^{(k)}$ and

$$\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f_\rho^{(k+s)}(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(k)} f(x)| \leq \text{Median} f(\xi^{(k)}) - \|f - f_\rho^{(k+s)}\|_\infty, \quad (\text{S19})$$

and then,

$$\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(k)} f(x)| \leq \|f - f_\rho^{(k+s)}\|_\infty + \max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f_\rho^{(k+s)}(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(k)} f(x)| \leq \text{Median} f(\xi^{(k)}); \quad (\text{S20})$$

further, for a fixed accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $K > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{K+1} < \epsilon \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{K+2}, \quad \text{or, } K+1 < \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon \leq K+2, \quad (\text{S21})$$

hence, after $K+1$ median-type contractions, one gets the approximate solution set $D^{(K+1)}$ with

$$\max_{x \in D^{(K+1)}} |f(x)| \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^K \text{Median} f(\xi^{(0)}) \quad (\text{S22})$$

and the total number of function evaluations is less than

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lceil CN_{\Omega, f}/2 \rceil + CN_{\Omega, f} = \mathcal{O}\left(N_{\Omega, f} \cdot \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon\right), \quad (\text{S23})$$

where $\lceil t \rceil$ is the smallest integer greater than or equal to t ; let the computational complexity of $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} f$ is $\mathcal{O}((N^{(k)})^a)$, then the time complexity is less than

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \lceil C^a N_{\Omega, f}^a / 2 \rceil + C^a N_{\Omega, f}^a = \mathcal{O}\left(N_{\Omega, f}^a \cdot \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon\right), \quad (\text{S24})$$

taking a logarithmic time for any desired accuracy ϵ .

Section S5. Category II: contractile in polynomial time

In the above discussion, Eq.4 helps us control the bound of the number of function evaluations as a constant value in each contraction; in fact, even without Eq.4, the bound can also be controlled in a probability sense. So in the following we first establish a weaker version of Eq.4, that is, if Ω is a compact set and f is continuous and not a constant on Ω , then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there must exist a $q_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\text{prctile}(f(\xi), 2^{-(k+1)} \cdot 100\%) > \frac{q_\epsilon}{1+q_\epsilon} \text{prctile}(f(\xi), 2^{-k} \cdot 100\%) \quad (\text{S25})$$

holds for every $k \geq 0$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, where ξ is a uniformly distributed random variable on Ω . From the definition Eq. S13, Eq. S23 is equivalent to saying that the upper bound of f is less than $1 + 1/q_\epsilon$ of the median of f on $D^{(k)}$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

Suppose $\xi^{(k)}$ is a uniformly distributed random variable on $D^{(k)}$, $\mu^{(k)} = \text{Mean}f(\xi^{(k)})$, $m^{(k)} = \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)})$ and $\sigma^{(k)} = \sqrt{\text{Var}f(\xi^{(k)})}$. Under the assumption of $f^* = 0$, since f is continuous and not a constant on $D^{(k)}$, we have $m^{(k)} > 0$ and $\sigma^{(k)} > 0$ and there exists a $C > 0$ such that $\sigma^{(k)} = Cm^{(k)}$. First, the distance between the median and the mean is bounded by standard deviation (10), i.e.,

$$m^{(k)} - \sigma^{(k)} \leq \mu^{(k)} \leq m^{(k)} + \sigma^{(k)}; \quad (\text{S26})$$

and it follows from Chebyshev's inequality that

$$P(|f(\xi^{(k)}) - \mu^{(k)}| > \sigma^{(k)}/\sqrt{\epsilon}) \leq \epsilon. \quad (\text{S27})$$

So it holds that

$$\text{prctile}(f(\xi^{(k)}), \epsilon \cdot 100\%) < \mu^{(k)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\sigma^{(k)} \leq m^{(k)} + \frac{1 + \sqrt{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\sigma^{(k)} = \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon} + C + C\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}m^{(k)} \quad (\text{S28})$$

with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, that is,

$$P\left(f(\xi^{(k)}) > \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon} + C + C\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}) = \frac{1 + q_\epsilon}{q_\epsilon}\text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)})\right) \leq \epsilon, \quad (\text{S29})$$

where $q_\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon}/(C + C\sqrt{\epsilon})$.

Let us now see what happens after replacing condition Eq. 4 with Eq. S23. Assume that

$$\frac{p}{1+p} > \frac{q_\epsilon}{1+q_\epsilon} \geq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^l. \quad (\text{S30})$$

If f is predictable in polynomial time, then there exist $\rho > 0$ and $p > 0$ such that Eq. 3 holds; similarly, for every $k \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\|f - f_\rho^{(kl+s)}\|_\infty \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{kl+s} \|\hat{f}\|_1 < \left(\frac{q_\epsilon}{1+q_\epsilon}\right)^k \text{Median}f(\xi^{(0)}) < \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}) \quad (\text{S31})$$

with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Further, according to the convergence shown in section 3, X^* is contained in every $D^{(k)}$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$; in addition, $\mu(D^{(k)}) < \mu(D^{(k-1)})$ and the Fourier approximation $f_\rho^{(kl+s)}$ can be reconstructed by its samples corresponding to a sampling density of $2^{kl+s}\rho^n/\pi^n$. And according to the discussion in the previous subsection, for every k there exist $C > 1$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}f$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}f$ could be constructed by less than $N^{(k)} = C2^{kl}N_{\Omega,f}$ samples of f over $D^{(k)}$ and

$$\max_{x \in D^{(k)}} |f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(k)}f(x)| \leq \text{Median}f(\xi^{(k)}); \quad (\text{S32})$$

further, for a fixed accuracy $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $K > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{(K+1)l} < \epsilon \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{(K+2)l}, \quad \text{or, } K+1 < \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon^{1/l} \leq K+2, \quad (\text{S33})$$

hence, after $K+1$ contractions, one can obtain the approximate solution set $D^{(K+1)}$ with

$$\max_{x \in D^{(K+1)}} |f(x)| \leq \left(\frac{p}{1+p}\right)^{Kl} \text{Median}f(\xi^{(0)}) \quad (\text{S34})$$

and clearly, the total number of function evaluations is much less than

$$\sum_{k=0}^K C 2^{kl} N_{\Omega, f} = \mathcal{O}\left(N_{\Omega, f} \cdot 2^{\log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon}\right); \quad (\text{S35})$$

similarly, let the computational complexity of $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}f$ is $\mathcal{O}((N^{(k)})^a)$, then the time complexity is much less than

$$\sum_{k=0}^K C^a 2^{akl} N_{\Omega, f}^a = \mathcal{O}\left(N_{\Omega, f}^a \cdot 2^{a \log_{\frac{p}{1+p}} \epsilon}\right), \quad (\text{S36})$$

taking a polynomial time for any desired accuracy ϵ . And it is worth noting that the algorithm is not limited to the median-type.

Section S6. Category III: noncontractile

For a noncontractile f , the contracting algorithm degrades totally into a model-based approach. In the following we consider the time complexities for sufficient smooth functions, Hölder continuous functions and non-Hölder continuous functions, respectively.

Suppose that χ are uniformly distributed over Ω with the sample size N , the relevant data values $f_\chi = \{f(\chi_i)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}f$ interpolates f on χ . For a sample set χ over Ω , we denote the associated fill distance with

$$h_N := \sup_{x \in \Omega} \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|x - \chi_i\|, \quad (\text{S37})$$

then for $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$P(h_N > C_\epsilon (\log N/N)^{1/n}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\epsilon}), \quad (\text{S38})$$

or, $h_N = \mathcal{O}(N^{(\delta-1)/n})$, where $0 < \delta \ll 1$; see Lemma 12 of (I1).

If $f \in C^s(\Omega)$ with $s > n/2$ on a bounded domain Ω , then there exists a band-limited interpolant $\mathcal{A}f$ (see Lemma 3.9 of (I2)) such that for any $x \in \Omega$, it holds that

$$|f(x) - \mathcal{A}f(x)| \leq C h_N^{s-n/2} \|f\|_{C^s(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-(s-n/2)(1-\delta)/n}\right), \quad (\text{S39})$$

where $\|f\|_{C^s(\Omega)} = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq s} \sup_{x \in \Omega} |D^\alpha f|$, see Theorem 3.10 of (I2); then for $\epsilon > 0$, the time complexity is

$$\mathcal{O}(N^a) = \mathcal{O}\left(2^{\frac{na}{(s-n/2)(1-\delta)} \log_{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon}\right), \quad (\text{S40})$$

where the complexity of $\mathcal{A}f$ is $\mathcal{O}((N^{(k)})^a)$. And this result is similar to that given in (I1).

If f satisfies a α -Hölder condition, i.e., there exist $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that $|f(x') - f(x'')| < C\|x' - x''\|^\alpha$, then there exists a nearest-neighbor interpolant $\mathcal{A}f$ which is closely related to the Voronoi diagram of χ , such that for any $x \in \Omega$, it holds that

$$|f(x) - \mathcal{A}f(x)| \leq Ch_N^\alpha = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\alpha(1-\delta)/n}), \quad (\text{S41})$$

then similarly, for $\epsilon > 0$, the time complexity is

$$\mathcal{O}(N^a) = \mathcal{O}\left(2^{\frac{na}{\alpha(1-\delta)} \log_{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon}\right). \quad (\text{S42})$$

Further, if f does not satisfy any Hölder condition, then the time complexity is larger than $\mathcal{O}(2^{\frac{na}{\alpha} \log_{\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon})$ for all $\alpha > 0$, so the algorithm shall not be done in polynomial time.

References and Notes

1. C. E. Rasmussen, C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006).
2. F. Aurenhammer, Voronoi diagrams - a survey of a fundamental geometric data structure. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **23**, 345-405 (1991). doi: 10.1145/116873.116880
3. D. Slepian, H. O. Pollak, Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty, I. *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **40**, 43-64 (1961). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03976.x
4. H. J. Landau, H. O. Pollak, Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty, II. *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **40**, 65-84 (1961). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1961.tb03977.x
5. H. J. Landau, H. O. Pollak, Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty, III. *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **41**, 1295-1336 (1962). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1962.tb03279.x
6. D. Slepian, Prolate spheroidal wave functions, Fourier analysis and uncertainty, IV. *Bell Systems Tech. J.* **43**, 3009-3057 (1964). doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1964.tb01037.x
7. D. Slepian, On bandwidth. *Proc. IEEE* **64**, 292-300 (1976). doi: 10.1109/PROC.1976.10110
8. J. P. Boyd, Approximation of an analytic function on a finite real interval by a bandlimited function and conjectures on properties of prolate spheroidal functions. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **25**, 168-176 (2003). doi: 10.1016/S1063-5203(03)00048-4
9. A. Bonamia, A. Karoui, Spectral decay of time and frequency limiting operator. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **42**, 1-20 (2017). doi: 10.1016/j.acha.2015.05.003

10. C. Mallows, Another comment on O’Cinneide. *The American Statistician* **45**, 257 (1991). doi: 10.1080/00031305.1991.10475815
11. A. D. Bull, Convergence rates of efficient global optimization algorithms. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **12**, 2879-2904 (2011).
12. F. J. Narcowich, J. D. Ward, H. Wendland, Sobolev bounds on functions with scattered zeros, with applications to radial basis function surface fitting. *Math. Comp.* **74**, 743-763 (2005). doi: 10.1090/S0025-5718-04-01708-9