
All Random Features Representations are Equivalent

Luke Sernau
 Google DeepMind
 sernau@google.com

Silvano Bonacina
 Google DeepMind
 sibonaci@google.com

Rif A. Saurous
 Google Research
 rif@google.com

Abstract

Random features are an important technique that make it possible to rewrite positive-definite kernels as infinite-dimensional dot products. Over time, increasingly elaborate random feature representations have been developed in pursuit of finite approximations with ever lower error. We resolve this arms race by deriving an optimal sampling policy, and show that under this policy all random features representations have the same approximation error. This establishes a lower bound that holds across all random feature representations, and shows that we are free to choose whatever representation we please, provided we sample optimally.

1 Introduction

Kernel methods have a long and illustrious history in machine learning [1]. Nowadays one of their most widespread applications is the softmax kernel inside the attention layers of a transformer. Unfortunately, kernel methods scale linearly in the size of the dataset, which is impractical for very large datasets.

In their seminal paper, Rahimi and Recht [2] show that this linear cost can be avoided in kernel machines by replacing the kernel with a randomized approximation that is correct in expectation. They did this by means of a *random feature representation*.

Definition 1. Given a positive-definite kernel $K : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a random feature representation of K is a symmetric function $\phi : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ together with a distribution Ω (most commonly the normal distribution) such that

$$K(x_1, x_2) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Omega} [\phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega)]. \quad (1)$$

To see why this is useful, consider a simple kernel estimator over some dataset $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$.

$$KE(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n K(x, x_i) y_i.$$

As written, this kernel estimator requires linear time, since for every new x it's necessary to compute a dot product with every element in the dataset. But if the kernel admits a random features representation, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} KE(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Omega} [\phi(x, \omega) \phi(x_i, \omega)] y_i \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Omega} \left[\phi(x, \omega) \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i, \omega) y_i \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This expectation can be approximated via sampling,

$$KE(x) \approx \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi(x, \omega_j) \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(x_i, \omega_j) y_i,$$

where $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_k$ are samples drawn from Ω . As long as k is less than n , we can save time by precomputing the sum on the right.

Choromanski et al. [3] were the first to apply this idea to attention. They did so by finding a choice of ϕ that was numerically stable and had low sample variance. This kicked off a flurry of research ([4] [5] [6]) into better choices of ϕ with ever lower sample variance.

We provide a possible resolution to this competition. Rather than optimizing ϕ , we simply chose our sampling strategy carefully. By approximating the expectation using an optimal importance sampling strategy, we are able to achieve a sample variance that is in a sense as low as possible. What's more, this sample variance *does not depend on* ϕ , meaning that when sampled optimally, *all* random features schemes have the same variance.

Ours is not the first scheme to consider importance sampling, but in contrast to others that sample based on kernel polarization heuristics [7] or quadrature rules [8], we directly solve the variance minimization problem. To our knowledge we are the first to obtain global optima that are independent of the choice of ϕ .

2 Importance sampling

Importance sampling [9] is a well known technique for reducing variance when estimating an expectation via sampling. It's based on the observation that some samples have a larger effect on the expectation than others, and we should prefer to sample those. It achieves this by sampling from some new distribution Ψ , and then rescaling the samples such that the correct final estimate is preserved.

In our case, we wish to estimate (1) via sampling. Let Ψ be some new distribution with the same support as Ω , and suppose Ψ and Ω have densities p_Ψ and p_Ω , respectively. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} K(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Omega} [\phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In other words, we are free to sample from Ψ without changing the value of the expectation. On the other hand, the sample variance, given by

$$\text{Var}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right],$$

does depend on Ψ . All we need to do is find a choice of Ψ to make this quantity small.

3 Optimal sampling

We are left with the question of how to choose an optimal Ψ . This is an intrinsically data-driven question, as the variance depends on the input. We'd like to minimize the sample variance for all inputs.

Definition 2. *Suppose x_1 and x_2 are sampled from \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 , respectively. If we approximate the expression in (2) by sampling from Ψ , the expected sample variance \mathcal{V}_Ψ over all x_1 and x_2 is given by*

$$\mathcal{V}_\Psi = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} \text{Var}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right]$$

The Ψ that minimizes \mathcal{V}_Ψ can be found analytically.

Theorem 1. Let K be a positive-definite kernel such that

$$K(x_1, x_2) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right]$$

for some ϕ and Ω , and every Ψ with the same support as Ω . Suppose x_1 and x_2 are sampled from \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 , respectively. Then the expected sample variance \mathcal{V}_Ψ over all x_1 and x_2 will be minimized when

$$p_\Psi(\omega) \propto p_\Omega(\omega) q_\phi(\omega),$$

where

$$q_\phi(\omega) = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} [\phi(x_1, \omega)^2] \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} [\phi(x_2, \omega)^2]}.$$

The resulting optimal variance will be

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}_\Psi = \left(\mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} q_\phi(\omega) \right)^2 - \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} K(x_1, x_2)^2.$$

This result tells us how to minimize the variance for a particular choice of ϕ . What is less clear in this form is that it also tells us something about optimizing over every ϕ . We will explore this in the next section.

The proof of Theorem 1 is a straightforward exercise in Lagrange optimization and can be found in the appendix.

4 The choice of feature representation does not matter

As written, Theorem 1 appears to be a statement about how to get the most out of any particular choice of ϕ . In this section, we'll show some corollaries that turn this on its head: the optimal sample variance is largely independent of ϕ .

Corollary 1. The optimal sample variance achieved in Theorem 1 is upper bounded by

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}_\Psi \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} \left[K(x_1, x_1) K(x_2, x_2) - K(x_1, x_2)^2 \right].$$

This follows from Theorem 1 by applying Jensen's inequality to the first term of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_\Psi$, and observing that $\mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} q_\phi(\omega)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} [K(x_1, x_1) K(x_2, x_2)]$.

Written this way, our bound is suggestively similar to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Indeed, since positive-definite kernels obey the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we know that this expression is positive as expected. More interestingly, since this expression does not depend on ϕ , this bound is the same regardless of which representation we're using.

In the (relatively common) case where $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2$, we can go even further.

Corollary 2. If $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2$ then the optimal sample variance achieved in Theorem 1 is exactly

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}_\Psi = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} \left[K(x_1, x_1)^2 - K(x_1, x_2)^2 \right].$$

This can be seen from Theorem 1 since in this case $q_\phi(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} [\phi(x_1, \omega)^2]$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} q_\phi(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} [K(x_1, x_1)]$, by exchanging the expectations.

We are able to write down the exact sample variance without any reference to ϕ . When it comes to optimizing the sample variance, it *does not matter* which ϕ you choose.

5 Practical Considerations and Future Work

While the sampling procedure outlined here is of theoretical interest, it remains to be seen whether it is tractable to compute in practice. As this is intended as a theory paper, we leave empirical tests to future experimentalists. Nonetheless, we'll make a few notes about how to do this practically.

First, sophisticated MCMC samplers [10] are now quite effective, and widely available in machine learning platforms like TensorFlow and Jax [11].

Second, if this technique is used for self attention (as in [3]) it's likely unnecessary to resample in every training step. By sampling less frequently, we can amortize the cost of the sampling procedure.

Finally, and perhaps most intriguingly for the theorists, p_Ψ is very closely related to p_Ω . It may be that there exists a convenient function f such that for $\omega \sim \Omega$ we have $f(\omega) \sim \Psi$. The form of p_Ψ is very structured, suggesting that there is room for manipulation.

References

- [1] Colin Campbell. Kernel methods: a survey of current techniques. *Neurocomputing*, 48(1): 63–84, 2002. ISSN 0925-2312. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-2312\(01\)00643-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-2312(01)00643-9). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925231201006439>.
- [2] Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht. Random features for large-scale kernel machines. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 20. Curran Associates, Inc., 2007. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2007/file/013a006f03dbc5392effeb8f18fda755-
- [3] Krzysztof Marcin Choromanski, Valerii Likhoshesterov, David Dohan, Xingyou Song, Andreea Gane, Tamas Sarlos, Peter Hawkins, Jared Quincy Davis, Afroz Mohiuddin, Lukasz Kaiser, David Benjamin Belanger, Lucy J Colwell, and Adrian Weller. Rethinking attention with performers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Ua6zuk0WRH>.
- [4] Valerii Likhoshesterov, Krzysztof Choromanski, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Frederick Liu, Tamás Sarlós, and Adrian Weller. Chefs' random tables: Non-trigonometric random features. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, abs/2205.15317, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249210161>.
- [5] Valerii Likhoshesterov, Krzysztof Choromanski, Avinava Dubey, Frederick Liu, Tamas Sarlos, and Adrian Weller. Favor#: Sharp attention kernel approximations via new classes of positive random features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00787*, 2023.
- [6] Isaac Reid, Krzysztof Marcin Choromanski, Valerii Likhoshesterov, and Adrian Weller. Simple random features. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 28864–28888. PMLR, 2023.
- [7] Shahin Shahrampour, Ahmad Beirami, and Vahid Tarokh. On data-dependent random features for improved generalization in supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- [8] Francis Bach. On the equivalence between kernel quadrature rules and random feature expansions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(21):1–38, 2017.
- [9] Surya T Tokdar and Robert E Kass. Importance sampling: a review. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 2(1):54–60, 2010.
- [10] Matthew D Hoffman, Andrew Gelman, et al. The no-u-turn sampler: adaptively setting path lengths in hamiltonian monte carlo. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1):1593–1623, 2014.
- [11] Joshua V Dillon, Ian Langmore, Dustin Tran, Eugene Brevdo, Srinivas Vasudevan, Dave Moore, Brian Patton, Alex Alemi, Matt Hoffman, and Rif A Saurous. Tensorflow distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10604*, 2017.

A Appendix

Proof of Theorem 1. We wish to minimize the expected sample variance. Recall that variance can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right] = \\ \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)^2} \phi(x_1, \omega)^2 \phi(x_2, \omega)^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega) \phi(x_2, \omega) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second term is just $K(x_1, x_2)^2$, meaning it does not depend on Ψ . We turn our attention to the first term. The expected value of the first term is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \Psi} \left[\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)^2} \phi(x_1, \omega)^2 \phi(x_2, \omega)^2 \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{x_1 \sim \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \sim \mathcal{X}_2} \int_X \frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)} \phi(x_1, \omega)^2 \phi(x_2, \omega)^2 d\omega \\ = \int_X \frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)} q_\phi(\omega)^2 d\omega \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We wish to find the p_Ψ that minimizes this expression, subject to the constraint that $\int_X p_\Psi(\omega) d\omega = 1$. We'll solve this using Lagrange optimization. The Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)} q_\phi(\omega)^2 + \lambda p_\Psi(\omega).$$

where λ is our Lagrange parameter. Differentiating with respect to $p_\Psi(\omega)$,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_\Psi} = -\frac{p_\Omega(\omega)^2}{p_\Psi(\omega)^2} q_\phi(\omega)^2 + \lambda.$$

Setting this equal to zero and solving, we find that

$$p_\Psi(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} p_\Omega(\omega) q_\phi(\omega)$$

as desired. The constraint that $\int_X p_\Psi(\omega) d\omega = 1$ forces $\sqrt{\lambda} = \int_X p_\Omega(\omega) q_\phi(\omega) d\omega$. By plugging this into (3), we obtain the desired variance. \square