

Asymptotic Optimism of Random-Design Linear and Kernel Regression Models

Hengrui Luo¹ and Yunzhang Zhu²

¹Department of Statistics, Rice University; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. hrluo@lbl.gov; hrluo@rice.edu

²Amazon; Department of Statistics, the Ohio State University. ryzhux@gmail.com

Abstract

We derived the closed-form asymptotic optimism (Efron, 2004; Ye, 1998) of linear regression models under random designs, and generalizes it to kernel ridge regression. Using scaled asymptotic optimism as a generic predictive model complexity measure (Luan et al., 2021), we studied the fundamental different behaviors of linear regression model, tangent kernel (NTK) regression model and three-layer fully connected neural networks (NN). Our contribution is two-fold: we provided theoretical ground for using scaled optimism as a model predictive complexity measure; and we show empirically that NN with ReLUs behaves differently from kernel models under this measure. With resampling techniques, we can also compute the optimism for regression models with real data.

Keywords: linear regression, kernel ridge regression, generalization errors, model complexity measure.

Contents

1	Introduction and Backgrounds	2
1.1	The Double-descent Phenomena	2
1.2	Training and Testing Errors	3
1.3	Linear Regression Model	5
2	Optimism Measures of Model Complexity	7
3	Optimism for Linear Regression Model	9
3.1	Theoretical Results	9
3.2	More Theoretical Results	12
3.3	Simulation Results	16
3.4	Real-data Experiments	18

4 Contribution and Discussion	20
4.1 Contributions	20
4.2 Future works	20
A Related Algorithms for Simulations	24
B Simulation Monte-Carlo Sample Sizes	25
C Proof of Proposition 1	33
D Proof of Proposition 2	35
E Calculation for (3.23)	36
F Proof of Theorem 3	37
G Proof of Corollary 5	43
H Proof of Corollary 7	43
I Proof of Corollary 8	44
J Computational Examples using Corollary 8	46
K Proof of Theorem 9	47
L Proof of Theorem 10	48
M Additional Experiments	55

1 Introduction and Backgrounds

1.1 The Double-descent Phenomena

The double descent phenomenon is an intriguing observation in the performance of machine learning models, including linear regression, as their model capacity or complexity is increased (Belkin et al., 2019; Ju et al., 2021). In the underparameterized region, the model capacity is too low to capture the underlying patterns in the training data fully. As a result, both training and testing errors are high. The gap between these errors (i.e., optimism) may be relatively small because the model isn't complex enough to exhibit strong overfitting.

At the interpolation threshold point, the model has exactly enough capacity to fit the training data perfectly, resulting in zero training error. However, without additional regularization, this perfect fit can lead to relatively high testing error if the learned patterns do not generalize. Here, optimism reaches its maximum because the training error is zero while the testing error is significantly higher due to overfitting the noise or non-generalizable aspects of the training set.

As the model complexity increases beyond the interpolation threshold, according to the double descent curve, the testing error initially increases and then may decrease again hence enter the overparameterized region. This counterintuitive phenomenon of double descent, in contrast to the classical bias-variance trade-off that covers only until interpolation threshold) implies that further increasing the model’s capacity allows it to learn more generalizable patterns. In the initial part of the overparameterized region, optimism might increase as the model fits more noise in training. However, as we move further into the overparameterized region, and if the double descent phenomenon holds true, the testing error may decrease, potentially reducing optimism.

1.2 Training and Testing Errors

Motivated by quantifying the double-descent phenomena, recent interests in describing the model complexity focus in the predictive setting (Hastie et al., 2020; Luan et al., 2021; Rosset and Tibshirani, 2019). The calculation of optimism as a predictive model complexity measure (Luan et al., 2021), is particularly interesting in the context of double descent. Initially, as the model complexity increases, the optimism increases due to overfitting. However, past the critical point of complexity (somewhere after the interpolation threshold), increased model capacity could theoretically lead to a more robust model that generalizes better, thus decreasing optimism again. This suggests a non-linear relationship between model complexity and optimism, with a critical peak around the interpolation threshold.

On one hand, this critical understanding challenges traditional views on model capacity and overfitting, indicating that sometimes "more is better," even when it seems counter-intuitive according to classical statistical learning theories (Belkin et al., 2019). On the other hand, model complexity is a central topic in statistics. Popular choices of model complexity include the VC dimension (e.g., neural networks (NN), supported vector machines (Vapnik, 1999)), the minimal length principle measures (e.g., encoders, decoders (Rissanen, 2007)) and the degree of freedom for classical statistical models (e.g., linear and ANOVA models (Ravishanker et al., 2002)). However, there is not a well-accepted model complexity measure that can describe a general model procedure across different types of tasks. Most of these classical complexity measures focused on the model performance on the training datasets. Therefore, classical model complexity measures have difficulty incorporating the model performance on the testing datasets.

The *training error* describes the in-sample performance of model. Given a fitted model $\hat{\mu}_n$ (e.g., linear regression model), the well-accepted definition of training error over a training set sample \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} of size n is (e.g., (2.1) in Luan et al. (2021)): $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(y_i, \hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{x}_i)) \stackrel{\ell=L_2}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} (y_i - \hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{x}_i))^2$ which is the loss we use in the rest of the paper. We denote the fitted mean model $\hat{\mu}_n = \hat{\mu}$ (for notational brevity) based on the sample of size n and ℓ denotes the loss function of our choice. We fit the model by minimizing the training error with optimization algorithms. The fitted model function $\hat{\mu}_n$ can be written into vector form $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{x}_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ depends on the training set input $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\}, \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and response $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^1$. The notation $T_{\mathbf{X}}$ explicitly reminds us that the

training error depends on the training set \mathbf{X} (and \mathbf{y}).

$$\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{X})\|^2 \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \text{ conditioned on } \mathbf{X}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(y_i, \hat{\mu}_n(\mathbf{x}_i)). \quad (1.1)$$

This notation means that when we assume that the response \mathbf{y} is random given the input \mathbf{X} , the average training error can be described by $\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}}$. The summation in (1.1) means that we fix \mathbf{X} and simulate N different \mathbf{y} 's and summing over these N pairs of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} .

The *testing error* describes the out-sample predictive performance of model, and it depends on both the training input \mathbf{X} and response \mathbf{y} . Unlike the well-accepted notion of training error (1.1), Rosset and Tibshirani (2019) discussed three different kinds of settings where model testing errors can be computed.

- The fixed-X setting (Efron, 2004). The testing and training set share the same input locations (\mathbf{X} is nonrandom), yet the response in testing set is regenerated to reflect the randomness in response.

$$\text{Err}F_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} := \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2^2. \quad (1.2)$$

The notation $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \{\tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_1), \tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_2), \dots, \tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_n)\}$, where each $\tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is an independent copy of y_i with the same distribution, corresponding to the input location \mathbf{x}_i . The notation $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}}$ means that we take conditional expectation on $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ conditioning on \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} .

- The same-X setting (Rosset and Tibshirani, 2019). The testing and training set share the same input location distribution (\mathbf{X} is random), and the response in testing set is independently regenerated to reflect the randomness in response. The same-X prediction error can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}S &:= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \|\tilde{y}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_1)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

In this setting, the error $\text{Err}S$ does not investigate any new input locations, but assume that the input locations are randomly drawn. Unlike (1.2), (1.3) does not depend on the input location \mathbf{X} in the training set, because the notation $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}}$ means that we take joint expectation on $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ jointly and get rid of the dependence on $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$.

- The random-X setting (Luan et al., 2021). The testing and training set may have different input location distributions (\mathbf{X} is random), and the response in testing set is independently regenerated to reflect the randomness in response. The random-X prediction error can be written as:

$$\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{y}_*|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|y_{i,*} - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_{i,*})\|_2^2 \quad (1.4)$$

$$\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \text{ conditioned on } \mathbf{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{y}_* | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(y_{i,*}, \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_{i,*})). \quad (1.5)$$

In this setting, the error $\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}}$ investigates the input locations where the model $\hat{\mu}$ any new input locations, but assume that the input locations are fixed.

Rosset and Tibshirani (2019) pointed out that the testing error in random-X setting would be more appropriate for assessing model performance on the testing set. *We would focus only on the training error (1.1) and the testing error (1.4).* We will also use the term prediction location \mathbf{x}_* , which can be considered as a one-point testing set.

1.3 Linear Regression Model

In a linear regression model, whose model complexity (or capacity) is well accepted as the number of features used in the model. The double descent curve comprises three distinct regions: underparameterized, interpolation threshold, and overparameterized. We consider a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and the goal is to learn a function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that approximates the relationship between \mathbf{x}_i and y_i in form of

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad (1.6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ is the coefficient vector to be learned. This setup covers both linear regression with and without intercepts, since we can fix the last element of \mathbf{x} to be a deterministic constant and consider the distribution of \mathbf{x} is degenerated at that location. We can optimize $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by minimizing the mean squared error (MSE, L_2 -loss) on the training data:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}))^2. \quad (1.7)$$

The solution to the problem can be written as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$ where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is the matrix obtained by stacking rows of \mathbf{x}_i 's in the training set. The classical degree of freedom of the matrix form $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ of model (1.6) is defined as $\text{tr}(\mathbf{H})$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$ for the linear regression model considers the in-sample error as a model complexity measure. However, the U-shape with respect to $\text{tr}(\mathbf{H})$ may not exist when we consider modern machine learning models (Belkin et al., 2019; Luan et al., 2021). Then, assuming $d < n$, we can sequentially increase the number d of parameters (i.e., regression coefficients) to get a better fit in the sense that the smallest L_2 loss keeps decreasing. Once we attain $d = n$, the linear regression model becomes *saturated*, the L_2 loss would not decrease further.

The above single-descent intuition based on the bias-variance trade-off tells us: a NN with moderate number of nodes (and layers) is preferred. This view is natural at first until Belkin et al. (2019) pointed out that for a deep neural network (DNN, i.e., the network architecture with a lot of nodes and layers), there occurs a *double-descent phenomena*.

When we plot the loss function against the model complexity measure of NN. The model complexity measure for NN is chosen to be the number of nodes and layers in the network architecture (i.e., the number of hidden units). Then we would observe the U-shape curve, followed by another descending curve after reaching the second peak. This is known as the

double-descent phenomena for the loss function in the NN setting (Belkin et al., 2019; Neal et al., 2018). Although the training procedure (i.e., fitting the model by minimizing the data-dependent loss function) remains the same, the traditional bias-variance trade-off on the loss function does not hold for the NN, otherwise we would expect the single-descent instead of the double-descent. In linear regression models, Hastie et al. (2020) pointed out that when the training dataset is not fixed, in an asymptotic setting, the double-descent phenomena even exists for linear regression models, motivating us to study the optimism using linear regression model.

Linear regression models (Ravishanker et al., 2002) is fitted by minimizing the L_2 loss function with respect to the regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$. In the matrix form $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, each instance is represented by a vector $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$, $\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_n^T \end{bmatrix}$ represents a location; $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, each row is a scalar response. We want to use n d -dimensional inputs $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ to predict the response $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$. The (Gaussian) *linear regression* model (without intercept) can be written as below.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon} &\sim N_n(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

where $\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ describes a linear relationship (or dependence) between input \mathbf{X} and response y , the random variable $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ picks up the potential Gaussian noise in observations. Therefore, we can write the model as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) &\sim N_n(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbf{I}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \mu(\mathbf{X}) &= \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

To fit the linear model we consider the loss function

$$\ell = L_2(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) := \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (1.10)$$

and suppose that \mathbf{X} is of full rank in the discussion below for simplicity. By taking the matrix gradient $\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ to be zero, we can solve for a minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$, which is known as the *least square estimator*. Our model estimate at observed locations \mathbf{X} is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{X}) = (\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_1), \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_2), \dots, \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_n))^T = (\mathbf{x}_1^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \mathbf{x}_2^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T = \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{y}$$

with a hat matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$.

For a single prediction location \mathbf{x}_* , we use the following notations $\mathbf{h}_i^T = \mathbf{x}_i^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$, $\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{h}_n^T \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{h}_*^T = \mathbf{x}_*^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$. The prediction mean is $\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} =$

$\mathbf{x}_*^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{h}_*^T \mathbf{y}$. The prediction error at a new input \mathbf{x}_* can be written as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}_*} \|y_*(\mathbf{x}_*) - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*)\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \quad (1.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sigma_\epsilon^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^T \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{\sigma_\epsilon^2}_{\text{noise var.}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^T \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)}_{\text{(square) bias of estimator } \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} + \\ &\quad \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^T \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)}_{\text{variance of estimator } \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

which induces the *bias-variance trade-off*. The notation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}_*}$ means that we take the expectation with respect to response \mathbf{y} given the observed locations \mathbf{X} and the prediction location \mathbf{x}_* , where we assume that the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}_*$ is known. This decomposition holds for other settings as shown in [Rosset and Tibshirani \(2019\)](#) (i.e., B^+ and V^+ in their notations).

With the above decomposition of the expected loss function, if we plot the L_2 loss of the fitted linear regression model (as y-axis) against the degree of freedom $tr(\mathbf{H})$ as model complexity measure (as the x-axis), then the loss function can be decomposed into bias and the variance components. This exhibits the U-shape curve discussed by multiple authors in classical regression setting ([Friedman, 2017](#); [Neal et al., 2018](#)). When there are few parameters (i.e., small p), the predictive variance is relatively large; when there are too many parameters (i.e., large p), the bias is relatively large.

After revisiting the linear models and testing training errors, to reconcile the seemingly dilemma, we investigate the notion of optimism in section 2 and link it to predictive model complexity measure. Detailed examples and our main results concerning linear models are presented in sections 3, followed by discussions in section 4.

2 Optimism Measures of Model Complexity

After identifying the first descent phenomena caused by the variance-bias trade-off ([Belkin et al., 2019](#)), it is unclear why the second descent occurs in complex models like NN. One thinking (which we would take) is that the x-axis of the prediction error against complexity plot uses an incorrect choice of complexity measure; while the others are suspicious in the robustness of an over-fitting model ([Jordan and Mitchell, 2015](#); [Ju et al., 2020, 2021](#)). In essence, the prediction error against complexity plot should be replaced with prediction error against a corrected version of “predictive complexity” ([Luan et al., 2021](#); [Patil et al., 2024](#)).

An adjusted complexity measure, namely the *optimism* ([Efron, 2004](#)) of the model, can be elicited as the difference between training and testing errors. When a model is trained on one training set that is different from the testing set where the model predicts, the optimism would tend to be larger (in both offline and online scenarios ([Luo et al., 2024a](#))). Extending the idea of using optimism, [Luan et al. \(2021\)](#) propose to adopt part of the optimism as complexity measures, namely the predictive complexity.

The first advantage of using optimism as a model complexity measure is that it not only reflects the goodness-of-fit of the model but also reflects the generalizability of the model from training to testing datasets (Wang et al., 2024). In addition, a scaled optimism can be shown to agree with the classical degree of freedom when we consider the linear regression model (Ye, 1998). Therefore, we could benefit from intuitions established in classic modeling contexts where the number of parameters are used for measuring model complexity.

The second advantage of using model optimism is that it can be computed via Monte-Carlo (MC) method since both 1.1 and 1.5 can be approximated by definition, (See Algorithm 1) for almost all predictive models without much assumption on the explicit model forms. This allows us to define complexity descriptors for black-box models like NN. We expect that this could be a more faithful model complexity measure. Precisely, we have following proposition that defines the optimism and we can have its closed form expression.

Proposition 1. (*Optimism in linear regression*) *The optimism (i.e., random- X prediction error (1.4) minus averaged training error (1.1)) can be defined and computed as below (e.g., (3.2) in Luan et al. (2021)):*

$$\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} - \text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} \quad (2.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mu(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_* \mu(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 \\ &+ \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*^T\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(2\mathbf{H}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

In (2.2), the second line is $\Delta B_{\mathbf{X}}$ and the third line is exactly (3.3) in Luan et al. (2021). Optimism is widely used as a complexity measure in modeling context (Efron, 2004; Hastie et al., 2020), in addition, Ye (1998) showed that a scaled version of optimism coincides with the degree of freedom. To show this fact, we want to use the quantity in $\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}$ that is inside the last bracket after σ_ϵ^2 in (2.2). Specifically, when $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{X}$, we can cancel the first two terms and have following expression, which is independent of signal μ :

$$\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} = \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\|\mathbf{H}\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(2\mathbf{H}) \right) \quad (2.3)$$

$$= \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\|\mathbf{H}\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}) \right). \quad (2.4)$$

This is the closed form expression when the model fitting procedure can be described as a linear projection method with a certain choice of basis functions (e.g., polynomial regression, B-splines (Gu, 2013)). The optimism is related to GDF (Ye, 1998), Malow’s C_p and other complexity measures (Efron, 2004). In (2.2), we separate the expression into “signal part” involving μ ; and the “noise part” involving σ_ϵ^2 . This separation is different from equations (3), (4) and (5) in Rosset and Tibshirani (2019) even without the $\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}}$.

Hastie et al. (2020); Luan et al. (2021) considered to approximate the signal part using a leave-one-out cross validation (LOOCV) technique with some adjustment. The LOOCV estimation is supported by the numerical evidence when the training set \mathbf{X} is fixed. The

original study focused on the estimation when the signal is fixed, in our study below we derived asymptotic exact formula, showing how this term depends on the signal.

We investigate the setting where the training set \mathbf{X} is assumed to be random and drawn from a distribution, as in $\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}$. Unlike Rosset and Tibshirani (2019) (e.g., their Theorem 3), we do not assume the model is correctly-specified and focus on the impact of the actual signal on the behavior of optimism. Arguably, it is more often than not that the model is not an unbiased estimate to the signal in reality, our technical calculation can be extended to more general models like linear smoothers at the cost of more complex notations.

Next, we would show that the optimism is signal-dependent, which is different from the predictive model complexity measure (Luan et al., 2021). That means, if the underlying data generating mechanism changes, then the model complexity measure for a fitted model would also change. A signal-independent model complexity measure could be defined through applying the modeling procedure to white noise and compare the complexity under white noise and nontrivial signals (e.g., the difference between model optimism and white noise optimism).

3 Optimism for Linear Regression Model

3.1 Theoretical Results

In the previous section, we have discussed the possible effect of signal when we try to measure the model complexity in predictive setting. In this section, we presume formally that we fit regression models for a training dataset (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) consisting of i.i.d. pairs of input and responses and a testing dataset (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) consisting of i.i.d. pairs of input and responses. Both of the rows of training set $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and a new location in testing set $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ share the same distribution (e.g., $N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$). Based on the definitions of (1.1) and (1.4), we can obtain the intuition that

$$\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} - \text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} \stackrel{\text{typically}}{\geq} 0 \quad (3.1)$$

Although the above derivation focused on the L_2 loss function in linear regression, the positivity holds in general model fitting procedures. We prove this fact as a proposition below.

Proposition 2. *(Positivity) The testing error $\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}}$ is greater than the training error $\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}}$ for a loss function minimization procedure, therefore, the optimism $\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \geq 0$. The trained model $\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}$ is defined in the same functional space \mathcal{F}_n , which is independent of $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ but may depend on sample size n :*

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} T_{\mathbf{X}} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i), \quad (3.2)$$

For the optimism defined for $\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}$ we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \geq 0$.

Proof. See Appendix D. □

For more complicated regression functions like NN shown in Figure B.2 below, the loss landscape could be more complicated. There can be more than one stationary points on the corresponding loss landscape, where the NN may not converge to the minimizer stationary point. Therefore, the resulting fitted regression model may not be an interpolator, and the step (D.6) in our proof cannot proceed. The mis-specification can arise from wrong smoothness (e.g., sigmoid) or hard misfit, in both situations the signal does not live in the space spanned by the activation functions (e.g., ReLU). Unfortunately, the correct activation (as a basis of interpolation, e.g., linear) is not known to the practitioner.

The following theorem gives the asymptotic formula for scaled optimism up to $O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ for linear regression models with intercept, and for linear models without intercept (1.8), it remains the same except that we need to assume that the design matrix \mathbf{X} has one fixed constant column consisting of 1's and a Σ with the corresponding diagonal element degenerated as 0.

Assumptions A1. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y}$ and $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X}$. We assume that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (3.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\mathbf{x}_*y(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\mathbf{x}_*y_*$ and $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T)$.

Theorem 3. Under Assumption A1, we can write down the errors as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left\|\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left(\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left(\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)^2\left(\mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}_*\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right). \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left(\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left(\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)^2\left(\mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}_*\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The expected random optimism for the least squares estimator is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt}R_{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{2}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left\|\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right\|_2^2\left(\mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}_*\right)\right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right). \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. See Appendix F; □

We will investigate next set of results about the scenario when the model is a perfect fit of the signal, the signal-dependent term vanishes.

Corollary 4. Under the same assumptions of Theorem 3, the term

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left[\left\|\mathbf{y}_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right\|_2^2\left(\mathbf{x}_*^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}_*\right)\right]$$

in (3.4) attains zero if and only if the function $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

Proof. From the (3.4), a non-negative random variable $\|\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2 > 0$ unless $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{0}$ due to the positive definiteness of the Σ . Therefore $\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) \equiv \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ which makes $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ a linear function in \mathbf{x}_* with coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}$. And this also makes the second term to be zero. \square

Corollary 5. *When $\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x}_{*i} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and $y(\mathbf{x}) = m(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon$ for an additive independent noise $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ with $\sigma_\epsilon^2 > 0$, we can yield formula (3.4) and write the expected scaled optimism as*

$$\frac{n\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \sim \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\|m(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_*\|_2^2 \right] + d + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \right) \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. See Appendix G. \square

Remark 6. If more generally $\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{x}_{*i} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, we can yield multivariate Stein's lemma to simplify the term $\Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} = [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})]^{-1} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{y}]$ in (3.5) via when the m is continuously differentiable. Assuming this, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} &= [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})]^{-1} \cdot [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{X} (m(\mathbf{X}) + \epsilon)] \\ &= [\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} m(\mathbf{X})]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can derive that $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{X} m(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) m(\mathbf{X}) + \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbb{E} m(\mathbf{X}) = \Sigma \mathbb{E}[\nabla m(\mathbf{X})] + \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbb{E} m(\mathbf{X})$. By Woodbury lemma, $(\Sigma + \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T)^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \Sigma^{-1} / (1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu})$, we have

$$[\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} m(\mathbf{X})] \quad (3.6)$$

$$= \left(\mathbf{I} - (1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu})^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \right) \mathbb{E}[\nabla m(\mathbf{X})] + (\Sigma + \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^T)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbb{E}(m(\mathbf{X})). \quad (3.7)$$

For 1-dimensional linear regression we have a formula for the scaled optimism in (3.4):

Corollary 7. *When $\mathbf{x}_* \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{X} \sim N(0, 1)$ we have a special form of (3.4) using an independent standard normal random variable Z :*

$$\frac{n\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \underset{Z \sim N(0,1)}{\sim} \frac{3(\mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z))^2 + \mathbb{E} Z^2 \mu(Z)^2 - 2\mathbb{E} Z^3 \mu(Z) \cdot \mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z)}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} + 1 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \right). \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. See Appendix H. \square

We can further write down the complexity measure when the actual signal $\mu(x)$ is of the form $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i x^i$:

Corollary 8. *Under the same assumption of Corollary 7, when the signal $\mu(x)$ is of the form $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i x^i$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot (F(A_i, i \neq 1)) + 1 + o(1), \quad (3.9)$$

which means that the signal part is a function that does not depend on A_1 , the linear part of the signal.

This result further confirms that the linear model only removes the linear part (when there is an explicit linear part in the signal) from the signal (as shown in Example 14 in Appendix J). When there is not an explicit expression for the linear part in the signal, this is less obvious (as shown in Example 15 in Appendix J). In the above corollaries 5, 7 and 8, we can observe that if we take the signal-independent part in (3.4), its scaled version coincide with the classical model degree of freedom. In Luan et al. (2021), they suggested that the signal-independent part can be used as generic predictive complexity measure for a wide class of models.

3.2 More Theoretical Results

A variant of the result in Theorem 3 can be elicited when we consider Eckhart-Young theorem in the context of the low-rank regressions, where the input is projected onto a low-dimensional space through projections (Ju et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2024c). When computing the covariance matrix, it is a common practice to use low-rank approximation to attain model sparsity or to reduce the cost of repeated matrix inversions (Luo et al., 2022, 2024a). Precisely, we use a rank- k approximation Σ_k to the matrix $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T)$ in prediction. The following theorem ensures that such a low-rank approximation will not increase optimism that exceeds a perturbation bound (3.10).

Theorem 9. *Under Assumption A1 and suppose that Σ_k is a rank- k approximation to the Σ , we can write down the expected random optimism for the rank- k least squares estimator is*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} & \quad (3.10) \\ & \leq \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}] \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T (\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x}_* \right) \right] + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where σ_{k+1} is the $(k+1)$ -th largest singular value of Σ .

Proof. See Appendix K. □

In other words, the optimism is “regularized by” an amount $\sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}$, and we can choose the most appropriate rank k based on the design of \mathbf{x}_* . This form of covariance $\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}$ in (3.10) inspired us to investigate the related ridge linear regression model. Then, we state a variant of Theorem 3 also holds for ridge regression and kernel ridge regressions under the following set of assumptions.

Assumptions A2. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for a fixed positive λ . We assume that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right), \quad \|\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \quad (3.11)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* y(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* y_*$ and $\Sigma_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})$.

By definitions of $\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda, \Sigma_\lambda$, Assumption A1 implies A2 for any $0 \leq \lambda < \infty$. When $\lambda = 0$, this reduces to Theorem 3, hence can be considered as a generalization to our main result.

Theorem 10. *Under Assumption A2, we can write down the errors as*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Err} R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right). \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Err} T_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The expected random optimism for the least squares estimator is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt} R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}) \left\| [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right). \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix L. □

Remark 11. Using Neumann series for $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B}\|_2 < 1$:

$$(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \dots \tag{3.13}$$

for $\mathbf{A} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}$, we can see that the effect of low-rank approximation in linear models is connected to ridge linear regression if we can find an λ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\| &= \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1}\| \\
&= \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \lambda \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-2} + \lambda^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-3} + \dots\| \\
&= \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} - \lambda \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-2} + \lambda^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-3} + \dots\| \\
&= \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}\| + O_p(\lambda \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-2}) \\
&\asymp \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}\| + O_p(\lambda \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-2}) \text{ as in (3.10)}.
\end{aligned}$$

with our results in Theorems 9 and 10. This means that when $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\|_2 < 1$, with appropriate choices of λ 's, the ridge regression models and low-rank approximated linear models can behave similarly in terms of optimism (i.e., generalization errors).

Note that the λ terms in (3.12) depends on both signal y_* and the model $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda$, which makes the signal-dependent and signal-independent parts no longer separable as in Luan et al. (2021). This motivates us to consider optimism as a more general form of predictive complexity that also applies to regularized models. In the case where $\lambda = 0$, the positivity

of the optimism is ensured; but when regularization is introduced, it is possible to obtain a negative optimism (See Appendix L for detailed discussion of positivity in line with Corollary 4).

It is clear that when $\lambda = 0$, (3.12) reduces to (3.4). When $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the fitted model will be a constant model, hence produce the same $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}}$ and zero $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt}R_{\mathbf{X}}$. To establish at what rate $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt}R_{\mathbf{X}}$ converges to zero, we first note that $\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} = (\Sigma + \lambda\mathbf{I})^{-1} = \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I} - \lambda^{-2}\Sigma^{1/2}(\lambda^{-1}\Sigma + \mathbf{I})^{-1}\Sigma^{1/2}$ by Woodbury lemma. So

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}\Sigma\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} + \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} &= \left(\lambda^{-1}\Sigma - \lambda^{-2}\Sigma^{1/2}(\lambda^{-1}\Sigma + \mathbf{I})^{-1}\Sigma^{3/2}\right)\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \\ &= \lambda^{-1}\Sigma\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} - \lambda^{-2}\Sigma^{1/2}(\lambda^{-1}\Sigma + \mathbf{I})^{-1}\Sigma^{3/2}\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

Using this expansion

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{\lambda} &= O(\lambda\mathbf{I}), \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} &= \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{I} + O(\lambda^{-2}\mathbf{I}).\end{aligned}$$

Then using these two limits we analyze terms in (3.12), we obtain that the optimism (3.12) converges to 0 at a rate $O(\lambda^{-1})$.

When $\lambda = 0$, we are fitting a linear model and can observe the same trend (zero for $k > 0.5$, non-zero for $k \leq 0.5$) (See Figures B.1 and 3.2 for more details). When $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, we are fitting a horizontal straight line model and $k = 0.5$ is the only correctly fitted model with zero optimism. The interesting phenomenon is when $\lambda \approx 1000$, where the difference in signals (different k 's) is highlighted in the optimism calculation.

To describe this generalization in the kernel ridge regression setting, we consider feature mapping $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, and $\Phi = (\phi(\mathbf{x}_1)^T, \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}_n)^T) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ consisting of row feature vectors $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times 1}$. We consider the following regression problem as a special case of (3.2):

$$\hat{\mu} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}_K} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \lambda \|f\|_K^2, \quad (3.14)$$

where we take the loss function ℓ as $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{H}_K$ as the reproducing Hilbert kernel space (Aronszajn, 1950) and its norm $\|\cdot\|_K$ induced by (the inner product) kernel function $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Its solution is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^T \underbrace{(\Phi^T \Phi + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \Phi^T}_{\in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}} \mathbf{y}, \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^T \Phi^T \underbrace{(\Phi \Phi^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1}}_{\in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \mathbf{y}, \\ &= K(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{X}) (K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y},\end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where $\Phi = (\phi(\mathbf{x}_1)^T, \dots, \phi(\mathbf{x}_n)^T) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ consisting of row feature vectors $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times 1}$ via feature mapping $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, $K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) = \llbracket K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) \rrbracket_{i,j=1}^n = \Phi^T \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ is the Gram matrix of the kernel $K : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $K(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{X})$ is the $1 \times n$ kernelized vector

$(K(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, K(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_n))$ and λ is the regularization parameter. The following assumption holds if the feature mapping ϕ is Lipschitz bounded and Assumption A2 holds.

Assumptions A3. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_\phi = \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T \mathbf{y}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\phi, \lambda} = \frac{1}{n} (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi} + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ for a fixed positive λ . We assume that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_\phi - \boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\phi, \lambda} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (3.16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \phi(\mathbf{x}_*) y(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \phi(\mathbf{x}_*) y_* \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times 1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda} = \mathbb{E}(\phi(\mathbf{x}_*) \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\phi = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, 0}$.

Under this assumption, the following result can be derived using identical arguments as Theorem 10 with \mathbf{x}_* replaced with $\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)$.

Theorem 12. *Under Assumption A3, the expected random optimism for the least squares kernel ridge estimator (3.15) defined by the kernel $K(\cdot, \cdot) = \phi(\cdot)^T \phi(\cdot)$, is*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[\left\| (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\phi \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1}) [\phi(\mathbf{x}_*) y_* - (\phi(\mathbf{x}_*) \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi] \right\|_2^2 \right] \quad (3.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\phi - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\phi, \lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}_\phi \\ &+ O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. This can be derived using identical arguments as in Appendix L for Theorem 10 with \mathbf{x}_* replaced with $\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)$. \square

Remark 13. This result does not only apply to kernel ridge regressions (KRR) (Hastie, 2009), but also applicable to the posterior mean estimator of a Gaussian process regression (Kanagawa et al., 2018; Kimeldorf and Wahba, 1970). This result in optimism also applies to GP regression with nugget λ , hence available to us when we need optimism for model selection as shown in Luo et al. (2024a) and kernel selection as shown in Allerbo and Jörnsten (2022).

Using NTK in KRR establishes a bridge between NN training and kernel methods. The neural tangent kernel (NTK) provides a linearized framework where the network output is approximated by a fixed kernel function. The assumption of small weight changes ensures this equivalence and validates the NTK's role as a linear approximation of NNs during training. Consider a two-layer fully connected NN (Arora et al., 2019; Geifman et al., 2020; Jacot et al., 2018) with m ReLU activation functions in the hidden layer, its functional form is:

$$g(\mathbf{x}; W, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \sigma(w_j^T \mathbf{x}),$$

where: $W = (w_1, \dots, w_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and $w_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ are the bottom-layer weights, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the top-layer weights and $\sigma(z) = \max\{z, 0\}$ is the ReLU activation function. During training, the bottom-layer weights W are updated using gradient descent (c.f., Section 2 and Proposition 1 of Jacot et al. (2018)). Let the change in weights




Figure 3.1: Testing signals functions f_k in (3.20) with white noise variance 0.1. The red solid line indicates the true signal, the blue dots are sample points with noise.

be denoted by ΔW , which is assumed to be small. In this regime, the network output can be linearized as:

$$g(x; W_0 + \Delta W, \mathbf{a}) \approx g(x; W_0, \mathbf{a}) + \nabla_W g(x; W_0, \mathbf{a}) \cdot \text{vec}(\Delta W),$$

where W_0 is the initialization of weights, $\text{vec}(\Delta W)$ is the vectorization of the weight updates. The neural tangent kernel $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is then defined through the mapping $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_W g(\mathbf{x}; W_0, \mathbf{a})$ as:

$$\Theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \nabla_W g(\mathbf{x}; W_0, \mathbf{a})^T \nabla_W g(\mathbf{x}'; W_0, \mathbf{a}), \quad (3.19)$$

with the same architecture as in Algorithm 4. This kernel takes gradient only with respect to the bottom layer weights W but has parameters W, \mathbf{a} and can be fitted as a kernel regression model as detailed in Algorithm 5.

Then, we can use the optimism to delineate the difference between linear models and NN under the setup (Arora et al., 2019), NTK acts as a kernel that transforms the input space into a feature space where regression is linear and regularized.

3.3 Simulation Results

In this section, we show that if we use optimism as a model complexity measure, the NN may have a very low complexity measure value because the NN usually generalize well even when trained on one set but tested on another.

In the subsequent simulation experiments, we set the $N = 100$ and $n_{\text{train}} = n_{\text{test}} = 1000$ unless otherwise is stated. We consider the following signal function f_k parameterized by $k \in [0, 1]$ on the domain $[-1, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with additive i.i.d. noise $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, i.e., $y(x) = f_k(x) + \epsilon$.

$$f_k(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{0.5-k}{0.5} \max(LU(x, 0)) = \frac{0.5-k}{0.5} \max(0, x) & k < 0.5 \\ \frac{k-0.5}{0.5} (-x) & k \geq 0.5 \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

To empirically verify our results, we study the signal function (3.20) fitted to the following linear (and ridge regression with $\lambda = 0.01, 0.1$), bended and 3-layer NN models with a specified number of hidden nodes (as expressed in Algorithm 4 and Figure B.2). For the linear and bended (a.k.a., ReLU) models, they assume explicit forms as:

$$\mu(x) = \alpha x + \beta, (\text{linear}) \tag{3.21}$$

$$\mu(x) = \alpha + \beta \cdot \max(x, 0), (\text{bended}) \tag{3.22}$$

where the optimization problem associated with models (3.21) and (3.22) are both convex from a direct verification.

The 3-layer NN we consider can be described by its fitting procedure in Algorithm 4 (See Appendix A) has 50 hidden nodes and ReLU activation function as an architecture choice. The choice of activation functions affects the weighting scheme between layers and has certain degree of influence in the resulting fit (Bishop, 1995). However, we observe that when we increase the number of nodes in the only hidden layer from 2 to 20, then the mis-specification effect seems to become milder. The optimism of a 3-layer NN with 50 hidden nodes is close to correctly specified models while the 3-layer NN with 2 hidden nodes shows random behavior. Its corresponding NTK kernel regression model, however, behaves more like simple linear and bended models.

The optimism can be computed using an MC Algorithm 1 (See Appendix A and B) where both the signal (varying with parameter k) and the noise variance can change. We want to investigate how the scaled expected optimism (divided by the known noise variance $\overline{\text{Opt}} = \frac{\text{Opt}}{2 \cdot \sigma^2} \cdot n_{\text{train}}$) and the raw expected optimism (simply Opt in (3.4)) changes when the noise variance changes. We fix the k in the signal function, resulting in different signals whose shapes are shown in Figure 3.1. The scaled expected optimism of a KRR with NTK kernel, however, is not similar to the 3.2. This empirical findings show that the expected optimism can tell kernel models apart from the NN in practice.

For the effect of different noise variances (on different panels of scaled expected optimism shown in Figure 3.2), we observe the magnitude of generalization errors changes. Most importantly, the relative magnitude of scaled optimism changes as the noise variance increases, even if scaled by the noise variance. The NN has an increasing optimism when the noise variance increases compared to linear models (and ridge, kernel models). Increasing optimism indicates a worse generalization ability as the additive noise in the signal increase (i.e., signal-to-noise ratio decreases)

As for the effect of different values of k (on the scale/magnitude of scaled expected optimism shown in Figure 3.2), this would depend on the specific form of the signal function and how it interacts with the \mathbf{x} variables in the model. If the signal function does not accurately capture the true relationship between the variables for certain values of k , then the model would be mis-specified for those values of k , which explains the trends for linear (correctly specified only when $k = 1.0$) and bended (correctly specified only when $k = 0.0$) models in Figure 3.2.

When $k \geq 0.5$, linear and NN converge to a correctly specified linear model within its model family and result in relatively small generalization errors. When $k = 0$, bended and NN converge to a correctly specified bended model within its model family and result in relatively small generalization errors. When $k < 0.5$, while parametric models (i.e., linear bended) both converge to constant white noise and result in nearly 0 generalization error, NN seem to be more sensitive to the amount of noise. This echoes the empirical fact that the NN rarely exhibits mis-specification due to its high flexibility. For kernel regression with




Figure 3.2: Different columns indicates difference additive noise variances $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1$ $k = 0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9, 1.0$ which controls the shapes of signals. In each panel, the x-axis is the changing k , y-axis is the (scaled) optimism computed from $N_{MC} = 10,000$. The model *NTK_0* means kernel regression using (3.19) (See Algorithm 5 in Appendix A) with no regularization; *Ridge_λ* means linear ridge regression with different regularization parameters λ .

NTK kernel, its optimism is lower than mis-specified linear and bended models, but never attain low optimism as good as correctly specified models nor NN (except for $k = 0.5$), arguably presenting robustness against mis-specifications.

Ridge models with $\lambda = 0.1, 0.01$ are among the worst models, especially when the noise variance is low. In Figure 3.2, we can observe that when the model is mis-specified the regularization only deteriorates the generalization. The kernel regression with NTK exhibits different behavior in terms of expected optimism, compared to NN. This comparison strengthens our theoretical results and support the findings that the NN is different from simple kernelization.

Using our Theorem 3, we plug in the expression (3.20) of f_k into (3.4) to compute the closed form of (scaled) optimism for linear model (3.21), and with the assumption that both training and testing sets are standard normal (See Appendix E for detailed calculations).

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \asymp \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \frac{3}{2}(1-2k)^2 & k < 0.5 \\ 0 & k \geq 0.5 \end{cases} + 1 + o(1). \quad (3.23)$$

This formula perfectly coincides with the experimental results in Figure 3.2, where linear model shows a quadratic decreasing trend when $k < 0.5$, followed by a nearly zero generalization error for linear signals after $k \geq 0.5$.

3.4 Real-data Experiments

For real datasets, one cannot simulate multiple batches of testing and training sets, Algorithms 2 and 3 in Appendix A generalize the simulation procedure of Algorithm 1 (which generates synthetic training and testing data) to real-world datasets where no such generation




Figure 3.3: Different models fitted on the diabetes dataset (Efron et al., 2004) with 442 samples and 10-dimensional input. The x-axis is the training epochs using the same Adam optimizer (fixed learning rate 0.1), y-axis is the optimism divided by sample size computed from $N_{MC} = \text{num_runs} = 10,000$ using hold-out (Algorithm 2) and k-fold (Algorithm 3 with $k = 2, 4$) methods. The table shows the optimism computed at epoch 10,000. Linear and NN models have the same architecture as in Section 3.3. The model *NTK* means kernel regression using (3.19) (See Algorithm 5 in Appendix A) with no regularization; *Ridge* means linear ridge regression with regularization parameter $\lambda = 0.01$.

mechanism is available. Instead of sampling from a known function, these methods estimate the generalization error in terms of optimism (Efron, 2004) by splitting or re-sampling finite data. Algorithm 2 (hold-out) divides the dataset once into training and testing partitions, then computes out-of-sample performance directly, the expected values are average across different hold-out splits. Algorithm 3 (k-fold cross-validation (Geisser, 1975)) partitions the data into k folds, cycling each fold as the test set for a more robust and often less biased estimate of error. While hold-out is faster and suited for large datasets, k-fold is preferred when data are limited or when a more stable error estimate is desired. Both approaches replace synthetic generation with principled observed data splitting, thereby offering practical methods to evaluate and correct for overfitting in real-data scenarios.

In Figure 3.3, we can observe that these methods (Algorithm 2 and 3) yield similar estimation of raw testing minus training errors, and normalized by the sample size 442.

First, the NN’s optimism grows substantially as training proceeds, underscoring that large-capacity models can strongly overfit if trained for many epochs. By contrast, the Linear model’s optimism remains near zero throughout, reflecting its relatively low capacity and inability to overfit severely on this dataset. The Ridge model and the NTK kernel regression approach lie between these extremes, showing moderate overfitting that eventually plateaus. Second, the final optimism estimates in the table vary with the data-splitting strategy. In particular, the k-fold estimates ($k = 2, 4$) often differ from the hold-out estimate because cross-validation both uses the data more efficiently and can lead to slightly different estimates of the gap between train and test performance.

Overall, the figure highlights that higher-capacity NN models may be more prone to growing train–test gaps over long training, yet regularization (as in Ridge regression) mitigates

overfitting but does not eliminate it entirely. For real datasets, different resampling methods can yield different numerical estimates of optimism, especially in small-to-medium data settings like the diabetes dataset (Efron et al., 2004).

4 Contribution and Discussion

4.1 Contributions

In this paper, we study the performance of linear regression and its variant kernel ridge regression in terms of the (scaled) optimism. As a predictive model complexity measure, we defined and computed expected optimism as the difference between testing and training errors under random-X setting. Then, we derive the asymptotic analytically closed expressions for the optimism for both linear (Theorem 3) and kernel ridge regressions (Theorem 10), showing its positivity and its connection to low-rank approximated model. A key contribution of our study is the closed-form expressions for regression models and the extension of theoretical understanding around the optimism metric — the expected difference between testing error and training error in model predictions under these models.

Our results show that the optimism is closely related to the model capacity (e.g., degree of freedom in linear model), and the intrinsic complexity of the underlying signal. With regularized and kernelized models, the asymptotic results can be used to study more complex models. By analyzing the asymptotic expressions for the optimism, we may gain more insights into the factors that drive the double descent phenomenon and understand how different models behave in the underparameterized, interpolation threshold, and overparameterized regions.

Our paper further delineates how various types of regression functions (linear, bended, NTK kernel) and regression NNs behave under different signal settings, thus contributing a layered complexity to the understanding of the double descent curve (Jiao and Lee, 2024; Luan et al., 2021). With analytically closed asymptotic expected optimism, we can compute it as a model predictive measure and we also find an interesting difference in generalization behavior between NTK kernel and NN regressions, showing that although NTK can approximate behavior of NN; NN is fundamentally different from simple kernelizations using NTK kernels (Jacot et al., 2018) in terms of optimism metrics.

4.2 Future works

The paper sets the groundwork for several promising directions of research. One immediate area for further exploration is the application of our theoretical findings to a different loss function than L_2 (e.g., L_1 /LASSO regressions (Ju et al., 2020), classification (Belkin et al., 2018)), which could potentially validate the applicability of the optimism metric across different types of predictive modeling beyond regression.

Since NN is different from simple kernelizations in terms of optimism behavior under different signals, it remains an open problem whether a recursive kernelization (e.g., deep GP (Dunlop et al., 2018)) can approximate the NN better in terms of optimism in the context of Theorem 3, 10 and 12. This could uncover additional insights into the behavior

of optimism in relation to kernel methods, and assists in adjusting the number of layers and nodes (Martin and Mahoney, 2021) based on generalization errors.

Extending the model complexity discussion into higher dimensional input spaces, tensor regressions usually have low-rank structures in the input space (Kielstra et al., 2024; Kolda and Bader, 2009; Luo et al., 2024b), therefore low-rank approximation are widely adopted in regression models while Eckhart-Young type theorem no longer holds. One interesting direction is to consider low-rank regression described in Theorem 9 for tensor inputs to calibrate tensor regressions and for rank estimation based on optimism.

Theorem 12 provides a generic expression for kernel ridge regression, however, its in-depth analysis will involve approximation characterization of kernel random matrices $\Sigma_\phi, \Sigma_{\phi,\lambda}$'s as shown in Koltchinskii and Giné (2000) when $n > d$. When $n < d$, we can also directly inspect kernel function K our random design assumption for inner product and stationary kernels satisfy the assumption for increasing dimension d (El Karoui, 2010). This could lead to a more comprehensive understanding of model generalization behaviors in high-dimensional input spaces.

Acknowledgment

HL was supported by U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 and U.S. National Science Foundation NSF-DMS 2412403. Authors thank Haoming Shi for proofreading our manuscripts and discussions on main results.

Our code is available at <http://github.com/hrluo>.

References

- Oskar Allerbo and Rebecka Jörnsten. Bandwidth selection for gaussian kernel ridge regression via jacobian control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11956*, 2022.
- Nachman Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American mathematical society*, 68(3):337–404, 1950.
- Sanjeev Arora, Simon Du, Wei Hu, Zhiyuan Li, and Ruosong Wang. Fine-grained analysis of optimization and generalization for overparameterized two-layer neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 322–332. PMLR, 2019.
- Mikhail Belkin, Daniel J Hsu, and Partha Mitra. Overfitting or perfect fitting? risk bounds for classification and regression rules that interpolate. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Mikhail Belkin, Daniel J Hsu, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. Reconciling modern machine learning practice and the bias-variance trade-off. *arXiv:1812.11118 [cs, stat]*, September 2019.
- CM Bishop. Neural networks for pattern recognition. *Clarendon Press google schola*, 2: 223–228, 1995.

- Matthew M Dunlop, Mark A Girolami, Andrew M Stuart, and Aretha L Teckentrup. How deep are deep gaussian processes? *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(54):1–46, 2018.
- Bradley Efron. The Estimation of Prediction Error: Covariance Penalties and Cross-Validation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(467):619–632, September 2004.
- Bradley Efron, Trevor Hastie, Iain Johnstone, and Robert Tibshirani. Least angle regression. 2004.
- Noureddine El Karoui. The spectrum of kernel random matrices. 2010.
- Jerome H Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: Data mining, inference, and prediction*. springer open, 2017.
- Amnon Geifman, Abhay Yadav, Yoni Kasten, Meirav Galun, David Jacobs, and Basri Ronen. On the similarity between the laplace and neural tangent kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1451–1461, 2020.
- Seymour Geisser. The predictive sample reuse method with applications. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 70(350):320–328, 1975.
- Chong Gu. *Smoothing spline ANOVA models*, volume 297. Springer, 2013.
- Trevor Hastie. The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction, 2009.
- Trevor Hastie, Andrea Montanari, Saharon Rosset, and Ryan J. Tibshirani. Surprises in High-Dimensional Ridgeless Least Squares Interpolation. *arXiv:1903.08560 [cs, math, stat]*, December 2020.
- Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clément Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Zhenbang Jiao and Yoonkyung Lee. Assessment of case influence in the lasso with a case-weight adjusted solution path. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00493*, 2024.
- Michael I Jordan and Tom M Mitchell. Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, 349(6245):255–260, 2015.
- Peizhong Ju, Xiaojun Lin, and Jia Liu. Overfitting can be harmless for basis pursuit, but only to a degree. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7956–7967, 2020.
- Peizhong Ju, Xiaojun Lin, and Ness Shroff. On the generalization power of overfitted two-layer neural tangent kernel models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5137–5147. PMLR, 2021.

- Motonobu Kanagawa, Philipp Hennig, Dino Sejdinovic, and Bharath K Sriperumbudur. Gaussian processes and kernel methods: A review on connections and equivalences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02582*, 2018.
- P Michael Kielstra, Tianyi Shi, Hengrui Luo, Jianliang Qian, and Yang Liu. A linear-complexity tensor butterfly algorithm for compressing high-dimensional oscillatory integral operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.03029*, 2024.
- George S Kimeldorf and Grace Wahba. A correspondence between bayesian estimation on stochastic processes and smoothing by splines. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 41(2):495–502, 1970.
- Tamara G Kolda and Brett W Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM review*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii and Evarist Giné. Random matrix approximation of spectra of integral operators. 2000.
- Bo Luan, Yoonkyung Lee, and Yunzhang Zhu. Predictive Model Degrees of Freedom in Linear Regression. *arXiv:2106.15682 [math, stat]*, June 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15682>.
- Hengrui Luo, Giovanni Nattino, and Matthew T Pratola. Sparse additive gaussian process regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(61):1–34, 2022.
- Hengrui Luo, Younghyun Cho, James W Demmel, Xiaoye S Li, and Yang Liu. Hybrid parameter search and dynamic model selection for mixed-variable bayesian optimization. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–14, 2024a.
- Hengrui Luo, Akira Horiguchi, and Li Ma. Efficient decision trees for tensor regressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01926*, 2024b.
- Hengrui Luo, Jeremy E Purvis, and Didong Li. Spherical rotation dimension reduction with geometric loss functions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(175):1–55, 2024c.
- Charles H Martin and Michael W Mahoney. Implicit self-regularization in deep neural networks: Evidence from random matrix theory and implications for learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):7479–7551, 2021.
- Brady Neal, Sarthak Mittal, Aristide Baratin, Vinayak Tantia, Matthew Scicluna, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Ioannis Mitliagkas. A modern take on the bias-variance tradeoff in neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08591*, 2018.
- Pratik Patil, Jin-Hong Du, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Revisiting optimism and model complexity in the wake of overparameterized machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01259*, 2024.
- Nalini Ravishanker, Zhiyi Chi, and Dipak K Dey. *A first course in linear model theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2002.

Jorma Rissanen. *Information and complexity in statistical modeling*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

Saharon Rosset and Ryan J Tibshirani. From fixed-x to random-x regression: Bias-variance decompositions, covariance penalties, and prediction error estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2019.

Vladimir Vapnik. *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer science & business media, 1999.

Lijun Wang, Hongyu Zhao, and Xiaodan Fan. Degrees of freedom: Search cost and self-consistency. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–12, 2024.

Jianming Ye. On measuring and correcting the effects of data mining and model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(441):120–131, 1998.

A Related Algorithms for Simulations

In this section, we introduce algorithms used for asymptotic optimism (3.1) for synthetic data and real data.

Algorithm 1 employs synthetically generated data for both training and testing, wherein each run constructs the input features and corresponding response values from a known function (e.g., f_k as in (3.20)) with simulated additive noise. This simulation-based framework is particularly useful for controlled experiments and theoretical investigations, since it allows the researcher to manipulate the level of noise or the complexity of the signal and then observe how the model responds during training and testing. However, this approach is not directly applicable to real-world data scenarios because one typically does not have the procedure of freely generating labeled samples from a specified known function. Instead, in practice, data are finite and often cannot be easily replaced or expanded through artificial means.

Algorithms 2 and 3 address this limitation by adapting the training and testing procedure to real datasets. The core difference is that instead of generating new training and testing sets at each run, the algorithms split or re-sample an existing dataset in systematic ways to estimate both the training performance and the generalization error. Algorithm 2, referred to as the “hold-out” generalization, creates a single split of the dataset into a training portion and a test portion, trains the model on the training set over a specified number of epochs, and then evaluates on the test set. By repeating this procedure several times with different splits or different random initializations, one can measure how the model performs on unseen data and thereby estimate its tendency to overfit. The hold-out approach is straightforward to implement and computationally less intensive; it is therefore appealing when the dataset is large enough that a single (e.g., 80-20 split) split will still produce a sufficiently reliable estimate of test performance.

Algorithm 3, often referred to as the k -fold cross-validation generalization, takes a more systematic approach by partitioning the dataset into k roughly equal folds. Each fold is used as a test set once, while the remaining $k-1$ folds are used for training. The average test

performance across $k-1$ folds provides a more robust estimate of the model’s generalization ability because every data point has served as test data exactly once. Although it is typically more computationally expensive than a single hold-out split: since one must train and evaluate the model k times. This procedure is especially valuable when the dataset is small and the goal is to make the most efficient use of available data while still obtaining a stable measure of test performance.

Deciding which method to adopt, hold-out or k -fold cross-validation, generally depends on the size of the dataset, the computational costs of training, and the desired precision in estimating generalization error. When ample data are available and training the model is computationally demanding, a single hold-out split (with or without repeated runs) is often sufficient. In contrast, when the dataset is relatively small or when a more reliable performance estimate is necessary, k -fold cross-validation is typically preferred. Both of these real-data generalizations of Algorithm 1 thus serve to replace synthetic data generation with proven data-splitting or re-sampling techniques, ensuring that model performance can be assessed appropriately in practical applications.

Above algorithms 1, 2 and 3 also works for NN and NTK fitting, like the one described in Algorithm 4 and 5. These two methods usually performs layer-wise fitting. Instead of updating all layers as in Algorithm 4, only the bottom-layer weights W and the top-layer weights \mathbf{a} are considered as kernel parameters and optimized, which approximates the feature learning and top-layer fitting in the NN. The NTK features Z_1 emulate the learned features of the NN where the ridge regression penalty on the NTK kernel matrix Z_2 approximates the NN’s regularization, capturing overparameterization effects inherent in wide networks. We do not use any regularization, namely $\lambda = 0$ in this setting. By dynamically computing the NTK features and kernel, this code emulates the training of a NN while leveraging the fixed NTK, consistent with the theoretical behavior of wide NNs.

B Simulation Monte-Carlo Sample Sizes

MC simulation settings. From different simulation settings in Figure B.1, we report the final scaled expected optimism estimated from each simulation. We observe that the MC error for this experiment is not negligible, especially at the initial stages of the training (i.e., when the number of epochs is small). This is due to a large variance of the scaled optimism but is also affected by the magnitude of the initialization weights (i.e., weights of nodes in NN, α, β in (3.21) and (3.22)). Further increasing the MC sample size could resolve this issue, but requires significantly more compute time. In our experiments, we notice that the improvement of the estimate is relatively small after the MC sample size exceeds 10,000. It is also observed that: when the noise variance is small, the model fit is basically determined by the signal shape. Then the raw optimism is relatively stable; when the noise variance is large (> 1 , not shown), the model fit is basically determined by the noise shape. If the true relationship between the variables is not linear or does not follow the specified signal function, then the model would be mis-specified.

Algorithm 1 Simulation algorithm for estimating optimism in linear and ridge regression models. This algorithm computes the average performance of different models (linear, hinge, and bended) over a specified number of training epochs and runs, which is assessed by the mean train and test losses. We use it to study how different levels of noise in the training data (as shown in Figure B.1) and different signal complexities (controlled by parameter k) affect the models’ learning process (as shown in Figure B.2) and their ability to generalize from training data to unseen test data (as shown in Figure 3.2).

- **Input:** Original dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$ of size N , number of runs `num_runs`, number of epochs `num_epochs`, penalty term λ , and choice of optimizer (e.g., Adam/SGD).
 - **For each run in num_runs:**
 - Generate training data \mathbf{X}_{train} and response values $\mathbf{y}_{train} = f_k(\mathbf{X}_{train})$ with noise $N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$
 - Generate testing data \mathbf{X}_{test} and response values $\mathbf{y}_{test} = f_k(\mathbf{X}_{test})$ with noise $N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$
 - Initialize the model using a different random seed (neural network or other function models)
 - Define the loss function (MSE) and the optimizer (Adam/SGD)
 - **For each epoch in num_epochs:**
 - * Perform a forward pass/fitting of the model with the training data \mathbf{X}_{train} and \mathbf{y}_{train} .
 - * Calculate the training loss with a penalty term $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{I}$ using model prediction $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{train}$ and \mathbf{y}_{train}
 - * Perform a forward pass/prediction with the testing data (without gradient computation)
 - * Calculate the test loss: $\mathcal{L}_{test} = \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{test}, \mathbf{y}_{test})$.
 - Compute the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{train}$ and the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{test}$ over all runs, as well as any variability measures.
-

Algorithm 2 Hold-out generalization of Algorithm 1 for real-data computation of optimism.

- **Input:** Original dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$ of size N , number of runs `num_runs`, number of epochs `num_epochs`, penalty term λ , and choice of optimizer (e.g., Adam/SGD).
 - **For each run in `num_runs`:**
 - Split \mathcal{D} into $(\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}})$, for example using an 80%–20% random split.
 - Let $\mathbf{X}_{\text{train}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$ be the **hold-out** training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{test}}$ be a **bootstrap sample** from the test set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$.
 - Initialize the model using a different random seed (neural network or other function models).
 - Define the loss function (MSE) and the optimizer (Adam/SGD).
 - **For each epoch in `num_epochs`:**
 - * Perform a forward pass/predicting of the model with the training data $\mathbf{X}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$.
 - * Calculate the training loss with a penalty term $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{I}$ using model prediction $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$.
 - * Perform backpropagation and update the model parameters (via optimizer).
 - After the final epoch, perform a forward pass with \mathbf{X}_{test} (no gradient computation).
 - Calculate the test loss: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}} = \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{test}})$.
 - Store or record $\mathcal{L}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}$.
 - Compute the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{train}}$ and the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{test}}$ over all runs, as well as any variability measures.
-

Algorithm 3 k-Fold generalization of Algorithm 1 for real-data computation of optimism.

- **Input:** Original dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$ of size N , number of runs `num_runs`, number of epochs `num_epochs`, number of folds `k`, penalty term λ , and choice of optimizer (e.g., Adam/SGD).
 - **For each run in num_runs:**
 - Partition \mathcal{D} into `k` folds of (approximately) equal sizes that are disjoint. Let **one fold** be $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = (\mathbf{X}_{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{test}})$.
 - **For each fold in the rest k-1 folds:**
 - * Let $\mathbf{X}_{\text{train}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$ be the **fixed fold** training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and use the current fold of the remaining `k-1` folds into $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = (\mathbf{X}_{\text{train}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{train}})$.
 - * Initialize the model using a different random seed (neural network or other function models).
 - * Define the loss function (MSE) and the optimizer (Adam/SGD).
 - * **For each epoch in num_epochs:**
 - Perform a forward pass/predicting of the model with the training data $\mathbf{X}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$.
 - Calculate the training loss with a penalty term $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{I}$ using model prediction $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\text{train}}$.
 - Perform backpropagation and update the model parameters (via optimizer).
 - * After the final epoch, perform a forward pass with \mathbf{X}_{test} (no gradient computation).
 - * Calculate the test loss: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}} = \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{test}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{test}})$.
 - * Store or record $\mathcal{L}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}$ for this fold.
 - Compute the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{train}}$ and the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{test}}$ over all runs, as well as any variability measures.
-

Algorithm 4 3-layer NN construction in python using pytorch. The network consists of linear input layer, with ReLU of 50 outputs; hidden layer with ReLU of 50 outputs; output layer with ReLU of 1 output.

- `class SimpleNN(nn.Module):`
 - `def __init__(seed,self):`
 - `super(SimpleNN, self).__init__()`
 - `nn.manual_seed(seed)`
 - `self.layers = nn.Sequential(nn.Linear(1, 50), nn.ReLU(), nn.Linear(50, 50), nn.ReLU(), nn.Linear(50, 1))`
 - `net = SimpleNN()`
 - `criterion = nn.MSELoss()`
 - `optimizer = optim.Adam(net.parameters(), lr=0.01)` or `optim.SGD(net.parameters(), lr=0.01, momentum=0.9)`
 - **For each epoch in num_epochs:**
 - `optimizer.zero_grad()`
 - `outputs = net(train_X)`
 - `loss = criterion(outputs, train_y)`
 - `loss.backward()`
 - `optimizer.step()`
 - **with** `torch.no_grad():`
 - * `outputs_test = net(test_X)`
 - * `loss_test = criterion(outputs_test, test_y)`
-

Algorithm 5 Simulation algorithm for estimating optimism in kernel regression model with NTK. This algorithm computes the average performance of kernel ridge regression models, specifically, this NTK kernel corresponds to a NN consists of linear input layer, with ReLU of 50 outputs; hidden layer with ReLU of 50 outputs; output layer with ReLU of 1 output as in Algorithm 4.

- **Input:** Original dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$ of size N , number of runs `num_runs`, number of epochs `num_epochs`, penalty term λ , and choice of optimizer (e.g., Adam/SGD).
 - **For each run in num_runs:**
 - Generate training data \mathbf{X}_{train} and response values $\mathbf{y}_{train} = f_k(\mathbf{X}_{train})$ with noise $N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$
 - Generate testing data \mathbf{X}_{test} and response values $\mathbf{y}_{test} = f_k(\mathbf{X}_{test})$ with noise $N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$
 - Initialize the model using a different random seed
 - Initialize W : Bottom-layer weights; \mathbf{a} : Top-layer weights both as i.i.d. $N(0, 1)$
 - Define the loss function (MSE) and the optimizer (Adam/SGD)
 - **For each epoch in epochs:**
 - * Perform a forward pass of the model with the training data
 - $Z_1 = \text{ReLU}(W^T \mathbf{X}_{train})$ as the feature mapping ϕ
 - $Z_2 = Z_1 \cdot Z_1^T$ as the NTK feature of the corresponding kernel Θ in (3.19).
 - $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{train} = Z_1 \mathbf{a}$
 - * Calculate the training loss with a penalty term $\lambda \cdot \text{trace}(Z_2)$ using model prediction $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{train}$ and \mathbf{y}_{train}
 - * Perform backpropagation and update the model parameters W, \mathbf{a}
 - * Perform a forward pass with the testing data (without gradient computation)
 - * Calculate the test loss: $\mathcal{L}_{test} = \text{MSE}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{test}, \mathbf{y}_{test})$.
 - Compute the \mathcal{L}_{train} and the average $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{test}$ over all runs, as well as any variability measures (e.g., standard deviation).
-




Figure B.1: Different rows of panels denote Linear, Bended and NN models correspondingly; different columns of panels denote $k = 0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0$ which controls the shapes of signals. In each panel, the x-axis is the changing number of MC runs, y-axis is the noise variance added to the signal and the color indicates the actual value (with text) of the (raw) optimism, i.e., the testing minus training loss (at the last epoch).

We choose the MC sample size to be 10000, which seems to guarantee the accuracy of estimated model optimism for the signal we considered.

Trends in optimism versus epochs. Figure B.2 shows us that for different signals of different complexities k , the same NN takes different number of epochs to attain convergence. For different $k = 0.0, 0.1, \dots, 1.0$, the scaled expected optimism, as a measure of overfitting, exhibits a distinct trend in contrast to the linear and bended models. Initially, the optimism is minimal, reflecting the random initialization of weights in the NN. Then the optimism increases to a peak, during which the model is trained to fit the training data. As the training concludes, the optimism stabilizes and shows a better performance over the testing dataset, indicating the attainment of a balance between model complexity and generalization.

We choose the max iteration to be 1000, which seems to guarantee the convergence of model training for the sample sizes we considered.




Figure B.2: Expected Optimism (averaged from 10000 MC simulations) versus the number of NN epochs for different k in (3.20) with $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 0.01$ for a training set sampled from $N(0, 1)$ of size 1000; and a testing set sampled from $N(0, 1)$ of size 1000. The network (with 2, 10, 25, 50 hidden nodes) is trained with 1000 maximum epoches and reLU activation functions. NNs are optimized via Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.01 or SGD with learning rate 0.01 and momentum 0.9, and we provide the optimism for the linear model for comparison.

C Proof of Proposition 1

Recall the row vector notations $\mathbf{h}_i^T = \mathbf{x}_i^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$ and $\mathbf{h}_*^T = \mathbf{x}_*^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$ we defined and the fact that $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y} = \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, $\mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{h}_*^T \mathbf{y} = \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*)$. The in-sample optimism (or classical optimism) can be defined as¹,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}} T_{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{y_i|\mathbf{x}_i} \left\| y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{y_i|\mathbf{x}_i} (y_i^T y_i - y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{h}_i y_i + \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) \\
&= \sigma_\epsilon^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \mu(\mathbf{x}_i) - 2\mathbb{E} y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y} + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \text{trace}(\mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_i^T) + \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_i^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})) \\
&= \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\text{trace} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H} \right) \right) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E} y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})
\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

We define out-of-sample prediction error (testing error) and calculate the corresponding optimism.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y}} &:= \mathbb{E}_{y_*|\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
y_* | \mathbf{x}_* &\sim N_1(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\epsilon^2) \in \mathbb{R}^1
\end{aligned}$$

and the expectation of this quantity is defined as $\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}_*} := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y},y_*|\mathbf{X},\mathbf{x}_*} (\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{y}})$.

We have the following expression for optimism $\text{Opt} R_{\mathbf{X}}$.

$$\text{Opt} R_{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} - \text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} \tag{C.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sigma_\epsilon^2 (1 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*\|_2^2) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \mu(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|_2^2 \\
&- \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\text{trace} \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H} \right) \right) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E} y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) - \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \mu(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) \\
&+ \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace}(\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \right) \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E} y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

¹Note that $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} = \text{trace}(\mathbf{A} \text{Var} \mathbf{X}) + (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{A} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}$

To simplify this expression further, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{n} (\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})) \\ \text{Note that } \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H} &= \mathbf{H} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

and use the fact that $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} = \text{trace}(\mathbf{A}\text{Var}\mathbf{X}) + (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{A}\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) - \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})) &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) - \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbb{E}\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (2\mathbf{H}) \cdot \sigma_\epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

We can insert $-\frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})$ into (C.3) and get,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 \\ &\quad \underbrace{-\frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) + \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{H}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})}_{\text{using (C.4)}} \\ &\quad + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*^T\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \right) \\ &\quad \underbrace{+ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}y_i^T \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{y}) - \frac{2}{n} \text{trace} (\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}))}_{\text{using (C.5)}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*^T\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (2\mathbf{H}) \cdot \sigma_\epsilon^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

which can be reduced into following familiar form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*^T\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (2\mathbf{H}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where the Opt $R_{\mathbf{X}}$ can be split into two parts as shown in the main text:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{signal part: } &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{h}_*^T \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X})\|_2^2 \\ \text{noise part: } &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \|\mathbf{h}_*^T\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{H}) + \frac{1}{n} \text{trace} (2\mathbf{H}) \end{aligned}$$

D Proof of Proposition 2

Consider an empirical risk minimization prediction rule $\hat{\mu}$ over \mathcal{F}_n , the model fitted on training data is defined as

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{1}{n_{\text{train}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{train}}} \ell(f(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i). \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where the loss function is taken as the L_2 loss function $\ell(x, x') = \|x - x'\|_2^2$. If the training data $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the testing data $\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n$ follow the same distribution, then (D.1) and (D.2) define the same solution.

We also need to define the model fitted using the testing set as follows:

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{test}} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(f(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}). \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Here, we assume that the model space \mathcal{F}_n only depends on the training sample size $n = n_{\text{train}}$, and does not depend on the training data $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) = \{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n$. We want to show that its testing error $\text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} := \mathbb{E}_{y_* | \mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2$ is no smaller than its training error $\text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{y_i | \mathbf{x}_i} \left\| y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2$, i.e., we want to prove

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n, (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_*, y_*), (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i) = \text{Err}T_{\mathbf{X}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

The equality comes from the fact that we assume the same distribution for the training and testing sets. For test data point (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_*, y_*)} \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_*), y_*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}} \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}).$$

The equality follows from taking n_{train} independent identical copies $\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}$ of (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) .

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}} \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) = \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) \right) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{test}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) \right) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i) \right). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

The first equality comes from the fact that we assume the same distribution for the training and testing sets. The inequality comes from the definition of $\hat{\mu}_{\text{test}}$ in (D.2) that it minimizes

the loss among all possible functions in the functional space \mathcal{F}_n . The last equality comes from the fact that the training and testing dataset follow the same distribution and the definitions in (D.1).

Collecting above arguments, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_*, y_*)} \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_*), y_*) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) \right),$$

and we can take expectation with respect to the training data $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n) = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, yielding

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}_*, y_*), (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)} \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{train}}(\mathbf{x}_*), y_*) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}, y_{*,i}\}_{i=1}^n, (\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{y}_n)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\hat{\mu}_{\text{test}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,i}), y_{*,i}) \right).$$

For the above proof to hold, we emphasize that in (D.1) the functional space \mathcal{F}_n must be the same and independent of training and testing dataset, although they can vary with the sample size $n = n_{\text{test}}$.

E Calculation for (3.23)

When $k < 0.5$, the calculation follows as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \mu(x))^2 &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \cdot \frac{0.5 - k}{0.5} \max(0, x) \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\int_0^\infty (1 - 2k) x^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx \right)^2 = \frac{1}{4} (1 - 2k)^2 \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \mu(x)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \left(\frac{0.5 - k}{0.5} \max(0, x) \right)^2 \\ &= \int_0^\infty (1 - 2k)^2 x^4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx = \frac{3}{2} (1 - 2k)^2 \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \left(\frac{0.5 - k}{0.5} \max(0, x) \right) \\ &= \int_0^\infty (1 - 2k) x^4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx = \frac{3}{2} (1 - 2k) \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x' \mu(x') &= \frac{3}{4} (1 - 2k)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \frac{3}{2} (1 - 2k)^2 + 1 + o(1).$$

When $k \geq 0.5$, the calculation follows as

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \mu(x))^2 &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \cdot \frac{k - 0.5}{0.5} (-x) \right)^2 \\
&= \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - 2k) x^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx \right)^2 = (1 - 2k)^2 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \mu(x)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \left(\frac{0.5 - k}{0.5} \max(0, x) \right)^2 \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} (1 - 2k)^2 x^4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx = 3(1 - 2k)^2 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \left(\frac{0.5 - k}{0.5} \max(0, x) \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} (1 - 2k) x^4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx = 3(1 - 2k) \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x' \mu(x') &= 3(1 - 2k)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \asymp 0 + 1 + o(1).$$

F Proof of Theorem 3

For testing error, we know that the coefficient estimate for training set $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and single testing point $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ as a column vector. We adopt the following notations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}, \\
\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} &= \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Sigma} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\
\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}, \\
\boldsymbol{\eta} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* y_* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the $y(\mathbf{x}_*)$ to denote the observed response value y at this single testing point \mathbf{x}_* which is not necessarily in the training set. Now consider an arbitrary pair (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) as an

independent draw from the same distribution of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} and the L_2 loss function:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right]^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}})
\end{aligned} \tag{F.1}$$

where we observe that in (F.1) has a quadratic term

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right]^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\
&= \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{F.2}$$

but the cross-product term in (F.1) vanishes due to the fact that $(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = 0$ under expectation with respect to the new observations (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_*^T y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma})}_{=0} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{F.3}$$

Therefore if we take expectation with respect to training set, the $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}$ (F.1) simplifies into

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(\text{F.1}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \tag{F.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)}_{(1)} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{F.5}$$

The step taken in (F.5) comes from the assumption that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$, $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$ and the following manipulation of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ in (F.7). First we observe that

$\hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}\right) &= \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1} \\
&= \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\Sigma\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&= \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\left(\hat{\Sigma} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right)\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{F.6}$$

Then, we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) &= \left(\left(\eta + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) - \hat{\Sigma}\left(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right)\eta\right) \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma^{-1}\eta - \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\hat{\eta} &= \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) \\
&= \Sigma^{-1}\left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) + \left(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}\right)\left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) \\
&= \Sigma^{-1}\left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{F.7}$$

Now part (1) in (F.5) can be expanded using another arbitrary pair (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) as an independent copy of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} :

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right)^T \Sigma^{-1} \left(\hat{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\eta\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[\hat{\eta} - \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}) \Sigma^{-1}\eta\right]^T \Sigma^{-1} \left[\hat{\eta} - \frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}) \Sigma^{-1}\eta\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \Sigma^{-1}\eta\right]^T \Sigma^{-1} \left[\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \Sigma^{-1}\eta\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1}\eta)^T (\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1}\eta) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1}\eta)^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*)
\end{aligned} \tag{F.8}$$

To sum up, plugging (F.8) back into F.5:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\beta} \right\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1}\eta)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1}\eta)^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right). \tag{F.9}$$

For training error, we recall the definition of hat matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T = \mathbf{X}\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T$ and $\mathbf{H}^T\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}$, and take yet another arbitrary pair (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) as an independent copy of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{y}^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - n \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} y_*^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \end{aligned} \tag{F.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + 2y_* \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - (\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{F.11}$$

We can compute the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}$ in (F.11), where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \\ &= \text{trace} (\Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1} \cdot \Sigma) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* (\Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* \\ &= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Then noticing that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} 2y_* \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} = 2\boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ we can simplify

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(F.11)} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{(2)} \end{aligned} \tag{F.12}$$

Now we want to compute the term (2) in (F.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
(2) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \text{ and we use (F.7),} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \left(\mathbf{I} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \left(\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)}_{=0} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \right] + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \underbrace{\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T}_{=O_p(\frac{1}{n}) \text{ by (F.7)}} \left(\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \quad \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}}_{=O_p(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n})} \text{ by (F.6)}} \right) \underbrace{\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T}_{=O_p(\frac{1}{n}) \text{ by (F.7)}} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^2 \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows the same argument as in (F.8):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^2 \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \right) \quad (\text{F.13}) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.2), we take the difference between testing and training error as optimism of the model:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} &:= (\text{F.9}) - (\text{F.13}) \\
&= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^2 \left(\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} &\sim \frac{1}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Statement: Consider model $y_* = \mu(\mathbf{x}_*) + \epsilon$ with an independent additive noise $\mathbb{E}\epsilon = 0$ and a linear function $\mu(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbf{x}_*^T \mathbf{w}$ in \mathbf{x}_* . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} &\sim \frac{1}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*, \epsilon} (\mu(\mathbf{x}_*) + \epsilon - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*, \epsilon} \left[\epsilon^2 + (\mu(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \right] (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

But we can observe that $\epsilon^2 \sim \chi^2(1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*, \epsilon} \epsilon^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) &= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon} \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) \\
&= 1 \cdot \left\{ (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_*)^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \cdot (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_*) + \text{trace}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \text{Var} \mathbf{x}_*) \right\} \\
&= 1 \cdot (0 + d) = d,
\end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\frac{n\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \sim \frac{1}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \mu(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|^2 + d + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right).$$

When there is an intercept term, we can repeat the above arguments with augmented \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{x}_* (augmented by 1) and yield the same result with d replaced by $d + 1$.

G Proof of Corollary 5

Proof. Plug in the $y_* = y(\mathbf{x}_*) = m(\mathbf{x}_*) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ back into (3.4), we can take expectation first with respect to $(\mathbf{x}_*, \boldsymbol{\epsilon})$ (they are independent):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\| m(\mathbf{x}_*) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| m(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 + 2\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T (m(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2^2 \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| m(\mathbf{x}_*) - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 + 0 + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \cdot d \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_* \right\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2^2$ is a chi-square distribution with degree of freedom d . \square

H Proof of Corollary 7

Proof. Take $\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = 1$ and $d = 1$ in (3.4), with the independent standard normal random variables $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ $(Z^2 \mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z) - Z \mu(Z))^2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}}}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} &\sim \frac{n}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\| Z^2 \mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z) - Z \mu(Z) \right\|_2^2 + 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\
&= \frac{n}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z^2 \mu(Z)^2 - 2Z^3 \mu(Z) \mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z) + Z^4 (\mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z))^2 \right\} \\
&\quad + 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\
&= \frac{n}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \left[\mathbb{E} Z^2 \mu(Z)^2 - 2 \mathbb{E} Z^3 \mu(Z) \cdot \mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z) + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} Z^4 (\mathbb{E} Z \mu(Z))^2}_{=3} \right] + 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

\square

I Proof of Corollary 8

Proof. We follow the same procedure

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \mu(x))^2 &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+1} \right)^2 = \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} + A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \right)^2 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \mu(x)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+1} \right)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i=0, j=0}^{\infty} A_i A_j x^{i+j+2} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right) \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right) + 2A_1 \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+3} \right) + 2A_1^2 x^4 \right) \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} \right) = \sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} + A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^4 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x' \mu(x') &= \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} + A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^4 \right) \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} + A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \\
&\asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \left\{ 6(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x_i \mu(x_i))^2 + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x_i^2 \mu(x_i)^2 - 4\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x_i^3 \mu(x_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x_{\ell} \mu(x_{\ell}) \right\} + 1 + o(1) \\
&\asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2} \left\{ 6 \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right)^2 + 2A_1 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right) + A_1^2 \right) \right. \\
&+ 2 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+1} \right) \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+1} \right) + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_1 x^2 \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+1} \right) + A_1^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^4 \right) \\
&- 4 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+3} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+1} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+3} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_1 x^2 + \right. \\
&\left. \left. - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_1 x^4 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_1 x^4 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_1 x^2 \right) \right\} + 1 + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \left\{ 6 \cdot \left(\left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right)^2 + 2A_1 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right) + A_1^2 \right) \right. \\
& + 2 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i A_j x^{i+j+2} \right) + 2A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+3} \right) + 3A_1^2 \right) \\
& - 4 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+3} \right) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j x^{j+1} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i x^{i+3} \right) A_1 \right. \\
& \left. \left. + 3A_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right) + 3A_1^2 \right) \right\} + 1 + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(A_i, i \neq 1) \\
& = 6 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \right)^2 + 2 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+j+2} \right) \\
& - 4 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} \right) \left(\sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right) \\
& = 6 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right) + 2 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+j+2} \right) \\
& - 4 \left(\sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} A_i A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

by Stein's Lemma (See also Remark 6), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+3} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \cdot x^{i+2} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(i+2)x^{i+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} (6A_i A_j - 4A_i A_j (i+2)) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} + 2A_i A_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+j+2} \\
& = \sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} [(-2-4i) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+j+2}] A_i A_j \tag{I.1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \sum_{j \neq 1}^{\infty} [(-4i) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} + 2\text{Cov}(x^{i+1}, x^{j+1})] A_i A_j \\
& = \sum_{i \neq 1}^{\infty} \left\{ [(-4i) (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1})^2 + 2\text{Cov}(x^{i+1}, x^{i+1})] A_i^2 \right. \\
& \left. + \sum_{j \neq 1, i}^{\infty} [(-4i) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{i+1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^{j+1} + 2\text{Cov}(x^{i+1}, x^{j+1})] A_i A_j \right\}. \tag{I.2}
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

J Computational Examples using Corollary 8

Example 14. (Polynomial signal) When $\mu(x) = A_3x^3 + A_2x^2 + A_1x^1 + A_0, x \sim N(0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \mu(x))^2 &= (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} A_3x^4 + A_2x^3 + A_1x^2 + A_0x)^2 = (3A_3 + A_1)^2 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \mu(x)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 (A_3^2x^6 + A_2^2x^4 + A_1^2x^2 + A_0^2 + 2A_3A_2x^5 + 2A_3A_1x^4 \\
&\quad + 2A_3A_0x^3 + 2A_2A_1x^3 + 2A_2A_0x^2 + 2A_1A_0x^1) \\
&= 105A_3^2 + 15A_2^2 + 3A_1^2 + A_0^2 + 30A_3A_1 + 6A_2A_0 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x_i^3 \mu(x_i) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} [A_3x^6 + A_2x^5 + A_1x^4 + A_0x^3] = 15A_3 + 3A_1 \\
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x' \mu(x') &= (15A_3 + 3A_1)(3A_3 + A_1) = 45A_3^2 + 24A_3A_1 + 3A_1^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \\
&\asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \{6(9A_3^2 + 6A_3A_1 + A_1^2) + 2(105A_3^2 + 15A_2^2 + 3A_1^2 + A_0^2 + 30A_3A_1 + 6A_2A_0) \\
&\quad - 4 \cdot (45A_3^2 + 24A_3A_1 + 3A_1^2)\} + 1 + o(1) \\
&\asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \left(2A_0^2 + \underbrace{30A_2^2 + 84A_3^2 + 12A_0A_2}_{\text{exceeding terms caused by mis-specification}} \right) + 1 + o(1) \tag{J.1}
\end{aligned}$$

And $G(\mu, P_{\mathbf{X}}) = g(A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3) = 2A_0^2 + 30A_2^2 + 84A_3^2 + 12A_0A_2$.

Example 15. (Exponential signal) When $\mu(x) = \exp(-a(x-b)^2), x \sim N(0, 1)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x \mu(x))^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x \mu(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x \mu(x) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x \exp(-a(x-b)^2) dx \\
&= \frac{abe^{-\frac{ab^2}{a+1}}}{\sqrt{2}(1+a)^{3/2}} \tag{J.2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^2 \mu(x)^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^2 \mu(x)^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^2 \mu(x)^2 dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^2 \exp(-2a(x-b)^2) dx \\
&= \frac{(1+2a+8a^2b^2)e^{-\frac{2ab^2}{2a+1}}}{2\sqrt{2}(1+2a)^{5/2}} \tag{J.3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} x^3 \mu(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^3 \mu(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^3 \mu(x) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) \times x^3 \exp(-a(x-b)^2) dx \\
&= \frac{ab(3+3a+2a^2b^2)e^{-\frac{ab^2}{a+1}}}{2\sqrt{2}(1+a)^{7/2}} \tag{J.4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{n}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \\
&\asymp \frac{1}{2\sigma_\epsilon^2} \cdot \left(\frac{3a^2b^2}{(1+a)^3} e^{-\frac{2ab^2}{1+a}} + \frac{1+2a^2+8a^2b^2}{\sqrt{2}(1+2a)^{5/2}} e^{-\frac{2ab^2}{1+2a}} + \frac{a^2b^2(2+a(3+2ab^2))}{(1+a)^5} e^{-\frac{2ab^2}{1+a}} \right) + 1 + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

And $G(\mu, P_{\mathbf{X}}) = g(a, b) = (\text{J.2}) + (\text{J.3}) + (\text{J.4})$.

K Proof of Theorem 9

Proof. From (3.4), we know that with a rank k approximation Σ_k to the matrix Σ , it becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}] \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} - \Sigma_k^{-1} + \Sigma^{-1}] \mathbf{x}_*) \right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \tag{K.1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\left(\left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 + 2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}] \boldsymbol{\eta}) (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \left\| \mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}] \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot ((\mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*) + (\mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma_k^{-1}] \mathbf{x}_*)) \right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \tag{K.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we suppose that $\Sigma = \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{V}^T$ is the singular value decomposition with orthogonal matrices \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} , $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d)$ such that $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d \geq 0$. Then $\Sigma^{-1} = \mathbf{V}^{-T} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{U}^{-1}$ and by Eckhart-Young theorem we have that with an optimal rank k approximation to the original matrix Σ , $\|\Sigma_k - \Sigma\|_2 \geq \sigma_{k+1}$ and $\|\Sigma_k^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1}\|_2 \leq \sigma_{k+1}^{-1}$. Then (K.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\text{K.2}) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\left(\left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 + 2\sigma_{k+1}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\eta}) (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \sigma_{k+1}^{-2} \left\| \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot (\mathbf{x}_*^T (\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x}_*) \right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T [\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}] \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 \right) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_*^T (\Sigma_k^{-1} + \sigma_{k+1}^{-1} \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x}_*) \right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

L Proof of Theorem 10

Assumptions A2. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ for a fixed positive λ . We assume that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda \right\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (\text{L.1})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* y(\mathbf{x}_*) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* y_*$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})$.

Theorem 16. *Under Assumption A2, we can write down the errors as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Err} R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right). \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Err} T_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The expected random optimism for the least squares estimator is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt} R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}) \left\| [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &\quad + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{L.2})$$

Remark 17. (Positivity) The red part in (L.3) is analogous to $\left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\|_2^2 (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_*)$ in (3.4) and remains positive regardless of the choice of λ . Now note that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda_1} \succeq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda_2}$ for $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda_1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda_2}$ is positive definite) we assume that $0 < \underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda \leq \bar{\lambda} < \infty$, then the blue parts in (L.3) consist of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \geq \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bar{\lambda}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bar{\lambda}}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\bar{\lambda}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}$. Therefore, $0 < \underline{\lambda} \leq \lambda$ is a sufficient condition to ensure positive optimism under Assumption A2.

Proof of Theorem 16 (Theorem 10 in the main text):

Parallel to the proof of Theorem (3) in Appendix (D) Testing Error: We know that the coefficient estimate for training set $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and single testing point $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ as a column vector.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda &= \frac{1}{n} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^T & \sqrt{n\lambda} \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \sqrt{n\lambda} \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \right) = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + n\lambda \mathbf{I}) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d},\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the $y(\mathbf{x}_*)$ to denote the observed values at this single testing point \mathbf{x}_* which is not necessarily in the training set. Now consider an arbitrary pair (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) as an independent draw from the distribution of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} and the L_2 loss function:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right]^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\end{aligned}\tag{L.4}$$

where we observe that in (L.4):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \right]^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)\end{aligned}\tag{L.5}$$

Unlike the cross-product term $(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = 0$ in (F.1) vanishes, we noticed that $\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \neq 0$ for any $\lambda \neq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} y_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\ &= \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma})}_{O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)\end{aligned}\tag{L.6}$$

$\neq 0$.

Taking the expectation with respect to the training set, then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}$ (L.4) still simplifies into

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(\text{L.4}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[\mathbf{x}_*^T \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \right]^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \Sigma \right) \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)^T \Sigma \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)}_{(1^*)} \\
&\quad + 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \Sigma \right) \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right)}_{(1^{**})}. \tag{L.7}
\end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we use the same argument like (F.7) in (L.8) and (L.9):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \right) \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \tag{L.8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} - \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \right) \boldsymbol{\eta} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \left(\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \tag{L.9} \\
&\quad + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}})
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition, $\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda = \Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right)}_{=O_p(1/\sqrt{n})} \underbrace{\Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda \right)}_{=O_p(1/\sqrt{n})} \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \left(\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \\
&= \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma} \right) \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right) \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \Sigma_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right). \tag{L.10}
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows since $\|\Sigma_\lambda - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda\|_2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$. If we take expectation with respect to \mathbf{X} and note that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}(\text{L.10}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\right)\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\right)}_{o_p(1/n)} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (\text{L.11})$$

Here we use the approximation order of $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|$ and $\|\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda - \Sigma_\lambda\|$ are both $O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ to allow substitution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ in the second line; and the replacement of Σ_λ with $\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda$ in the third line. And the part (1*) in (L.7) can be expanded using definition of symbols, using another arbitrary pair (\mathbf{x}_*, y_*) as an independent copy of \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} :

$$\begin{aligned}(1*) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right)^T \Sigma\left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right)^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left[\mathbf{x}_*y_* - (\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda\mathbf{I})\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right]^T \Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left[\mathbf{x}_*y_* - (\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda\mathbf{I})\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\left\|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left[\mathbf{x}_*y_* - (\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda\mathbf{I})\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right]\right\|_2^2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(1**)&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\right)\left(\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta} - \hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\right) \\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\left(\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right) \text{ using (L.11)} \\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\eta}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\right)\hat{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right)\right] \quad (\text{L.12}) \\ &= \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T - \Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\Sigma - \mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{x}_*y_*\right] \\ &\quad + \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\Sigma\right)\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left[\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*}\Sigma_\lambda^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T - \Sigma\right)\left(\mathbf{x}_*\mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda\mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}_*y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}\right)\right] + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}}\right) \quad (\text{L.13})\end{aligned}$$

To sum up,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* y_* \right] \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \right] \\
&+ O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \text{ by the magnitude in (L.13)}. \tag{L.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for training error, we recall the definition of hat matrix $\mathbf{H}_\lambda = \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T = \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}_\lambda) \mathbf{y} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\text{where } \mathbf{H}_\lambda = \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - n \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} y_*^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left[(y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + 2y_* \cdot \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \underbrace{2\boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}}_{(2^{**})} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}}_{(2^*)} \tag{L.15}
\end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from noting that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \mathbf{x}_*^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \\
&= \text{trace} [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}] \\
&= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we want to compute the term (2*) but keep (2**) to be the same in (L.15):

$$\begin{aligned}
(2^*) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \text{ using (L.11)} \tag{L.16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{and note that } \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \tag{L.17}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1/2} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\lambda}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta} \right) \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \text{ using Assumption A3 and (3.13)} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1/2} \left[\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{y}_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \right] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \tag{L.18}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{L.16}) &= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \\
&+ O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&\text{since by definition } \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \\
&= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&+ \frac{2}{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \quad (\text{L.19})
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we can plug (L.19) into (2*) to yield:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \underbrace{2 \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}}_{(2^{**})} \\
&- \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&- \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} (y_* - \mathbf{x}_*^T (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&- \frac{2}{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} \\
&- \frac{2}{n} \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\lambda^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \\
&- \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right). \quad (\text{L.20})
\end{aligned}$$

Then we compute optimism: From (2.2), we take the difference between testing and

training error:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Opt } R_{\mathbf{X}} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{4}{n} (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}) \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \Sigma) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\Sigma - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* y_* \right] \\
&+ \frac{4}{n} (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}) \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \Sigma) (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \right] \\
&- \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \tag{L.21}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{4}{n} (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}) \\
&+ \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T - \Sigma) \left\{ \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\Sigma - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* y_* + (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \right\} \right] \\
&- \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right) \tag{L.22}
\end{aligned}$$

But we have the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} (\Sigma - \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* y_* + (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_*} \left(\underbrace{\Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} - \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}}_{O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \right)} \mathbf{x}_* y_* + \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \underbrace{(\mathbf{x}_* y_* - \boldsymbol{\eta})}_{O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \right)} \right) = O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

therefore, the red terms are of $O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right)$, as in the statement.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(L.22)} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1/2} [\mathbf{x}_* y_* - (\mathbf{x}_* \mathbf{x}_*^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}) \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}] \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&- \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \Sigma \Sigma_{\lambda}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

M Additional Experiments




Figure M.1: Expected scaled optimism (averaged from 1000 MC simulations) versus the number of NN epochs for different k in (3.20) with $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 0.01$ for a training set sampled from $N(0, 1)$ of size 1000; and a testing set sampled from $N(0, 1)$ of size 1000. Models are optimized via Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.01 and we provide the optimism for the ridge linear regression model for comparison.

End of training scaled optimism for different combinations of (k, λ_{ridge}) 300 epochs						
$k \backslash \lambda_{ridge}$	0.00	0.01	0.10	1.00	2.00	10.00
0.00	35.953481	35.941453	36.177433	38.346467	33.919739	14.174405
0.25	9.564725	9.544049	9.480763	9.686489	8.514813	3.547711
0.50	0.021075	0.020862	0.019124	0.010376	0.006821	0.001653
0.75	0.021074	0.028329	0.642780	10.412455	12.357121	6.415719
1.00	0.021075	0.052095	2.525693	41.667581	49.464615	25.714433

Table 1: Final scaled optimism (at the end of 300 epoches from Figure M.1).