

# Spectral Algorithms under Covariate Shift<sup>†</sup>

Jun Fan<sup>1</sup>, Zheng-Chu Guo<sup>2</sup>, and Lei Shi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon, Hong Kong

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China

## Abstract

Spectral algorithms leverage spectral regularization techniques to analyze and process data, providing a flexible framework for addressing supervised learning problems. To deepen our understanding of their performance in real-world scenarios where the distributions of training and test data may differ, we conduct a rigorous investigation into the convergence behavior of spectral algorithms under distribution shifts, specifically within the framework of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. Our study focuses on the case of covariate shift. In this scenario, the marginal distributions of the input data differ between the training and test datasets, while the conditional distribution of the output given the input remains unchanged. Under this setting, we analyze the generalization error of spectral algorithms and show that they achieve minimax optimality when the density ratios between the training and test distributions are uniformly bounded. However, we also identify a critical limitation: when the density ratios are unbounded, the spectral algorithms may become suboptimal. To address this limitation, we propose a weighted spectral algorithm that incorporates density ratio information into the learning process. Our theoretical analysis shows that this weighted approach achieves optimal capacity-independent convergence rates. Furthermore, by introducing a weight clipping technique, we demonstrate that the convergence rates of the weighted spectral algorithm can approach the optimal capacity-dependent convergence rates arbitrarily closely. This improvement resolves the suboptimality issue in unbounded density ratio scenarios and advances the state-of-the-art by refining existing theoretical results.

**Keywords and phrases:** Learning theory, Spectral algorithms, Covariate shift, Reproducing kernel Hilbert space, Convergence analysis, Integral operator

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2020):** 68Q32, 68T05, 62J02

---

<sup>†</sup> The work by J. Fan is partially supported by the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong [Project No. HKBU12303220, No. HKBU12303024], Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Fund [Project No. 2024A1515011878], and Hong Kong Baptist University [Project No. RC-FNRA-IG/22-23/SCI/02]. The work by Z. C. Guo is partially supported by Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China [Project No. LR20A010001] and National Natural Science Foundation of China [Project No. 12271473, No. U21A20426]. The work by L. Shi is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12171039). All authors contributed equally to this work and are listed alphabetically. The corresponding author is Zheng-Chu Guo. Email addresses: junfan@hkbu.edu.hk (J. Fan), guozc@zju.edu.cn (Z. C. Guo), leishi@fudan.edu.cn (L. Shi).

# 1 Introduction and Main Results

In machine learning [3, 5, 24, 23], it is typically assumed that the training and test samples are drawn from the same underlying distribution. This assumption is fundamental to reliably generalize the learned patterns from training data to unseen test data. However, it is essential to recognize that this assumption does not always hold in practice. There are numerous scenarios where the distribution of the test data may differ significantly from that of the training data, which can lead to challenges in achieving effective generalization. For instance, in applications such as medical diagnosis, the data collected during training might reflect a specific population, while the test data may come from a different demographic. This disparity can result in models performing well on training data but failing to deliver accurate test data predictions. Various techniques have been developed to address these challenges, including domain adaptation and transfer learning. Domain adaptation focuses on adjusting the model to better align with the different distributions between the training and test datasets. This may involve re-weighting the training samples or using specific algorithms to minimize discrepancies. Transfer learning, on the other hand, aims to leverage knowledge from related tasks or domains to enhance generalization performance. We can often achieve better results even when the training and test distributions differ by pre-training on a larger, related dataset and fine-tuning the model on the target dataset. These approaches are crucial in mitigating the limitations of distribution mismatches in real-world machine learning applications. They enable models to maintain robustness and adaptability, ensuring they can perform effectively across varied datasets and changing conditions. Addressing distribution shifts is a vital area of research that continues to evolve, with ongoing innovations aimed at improving model performance in diverse settings.

Covariate shift [6, 13, 25, 14], as discussed in this paper, refers to a scenario where the distribution of input data changes between the training and test phases of a machine learning model. Specifically, this means that while the distribution of the input variables (covariates) varies, the conditional distribution of the output variable given these inputs remains the same. Such a shift in the input distribution can significantly degrade the model’s performance when applied to test data, as the patterns learned during training may no longer be applicable. Covariate shifts can occur in various real-world scenarios. For instance, a model trained on data collected during a specific period may face challenges when applied to data from a different period, reflecting changes in trends or behaviors. Similarly, training on data from one geographic region and testing on data from another can lead to discrepancies due to regional variations in the underlying population or environmental factors. Additionally, shifts can occur due to changes in data collection processes or measurement techniques, which may introduce biases or alter the characteristics of the data. Addressing covariate shifts is essential for ensuring that machine learning models generalize well and remain robust in diverse applications. Several techniques have been developed to mitigate the effects of covariate shifts. Among these, importance weighting [6, 11, 12, 15, 18, 31, 19, 27, 29] adjusts the training data based on the likelihood of the input samples appearing in the test dataset, effectively giving more weight to instances that are more representative of the test distribution [32, 33]. Domain adaptation focuses on learning a model that can effectively transfer knowledge from the training domain to the test domain, often employing methods that align the feature distributions between the two. Reweighting methods also play a crucial role; they modify the training data distribution to better match the test data, either through direct reweighting of samples or by learning mappings between the source and target domains. Using these techniques, researchers aim

to bridge the gap caused by covariate shifts, enhancing the model's capability to perform accurately across varying datasets and conditions.

In this paper, we consider nonparametric regression in the context of reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) [1]. The RKHS  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is defined as the completion of the linear span of  $\{K_x : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with the inner product denoted as  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_K$  satisfying  $\langle K_x, K_{x'} \rangle_K = K(x, x')$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a separable and compact metric space. Here  $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Mercer kernel, i.e., a continuous, symmetric, positive semi-definite function. We say that  $K$  is positive semi-definite, if for any finite set of points  $\{s_1, \dots, s_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{X}$  and any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , the matrix  $(K(s_i, s_j))_{i,j=1}^\ell$  is positive semi-definite. Let  $K_x : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined by  $K_x(s) = K(x, s)$  for  $x, s \in \mathcal{X}$ . Denote by  $\|\cdot\|_K$  the norm of  $\mathcal{H}_K$ . It is well-known that the reproducing property

$$f(x) = \langle f, K_x \rangle_K \quad (1)$$

holds for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact, the space  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is separable and contained in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ , i.e., the space of continuous functions on  $\mathcal{X}$  with the norm  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)|$  and note, by the reproducing property (1), for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ , that

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq \kappa \|f\|_K. \quad (2)$$

Here  $\kappa = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sqrt{K(x, x)} < \infty$  and we will always assume  $\kappa \geq 1$  without loss of generality.

Given i.i.d. training samples  $\mathbf{z} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  drawn from an unknown distribution  $\rho^{tr}$  on  $\mathcal{Z} := \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , where the input space  $\mathcal{X}$  is a separable and compact metric space, and  $Y \in \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$  stands for the response variable and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|X = x]$  is the conditional expectation with respect to  $X = x$ . The target of regression is to recover the regression function

$$f_\rho(x) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} y d\rho(y|x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X},$$

by utilizing the training samples  $\mathbf{z}$ , where  $\rho(y|x)$  is the conditional distribution of  $\rho^{tr}$  or  $\rho^{te}$ . Since  $\rho^{tr}$  is completely unknown and one attempts to learn a function  $f_{\mathbf{z}}$  as a good approximation of  $f_\rho$ . Taking the least square regression as an example, we define the generalization error as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{tr}}(f) = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (f(x) - y)^2 d\rho^{tr}(x, y),$$

Moreover, the regression function  $f_\rho$  is the minimizer of the generalization error. In the standard least square regression, we usually assume the test samples are drawn from the same distribution as the training sample, and the performance of  $f_{\mathbf{z}}$  is usually measured by the excess generalization error

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{tr}}(f_{\mathbf{z}}) - \mathcal{E}_{\rho^{tr}}(f_\rho) = \|f_{\mathbf{z}} - f_\rho\|_{L^2_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}}}^2,$$

where  $L^2_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}}$  be the Hilbert space of functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  square-integrable with respect to the marginal distribution  $\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}$  of  $\rho^{tr}$ . Denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}}$  the  $L^2$  norm in the space  $L^2_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}}$  induced by the inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)g(x)d\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$  with  $f, g \in L^2_{\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ .

In the covariate shift setting, we assume the test samples are drawn from distribution  $\rho^{te}$  which is different from  $\rho^{tr}$ , but the conditional distribution are the same, that is,

$$\rho^{tr}(x, y) = \rho(y|x)\rho^{tr}_{\mathcal{X}}(x),$$

and

$$\rho^{te}(x, y) = \rho(y|x)\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x).$$

To mitigate distribution shifts, transfer learning has emerged as a crucial technique, particularly in situations where labeled data is scarce or expensive to acquire. This approach leverages knowledge from related tasks to enhance learning in new contexts, effectively bridging the gaps between different data distributions. This is especially relevant in cases of covariate shift, where the input feature distributions differ between training and test datasets, while the underlying relationships between inputs and outputs remain consistent. In this scenario, test samples are drawn from a distribution  $\rho^{te}$  that differs from the training distribution  $\rho^{tr}$ , while the conditional distributions stay unchanged, expressed as  $\rho^{tr}(x, y) = \rho(y|x)\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}(x)$  and  $\rho^{te}(x, y) = \rho(y|x)\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x)$ . Transfer learning also addresses regression shift, where the relationship between inputs and outputs evolves over time, complicating predictions based on outdated models. In this case, the regression functions  $f_{\rho^{tr}}$  and  $f_{\rho^{te}}$  may differ between training and test datasets, even as the input feature distributions  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$  remain constant.

We define the prediction error as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x^{te}, y^{te}) \sim \rho^{te}}[(f(x) - y)^2] = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} (f(x) - y)^2 d\rho^{te}(x, y).$$

Our goal in covariate shift is to learn a function  $f_{\mathbf{z}}$  such that the prediction error  $\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f_{\mathbf{z}})$  as small as possible, that is, we need to estimate the following excess prediction error

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f_{\mathbf{z}}) - \mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f_{\rho}) = \|f_{\mathbf{z}} - f_{\rho}\|_{L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}}^2.$$

One popular algorithm is the following weighted regularized least square algorithm (also known as weighted kernel ridge regression)

$$f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{ls} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}_K} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(x_i)(f(x_i) - y_i)^2 + \lambda \|f\|_K^2, \quad (3)$$

here  $w(x)$  is the Radon-Nikodym derivative (also known as density ratio), which is defined as

$$w(x) = \frac{d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}{d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}(x).$$

Recently, [25] studied the algorithm (3) under the assumption that  $w(\cdot)$  is either uniformly bounded or possesses a finite bounded second moment with respect to the training distribution. In contrast, [14] investigated (3) within the framework of covariate shift, addressing more general conditions on  $w(\cdot)$  as specified in (8). The solution to algorithm (3) can be expressed as

$$f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{ls} = (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} S_X^\top W \bar{y},$$

where  $S_X : \mathcal{H}_K \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$S_X f = (f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and  $S_X^\top : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathcal{H}_K$ , with

$$S_X^\top u(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K(\cdot, x_i) u_i, u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and

$$W = \text{diag}(w(x_1), \dots, w(x_n)),$$

$$\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top.$$

In this paper, we consider a family of more general learning algorithms known as spectral algorithms, which were proposed to address ill-posed linear inverse problems (see, e.g., [9]) and have been employed in regression [21, 3, 17, 13, 28, 10] by highlighting the connections between learning theory and inverse problems [8]. The weighted spectral algorithm considered in this paper is of the form

$$f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} = g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W \bar{y}, \quad (4)$$

where the filter function  $g_\lambda(\cdot)$  is defined as follows.

**Definition 1.** We say that  $g_\lambda : [0, \kappa^2] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ , with  $0 < \lambda \leq \kappa^2$ , is a filter function with qualification  $\nu_g \geq \frac{1}{2}$  if there exists a positive constant  $b$  independent of  $\lambda$  such that

$$\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa^2} |g_\lambda(u)| \leq \frac{b}{\lambda}, \quad \sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa^2} |g_\lambda(u)u| \leq b, \quad (5)$$

and

$$\sup_{0 < u \leq \kappa^2} |1 - g_\lambda(u)u| u^\nu \leq \gamma_\nu \lambda^\nu, \quad \forall 0 < \nu \leq \nu_g, \quad (6)$$

where  $\gamma_\nu > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\nu \in (0, \nu_g]$ ,  $\kappa = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sqrt{K(x, x)}$ .

If we choose the filter function  $g_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{\lambda + u}$ , the corresponding estimator simplifies to the weighted regularized least square algorithm defined in (3). In this scenario, the constant  $b = 1$ , the qualification  $\nu_g = 1$  and the constant  $\gamma_\nu = 1$ . When  $W = I$ , other examples of spectral algorithms with different filter functions include the Landweber iteration (gradient descent), defined by the filter function  $g_\lambda(u) = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (1-u)^i$  with  $\lambda = \frac{1}{t}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Additionally, the spectral cutoff is induced by the filter function

$$g_\lambda(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{u}, & \text{if } u \geq \lambda, \\ 0 & \text{if } u < \lambda. \end{cases}$$

For more examples of spectral algorithms and additional details, we refer readers to [21, 9, 3, 17] and the references therein. In this paper, we aim to estimate the excess error

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}) - \mathcal{E}_{\rho^{te}}(f_\rho) = \|f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_\lambda^{te}}^2. \quad (7)$$

Before presenting the main results, we establish assumptions regarding the target function, weight function, and hypothesis space. This paper considers the following conditions for the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  introduced in [14].

**Assumption 1.** There exists constants  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ ,  $C > 0$  and  $\sigma > 0$  such that, for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $p \geq 2$ , it holds that

$$\left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_\lambda^{te}(x) \right)^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2} p! C^{p-2} \sigma^2, \quad (8)$$

where the left hand side for  $\alpha = 0$  is defined as  $\|w^{p-1}\|_{\infty, \rho_\lambda^{te}}$ , the essential supremum of  $w^{p-1}$  with respect to  $\rho_\lambda^{te}$ .

Assumption 1 can be equivalently expressed as a condition on the Rényi divergence between  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}$  [26, 6, 14]. The Rényi divergence between  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}$  with parameter  $a \in (0, \infty]$  is defined as

$$H_a(\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te} \parallel \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}) := \begin{cases} a^{-1} \log \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(x)^a d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) & (a > 0) \\ \log(\|w\|_{\infty, \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}) & (a = \infty). \end{cases}$$

Under Assumption 1, for all integers  $p \geq 2$ , the Rényi divergence must satisfy the following upper bound

$$H_{(p-1)/\alpha}(\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te} \parallel \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}) \leq \frac{1}{p-1} \left( \log p! + \log \left( \frac{C^{p-2} \sigma^2}{2} \right) \right).$$

Intuitively, Assumption 1 ensures that the testing distribution  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$  remains close to the training distribution  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}(x)$ , and the parameter  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  controls the allowable deviation [14]. Notably, when  $\alpha = 1$ , the assumption guarantees that all moments of the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  with respect to the testing distribution  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$ .

Define the integral operator  $L_K : L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2 \rightarrow L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2$  on  $\mathcal{H}_K$  or  $L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2$  associated with the Mercer kernel  $K$  by

$$L_K f = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x), f \in L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2.$$

Next we introduce our assumption regarding the regularity (often interpreted as smoothness) of the regression function  $f_{\rho}$ .

**Assumption 2.**

$$f_{\rho} = L_K^r(u_{\rho}) \quad \text{for some } r > 0 \text{ and } u_{\rho} \in L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2, \quad (9)$$

where  $L_K^r$  denotes the  $r$ -th power of  $L_K$  on  $L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2$  since  $L_K : L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2 \rightarrow L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2$  is a compact and positive operator.

This assumption is standard in learning theory and can be further interpreted through the theory of interpolation spaces [30]. Moreover, since  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$  is non-degenerate, Theorem 4.12 in [7] implies that  $L_K^{1/2}$  is an isomorphism from  $\overline{\mathcal{H}_K}$ , the closure of  $\mathcal{H}_K$  in  $L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2$ , to  $\mathcal{H}_K$ . That is, for every  $f \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_K}$ , we have  $L_K^{1/2} f \in \mathcal{H}_K$  and

$$\|f\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}} = \left\| L_K^{1/2} f \right\|_K. \quad (10)$$

Therefore,  $L_K^{1/2}(L_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2) = \mathcal{H}_K$ , and when  $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , condition (9) ensures  $f_{\rho} \in \mathcal{H}_K$ .

We shall use the *effective dimension*  $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$  to measure the complexity of  $\mathcal{H}_K$  with respect to  $\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}$ , which is defined to be the trace of the operator  $(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} L_K$ , that is

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda) = \text{Tr}((\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} L_K), \quad \lambda > 0.$$

**Assumption 3.** *There exist a parameter  $0 < \beta \leq 1$  and a constant  $C_0 > 0$  as*

$$\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \leq C_0 \lambda^{-\beta}, \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \quad (11)$$

The condition (11) with  $\beta = 1$  is always satisfied by taking the constant  $C_0 = \text{Tr}(L_K) \leq \kappa^2$ . The capacity of the hypothesis space  $\mathcal{H}_K$  is commonly characterized by covering number, effective dimension and eigenvalue decay conditions of the integral operator  $L_K$ . It has been demonstrated in [16] that Assumption 3 with  $0 < \beta < 1$  is equivalent to  $\lambda_i(L_K) = \mathcal{O}(i^{-1/\beta})$ , where  $\{\lambda_i(L_K)\}_{i=1}^\infty$  of  $L_K$  are the eigenvalues arranged in non-increasing order. Here, we remark that if  $L_K$  is of finite rank, i.e., the range of  $L_K$  is finite-dimensional, we will set  $\beta = 0$ .

Our first main result establishes an upper bound for  $\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}}$  when the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  satisfies Assumption 1 with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let the weighted spectral algorithm  $f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$  be defined by (4), under Assumption 1 with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , Assumption 2 with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ , and Assumption 3 with  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ , if we take  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+\beta+\alpha(1-\beta)}}$ , then with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq \tilde{C} n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta+\alpha(1-\beta)}} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C}$  is independent of the sample size  $n$  or  $\delta$  and will be given in the proof.

If the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  is uniformly bounded, then Assumption 1 holds with  $\alpha = 0$ . In this case, we can directly derive the following optimal capacity dependent convergence rates by letting  $\alpha = 0$  in Theorem 1.

**Corollary 1** (Bounded case). *Let the weighted spectral algorithm  $f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$  be defined by (4), under Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 0$ , Assumption 2 with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ , and Assumption 3 with  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ , and  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+\beta}}$  then we have with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$*

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq \tilde{C} n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C}$  is independent of the sample size  $n$  or  $\delta$  and will be given in the proof.

When  $\alpha = 1$  in Assumption 1, it implies that all the moments of weight function  $w(\cdot)$  are bounded. Consequently, we can directly obtain the optimal capacity independent convergence rates by setting  $\alpha = 1$  in Theorem 1.

**Corollary 2.** *Let the weighted spectral algorithm  $f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$  be defined by (4), under Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 1$ , Assumption 2 with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ , if we take  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+1}}$ , then for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq \tilde{C} n^{-\frac{r}{2r+1}} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C}$  is independent of the sample size  $n$  or  $\delta$  and will be given in the proof.

It remains open to derive optimal capacity dependent convergence rates for the weighted spectral algorithm (4) with unbounded weights under the capacity assumption, i.e., Assumption 3 with  $0 < \beta < 1$ . Our second main result (Theorem 2) reveals that the weighted spectral algorithm

$$f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\hat{\mathbf{w}}} = g_\lambda(\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} \quad (12)$$

with weights clipped as described in (13), can approach the optimal capacity dependent convergence rates arbitrarily closely.

$$\hat{w}(x) = \begin{cases} w(x), & \text{when } w(x) < D, \\ D, & \text{when } w(x) > D. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $D$  is to be determined.

**Theorem 2.** *Let the spectral algorithm with clipped weight be defined by (12), under Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 1$ , Assumption 2 with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ , and Assumption 3 with  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ , if we take  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+\beta} + \frac{\epsilon}{r}}$  for any  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{r}{2r+\beta}$ , then with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\hat{\mathbf{w}}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq \tilde{C}_{r,\epsilon} n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta} + \epsilon} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C}_{r,\epsilon}$  is independent of the sample size  $n$  and will be given in the proof.

Our third main result demonstrates that when the weights are uniformly bounded, we prove that the classical (unweighted) spectral algorithm can achieve optimal capacity dependent convergence rates under certain mild assumptions.

**Assumption 4.**

$$f_\rho = \tilde{L}_K^{\tilde{r}}(v_\rho) \quad \text{for some } \tilde{r} > 0 \text{ and } v_\rho \in L_{\rho_X^{tr}}^2, \quad (14)$$

where  $\tilde{L}_K^{\tilde{r}}$  denotes the  $\tilde{r}$ -th power of  $\tilde{L}_K$  on  $L_{\rho_X^{tr}}^2$  since  $\tilde{L}_K : L_{\rho_X^{tr}}^2 \rightarrow L_{\rho_X^{tr}}^2$  is a compact and positive operator.

We shall use the *effective dimension*  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda)$  to measure the complexity of  $\mathcal{H}_K$  with respect to  $\rho_X^{tr}$ .

**Assumption 5.** *There exist a parameter  $0 < \tilde{\beta} \leq 1$  and a constant  $C_0 > 0$  as*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) = \text{Tr}((\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1} \tilde{L}_K) \leq C_0 \lambda^{-\tilde{\beta}}, \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \quad (15)$$

**Theorem 3.** *Let the unweighted spectral algorithm be defined by  $f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda} = g_\lambda(\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X) S_X^\top \bar{y}$ , under Assumption 4 with  $1/2 \leq \tilde{r} \leq \nu_g$ , and Assumption 5 with  $0 < \tilde{\beta} \leq 1$ , if we take  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2\tilde{r}+\tilde{\beta}}}$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$*

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq \tilde{C}_{\tilde{r}} n^{-\frac{\tilde{r}}{2\tilde{r}+\tilde{\beta}}} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},$$

where the constant  $\tilde{C}_{\tilde{r}}$  is independent of the sample size  $n$  and will be given in the proof.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We discuss related work in Section 2 and conduct error decomposition in Section 3. Before proving the main results, we present some preliminary results in Section 4. The proofs of our main results are provided in Section 5.



## 2 Related Work and Discussion

Although the literature on covariate shift is extensive, we focus specifically on the algorithms most relevant to our work. Recently, the work presented in [25] explored the implications of kernel ridge regression (KRR) in the context of covariate shift. The authors demonstrated that when the density ratios are uniformly bounded, the KRR estimator can achieve a minimax optimal convergence rate, even without complete knowledge about the density ratio—only an upper bound is necessary for practical application. Furthermore, they investigated a wider array of covariate shift issues where the density ratio may not be bounded but possesses a finite second moment for the training distribution. In such scenarios, they studied an importance-weighted KRR estimator that modifies sample weights by carefully truncating the density ratios, which maintains minimax optimality. Their findings also emphasized that in situations characterized by model misspecification, employing importance weighting can lead to a more accurate approximation of the regression function for the distribution of the test inputs. [12] extends the results of [25] to a broader class of learning algorithms with general convex loss functions, establishing sharp convergence rates under the same covariate shift assumptions as in [25].

However, the assumptions made in [25], particularly regarding the uniform boundedness of the eigenfunctions of the kernel integral operator, can be challenging to verify in practical applications. In response, the authors of [14] relaxed these assumptions regarding density ratios and eigenfunctions discussed in [25]. Their analysis of the importance-weighted KRR (3) encompassed a broader range of contexts, including both parametric and nonparametric models, as well as cases of model specification and misspecification, thereby allowing for arbitrary weighting functions. These comprehensive studies significantly enhanced the understanding of how to effectively implement importance weighting across various modeling scenarios.

Despite these advancements, the algorithms proposed in [25] and [14] confront the saturation effect, where improvements in the learning rate stabilize and cease to increase effectively once the regression function attains a certain level of regularity. To address this issue, [13] introduced a generalized regularization framework for covariate shifts via weighted spectral algorithms. Their analysis establishes capacity-independent learning rates for the resulting regularized estimators, extending the guarantees of importance-weighted KRR while requiring the bounded density ratio assumption.

This work presents a solid theoretical analysis of spectral algorithms under covariate shifts, with kernel ridge regression (KRR) as a canonical special case. Our analysis removes the restrictive bounded eigenfunction condition required in [25], thereby significantly expanding the theoretical applicability of spectral methods. Our main contributions are twofold. First, Theorem 3 demonstrates that a uniform bound on the density ratio suffices to attain minimax optimal convergence rates for the unweighted spectral algorithms. Second, for the more challenging case of potentially unbounded density ratios  $w(\cdot)$ , we develop a generalized framework inspired by [14]. Our weighted spectral algorithm advances the state-of-the-art by eliminating weight truncation requirements. Specifically, Corollary 2 establishes capacity independent optimal convergence rates when all moments of  $w(\cdot)$  are bounded. Furthermore, Theorem 2 demonstrates that when using truncated weight functions, the resulting spectral algorithms can approach capacity-dependent optimal rates arbitrarily closely. These theoretical advances significantly expand the scope of existing approaches and provide fundamental insights for optimizing learning under covariate shifts.

### 3 Error Decomposition

In this section, we consider the error decomposition when the regression function  $f_\rho$  satisfies condition (9) with  $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , which implies  $f_\rho \in \mathcal{H}_K$ . We begin with some useful lemmas.

First, we establish the following lemma, which corresponds to Lemma 5 in [17], based on the properties of the filter function.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $0 < t \leq \nu_g$ , we have*

$$\left\| (g\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I)(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^t \right\| \leq 2^t(b+1+\gamma_t)\lambda^t.$$

The following Cordes inequality was proved in [2] for positive definite matrices and later presented in [4] for positive operators in Hilbert spaces.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $s \in [0, 1]$ . For positive operators  $A$  and  $B$  on a Hilbert space we have*

$$\|A^s B^s\| \leq \|AB\|^s. \quad (16)$$

We also need the following lemma in our error decomposition, which can be found in [4].

**Lemma 3.3.** *For positive operators  $A$  and  $B$  on a Hilbert space with  $\|A\|, \|B\| \leq C$  for some constant  $C > 0$ , we have for  $t \geq 1$ ,*

$$\|A^t - B^t\| \leq tC^{t-1}\|A - B\|.$$

Now we give the error decomposition for the weighted spectral algorithm (4).

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$  be defined by (4). Suppose Assumption 3 holds with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ . When  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{t_\varepsilon}} &\leq 2b \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\quad + C_r \lambda^r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^r. \end{aligned}$$

When  $r > 3/2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{t_\varepsilon}} &\leq 2b \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\quad + C_r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^{1/2} \left( \left\| L_K - S_X^\top W S_X \right\|_{op} + \lambda^r \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_r = (\sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})\lambda^{1/2}(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{t_\varepsilon}}$ .

*Proof.* First, by the definition (4) of  $f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho &= g\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W \bar{y} - f_\rho \\ &= g\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W \bar{y} - g\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho + g\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho - f_\rho \end{aligned}$$

$$= g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) + (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)S_X^\top W S_X - I)f_\rho.$$

Then we see from the identity  $\|f\|_{\rho_X^{te}} = \left\|L_K^{1/2}f\right\|_K$  for  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$  and  $\left\|L_K^{1/2}(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}\right\|_{op} \leq 1$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} &= \left\|L_K^{1/2}(f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho)\right\|_K \leq \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}(f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho)\right\|_K \\ &= \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho)\right\|_K \\ &\leq \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}\right\|_{op} \cdot \\ &\quad \left[ \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho))\right\|_K \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)S_X^\top W S_X - I)f_\rho\right\|_K \right] \\ &=: I_1(I_2 + I_3), \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}\right\|_{op}, \\ I_2 &= \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho))\right\|_K, \\ I_3 &= \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)S_X^\top W S_X - I)f_\rho\right\|_K. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we will estimate the above three terms.

For the first term  $I_1$ , by Lemma 3.2 with  $s = 1/2$ , it follows that

$$I_1 = \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}\right\|_{op} \leq \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}\right\|_{op}^{1/2}.$$

For the second term  $I_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho))\right\|_K \\ &= \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho))\right\|_K \\ &\leq \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X))\right\|_{op} \cdot \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1/2}(\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2}\right\|_{op} \\ &\quad \cdot \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho)\right\|_K \\ &\leq 2b \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K)\right\|_{op}^{1/2} \cdot \left\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho)\right\|_K. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to the property (5) of the filter function  $g_\lambda$  and the Cordes inequality with  $s = 1/2$  in Lemma 3.2.

For the third term  $I_3$ , since  $f_\rho = L_K^r u_\rho$  with  $u_\rho \in L_{\rho_X^{te}}^2$  and  $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , there holds

$$I_3 = \left\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2}(g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X)S_X^\top W S_X - I)f_\rho\right\|_K$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) L_K^r u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the term  $\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op}$ , we will consider two cases based on the regularity of  $f_\rho$ .

Case 1:  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ .

In this case,  $0 \leq r - 1/2 \leq 1$ , we rewrite  $L_K^{r-1/2}$  as

$$L_K^{r-1/2} = (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-(r-1/2)} (\lambda I + L_K)^{r-1/2} (\lambda I + L_K)^{-(r-1/2)} L_K^{r-1/2}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_K \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-(r-1/2)} (\lambda I + L_K)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-(r-1/2)} L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^r (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-(r-1/2)} (\lambda I + L_K)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-(r-1/2)} L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^r (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^{r-1/2} \cdot \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\leq 2^r (b+1 + \gamma_r) \lambda^r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^{r-1/2} \cdot \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to Lemma 3.1 with  $t = r$ , and Lemma 3.2 with  $s = r - 1/2$  and  $A = (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}$  and  $B = \lambda I + L_K$ .

Case 2:  $r > 3/2$ .

In this case  $r - 1/2 > 1$ , we can rewrite the term  $L_K^{r-1/2}$  as

$$L_K^{r-1/2} = \left( L_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2} \right) + (S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) (L_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2}) \right\|_{op} \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) (L_K^{r-1/2} - (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2}) \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\quad + \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top W S_X) S_X^\top W S_X - I) (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2} (b+1 + \gamma_{1/2}) \lambda^{1/2} (r-1/2) \kappa^{2r-3} \left\| L_K - S_X^\top W S_X \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} + 2^r (b+1 + \gamma_r) \lambda^r \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to Lemma 3.3 with  $A = S_X^\top W S_X$ ,  $B = L_K$  and  $t = r - 1/2$ , and Lemma 3.1 with  $t = r$ . Then putting the estimates back into (17) yields the desired result. We then complete the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Preliminary

In this section, we will give some useful lemmas and propositions that are crucial in our analysis.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  be a sequence of independent identically distributed random vectors on a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , assume there exists constant  $\tilde{\sigma}$ ,  $L > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\xi_1 - \mathbb{E}(\xi_1)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p \leq \frac{1}{2}p!\tilde{\sigma}^2 L^{p-2}$$

for all  $p \geq 2$ . Then for any  $\tau \geq 0$ :

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i - \mathbb{E}(\xi_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{2L \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{2\tilde{\sigma}^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , then the following result holds at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^{2+\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

*Proof.* We apply Lemma 4.1 to the random variable

$$\xi(x) = (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x) \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

which takes value in  $HS(\mathcal{H}_K)$ , the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on  $\mathcal{H}_K$  with inner product  $\langle A, B \rangle_{HS} = \text{Tr}(B^\top A)$ . The Hilbert Schmidt norm is given by  $\|A\|_{HS} = \sum_i \|Ae_i\|_K^2$  where  $\{e_i\}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_K$ , and we have the norm relations  $\|A\|_{op} \leq \|A\|_{HS}$ . Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\xi(x)] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x) \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x] = (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} L_K,$$

then

$$(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi(x_i) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\xi(x)].$$

Then for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}} \left[ \left\| \xi(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\xi(x)] \right\|_{HS}^p \right] \leq 2^p \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}} \left[ \|\xi(x)\|_{HS}^p \right] \\ &= 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x) \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^p d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}(x) \\ &= 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^p (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \\ &= 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^{p-2+2\alpha} \\ & \quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^{2-2\alpha} (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \\ &\leq 2^p (\kappa^2 \lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^{2-2\alpha} (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2^p(\kappa^2\lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^{(2-2\alpha) \cdot \frac{1}{1-\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} \\
&\quad \cdot \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{\alpha} \\
&= 2^p(\kappa^2\lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^2 d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} \\
&\quad \cdot \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the bound  $\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x\|_{HS} \leq \kappa\lambda^{-1/2}$  and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Next we further estimate  $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \|(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^2 d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x)$ . Let  $\{(\lambda_i, \phi_i)\}_i$  be a set of normalized eigenpairs of  $L_K$  on  $\mathcal{H}_K$  with  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  forming an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_K$ , then by the Mercer Theorem, we have

$$K(x, x') = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi_i(x)\phi_i(x'), \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Moreover, by the reproducing property, we have  $\langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \phi_i = \phi_i(x)K_x$  and  $K_x = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \langle K_x, \phi_{\ell} \rangle \phi_{\ell} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \phi_{\ell}(x)\phi_{\ell}$ . Then the definition of the Hilbert-Schmidt (HS) norm implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \phi_i(x) \right\|_K^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \phi_i(x) \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \phi_{\ell}(x)\phi_{\ell} \right\|_K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\phi_i(x))^2 \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \phi_{\ell}(x) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda + \lambda_{\ell}}} \phi_{\ell} \right\|_K^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\phi_i(x))^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\phi_{\ell}(x))^2}{\lambda + \lambda_{\ell}} = K(x, x) \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\phi_{\ell}(x))^2}{\lambda + \lambda_{\ell}} \leq \kappa^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\phi_{\ell}(x))^2}{\lambda + \lambda_{\ell}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}} \left[ \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \right\|_{HS}^2 \right] \leq \kappa^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\phi_{\ell}(x))^2}{\lambda + \lambda_{\ell}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) = \kappa^2 \mathcal{N}(\lambda),$$

here we use the fact  $\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\phi_{\ell}(x))^2 d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) = \left\| \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \frac{\phi_{\ell}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}} \right\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}}^2 = \lambda_{\ell}$ . Then, under the assumption that Assumption 1 holds with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , we can substitute the above estimates back into (18), resulting in the following expression for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}} \left[ \left\| \xi(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\xi(x)] \right\|_{HS}^p \right] &\leq 2^p(\kappa^2\lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} (\kappa^2 \mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{2} p! C^{p-2} \sigma^2 \\
&:= \frac{1}{2} p! (2C\kappa^2\lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2} (4\kappa^{2+\alpha}\lambda^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 to the random variable  $\xi(x) = (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x) \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x$ , with  $L = 2C\kappa^2\lambda^{-1/2}$ , and  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 4\kappa^{2+\alpha}\lambda^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2$ , for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds

$$\left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^{\top} W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{op} \leq \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^{\top} W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{HS}$$

$$\leq \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}\lambda^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , then the following result holds at least  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \leq \left( \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}\lambda^{-1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} + 1 \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* By the second order decomposition proposed in [20], which asserts

$$\begin{aligned} A^{-1} - B^{-1} &= A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1} = (A^{-1} - B^{-1})(B - A)B^{-1} + B^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1} \\ &= A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1} + B^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} A^{-1}B &= (A^{-1} - B^{-1} + B^{-1})B = (A^{-1} - B^{-1})B + I \\ &= A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}(B - A) + B^{-1}(B - A) + I. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Using  $\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \leq \lambda^{-1}$ ,  $\left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and taking  $A = \lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X$  and  $B = \lambda I + L_K$  in (19) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \\ &= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) + I \right\|_{op} \\ &\leq \lambda^{-1} \left\| (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \right\| \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{op} \\ &\quad + \left\| (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \lambda^{-1/2} + 1 \\ &\leq \left( \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \lambda^{-1/2} + 1 \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to the fact that  $\|L_1 L_2\| = \|(L_1 L_2)^T\| = \|L_2^T L_1^T\| = \|L_2 L_1\|$  for any self-adjoint operators  $L_1, L_2$  on Hilbert spaces. Then by Proposition 4.1, for any  $\delta > 0$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds

$$\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \leq \left( \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}\lambda^{-1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} + 1 \right)^2.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *For any  $\delta > 0$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\leq \frac{4MC\kappa \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2\kappa^{2\alpha}\lambda^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We consider the random variable  $\eta(x, y) = (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x)(y - f_\rho(x))K_x$ , which takes value in  $\mathcal{H}_K$ . One can easily see that  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}}[\eta(x, y)] = 0$ . Then we have

$$(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(x_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}}[\eta(x, y)].$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right\|_K^2 d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{Tr} \left( (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \otimes (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right) d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{Tr} \left( (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} K_x \otimes K_x \right) d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) = \text{Tr} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} K_x \otimes K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right) = \mathcal{N}(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Then under Assumption 1 with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , and by Cauchy Schwarz inequality, for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} \left[ \left\| \eta(x, y) - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}}[\eta(x, y)] \right\|_K^p \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} \left[ \left\| \eta(x, y) \right\|_K^p \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x)(y - f_\rho(x))K_x \right\|_K^p d\rho^{tr}(x, y) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right\|_K^p |y - f_\rho(x)|^p (w(x))^p d\rho^{tr}(x, y) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right\|_K^p (2M)^p (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \\ &\leq (2M)^p (\kappa \lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right\|_K^{(2-2\alpha) \cdot \frac{1}{1-\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} \left( (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^\alpha \\ &= (2M)^p (\kappa \lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} K_x \right\|_K^2 d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^{1-\alpha} \left( (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^\alpha \\ &\leq (2M)^p (\kappa \lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2+2\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{2} p! C^{p-2} \sigma^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} p! (2MC\kappa \lambda^{-1/2})^{p-2} (4M^2 \kappa^{2\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 to the random variable  $\eta(x, y) = (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} w(x)(y - f_\rho(x))K_x$  with  $L = 2MC\kappa \lambda^{-1/2}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 4M^2 \kappa^{2\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2$ , we have confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(x_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}}[\eta(x, y)] \right\|_K \leq \frac{4MC\kappa \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 \kappa^{2\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *For any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\left\| S_X^\top W S_X - L_K \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^4 \sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Proposition 4.1. We consider the random variable  $\zeta(x) = w(x)\langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x$ , which takes value in  $HS(\mathcal{H}_K)$ . And one can easily see that  $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\zeta(x)] = L_K$ , then

$$S_X^\top W S_X - L_K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta(x_i) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\zeta(x)].$$



Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}\|\langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|\langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x \phi(x)\|_K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\| \phi_i(x) \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \phi_\ell(x) \phi_\ell \right\|_K^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\phi_i(x))^2 \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \phi_\ell(x) \phi_\ell \right\|_K^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\phi_i(x))^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (\phi_\ell(x))^2 = (K(x, x))^2 \leq \kappa^4.\end{aligned}$$

Then for any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}} \left[ \left\| \zeta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}}[\zeta(x)] \right\|_{HS}^p \right] &\leq 2^p \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}} [\|\zeta(x)\|_{HS}^p] = 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|w(x) \langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^p d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}(x) \\ &= 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|\langle K_x, \cdot \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^p (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \leq 2^p \int_{\mathcal{X}} \kappa^{2p} (w(x))^{p-1} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \\ &\leq 2^p \kappa^{2p} \left( (w(x))^{\frac{p-1}{\alpha}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}(x) \right)^\alpha \leq 2^p \kappa^{2p} \cdot \frac{1}{2} p! C^{p-2} \sigma^2 =: \frac{1}{2} p! (2C\kappa^2)^{p-2} (4\kappa^4 \sigma^2).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma (4.1) to the random variable  $\zeta(x) = w(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x$  with  $L = 2C\kappa^2$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = 4\kappa^4 \sigma^2$  we have confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| S_X^\top W S_X - L_K \right\|_{op} \leq \left\| S_X^\top W S_X - L_K \right\|_{HS} \leq \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^4 \sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Proofs of Main Results

In this section, we will provide the proofs for the three main results.

### 5.1 Convergence analysis of weighted spectral algorithm

In this subsection, we will establish the convergence rates for the weighted spectral algorithm.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** To prove the theorem, we are required to estimate the three terms  $\|(\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K)\|_{op}$ ,  $\|(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2}(S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho)\|_K$ ,  $\|L_K - S_X^\top W S_X\|_{op}$  involved in the error decomposition mentioned in the proposition 3.1.

First, by Proposition 4.2, for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a subset  $\mathcal{Z}_{\delta,1}^{|D|}$  of  $\mathcal{Z}^{|D|}$  of measure at least  $1 - \delta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1}(\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^{2+\alpha} \lambda^{-1-\alpha} (\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} + 1 \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^{2+\alpha} (C_0)^{1-\alpha} \sigma^2} + 1 \right)^2 \max \left\{ \log^2 \frac{2}{\delta}, \log \frac{2}{\delta}, 1 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 4.3, there exists another subset  $\mathcal{Z}_{\delta,2}^{|D|}$  of  $\mathcal{Z}^{|D|}$  of measure at least  $1 - \delta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ & \leq \frac{4MC\kappa \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2\kappa^{2\alpha}\lambda^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(\lambda))^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} \\ & \leq \left( 4MC\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2\kappa^{2\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} \right) n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta+\alpha(1-\beta)}} \max \left\{ \log \frac{2}{\delta}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting the above results back into Proposition 3.1, when  $\frac{1}{2} \leq r \leq \frac{3}{2}$  and  $D \in \mathcal{Z}_{\delta,1}^{|D|} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\delta,2}^{|D|}$ , the following inequality holds with confidence at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{t\epsilon}} & \leq 2b \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ & \quad + C_r \lambda^r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^r \\ & \leq C_2 n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta+\alpha(1-\beta)}} \max \left\{ \log^3 \frac{2}{\delta}, 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 & = 2b \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} + 1 \right)^2 \left( 4MC\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2\kappa^{2\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} \right) \\ & \quad + C_r \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} + 1 \right)^{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.4 there exists another subset  $\mathcal{Z}_{\delta,3}^{|D|}$  of  $\mathcal{Z}^{|D|}$  of measure at least  $1 - \delta$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| S_X^\top W S_X - L_K \right\|_{op} & \leq \frac{4C\kappa^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{8\kappa^4\sigma^2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} \\ & \leq \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^4\sigma^2} \right) \max \left\{ \log \frac{2}{\delta}, \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when  $r > \frac{3}{2}$ , and  $D \in \mathcal{Z}_{\delta,1}^{|D|} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\delta,2}^{|D|} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\delta,3}^{|D|}$ , with confidence at least  $1 - 3\delta$ , there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{t\epsilon}} & \leq 2b \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W \bar{y} - S_X^\top W S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ & \quad + C_r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top W S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + L_K) \right\|_{op}^{1/2} \left( \left\| L_K - S_X^\top W S_X \right\|_{op} + \lambda^r \right) \\ & \leq C_3 n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta+\alpha(1-\beta)}} \max \left\{ \log^3 \frac{2}{\delta}, 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_3 & = 2b \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} + 1 \right)^2 \left( 4MC\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2\kappa^{2\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} \right) \\ & \quad + \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^{2+\alpha}(C_0)^{1-\alpha}\sigma^2} + 1 \right) \left( \left( 4C\kappa^2 + \sqrt{8\kappa^4\sigma^2} \right) + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired results holds by  $2\delta$  and  $3\delta$  to  $\delta$  respectively, taking  $\tilde{C} = \max\{C_2, C_3\}$  and  $\log \frac{6}{\delta} > \log \frac{4}{\delta} > 1$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Convergence analysis of spectral algorithms with clipped weights

In this subsection, we will prove the convergence results for the spectral algorithm with clipped weights. To analyze the error of spectral algorithm with clipped weight, similar to Proposition 3.1, we need the following error decomposition.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let the spectral algorithm with clipped weight be defined by (12). Suppose Assumption 2 holds with  $1/2 \leq r \leq \nu_g$ . The following estimates hold:*

When  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ ,

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \leq 2bJ_1^{1/2} J_2 J_3 + 2^r (b + 1 + \gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \lambda^r J_1^r J_2^r. \quad (20)$$

When  $r > 3/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} &\leq J_1^{1/2} J_2^{1/2} \left( 2bJ_2^{1/2} J_3 + \sqrt{2}(b + 1 + \gamma_{1/2})(r - 1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \lambda^{1/2} D^{r-3/2} (J_4 + J_5) + 2^r (b + 1 + \gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \lambda^r \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \left\| L_K(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op}; \\ J_2 &= \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)(\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1} \right\|_{op}; \\ J_3 &= \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K; \\ J_4 &= \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op}; \\ J_5 &= \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op}, \end{aligned}$$

and the integral operator  $\hat{L}_K$  is defined as

$$\hat{L}_K f = \int_X f(x) K(\cdot, x) \hat{w}(x) d\rho_X^{tr}.$$

*Proof.* First, by the definition of  $f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}}$  and the identity  $\|f\|_{\rho_X^{te}} = \left\| L_K^{1/2} f \right\|_K$  for  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\ &= \left\| L_K^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho) \right\|_K = \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &= \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \\ &\quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\leq J_1^{1/2} J_2^{1/2} \cdot \left[ \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho)) \right\|_K \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We further divide the term  $\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho)) \right\|_K$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho)) \right\|_K \\
&= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)) (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\
&= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)) (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{1/2} \right\|_{op} \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\
&\leq 2b \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K) \right\|_{op}^{1/2} \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \\
&= 2b J_2^{1/2} J_3.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term  $\left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K$ , since  $f_\rho = L_K^r u_\rho$  with  $u_\rho \in L_{\rho_X^{te}}^2$  and  $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , we consider two cases due to the regularity of  $f_\rho$ .

Case 1:  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ .

In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-(r-1/2)} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-(r-1/2)} L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&= \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^r (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-(r-1/2)} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-(r-1/2)} L_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq 2^r (b+1 + \gamma_r) \lambda^r \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K) \right\|_{op}^{r-1/2} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} L_K \right\|_{op}^{r-1/2} \cdot \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&= 2^r (b+1 + \gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \lambda^r J_2^{r-1/2} J_1^{r-1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holds due to Lemma 3.1 with  $t = r$ , and Lemma 3.2 with  $s = r - 1/2$  and  $A = (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{-1}$  and  $B = \lambda I + L_K$ .

Case 2:  $r > 3/2$ .

In this case, we see that  $r - 1/2 > 1$ , then  $L_K^{r-1/2}$  can be rewritten as

$$L_K^{r-1/2} = \left( L_K^{r-1/2} - \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} + \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right) + (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) (L_K^{r-1/2} - \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} + \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2}) \right\|_{op} \left\| L_K^{1/2} u_\rho \right\|_K
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) (L_K^{r-1/2} - \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} + \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2}) \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \cdot \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} + \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\leq \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) \right\|_{op} \\
&\quad \cdot \left[ \left\| L_K^{r-1/2} - \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} + \left\| \hat{L}_K^{r-1/2} - (S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \right] \\
&\quad + \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X - I) (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X)^{r-1/2} \right\|_{op} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})\lambda^{1/2}(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3}D^{r-3/2} \left[ \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} + \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op} \right] \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&\quad + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)\lambda^r \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \\
&= \sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}} \lambda^{1/2} D^{r-3/2} (J_4 + J_5) + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)\lambda^r \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_X^{te}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to Lemma 3.3 with  $A = S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X$ ,  $B = \hat{L}_K$  and  $t = r - 1/2$ , and Lemma 3.1 with  $t = r$ . Then putting the estimates back into (22) yields the desired result.  $\square$

In the following, we will estimate  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4$  and  $J_5$  respectively. To this end, we need the following Bernstein inequality for vector-valued random variables, as presented in [22].

**Lemma 5.1.** *For a random variable  $\xi$  on  $(Z; \rho)$  with values in a Hilbert space  $(\mathcal{H}; \|\cdot\|)$  satisfying  $\|\xi\| \leq \tilde{M} < \infty$  almost surely, and a random sample  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^s$  independent drawn according to  $\rho$ , there holds with confidence  $1 - \delta$ ,*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \xi_i - \mathbb{E}(\xi_1) \right\| \leq \frac{2\tilde{M} \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{s} + \sqrt{\frac{2\mathbb{E}(\|\xi\|^2) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{s}}.$$

The following proposition provides estimates for the norm of the operator

$$(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X),$$

which is crucial to our proof.

**Proposition 5.2.** *For any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$\left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}},$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) = \text{Tr}(\hat{L}_K(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K))$ .

*Proof.* We consider the random variable  $\xi(x) = (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x$  which takes values in  $\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}_K)$ , then  $\|\xi(x)\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2 \lambda^{-1/2} D$  and

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}}(\|\xi(x)\|_{HS}^2) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}}(\|(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x \right)^\top (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x \right) \Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \hat{w}^2(x) K(x, x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x \right) \right] \\
&\leq \kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Then applying Lemma 5.1 to the random variable  $\xi(x)$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{op} &\leq \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{HS} \\
&\leq \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are prepared to estimate  $J_2, J_3, J_4$  and  $J_5$  in the following propositions.

**Proposition 5.3.** *For any  $0 < \delta < 1$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$J_2 = \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{op} \leq \left( \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda}} + 1 \right)^2.$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar as that of Proposition 4.2. By the second order decomposition [20], we have

$$J_2 = \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{op} \leq \left( \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top W S_X - L_K) \right\|_{op} \cdot \lambda^{-1/2} + 1 \right)^2.$$

Then using Proposition 5.2, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , we can assert that the following statement holds

$$J_2 = \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_{op} \leq \left( \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\lambda}} + 1 \right)^2.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.** *With confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$J_3 = \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} f_\rho) \right\|_K \leq \frac{4M\kappa D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

*Proof.* We consider the random variable  $\xi_3(x, y) = (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) (y - f_\rho(x)) K(\cdot, x)$ , then  $\|\xi_3(x, y)\|_K \leq 2M\kappa\lambda^{-1/2}D$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} (\|\xi_3(x, y)\|_K^2) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} (\|(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) (y - f_\rho(x)) K(\cdot, x)\|_K^2) \\
&\leq 4M^2 \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} (\|(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) K(\cdot, x)\|_K^2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 4M^2 \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} \text{Tr}((\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) K(\cdot, x) \otimes (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) K(\cdot, x)) \\
&= 4M^2 \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \rho^{tr}} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) K(\cdot, x) \otimes (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} \hat{w}(x) K(\cdot, x)) \\
&\leq 4M^2 D \text{Tr}((\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \hat{L}_K) \\
&= 4M^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 5.1, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds

$$J_3 = \left\| \left( \lambda I + \hat{L}_K \right)^{-1/2} \left( S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} f_\rho \right) \right\|_K \leq \frac{4M\kappa D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

This finished the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** *With confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , there holds*

$$J_5 = \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^4 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

*Proof.* We consider the random variable  $\xi_5(x) = \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x$  which take values in  $\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}_K)$ , then  $\|\xi_5(x)\|_{HS} \leq \kappa^2 D$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} (\|\xi_5(x)\|_{HS}^2) &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} (\|\hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x\|_{HS}^2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} \left[ \text{Tr}((\hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x)^\top \hat{w}(x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_X^{tr}} \left[ \text{Tr}(\hat{w}^2(x) K(x, x) \langle \cdot, K_x \rangle K_x) \right] \\
&\leq \kappa^2 D \text{Tr}(\hat{L}_K) \\
&\leq \kappa^4 D.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 5.1 to the random variable  $\xi_5(x)$ , with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , we can conclude that

$$J_5 = \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op} \leq \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{HS} \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^4 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}}.$$

The proof is now complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.6.** *Under Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 1$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \geq 2$ , we have*

$$J_4 = \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 D^{-k} (k+1)! C^{k-1} \sigma^2.$$

*Proof.* First, for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \geq 2$ , we have

$$\mathbb{I}_{\{w(x) \geq D\}} \leq \left( \frac{w(x)}{D} \right)^k.$$

Then, for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ ,

$$J_4 = \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} = \sup_{\|f\|_K=1} \left\| (L_K - \hat{L}_K) f \right\|_K$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\|f\|_K=1} \left\| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te} - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{w}(x) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \right\|_K \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_K=1} \left\| \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(x) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{w}(x) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \right\|_K \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_K=1} \left\| \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x) - \hat{w}(x)) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \right\|_K \\
&\leq \sup_{\|f\|_K=1} \|f\|_K^2 \kappa^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} |w(x) - \hat{w}(x)| d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \\
&\leq \kappa^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(x) \mathbb{I}_{\{w(x) \geq D\}} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \\
&\leq \kappa^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x))^{k+1} D^{-k} d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} = \kappa^2 D^{-k} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (w(x))^k d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 D^{-k} (k+1)! C^{k-1} \sigma^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 1$ . Then the proof is now finished.  $\square$

By Proposition 5.6, we can estimate  $J_1$  as follows.

**Proposition 5.7.** *Under Assumption 1 with  $\alpha = 1$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \geq 2$ , we have*

$$J_1 = \left\| L_K (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 D^{-k} \lambda^{-1} (k+1)! C^{k-1} \sigma^2 + 1.$$

*Proof.* Initially, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \left\| L_K (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} = \left\| L_K \left[ (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} - (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right] + L_K (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \\
&= \left\| L_K (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \left[ (\lambda I + L_K) - (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K) \right] (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} + L_K (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \\
&\leq \left\| L_K (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \left\| (L_K - \hat{L}_K) \right\|_{op} \lambda^{-1} + \left\| L_K (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \\
&\leq \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} \lambda^{-1} + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the desired result holds due to Proposition 5.6.  $\square$

The following proposition describes the relationship between  $\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ . Let  $A$  and  $B$  be self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . The notation  $A \succeq B$  indicates that  $A - B \succeq 0$ , where  $A - B$  is a positive semidefinite operator.

**Proposition 5.8.** *For any  $\lambda > 0$ , we have*

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{N}(\lambda). \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* On one hand, for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle (L_K - \hat{L}_K) f, f \right\rangle_K &= \left\langle \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(x) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{w}(x) f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr}, f \right\rangle_K \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{X}} f^2(x) (w(x) - \hat{w}(x)) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$



which implies that  $L_K \succeq \hat{L}_K$ , it follows that  $(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \succeq (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1}$ .

On the other hand, since  $L_K(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} = I - \lambda(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1}$ , then

$$L_K(\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} - \hat{L}_K(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} = \lambda \left( (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} - (\lambda I + L_K)^{-1} \right) \succeq 0,$$

this completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove our second main result.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** To prove the theorem, we need to estimate the five terms  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4,$  and  $J_5$  respectively mentioned in Proposition 5.1.

When  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ , we can choose  $D = n^\epsilon$  and set  $k$  to be the integer part of  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ , i.e.,  $k = \lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil$ , then we have  $1 - \epsilon \leq k\epsilon \leq 1$ , it follows that  $D^{-k} = n^{-k\epsilon} \leq n^{-1+\epsilon}$ . If we take  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+\beta} + \frac{\epsilon}{r}}$  with  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{r}{2r+\beta}$ , then by Proposition 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \left\| L_K(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 D^{-k} \lambda^{-1} (k+1)! C^{k-1} \sigma^2 + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 n^{-1+\epsilon} n^{\frac{1}{2r+\beta} - \frac{\epsilon}{r}} \left( \lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.3, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1} (\lambda I + S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X) \right\|_K \\ &\leq \left( \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + 1} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left( \frac{2\kappa^2 n^\epsilon}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2r+\beta} + \frac{\epsilon}{r}}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2 n^\epsilon C_0 n^{\frac{\beta}{2r+\beta} - \frac{\beta\epsilon}{r}}}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2r+\beta} + \frac{\epsilon}{r}}} + 1} \right)^2 \log^2 \frac{4}{\delta} \\ &\leq \left( 2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1 \right)^2 \log^2 \frac{4}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 5.4, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta/2$ , there holds

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= \left\| (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\leq \frac{4M\kappa D \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{4M\kappa n^\epsilon \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2r}}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 n^\epsilon C_0 n^{\frac{\beta}{2r+\beta} - \frac{\beta\epsilon}{r}} \log \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}} \\ &\leq \left( 4M\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2 C_0} \right) n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta} + \epsilon} \log \frac{4}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting the above estimates back into Proposition 5.1, for  $1/2 \leq r \leq 3/2$ , with confidence at least  $1 - 2\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_{\rho}\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{\epsilon}} &\leq 2bJ_1^{1/2}J_2J_3 + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)\|u_{\rho}\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{\epsilon}}\lambda^rJ_1^rJ_2^r \\
&\leq 2b\left(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\left(\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1\right)^{1/2}\cdot\left(2\kappa^2+\sqrt{2\kappa^2C_0}+1\right)^2 \\
&\quad\cdot\left(4M\kappa+\sqrt{8M^2C_0}\right)n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon}\log^3\frac{4}{\delta} \\
&\quad+2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)\|u_{\rho}\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{\epsilon}}n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon}\left(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\left(\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1\right)^r \\
&\quad\cdot\left(2\kappa^2+\sqrt{2\kappa^2C_0}+1\right)^{2r}\log^{2r}\frac{4}{\delta} \\
&\leq C_1n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon}\log^3\frac{4}{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 &= 2b\left(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\left(\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1\right)^{1/2}\cdot\left(2\kappa^2+\sqrt{2\kappa^2C_0}+1\right)^2\left(4M\kappa+\sqrt{8M^2C_0}\right) \\
&\quad+2^r(b+1+\gamma_r)\|u_{\rho}\|_{\rho_{\mathbf{X}}^{\epsilon}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\left(\left\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{1}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1\right)^r\cdot\left(2\kappa^2+\sqrt{2\kappa^2C_0}+1\right)^{2r}.
\end{aligned}$$

When  $r > 3/2$ , let's set  $D = n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}$  and  $k$  to be the integer of  $\frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon}$ , then we have  $D^{-k} = n^{-\frac{k\epsilon}{r-1/2}} \leq n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}$ . Now, if we choose  $\lambda = n^{-\frac{1}{2r+\beta}+\frac{\epsilon}{r}}$  with  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{r}{2r+\beta}$ , we can apply Proposition 5.7 to obtain the following result

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \left\|L_K(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1}\right\|_{op} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\kappa^2D^{-k}\lambda^{-1}(k+1)!C^{k-1}\sigma^2+1 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\kappa^2n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}n^{\frac{1}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\epsilon}{r}}\left(\left\lceil\frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\left(\left\lceil\frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon}\right\rceil+2\right)!C^{\lceil\frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon}\rceil}\sigma^2+1,
\end{aligned}$$

where we can verify that  $n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}n^{\frac{1}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\epsilon}{r}} \leq 1$ .

By Proposition 5.3, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta/3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= \left\|\left(\lambda I + \hat{L}_K\right)^{-1}\left(\lambda I + S_X^{\top}\hat{W}S_X\right)\right\|_K \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2\kappa^2D\log\frac{6}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2D\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda)\log\frac{6}{\delta}}{n\lambda} + 1}\right)^2 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2\kappa^2n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}\log\frac{6}{\delta}}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2r+\beta}+\frac{\epsilon}{r}}} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^2n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}C_0n^{\frac{\beta}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{r}}\log\frac{6}{\delta}}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2r+\beta}+\frac{\epsilon}{r}}} + 1}\right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left(2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1\right)^2 \log^2 \frac{6}{\delta}.$$

where we can verify that  $n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} n^{\frac{1}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\epsilon}{r}} \leq 1$  and  $n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} n^{1-\frac{1}{2r+\beta}+\frac{\epsilon}{r}} n^{-1+\frac{1}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\epsilon}{r}} \leq 1$ .

According to Proposition 5.4, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta/3$ , there holds

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= \left\| \left( \lambda I + \hat{L}_K \right)^{-1/2} \left( S_X^\top \hat{W} \bar{y} - S_X^\top \hat{W} f_\rho \right) \right\|_K \\ &\leq \frac{4M\kappa D \log \frac{6}{\delta}}{n\sqrt{\lambda}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 D \hat{\mathcal{N}}(\lambda) \log \frac{6}{\delta}}{n}} \\ &\leq \frac{4M\kappa n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} \log \frac{6}{\delta}}{n^{1-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}}} + \sqrt{\frac{8M^2 n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} C_0 n^{\frac{\beta}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{r}} \log \frac{6}{\delta}}{n}} \\ &\leq \left( 4M\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2 C_0} \right) n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon} \log \frac{6}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

where we can easily verify that  $n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} n^{-1+\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}-\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} \leq n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon}$ , and  $n^{\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} n^{\frac{\beta}{2r+\beta}-\frac{\beta\epsilon}{r}} n^{-1} \leq n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}+\epsilon}$ .

By Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 5.5, we can obtain it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J_4 &= \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 D^{-k} (k+1)! C^{k-1} \sigma^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil} \sigma^2 n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} D^{r-3/2} \lambda^{1/2} J_4 &= n^{\frac{r-3/2}{r-1/2}\epsilon} n^{-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} \left\| L_K - \hat{L}_K \right\|_{op} \\ &\leq n^{\frac{r-3/2}{r-1/2}\epsilon} n^{-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil} \sigma^2 n^{-1+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil} \sigma^2 n^{-1+\epsilon-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil} \sigma^2 n^{-1+\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to the fact that  $-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2r} < 0$  since  $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2r+\beta}$ . And by Proposition 5.5, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta/3$ , we can conclude that

$$J_5 = \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{2\kappa^2 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa^4 D \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} \leq 4\kappa^2 n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} \log \frac{6}{\delta}.$$

Together with the choice of  $D$  and  $\lambda$ , with confidence  $1 - \delta/3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^{r-3/2} \lambda^{1/2} J_5 &= n^{\frac{r-3/2}{r-1/2}\epsilon} n^{-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} \left\| \hat{L}_K - S_X^\top \hat{W} S_X \right\|_{op} \\ &\leq 4\kappa^2 n^{\frac{r-3/2}{r-1/2}\epsilon} n^{-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)}+\frac{\epsilon}{2r}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\epsilon}{r-1/2}} \log \frac{6}{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 4\kappa^2 n^{-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2r} - \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \log \frac{6}{\delta} \\
&\leq 4\kappa^2 n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \log \frac{6}{\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to the fact that  $-\frac{1}{2(2r+\beta)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2r} < 0$  since  $\epsilon < \frac{r}{2r+\beta}$ . Therefore, for  $r \geq 3/2$ , substituting the above-mentioned estimates into Proposition 5.1, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{\mathbf{z},\lambda}^{\mathbf{w}} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} &\leq J_1^{1/2} J_2^{1/2} \left( 2bJ_2^{1/2} J_3 + \sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} \lambda^{1/2} D^{2r-3} (J_4 + J_5) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} \lambda^r \right) \\
&\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{1/2} \left( 2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1 \right) \log \frac{6}{\delta} \\
&\quad \cdot \left( 2b \left( 2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1 \right) \left( 4M\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2 C_0} \right) n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta} + \epsilon} \log^2 \frac{6}{\delta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 n^{-1+\epsilon} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 4\kappa^2 n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \log \frac{6}{\delta} \right) + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta} + \epsilon} \right) \\
&\leq C_2 n^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta} + \epsilon} \log^3 \frac{6}{\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2 &= \left( \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{1/2} \left( 2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1 \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left( 2b \left( 2\kappa^2 + \sqrt{2\kappa^2 C_0} + 1 \right) \left( 4M\kappa + \sqrt{8M^2 C_0} \right) + \sqrt{2}(b+1+\gamma_{1/2})(r-1/2)\kappa^{2r-3} \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \left( \left\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \right\rceil + 2 \right)! C^{\lceil \frac{r-1/2}{\epsilon} \rceil} \sigma^2 + 4\kappa^2 \right) + 2^r(b+1+\gamma_r) \|u_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{\epsilon}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the desired results holds by choosing  $\tilde{C}_{r,\epsilon} = \max\{C_1, C_2\}$  and the fact that  $\log \frac{4}{\delta} < \log \frac{6}{\delta}$  for  $0 < \delta < 1$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Convergence analysis of unweighted spectral algorithms under covariate shift

In this subsection, we prove the main results for classical spectral algorithm (unweighted spectral algorithm) with covariate shift. Recall that, given two self-adjoint operators  $A$  and  $B$ , the notation  $A \succeq B$  indicates that  $A - B \succeq 0$ , where  $A - B$  is a positive semidefinite operator. Alternatively, this condition can be expressed as  $\langle Af, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \langle Bf, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{H}$ . If  $A \succeq B$ , then for any operator  $C$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ , it follows that  $C^T A C \succeq C^T B C$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *If the weight function is uniformly bounded, i.e., there exists some constant  $U$  such that  $|w(x)| \leq U$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , then*

$$\left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{U}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_K f, f \rangle_K &= \left\langle \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) K_x d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}, f \right\rangle_K = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f^2(x) w(x) d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \leq U \int_{\mathcal{X}} f^2(x) d\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{tr} \\ &\leq U \langle \tilde{L}_K f, f \rangle_K \leq U(\lambda \|f\|_K^2 + \langle \tilde{L}_K f, f \rangle_K) = U \langle (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K) f, f \rangle_K, \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $L_K \preceq U(\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)$ . Then we

$$(\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} L_K (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \preceq UI.$$

Then we have

$$\left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op}^2 = \left\| (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} L_K (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \leq U.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to demonstrate the proof of Theorem 3.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** By the definition of  $f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}$  and the property (6) of the filter function  $g_\lambda$ , we have the following error decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}} &= \left\| L_K^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda} - f_\rho) \right\|_K = \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda} - f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &= \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + \hat{L}_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{-1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{1/2} (f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda} - f_\rho) \right\|_K \\ &\leq \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \\ &\quad \left[ \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top S_X)(S_X^\top \bar{y} - S_X^\top S_X f_\rho)) \right\|_K + \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top S_X) S_X^\top S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K \right] \\ &\leq \left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \\ &\quad \left[ 2b \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op}^2 \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (S_X^\top \bar{y} - S_X^\top S_X f_\rho) \right\|_K \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\| (\lambda I + L_K)^{1/2} (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op} \cdot \left\| (\lambda I + S_X^\top S_X)^{1/2} (g_\lambda(S_X^\top S_X) S_X^\top S_X - I) f_\rho \right\|_K \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We can observe that the error decomposition above is almost the same as Proposition 2 in [17], except for the additional term  $\left\| L_K^{1/2} (\lambda I + \tilde{L}_K)^{-1/2} \right\|_{op}$  on the right-hand side in our case. Then by Theorem 2 in [17] and Lemma 5.2, with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\|f_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda} - f_\rho\|_{\rho_{\mathcal{X}}^{te}} \leq \tilde{C} N^{-\frac{r}{2r+\beta}} (\log 6/\delta)^4,$$

where  $\tilde{C} = 2\sqrt{UC} \left[ 4(\kappa^2 + \kappa\sqrt{C_0})^2 + 1 \right] (\kappa^2 + \kappa\sqrt{C_0} + 2)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels, *Transactions of the American mathematical society*, 68(3):337–404, 1950.

- [2] R. Bathis. Matrix Analysis, Volume 169 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 1997.
- [3] F. Bauer, S. Pereverzev, L. Rosasco. On regularization algorithms in learning theory, *Journal of complexity*, 23(1):52-72, 2007.
- [4] G. Blanchard, N. Krämer. Optimal learning rates for kernel conjugate gradient regression, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* pages 226-234, 2010.
- [5] A. Caponnetto, E. De Vito. Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7(3):331-368, 2007.
- [6] C. Cortes, Y. Mansour, M. Mohri. Learning bounds for importance weighting, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 442-450, 2010.
- [7] F. Cucker, D. X. Zhou. *Learning Theory: An Approximation Theory Viewpoint*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [8] E. De Vito, L. Rosasco, A. Caponnetto, U. De Giovannini, F. Odone. Learning from examples as an inverse problem. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6: 883-904, 2005.
- [9] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, A. Neubauer. Regularization of inverse problems, Vol. 375 of Mathematics and Its Applications. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996. Group, Dordrecht.
- [10] J. Fan, Z. C. Guo, L. Shi. Spectral algorithms for functional linear regression, *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, 23(7), 895-915, 2024.
- [11] T. Fang, N. Lu, G. Niu, M. Sugiyama. Rethinking importance weighting for deep learning under distribution shift, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11996-12007, 2020.
- [12] X. Feng, X. He, C. Wang, C. Wang, J. Zhang. Towards a unified analysis of kernel-based methods under covariate shift, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:73839-73851, 2023.
- [13] E. Gizewski, L. Mayer, B. Moser, D. Nguyen, S. Pereverzyev Jr, S. Pereverzyev, N. Shepeleva, W. Zellinger. On a regularization of unsupervised domain adaptation in RKHS, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 57: 201-227, 2022.
- [14] D. Gogolashvili, M. Zecchin, M. Kanagawa, M. Kountouris, M. Filippone. When is Importance Weighting Correction Needed for Covariate Shift Adaptation? arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04020, 2023.
- [15] A. Gretton, A. Smola, J. Huang, M. Schmittfull, K. Borgwardt, B. Schölkopf. Covariate shift by kernel mean matching, *Dataset Shift in Machine Learning*, 3:131-160, 2009.
- [16] X. Guo, Z. C. Guo, L. Shi. Capacity dependent analysis for functional online learning algorithms, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 67(2023), 101567, 30pages.
- [17] Z. C. Guo, S. B. Lin, D. X. Zhou. Learning Theory of distributed spectral algorithms, *Inverse Problems*, 33 (2017), 1-29.

- [18] T. Kanamori, S. Hido, M. Sugiyama. A least-squares approach to direct importance estimation, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:1391–1445, 2009.
- [19] T. Kanamori, T. Suzuki, M. Sugiyama. Statistical analysis of kernel-based least-squares density-ratio estimation, *Machine Learning*, 86:335-367, 2012.
- [20] S. Lin, X. Guo, D.-X. Zhou, Distributed learning with least square regularization, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(92), 1-31, 2017.
- [21] L. Lo Gerfo, L. Rosasco, F. Odone, E. De Vito. A. Verri. Spectral algorithms for supervised learning, *Neural Computation*, 20:1873-1897, 2008.
- [22] I. Pinelis. Optimum bounds for the distributions of martingales in Banach spaces, *The Annals of Probability*, 22:1679-1706, 1994.
- [23] L. Rosasco, F. Odone, E. De Vito, A. Verri. Spectral algorithms for supervised learning. *Neural computation*, 20(7): 1873-1897, 2008.
- [24] S. Lu, P. Mathé, S. Pereverzyev. Balancing principle in supervised learning for a general regularization scheme, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 48(1): 123-148, 2020.
- [25] C. Ma, R. Pathak, M. J. Wainwright. Optimally tackling covariate shift in RKHS- based nonparametric regression, *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2), 738-761, 2023.
- [26] Y. Mansour, M. Mohri, A. Rostamizadeh. Multiple source adaptation and the Rényi divergence, *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, page 367-374. AUAI Press, 2009.
- [27] X. Nguyen, M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5847-5861, 2010.
- [28] D. H. Nguyen, S. Pereverzyev, W. Zellinger. General regularization in covariate shift adaptation, *Data-driven Models in Inverse Problems*, 31 (2024): 245.
- [29] H. Shimodaira. Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 90:227-244, 2000.
- [30] S. Smale, D. X. Zhou. Estimating the approximation error in learning theory, *Analysis and Applications*, 1(1):17–41, 2003.
- [31] M. Sugiyama, M. Krauledat, K. R. Müller. Covariate shift adaptation by importance weighted cross validation, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(35):985–1005, 2007.
- [32] M. Sugiyama, T. Suzuki, T. Kanamori. Density ratio estimation in machine learning, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [33] W. Zellinger, S. Kindermann, S. V. Pereverzyev. Adaptive learning of density ratios in RKHS, *Journal of Machine Learning. Research*, 24(1): 18863-18891, 2023.