Learning multivariate functions with low-dimensional structures using polynomial bases

Daniel Potts* M

Michael Schmischke[†]

In this paper we study the multivariate ANOVA decomposition for functions over the unit cube with respect to complete orthonormal systems of polynomials. In particular we use the integral projection operator that leads to the classical ANOVA decomposition. We present a method that uses this decomposition as a tool to understand and learn the structure of high-dimensional functions, i.e., which dimensions and dimension interactions are important. The functions we consider are either exactly or approximately of a low-dimensional structure, i.e., the number of simultaneous dimension interactions is effectively low. The structural knowledge of the function is then used to find an approximation.

Keywords and phrases: ANOVA decomposition, high-dimensional approximation, Chebyshev, orthogonal polynomials

2010 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 65T, 42B05.

1 Introduction

The approximation of high-dimensional functions is an active topic and is of high relevance to numerous applications. In a general setting we are given some data about a function which we have a little to no control over. The related approximation problem is generally referred to as scattered data approximation. Classical methods suffer from the curse of dimensionality in this setting, meaning that the amount of data needed increases

^{*}Faculty of Mathematics, Chemnitz University of Technology, D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany. E-mail: potts@math.tu-chemnitz.de

[†]Faculty of Mathematics, Chemnitz University of Technology, D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany. E-mail: michael.schmischke@math.tu-chemnitz.de

exponentially with the dimension. Finding ways to circumvent the curse poses the main challenge. Besides finding an approximation there is the question of interpretability. In many application one wishes to understand how important the different dimensions and dimension interactions are to interpret the results.

In this paper we consider functions $f: [-1,1]^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined over the unit cube with high spatial dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Given scattered data about f, i.e., a finite sampling set $X \subseteq (-1,1)^d$ and evaluations $\boldsymbol{y} = (f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$, we aim to learn the structure of the function and apply this information to obtain an approximation. As opposed to black-box approximation, we may not choose the location of the nodes in X. This prohibits us from using well-established spatial discretizations such as sparse grids, see [7], or rank-1 lattice, see [22, 19], that use a low-dimensional structure in the node set. Our approach to circumvent the curse of dimensionality is to assume sparsity in the structure of the function itself, i.e., we assume that f consists of low-dimensional parts.

We focus on complete orthonormal systems $\{\varphi_k\}$ in $L_2([-1, 1]^d, \omega)$ where the functions are tensor products of univariate polynomials, e.g., the Chebyshev polynomials. Any function from the weighted Lebesgue space $L_2([-1, 1]^d, \omega)$ can then be written as a series $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ with coefficients $c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. Our method focuses on approximations using partial sums of the type $S_I f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x})$, with a special type of finite index sets $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0^d$ that reflects the low-dimensional structure of f. Determining a frequency index set I that yields a good approximation while not scaling exponentially in d poses one of the main challenges.

The method presented here uses the classical ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) decomposition, see [3, 23, 16, 11], as a main tool. The decomposition is important in the analysis of the dimensions for multivariate, high-dimensional functions. It has also been used in understanding the reason behind the success of certain quadrature methods for high-dimensional integration [17, 2, 8] and also infinite-dimensional integration [1, 10, 14]. The ANOVA decomposition decomposes a *d*-variate function in 2^d ANOVA terms where each term belongs to a subset of $\{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$. Each term depends only on the variables in the corresponding subset and the number of these variables is the order of the ANOVA term.

Our method assumes sparsity by restricting the number of possible simultaneous dimension interactions. The knowledge that the function f has a structure such that it can be well approximated using this sparsity assumption is the only information we require a-priori. The approach allows us to determine or *learn* the basis coefficients by solving a linear least-squares problem by exploting the structure of the matrix.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In the following we introduce some necessary preliminaries for weighted Lebesgue spaces with complete orthonormal systems of polynomials. Moreover, we discuss the nonequispaced fast cosine transform and the fast polynomial transform for the evaluation of Chebyshev partial sums and computing the basis exchange from any polynomial bases to the Chebyshev system, respectively. In Section 2 we consider the properties of the ANOVA decomposition in the previously explained setting. The approximation method itself is discussed in Section 3 with numerical examples in Section 4.

Prerequisites, Notation and orthogonal Polynomials

Let $\omega: (-1,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative, integrable weight function with $\int_{-1}^{1} \omega(x) dx = 1$ and let $L_2([-1,1],\omega)$ be the weighted Hilbert space of all measurable functions $f: [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with the inner product and norm defined by

$$\langle f,g \rangle := \int_{-1}^{1} f(x)g(x)\omega(x) \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad ||f||_2 := \langle f,f \rangle^{1/2}.$$

We consider the system of polynomials $\{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ where the functions are tensor products $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \coloneqq \prod_{j=1}^d \varphi_{k_j}(x_j)$ for $\varphi_N \in \Pi_N$. Here, Π_N denotes the set of polynomials of degree $\leq N$. The system $\{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $L_2([-1, 1]^d, \omega)$ if $\{\varphi_N\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $L_2([-1, 1], \omega)$.

We consider functions $f \in L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$ that have a unique representation with respect to the system $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$ as series

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}),$$

where $c_{\mathbf{k}} := c_{\mathbf{k}}(f) \coloneqq \int_{[-1,1]^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \omega(\mathbf{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}, \, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, are the basis coefficients of f with respect to $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}$. For a finite index set $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0^d$, we call the finite series

$$S_I f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \, \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad (1.1)$$

the partial sum of f with respect to the index set I. In the following me make heavy use of the fact, that we are able to compute the sum (1.1) on arbitrary nodes $\boldsymbol{x}_j \in [-1, 1]^d$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, M, M \in \mathbb{N}$, in an efficient manner. We realize the fast evaluation as follows:

Consider the univariate polynomial

$$P := \sum_{k=0}^{N} c_k \varphi_k \in \Pi_N$$

with known real coefficients c_k . Our concern is the realization of a the basis exchange from $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=0}^N$ to $\{T_k\}_{k=0}^N$ in Π_N and produces the Chebyshev coefficients \tilde{c}_k in

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \tilde{c}_k T_k.$$

By $T_k := \sqrt{2}^{1-\delta_{k,0}} \cos(k \arccos \cdot)$, we denote the normed Chebyshev polynomials of first kind. Note that $\arccos : [-1, 1] \to [0, \pi]$ is the inverse function of $\cos restricted$ to $[0, \pi)$. As known, the Chebyshev polynomials form a complete orthonormal system in $L_2([-1, 1], \omega)$ with the special Chebyshev weight $\omega(x) := \pi^{-1} \cdot (1 - x^2)^{-1/2}$. For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have

$$\langle T_m, T_n \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & m = n, \\ 0 & m \neq n. \end{cases}$$

An algorithm, that realize the fast evaluation of \tilde{c}_k from c_k is known as discrete polynomial transform and was developed in [21], see also the approach of Driscoll and Healy for the transposed problem developed in [6]. Our approach computes the basis exchange with $\mathcal{O}(N \log^2 N)$ arithmetical operations by a divide-and-conquer technique combined with fast polynomial multiplications. The algorithm was designed for arbitrary polynomials P_n satisfying a three-term recurrence relation, see [19, Section 6.5]. We introduce the notation $T_k(\boldsymbol{x}) := \prod_{j=1}^d T_{k_j}(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$ and observe that this algorithm can be straightforward generalized to the tensor product case, such that we realize the basis exchange, i.e. compute the Chebyshev coefficients $\tilde{c}_k \in \mathbb{R}$ from the coefficients $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$P = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in [0,N]^d} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in [0,N]^d} \tilde{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}} T_{\boldsymbol{k}},$$

in $\mathcal{O}(N^d \log^{2d} N)$ arithmetical operations. Knowing the Chebyshev coefficients \tilde{c}_k , the values $P(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$ (j = 0, ..., M) can be computed by the nonequisistant cosine transform at the nodes $\arccos(\boldsymbol{x}_j)$ by Algorithm [19, Section 7.4] in $\mathcal{O}(N^d \log N + M)$ arithmetical operations. In summary we are able to compute the polynomial P at all arbitrary nodes $\boldsymbol{x}_j, j = 0, ..., M$

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}_j) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in [0,N]^d} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_j), \qquad (1.2)$$

in only $\mathcal{O}(N^d \log^{2d} N + M)$ arithmetical operations. For the special case of Chebyshev polynomials, i.e. $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}} = T_{\mathbf{k}}$ we need only $\mathcal{O}(N^d \log N + M)$ arithmetical operations, since the discrete polynomial transform is not necessary. We stress on the fact, that a fast algorithm implies the factorization of the transform matrix $\mathbf{P} := (\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}_j))_{j=0,\dots,M,\mathbf{k}\in[0,N]^d}$ into a product of sparse matrices. Consequently, once a fast algorithm for (1.2) is known, a fast algorithm for the "transposed" problem

$$c_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \sum_{j=0}^{M} f_{j} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{j}), \quad \boldsymbol{k} \in [0, N]^{d}$$
(1.3)

with the transform matrix \mathbf{P}^{T} and the same arithmetical complexity is also available by transposing the sparse matrix product. The algorithms are part of the software package [13].

In order to overcome the high complexity with growing dimensions d, we focus on models with low effective dimensions. To this end we assume, that the effects of degree interactions among the input variables weaken rapidly or vanish altogether.

2 Analysis of Variance Decomposition on the Cube

In this section we follow the approach of [20] and introduce the ANOVA decomposition in the setting of weighted Lebesgue spaces with orthonormal polynomials als bases. See also [3, 16, 15, 11]. For a given spatial dimension d we denote with $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ the set of coordinate indices and subsets as bold small letters, e.g., $\boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. The complement of those subsets are always with respect to \mathcal{D} , i.e., $\boldsymbol{u}^c = \mathcal{D} \setminus \boldsymbol{u}$. For a vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ we define $\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}} = (x_i)_{i \in \boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$. Furthermore, we use the *p*-norm (or quasi norm) of a vector which is defined as

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{p} = \begin{cases} |\{i \in \mathcal{D} : x_{i} \neq 0\}| & : p = 0\\ \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} |x_{i}|^{p}\right)^{1/p} & : 0$$

for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The space $L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$ with weight function ω and complete orthonormal system $\{\varphi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}^d_*}$ consisting of tensor product functions, see Section 1, is fixed.

We start by defining the projection operator

$$P_{\boldsymbol{u}}f(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \coloneqq \int_{[-1,1]^{d-|\boldsymbol{u}|}} f(\boldsymbol{x})\omega(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{c}}) \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{c}}$$
(2.1)

that integrates over the variables x_{u^c} . Clearly, the image $P_u f$ depends only on the variables $x_u \in [-1, 1]^{|u|}$. We define the index set

$$\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)} \coloneqq \left\{ \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \colon \boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}^c} = \boldsymbol{0} \right\}$$
(2.2)

which can be identified with $\mathbb{N}_0^{|u|}$ using the mapping $k \mapsto k_u$. Furthermore we use the index set

$$\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)} \coloneqq \left\{ \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_{0}^{d} \colon \boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{c}} = \boldsymbol{0}, k_{j} \neq 0 \; \forall j \in \boldsymbol{u} \right\}$$

which can be identified with $\mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$ using the mapping $\boldsymbol{k} \mapsto \boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. Moreover, we use the convention $\mathbb{N}_{0}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|} = \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|} = \{0\}$. The **ANOVA term** for $\boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is defined as

$$f_{\boldsymbol{u}} \coloneqq \mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}} f - \sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \subsetneq \boldsymbol{u}} f_{\boldsymbol{v}}.$$
(2.3)

We now prove a relationship between the basis coefficients of $P_u f$, f_u and f.

Lemma 2.1. Let $f \in L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$ and $\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$. Then

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}}f\right) = c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f)$$

and

$$\mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}\right) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) & : \boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|} \\ \delta_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\emptyset}} \cdot \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f) & : \boldsymbol{\ell} = \boldsymbol{0} \\ 0 & : \exists i, j \colon \ell_i = 0, \ell_j \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u}} = \boldsymbol{\ell}$ and $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{u}^c} = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{u}}f, f_{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbf{L}_2([-1,1]^{|\mathbf{u}|}, \omega)$.

Proof. We prove the formula for $c_{\ell}(P_u f)$, consolidate the two integrals and derive

$$c_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} (\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}} f) = \int_{[-1,1]^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} \int_{[-1,1]^{d-|\boldsymbol{u}|}} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{c}}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{c}} \, \varphi_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$$
$$= \int_{[-1,1]^{d}} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \varphi_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$$
$$= \int_{[-1,1]^{d}} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f)$$

for $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\mathbf{k}_u = \boldsymbol{\ell}$ and $\mathbf{k}_{u^c} = \mathbf{0}$. Then $P_u f \in L_2([-1, 1]^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}, \omega)$ is clear due to Parseval's identity.

We prove the formula for $c_{\ell}(f_u)$ by employing the direct formula for the ANOVA terms $f_u(x_u) = \sum_{v \subseteq u} (-1)^{|u| - |v|} P_v f(x_v)$ to obtain

$$c_{\ell}(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} f_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) e^{-2\pi i \boldsymbol{\ell} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}} d\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} \left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} P_{\boldsymbol{v}} f(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{v}}) \right] e^{-2\pi i \boldsymbol{\ell} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}} d\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} P_{\boldsymbol{v}} f(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{v}}) e^{-2\pi i \boldsymbol{\ell} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}} d\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} c_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{v}}} (P_{\boldsymbol{v}} f) \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u} \setminus \boldsymbol{v}}, \boldsymbol{0}}.$$

We go on to prove $c_0(f_u) = \delta_{u,\emptyset} \cdot c_0(f)$. In this case, $k_v = 0$ and $\delta_{k_{u\setminus v},0} = 1$ for every $v \subseteq u$. By the Binomial Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}\right) &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}\subseteq\boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}|-|\boldsymbol{v}|} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}}f\right) \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}\setminus\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{0}} = \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f) \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}\subseteq\boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}|-|\boldsymbol{v}|} \\ &= \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f) \sum_{n=0}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|} \binom{|\boldsymbol{u}|}{n} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}|-n} = \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f) \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\emptyset}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second case, we consider an ℓ and with a set $\overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}$ such that $\emptyset \neq \overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \coloneqq \{i \in \boldsymbol{u} \colon k_i = 0\} \neq \boldsymbol{u}$. Then $\delta_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u} \setminus \boldsymbol{v}}, \boldsymbol{0}} = 1 \iff \overline{\boldsymbol{v}}^c \coloneqq \boldsymbol{u} \setminus \overline{\boldsymbol{v}} \subseteq \boldsymbol{v}$ and with the Binomial Theorem we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}\right) &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}}f\right) \delta_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u} \setminus \boldsymbol{v}}, \mathbf{0}} = \sum_{\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c} \subseteq \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}\left(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}}f\right) \\ &= \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \sum_{\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c} \subseteq \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u}}} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\boldsymbol{v}|} = \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \sum_{n = |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}|} \binom{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}|}{n - |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}|} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - n} \\ &= \mathbf{c}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \sum_{m = 0}^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}|} \binom{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}|}{m} (-1)^{|\boldsymbol{u}| - |\overline{\boldsymbol{v}^{c}}| - m} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the case where the entries of ℓ are all nonzero, only the addend where v = u is nonzero, i.e., $c_{\ell}(f_u) = c_k(f)$ and $f_u \in L_2([-1,1]^{|u|}, \omega)$ is clear due to Parseval's identity.

Using Lemma 2.1, we are able to write $P_u f$ and f_u as both, d-dimensional

$$P_{\boldsymbol{u}}f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}), \ f_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x})$$

and $|\boldsymbol{u}|$ -dimensional series

$$P_{\boldsymbol{u}}f(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_{0}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} c_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(P_{\boldsymbol{u}}f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}), \ f_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}} c_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

Theorem 2.2. Let $f \in L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$, the ANOVA terms f_u as in (2.3) and the set of coordinate indices $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$. Then f can be uniquely decomposed as

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = f_{\emptyset} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} f_{\{i\}}(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{d} f_{\{i,j\}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\{i,j\}}) + \dots + f_{\mathcal{D}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}} f_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}})$$
(2.4)

which we call analysis of variance (ANOVA) decomposition. Moreover, $\bigcup_{u \subseteq D} \mathbb{F}_{u}^{(d)} = \mathbb{N}_{0}^{d}$ and the union is disjoint.

Proof. We use that \mathbb{N}_0^d is clearly the disjoint union of the sets $\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)}$ for $\boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Using this fact we obtain

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\subseteq\mathcal{D}} f_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\subseteq\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\bigcup_{\boldsymbol{u}\subseteq\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x})$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathbb{N}_{0}^{d}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Since the union is disjoint, the decomposition is unique.

In order to get a notion of the importance of single terms compared to the entire function, we define the **variance of a function**

$$\sigma^{2}(f) \coloneqq \int_{[-1,1]^{d}} \left(f(\boldsymbol{x}) - c_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f)\right)^{2} \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$$

and the equivalent formulation

$$\sigma^{2}(f) = \left\| f \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_{2}([-1,1]^{d},\omega)}^{2} - \left| c_{\mathbf{0}}(f) \right|^{2} .$$
(2.5)

For the ANOVA terms $f_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ with $\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ we have $c_{\boldsymbol{0}}(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = 0$ and therefore $\sigma^2(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}) = \|f_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|^2_{L_2([-1,1]^{|\boldsymbol{u}|},\omega)}$. For $f \in L_2([-1,1]^d,\omega)$ we obtain for the variance

$$\sigma^2(f) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}} \sigma^2(f_{\boldsymbol{u}})$$

by Parsevel's identity. The global sensitivity indices, cf. [24, 25, 16],

$$\varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, f) \coloneqq \frac{\sigma^2(f_{\boldsymbol{u}})}{\sigma^2(f)} \in [0, 1]$$
(2.6)

for $\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ provide a comparable score to rank the importance of ANOVA terms $f_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ against each other. We observe $\sum_{\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D}} \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, f) = 1$.

We now introduce the notion of effective dimensions as proposed in [3]. Given a fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the superposition dimension, one notion of effective dimension, is defined as the smallest integer $d_s \in \{1, 2, ..., d-1\}$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \\ |\boldsymbol{u}| \leq d_s}} \sigma^2(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}) \ge \alpha \sigma^2(f).$$
(2.7)

Instead of determining d_s corresponding to an $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we consider choosing d_s in which case we have

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\sigma^2(f)} \sum_{\substack{\emptyset \neq \boldsymbol{u} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \\ |\boldsymbol{u}| \leq d_s}} \sigma^2(f_{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

Since the number of ANOVA terms is 2^d and therefore grows exponentially in d we now want to focus on truncating the ANOVA decomposition, i.e., removing certain terms f_u . We therefore define a **subset of ANOVA terms** as a subset of the power set of \mathcal{D} , i.e., $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(D)$, such that the inclusion condition

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in U \Longrightarrow \forall \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq U \colon \boldsymbol{v} \in U \tag{2.8}$$

holds, cf. [11, Chapter 3.2]. This is necessary due to the recursive definition of the ANOVA terms, see (2.3). For any subset of ANOVA terms U we then define the truncated ANOVA decomposition as

$$\mathrm{T}_U f \coloneqq \sum_{\boldsymbol{u} \in U} f_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

This truncation can be done with the superposition dimension d_s in mind, see (2.7). We define $U_{d_s} \coloneqq \{u \subseteq \mathcal{D} \colon |u| \leq d_s\}$ and $T_{d_s} \coloneqq T_{U_{d_s}}$. This reduces the number of ANOVA terms to grow polynomially in d, i.e.,

$$|U_{d_s}| \le \left(\frac{d \cdot \mathbf{e}}{d_s}\right)^{d_s},\tag{2.9}$$

cf. [20]. The basis coefficients of the truncated ANOVA decomposition are then only nonzero for d_s -sparse frequencies

$$c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(T_U f) = \begin{cases} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) & : \exists \boldsymbol{u} \in U \colon \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{F}_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{(d)} \\ 0 & : \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The approximation method introduced in Section 3 uses partial sums where the frequency index sets are related to the ANOVA terms in a set $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$. We fix those sets by choosing frequencies for the ANOVA terms $f_u, u \in U$, i.e., choosing $I_u \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{|u|}$, and then projecting them as

$$\mathsf{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}}I_{\boldsymbol{u}} = egin{cases} \left\{ egin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon oldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}^{\mathrm{c}}} = oldsymbol{0}, oldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{u}} \in I_{\boldsymbol{u}}
ight\} & \colon oldsymbol{u} \neq \emptyset \ \left\{ oldsymbol{0}
ight\} & \colon oldsymbol{u} = \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Given finite sets $I_{\boldsymbol{u}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}, \ \boldsymbol{u} \in U$, we define

$$I(U) = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{u} \in U} \mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{u}} I_{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$
(2.10)

It is possible to choose the frequencies only based on the order of the ANOVA term $|\boldsymbol{u}|$ if one does not want or can make a distinction between terms with the same order. In this case we set $I_{\boldsymbol{u}} = I_{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$ for $I_0 = \{0\}, I_j \subseteq \mathbb{N}^j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_s$.

3 Approximation Method

In this section, we present a general approximation scheme for high-dimensional functions $f: [-1, 1]^d \to \mathbb{C}$ with spatial dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}([-1, 1]^d) \cap L_2([-1, 1]^d, \omega)$. The main goal of the method is to understand the structure of the function regarding the importance of dimensions and dimension interactions, i.e., the importance of ANOVA terms f_u . Here, we measure the importance of a term f_u using the global sensitivity indices $\varrho(u, f)$.

Since we consider scattered data approximation, our data consists of a finite set of sampling nodes $X \subseteq (-1, 1)^d$ and the function evaluations at those nodes $\boldsymbol{y} \coloneqq (f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$. Note that in scattered data approximation the node set is fixed and cannot be chosen. The main idea is to reduce the number of involved ANOVA terms by using a strategy to arrive at a certain subset $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(D)$ of ANOVA terms.

We focus on functions with a low-dimensional structure, i.e., there exsists a $d_s \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $f(\boldsymbol{x}) \approx T_{d_s} f(\boldsymbol{x})$. It has been speculated that functions in many applications consist of a low-dimensional structure and therefore belong to our class, see e.g. [3, 9]. From a theoretical standpoint, functions of certain smoothness classes also have an approximately low-dimensional structure. In [20] it was shown that functions of isotropic and dominating-mixed smoothness belong to our class. The immediate benefit is that the number of terms is reduced from being exponential in the spatial dimension d to being polynomial.

We then cut the series expansion of the ANOVA terms in U_{d_s} to an index set of the structure $I(U_{d_s})$, see (2.10), with finite order-dependend search sets $I_0 = \{0\}, I_j \subseteq \mathbb{N}^j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_s$. This leads to the approximation by the partial sum

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \approx S_{I(U_{d_s})} f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{d_s})} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \ \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$
(3.1)

The coefficients $c_k(f)$ are unknown and have to be determined from the given scattered data X and y. We determine approximations for the basis coefficients by solving the minimization problem

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{f}}_{\text{sol}} = \underset{\hat{\boldsymbol{f}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\left| I(U_{d_s}) \right|}}{\arg \min} \left\| \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{F}_{I(U_{d_s})} \hat{\boldsymbol{f}} \right\|_{2,\boldsymbol{W}}^{2}$$
(3.2)

with matrix $\mathbf{F}_{I(U_{d_s})} = (\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}))_{\mathbf{x} \in X, \mathbf{k} \in I(U_{d_s})}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\mathbf{W}}^2 \coloneqq \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{x}$ is a weighted ℓ_2 -norm with $\mathbf{W} = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w} = (w(\mathbf{x}))_{\mathbf{x} \in X}$. If the Matrix $\mathbf{F}_{I(U_{d_s})}$ has full rank, the elements of the solution vector $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{sol} = (\hat{f}_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in I(U_{d_s})}$ are the unique least-squares approximation to the basis coefficients, i.e., $\hat{f}_{\mathbf{k}} \approx c_{\mathbf{k}}(f)$, with respect to X and \mathbf{y} . We then have an approximation by the approximate partial sum

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) \approx S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{d_s})} \hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Remark 3.1. The matrix $\mathbf{F} = (\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}))_{\mathbf{x} \in X, \mathbf{k} \in I(U)}$ for $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$ has a structure corresponding to the ANOVA terms if one introduces an order $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_n, n = |U|$, on them. It can then be written as

$$\boldsymbol{F} = (\boldsymbol{F}_1 \ \boldsymbol{F}_2 \ \cdots \ \boldsymbol{F}_n) \tag{3.3}$$

with $\mathbf{F}_j = (\varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}_{u_j}))_{\mathbf{x} \in X, \ell \in I_{u_j}}$. Given a vector $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I(U_{d_s})|}$ where $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_j|}$ we have

$$oldsymbol{F}\hat{oldsymbol{f}} = \sum_{j=1}^n oldsymbol{F}_j \hat{oldsymbol{f}}_j$$

Considering the multiplication of \mathbf{F}^{\top} with a vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{|X|}$ where we denote the resulting vector with $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ and its component vectors as $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_j$, respectively, we have $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_j = \mathbf{F}_j^{\top} \mathbf{a}$, j = 1, 2, ..., n. Therefore, any multiplication of \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{F}^{\top} with a vector requires n multiplications with low-dimensional submatrices.

We solve the system (3.2) using an iterative least-squares solvers and realize the matrix vector multiplications with \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{F}^T using the methods described in Section 1 for the low-dimensional submatrices corresponding to the ANOVA terms, see [20].

The goal is to use this initial approximation $S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f$ to understand the structure of f, i.e., find the important ANOVA terms f_u . This gives us the location of important basis coefficients $c_k(f)$. In that sense, the method is related to nonlinear approximation or best n-term approximation, see [5]. Since we have no a-priori knowledge of the important terms (or basis locations) we use the approximation $S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f$ to determine them. To this end, we assume that the global sensitivity indices $\varrho(u, f)$ of f and the global sensitivity indices $\varrho(u, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f)$ of $S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f$ behave similarly for $|u| \leq d_s$, i.e.,

$$\varrho(\boldsymbol{u}_1, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) \le \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}_2, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) \Longrightarrow \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}_1, f) \le \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}_2, f), \boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2 \in U_{d_s}.$$
(3.4)

The accuracy of this assumption may depend on multiple factors like the size of $I(U_{d_s})$, the underlying function and the number of samples, but numerical experiments suggest that for continuous functions we are able to achieve this for small index sets $I(U_{d_s})$. We then use a threshold parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ to form an active set of ANOVA terms

$$U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)} \coloneqq U(S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X \mathrm{T}_{d_s} f, \varepsilon) \coloneqq \left\{ \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \colon \exists \boldsymbol{u} \colon \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) > \varepsilon \right\}$$

We use the active set $U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)}$ to build an index set $I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})$, see (2.10), with finite frequency sets $I_{\emptyset} = \{0\}, I_{\boldsymbol{u}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}, \boldsymbol{u} \in U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)}$. Depending on the information from the global sensitivity indices one may choose to vary the number of frequencies for terms of the same order now. Taking again the corresponding partial sum, we get

$$S_{I(U_{d_s})}f(\boldsymbol{x}) \approx S_{I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})}f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})} c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

With our data X and y we arrive at the minimization problem

$$\min_{\hat{\boldsymbol{f}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\left| I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)}) \right|}} \left\| \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{F} \hat{\boldsymbol{f}} \right\|_{2,\boldsymbol{W}}^{2}$$
(3.5)

with matrix $\boldsymbol{F} = (\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X, \boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})}$. The benefit of this new problem is that through the smaller number of ANOVA terms we have reduced the model complexity in this way and we may use more frequencies per remaining ANOVA term in our frequency set $I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})$ while maintaining the full rank of the system matrix. We solve the system iteratively in the same manner as before and obtain the approximation

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) \approx S_{I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})}^{X} f(\boldsymbol{x}) \coloneqq \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})} \hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Remark 3.2. The Remark 3.1 shows that we are able to separate the matrix-vector multiplications to corresponding low-dimensional multiplications. Since they are independent of each other, the proposed method is opportune for parallelization.

The Algorithm 1 summarizes the proposed method. The following lemma and corollary consider the complexity of the algorithm to solve minimization problems of type (3.2) and (3.5).

Lemma 3.3. Let $L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$ be the weighted Lebesgue space with Chebyshev product weight ω and the Chebyshev system $\{T_k\}$ as orthonormal basis. Moreover, let I(U) for $U \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D})$ be formed by index sets $I_{\emptyset} = \{0\}, I_u = \{1, 2, ..., N_u - 1\}^{|u|}, N_u \in \mathbb{N}, u \in U$. Then each iteration of the algorithm to solve the minimization problem

$$\min_{\hat{f}\in\mathbb{C}^{\left|I\left(U
ight)
ight|}}\left\|oldsymbol{y}-oldsymbol{F}\hat{f}
ight\|_{2,oldsymbol{W}}^{2}$$

Algorithm 1 ANOVA Approximation Method

- $X \subseteq (-1,1)^d$ Input: finite node set $\boldsymbol{y} = (f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$ function values superposition dimension $d_s \in \mathcal{D}$
- 1: Choose finite order-dependent search sets $I_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}, \ldots, I_{d_s} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{d_s}$.
- 2: Compute solution of least-squares problem (3.2).

3:
$$\hat{f}_{sol} = (\hat{f}_{k})_{k \in I(U_{d_s})} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\hat{f} \in \mathbb{C}^{|I(U_{d_s})|}} \left\| \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{F}_{I(U_{d_s})} \hat{f} \right\|_{2, \mathbf{V}}^{2}$$

4: Compute global sensitivity indices for approximation $S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f$ using (2.5).

5:
$$\varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) \leftarrow \left\| (S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f)_{\boldsymbol{u}} \right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^d,\omega)}^2 / \left(\left\| S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f \right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^d,\omega)}^2 - \left| c_0 \left(S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f \right) \right|^2 \right),$$

 $\boldsymbol{u} \in U_{d_s}$

- 6: Choose threshold parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and build active set.
- 7: $U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)} \leftarrow \left\{ \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \mathcal{D} : \exists \boldsymbol{u} : \boldsymbol{v} \subseteq \boldsymbol{u} \text{ and } \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) > \varepsilon \right\}$ 8: Use information from global sensitivity indices to choose finite index sets $I_{\boldsymbol{u}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$ per ANOVA term in $U_{X,y}^{(\varepsilon)}$.
- 9: Compute solution of least-squares problem (3.5).

10:
$$\hat{\boldsymbol{f}}_{sol} = (\hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{k}})_{\boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\hat{\boldsymbol{f}} \in \mathbb{C}} |I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})| \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{F}_{I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})} \hat{\boldsymbol{f}}\|_{2,\boldsymbol{W}}^{2}$$

Output: $\hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \in \mathbb{C}, \boldsymbol{k} \in I(U_{X,\boldsymbol{y}}^{(\varepsilon)})$ approximations to basis coefficients $c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f)$

with data $X \subseteq (-1,1)^d$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|X|}$ has a complexity in

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{u}\in U} N_{\boldsymbol{u}}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|} \log N_{\boldsymbol{u}} + |X| |U|\right).$$

Proof. During each iteration of the least-squares algorithm [18] there are two matrix multiplications, one with F and one with F^{\top} . Taking Remark 3.1 into account, we have to compute one nonequispaced fast cosine transform (NFCT) and one adjoined nonequispaced fast cosine transform for each ANOVA term $f_u, u \in U$, with complexity in $\mathcal{O}(N_u^{|\hat{u}|} \log N_u)$ each. Summing over the complexities yields the result.

Corollary 3.4. Let $L_2([-1,1]^d, \omega)$ be the weighted Lebesgue space with Chebyshev product weight ω and the Chebyshev system $\{T_k\}$ as orthonormal basis. Moreover, let $I(U_{d_s})$ be formed by order-dependent index sets $I_0 = \{0\}, I_{|\boldsymbol{u}|} = \{1, 2, \dots, N_{|\boldsymbol{u}|} - 1\}^{|\boldsymbol{u}|}, N_{|\boldsymbol{u}|} \in \mathbb{N},$ $|\boldsymbol{u}| = 1, 2, \dots, d_s$. Then each iteration of the algorithm to solve the minimization problem

$$\min_{\hat{f}\in\mathbb{C}^{\left|I\left(U_{d_{s}}
ight)
ight|}}\left\|m{y}-m{F}\hat{f}
ight\|_{2,m{W}}^{2}$$

with data $X \subseteq (-1,1)^d$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{|X|}$ has a complexity in

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{\mathbf{e}\cdot d}{d_s}\right)^{d_s} \left(N_{d_s}^{d_s}\log N_{d_s} + |X|\right)\right).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the previous lemma when estimating $|\boldsymbol{u}|$ by d_s and therefore $N_{|\boldsymbol{u}|}$ by N_{d_s} . Moreover, we use the estimate $|U_{d_s}| \leq (e \cdot d/d_s)^{d_s}$ from (2.9).

The number of iterations for solving least-squares systems of type (3.2) and (3.5) depends on the condition number of the matrix $F_{I(U)}$. These condition numbers were considered in [12] for a similar setting. The results suggest that the number of iterations stays small (given enough samples), but this has to be considered further.

Remark 3.5. The proposed method is in principle related to sparse polynomial approximation, see e.g. [4]. The first step of considering ANOVA terms of order up to the superposition dimension d_s is equal to considering the basis functions $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}}$ with $\|\mathbf{k}\|_0 \leq d_s$. We combine this with fast algorithms for the solution of the corresponding least-squares problems that are able to deal with scattered data. Our approach also differs in the fact that we use the importance of ANOVA terms with global sensitivity indices to characterize important basis functions.

4 Numerical Experiments

In this section we apply the previously introduced method to the test function $f: [-1, 1]^9 \to \mathbb{R}$

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) \coloneqq \prod_{i \in \{1,3\}} B_2(x_i) + \prod_{i \in \{4,7\}} B_2(x_i) + B_2(x_9) + \prod_{i \in \{2,5\}} B_4(x_i) + \prod_{i \in \{6,8\}} B_4(x_i), \quad (4.1)$$

where B_2 and B_4 are parts of shifted, scaled and dilated B-splines of order 2 and 4, respectively, see Figure 4.1 for illustration. The functions B_2 and B_4 are elements of $L_2([-1,1],\omega)$ with weight $\omega(x) := \pi^{-1} \cdot (1-x^2)^{-1/2}$ such that $\|B_2\|_{L_2([-1,1],\omega)} = \|B_4\|_{L_2([-1,1],\omega)} = 1$ and f is an element of the tensor product space $L_2([-1,1]^9,\omega)$. As basis we use the normed Chebyshev polynomials of first kind $\{T_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^9}$. A similar function has been considered in [22].

The ANOVA terms $f_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ are only nonzero for

$$u \in U^* \coloneqq \mathcal{P}(\{1,3\}) \cup \mathcal{P}(\{4,7\}) \cup \{9\} \cup \mathcal{P}(\{2,5\}) \cup \mathcal{P}(\{6,8\}).$$

The function f therefore has an exact low-dimensional structure, i.e., $T_2 f = f$. This leads to $d_s = 2$ being the optimal choice for the superposition dimension which is in a scattered data scenario with unkown underlying function f of course not known as well. For our numerical experiments we fix a sampling set $X \subseteq (-1, 1)^9$ (uniformly distributed), $M := |X| = 2.5 \cdot 10^6$, and an evaluation vector $\boldsymbol{y} = (f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$.



Figure 4.1: B-splines B_2 (left) and B_4 (right) in the interval [-3/2, 3/2] with the relevant part in [-1, 1].

In order to find the important ANOVA terms we use the first step of our method and choose a frequency index set $I(U_{d_s}) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^9$ through order-dependent sets $I_0 = \{0\}$, $I_1 = \{1, \ldots, N_1 - 1\}$, and $I_2 = \{1, \ldots, N_2 - 1\}^2$ with $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider the two errors

$$\varepsilon_{\ell_2} = \frac{\left\| \boldsymbol{y} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} \right\|_2}{\left\| \boldsymbol{y} \right\|_2}, \quad \varepsilon_{L_2} = \frac{\left\| f - S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f \right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^9,\omega)}}{\left\| f \right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^9,\omega)}}.$$

with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} = (S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$. Here, the error ε_{ℓ_2} can be regarded as a training error since it is taken at the given sampling set X and the error ε_{L_2} as a generalization error since it measures the error of the basis coefficients. Since our goal is to find the important ANOVA terms, i.e., the terms in U^* , we expect to have an interval (or gap) in which to choose the threshold ε . Therefore, we define

$$I_{\varepsilon} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & : \text{ assumption } (3.4) \text{ is not fulfilled} \\ (a_{\varepsilon}, b_{\varepsilon}) & : \text{ assumption } (3.4) \text{ is fulfilled} \end{cases}$$

where $a_{\varepsilon} \coloneqq \max \left\{ \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) \colon \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}) \setminus U^* \right\}$ and $b_{\varepsilon} \coloneqq \min \left\{ \varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f) \colon \boldsymbol{u} \in U^* \right\}$. The results of our numerical experiments with the function f from (4.1) are displayed in Table 4.1.

Remark 4.1. The norm occuring in the error ε_{L_2} can be calculated using Parselval's identity

$$\left\|f - S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f\right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^d,\omega)}^2 = \left\|f\right\|_{L_2([-1,1]^d,\omega)}^2 + \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in I(U_{d_s})} \left|c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f) - \hat{f}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\right|^2 - \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in I(U_{d_s})} \left|c_{\boldsymbol{k}}(f)\right|^2.$$

This is of course only possible if the original coefficients and the norm of the function f is known.

	size of index sets			relative	e errors	
	N_1	N_2	$ I(U_{d_s}) $	ε_{ℓ_2}	$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{L}_2}$	$I_{arepsilon}$
1	32	4	604	$4.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.0\cdot 10^{-3}$	$(7.7 \cdot 10^{-7}, 0.1294)$
2	32	6	1180	$8.0\cdot10^{-4}$	$8.7\cdot 10^{-4}$	$(1.9 \cdot 10^{-8}, 0.1297)$
3	32	8	2044	$4.7\cdot 10^{-4}$	$5.2\cdot 10^{-4}$	$(7.2 \cdot 10^{-9}, 0.1297)$
4	32	16	8380	0.020	0.058	(0.001836, 0.1300)
5	64	4	892	$4.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.0 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$(6.9 \cdot 10^{-7}, 0.1294)$
6	64	6	1468	$8.0\cdot10^{-4}$	$8.8\cdot10^{-4}$	$(1.7 \cdot 10^{-8}, 0.1297)$
7	64	8	2332	$4.9\cdot10^{-4}$	$5.5\cdot10^{-4}$	$(1.2 \cdot 10^{-8}, 0.1297)$
8	64	16	8668	0.022	0.065	$(2.2 \cdot 10^{-3}, 0.1307)$
9	128	4	1468	$4.9 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$(5.5 \cdot 10^{-7}, 0.1297)$
10	128	6	2044	$8.1\cdot10^{-4}$	$8.9\cdot10^{-4}$	$(1.6 \cdot 10^{-8}, 0.1297)$
11	128	8	2908	$6.6\cdot10^{-4}$	$9.0\cdot10^{-4}$	$(3.3 \cdot 10^{-7}, 0.1297)$
12	128	16	9244	0.033	0.087	(0.002745, 0.1330)

Table 4.1: Results of detection step for important ANOVA terms. The least squares solver was limited to 25 iterations.



Figure 4.2: Behavior of the global sensitivity indices $\rho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f)$ for the examples 3 and 8 from Table 4.1.

The results show that it is possible to detect the ANOVA terms in U^* using polynomials of a small degree. Since our number of samples M is fixed, we want to find values N_1 and N_2 such that one balances the effects of underfitting, i.e., the model is not complex enough, and overfitting, i.e., the model is too complex. The experiments show that this

	size of index sets			relative errors		
	N_1	N_2	$ I(U_{d_s}) $	ε_{ℓ_2}	$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{L}_2}$	
1	32	4	604	0.089	0.154	
2	32	6	1180	0.090	0.154	
3	32	8	2044	0.091	0.155	
4	32	16	8380	0.041	0.100	
5	64	4	892	0.091	0.155	
6	64	6	1468	0.092	0.155	
7	64	8	2332	0.092	0.155	
8	64	16	8668	0.042	0.103	
9	128	4	1468	0.093	0.156	
10	128	6	2044	0.093	0.156	
11	128	8	2908	0.094	0.157	
12	128	16	9244	0.045	0.108	

Table 4.2: Results of detection step for important ANOVA terms with 5% Gaussian noise. The least squares solver was limited to 25 iterations.



Figure 4.3: Behavior of the global sensitivity indices $\varrho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f)$ for the examples 4 and 9 from Table 4.2.

occurs at about 2000 basis functions. In Figure 4.2 we depicted the global sensitivity indices $\rho(\boldsymbol{u}, S_{I(U_{d_s})}^X f)$ for examples 3 and 8 from Table 4.1. The size of the interval I_{ε} suitable to choose the parameter ε is especially relevant. We observe that the interval is significantly larger if the approximation error is better. Table 4.2 shows results for the same data with

5% Gaussian noise. In this case, the noise prevents us from recovering U^* exactly. Instead, we see a gap that suggests to choose $\tilde{U}^* = U^* \cup \{3, 5\}$. Figure 4.3 visualizes the behavior of the global sensitivity indices for two tests with noise.

Since there exsists N_1 , N_2 , and ε such that we are able to recover the set of ANOVA terms U^* , we set $U_{X,y}^{(\varepsilon)} = U^*$ from now on for the noiseless case and $U_{X,y}^{(\varepsilon)} = \tilde{U}^*$ for the test with noise. We aim to improve our approximation quality with the given data by solving the minimization problem (3.5). Here, we could choose individual index sets for every ANOVA term in U^* to form $I(U^*)$ based on the global sensitivity indices, but for our function they correctly suggest to stay order-dependent. Table 4.3 shows the results of the approximation using the index set $I(U^*)$ for the test without noise and $I(\tilde{U}^*)$ for the test with 5% Gaussian noise.

	size of index sets			relative	relative errors		relative errors with noise		
	N_1	N_2	$ I(U^*) $	ε_{ℓ_2}	$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{L}_2}$		ε_{ℓ_2}	$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{L}_2}$	
1	64 64	8 16	764 1468	$9.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ 9.3 · 10^{-5}	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ 2 8 · 10^{-4}		$2.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$ 2 5 · 10^{-2}	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ 2.9 \cdot 10^{-2}	
$\frac{2}{3}$	128	8	1340	$9.3 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$ $2.8 \cdot 10^{-4}$		$2.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$ $2.7 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-2}$	
4	128	16	2044	$9.7\cdot10^{-5}$	$2.9\cdot 10^{-4}$		$2.9 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.2 \cdot 10^{-2}$	

Table 4.3: Results of detection step for important ANOVA terms. The least squares solver was limited to 50 iterations.

Since the number of terms in U^* is smaller than in U_{d_s} , we are able to increase N_1 and N_2 while balancing the effects of over- and underfitting. We observe that especially in the tests with noise, the reduction of the ANOVA terms to U^* yields significant benefit with regard to approximation quality. This results from the reduction in model complexity to reduce the effects of overfitting.

5 Summary

In this paper we considered the classical ANOVA decomposition for functions f in weighted Lebesgue spaces $L_2([-1, 1]^d, \omega)$ with orthogonal polynomials as bases. We were able to translate previous results from the torus and other settings. Specifically, we proved relations between the basis coefficients of the projections $P_u f$, the ANOVA terms f_u , and the function f. Furthermore, we considered sensitivity analysis and truncating the ANOVA decomposition to a certain subset of terms.

We introduced a method to determine important ANOVA terms, i.e., terms with a high global sensitivity index $\rho(\boldsymbol{u}, f)$, by approximation with index sets with a low-dimensional structure related to the truncated ANOVA decomposition. Our scenario was scattered data approximation where only a sampling set $X \subseteq (-1, 1)^d$ and function values $\boldsymbol{y} = (f(\boldsymbol{x}))_{\boldsymbol{x} \in X}$ are known. The numerical experiments show that the method works using a specific test

function consisting of sums of products of B-splines. The test function was of an exactly low-dimensional structure, i.e., $T_2 f = f$, and we were able to recover the analytically important ($\neq 0$) ANOVA terms with our approach.

It remains to show error bounds for this method and how functions of dominating mixed smoothness work with the approach as in the periodic case. Moreover, numerical experiments with different classes of test functions, and testing with application problems have to be considered.

Acknowledgments

We thank Tino Ullrich and Toni Volkmer for fruitful discussions on the contents of this paper. The second named author gratefully acknowledges the support by the funding of the European Union and the Free State of Saxony (ESF).

References

- J. Baldeaux and M. Gnewuch. Optimal randomized multilevel algorithms for infinitedimensional integration on function spaces with ANOVA-type decomposition. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 52(3):1128–1155, 2014.
- [2] H.-J. Bungartz and M. Griebel. Sparse grids. Acta Numer., 13:147–269, 2004.
- [3] R. Caflisch, W. Morokoff, and A. Owen. Valuation of mortgage-backed securities using brownian bridges to reduce effective dimension. J. Comput. Finance, 1(1):27–46, 1997.
- [4] A. Chkifa, A. Cohen, and C. Schwab. Breaking the curse of dimensionality in sparse polynomial approximation of parametric PDE. J. Math. Pures Appl., 103:400 – 428, 2015.
- [5] R. A. DeVore. Nonlinear approximation. Acta Numerica, 7:51–150, 1998.
- [6] J. R. Driscoll and D. Healy. Computing Fourier transforms and convolutions on the 2-sphere. Adv. in Appl. Math., 15:202–250, 1994.
- [7] M. Griebel. Sparse grids and related approximation schemes for higher dimensional problems. In L. Pardo, A. Pinkus, E. Suli, and M. Todd, editors, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics (FoCM05), Santander*, pages 106–161. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [8] M. Griebel and M. Holtz. Dimension-wise integration of high-dimensional functions with applications to finance. J. Complexity, 26(5):455–489, 2010.
- [9] M. Griebel, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. The smoothing effect of the ANOVA decomposition. J. Complexity, 26(5):523-551, 2010.

- [10] M. Griebel, F. Y. Kuo, and I. H. Sloan. The ANOVA decomposition of a non-smooth function of infinitely many variables can have every term smooth. *Math. Comp.*, 86(306):1855–1876, 2016.
- [11] M. Holtz. Sparse grid quadrature in high dimensions with applications in finance and insurance, volume 77 of Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011.
- [12] L. Kaemmerer, T. Ullrich, and T. Volkmer. Worst case recovery guarantees for least squares approximation using random samples. ArXiv e-prints 1911.10111, 2019.
- [13] J. Keiner, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. NFFT 3.5, C subroutine library. http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/~potts/nfft. Contributors: F. Bartel, M. Fenn, T. Görner, M. Kircheis, T. Knopp, M. Quellmalz, M. Schmischke, T. Volkmer, A. Vollrath.
- [14] F. Y. Kuo, D. Nuyens, L. Plaskota, I. H. Sloan, and G. W. Wasilkowski. Infinitedimensional integration and the multivariate decomposition method. J. Comput. Appl. Math., 326:217–234, Dec. 2017.
- [15] F. Y. Kuo, I. H. Sloan, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. On decompositions of multivariate functions. *Math. Comp.*, 79(270):953–966, 2009.
- [16] R. Liu and A. B. Owen. Estimating mean dimensionality of analysis of variance decompositions. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc., 101(474):712–721, 2006.
- [17] H. Niederreiter. Random Number Generation and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1992.
- [18] C. C. Paige and M. A. Saunders. LSQR: An algorithm for sparse linear equations and sparse least squares. ACM Trans. Math. Software, 8:43–71, 1982.
- [19] G. Plonka, D. Potts, G. Steidl, and M. Tasche. Numerical Fourier Analysis. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser, 2018.
- [20] D. Potts and M. Schmischke. Learning high-dimensional additive models on the torus. ArXiv e-prints 1907.11412, 2019.
- [21] D. Potts, G. Steidl, and M. Tasche. Fast algorithms for discrete polynomial transforms. *Math. Comput.*, 67:1577–1590, 1998.
- [22] D. Potts and T. Volkmer. Multivariate sparse FFT based on rank-1 chebyshev lattice sampling. In 2017 International Conference on Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA). IEEE, 2017.

- [23] H. Rabitz and O. F. Alis. General foundations of high dimensional model representations. J. Math. Chem., 25:197–233, 1999.
- [24] I. M. Sobol. On sensitivity estimation for nonlinear mathematical models. Keldysh AppliedMathematics Institute, 1:112–118, 1990.
- [25] I. M. Sobol. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo estimates. Math. Comput. Simulation, 55(1-3):271–280, 2001.