arXiv:2002.09677v1 [stat.ML] 22 Feb 2020

Kernel interpolation with continuous volume sampling

Ayoub Belhadji[†,*], Rémi Bardenet[†], Pierre Chainais[†]
[†] Univ. Lille, CNRS, Centrale Lille, UMR 9189 - CRIStAL, 59651 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

Abstract

A fundamental task in kernel methods is to pick nodes and weights, so as to approximate a given function from an RKHS by the weighted sum of kernel translates located at the nodes. This is the crux of kernel density estimation, kernel quadrature, or interpolation from discrete samples. Furthermore, RKHSs offer a convenient mathematical and computational framework. We introduce and analyse continuous volume sampling (VS), the continuous counterpart – for choosing node locations – of a discrete distribution introduced in (Deshpande and Vempala, 2006). Our contribution is theoretical: we prove almost optimal bounds for interpolation and quadrature under VS. While similar bounds already exist for some specific RKHSs using ad-hoc node constructions, VS offers bounds that apply to any Mercer kernel and depend on the spectrum of the associated integration operator. We emphasize that, unlike previous randomized approaches that rely on regularized leverage scores or determinantal point processes, evaluating the pdf of VS only requires pointwise evaluations of the kernel. VS is thus naturally amenable to MCMC samplers.

Keywords— Kernel interpolation; kernel quadrature; volume sampling; determinantal point processes; reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Related work **4**
2.1 Interpolation for optimal kernel quadrature 4
2.2 Kernel interpolation beyond embeddings 5
2.3 Optimization algorithms 5
2.4 Random designs 6
2.5 Lower bounds 7

3 Volume sampling and DPPs **7**
3.1 Continuous volume sampling 7
3.2 Continuous volume sampling as a mixture of DPPs 8
3.3 Sampling algorithms 9

4 Main results **9**
4.1 The interpolation error for embeddings μ_g 9
4.2 The interpolation error of any element of $\mathcal{F}$ 11
4.3 Asymptotic unbiasedness of kernel quadrature 11

[*]Corresponding author: ayoub.belhadji@centralelille.fr

5 Sketch of the proofs **12**
5.1 Decomposing the interpolation error . . . 12
5.2 Explicit formulas for expected leverage scores . . . 13

6 Conclusion **14**

A Technical results borrowed from other papers **20**
A.1 The Jacobi identity . . . 20
A.2 The Markov brothers' inequality . . . 20
A.3 An inequality on the ratio of symmetric polynomials . . . 21

B Proofs **22**
B.1 Proof of Proposition 2 . . . 22
B.2 Proof of Lemma 3 . . . 23
B.3 Proof of Lemma 8 . . . 23
B.4 Proof of Theorem 4 . . . 24
B.5 Proof of Proposition 5 . . . 26
B.6 Proof of Proposition 11 . . . 27
B.7 Proof of Proposition 10 . . . 30
B.8 Proof of Proposition 9 . . . 31
B.9 Proof of Theorem 6 . . . 33
B.10 Proof of Theorem 7 . . . 35

C More concrete examples of RKHSs **38**
C.1 The uni-dimensional periodic Sobolev spaces . . . 38
C.2 The uni-dimensional Gaussian spaces . . . 39

1 Introduction

Kernel approximation is a recurrent task in machine learning (Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman, 2009)[Chapter 5], signal processing (Unser, 2000) or numerical quadrature (Larkin, 1972). Expressed in its general form, we are given a reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{F}$ (RKHS; Berlinet and Thomas-Agnan, 2011) of functions over $\mathcal{X}$, with a symmetric kernel $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+$, and an element $\mu : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ of $\mathcal{F}$. We ask for conditions on a *design* $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, and on the corresponding weights $w_1, \dots, w_N$, such that the RKHS norm

$$\left\| \mu - \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i k(x_i, .) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{1}$$

is small. In other words, μ should be well reconstructed in $\mathcal{F}$ by the weighted design.

Measuring the error in RKHS norm has a computational advantage. Indeed, minimizing (1) boils down to minimizing a quadratic form; and given a design $\boldsymbol{x}$ such that $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \operatorname{Det}(k(x_i, x_j)) > 0$, Equation (1) has a unique set of minimizing weights. The minimizer corresponds to the weights $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\mu(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\mu(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ contains the evaluation of μ at the N design nodes x_i. Whenever the weights are chosen to be $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$, the sum in (1) takes the same values as μ at the nodes x_i, and the optimal value of (1) is thus called *interpolation error*; otherwise we speak of *approximation error*. Note that when the kernel k is bounded, guarantees in RKHS norm translate to guarantees in the supremum norm.

In this work, we propose and analyze the interpolation based on a random design drawn from a distribution called *continuous volume sampling*, which favours designs $\boldsymbol{x}$

with a large value of $\mathrm{Det}\,\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})$. After introducing this new distribution, we prove non-asymptotic guarantees on the interpolation error which depend on the spectrum of the kernel k. Previous kernel-based randomized designs, both i.i.d. (Bach, 2017) and repulsive (Belhadji et al., 2019), can be hard to compute in practice since they require access to the Mercer decompostion of k. We show here that continuous volume sampling enjoys similar error bounds as well as some additional interpretable geometric properties, while having a joint density that can be evaluated as soon as one can evaluate the RKHS kernel k. In particular, this opens the possibility of Markov chain Monte Carlo samplers (Rezaei and Gharan, 2019).

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews kernel-based interpolation. In Section 3, we define continuous volume sampling and relate it to projection determinantal point processes, as used by Belhadji et al. (2019). Section 4 contains our main results while Section 5 contains sketches of all proofs with pointers to the appendices for missing details. Finally, in Section 6, we conclude and discuss some consequences of our results beyond kernel interpolation.

Notation and assumptions. We assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is equipped with a Borel measure $\mathrm{d}\omega$, and that the support of $\mathrm{d}\omega$ is $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ be the Hilbert space of square integrable, real-valued functions on $\mathcal{X}$, with inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}$, and associated norm $\|.\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega}$.

Assumption A. $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,x)\mathrm{d}\omega(x) < +\infty$.

Under Assumption A, define the integral operator

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} f(\cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(\cdot,y) f(y)\mathrm{d}\omega(y), \quad f \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega). \tag{2}$$

By construction, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is self-adjoint, positive semi-definite, and trace-class (Simon, 2005). For $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, denote by e_m the m-th eigenfunction of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, normalized so that $\|e_m\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} = 1$, and σ_m the corresponding eigenvalue. Assumption A implies that the embedding operator $I_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ is compact; moreover, since $\mathrm{d}\omega$ is of full support in $\mathcal{X}$, $I_{\mathcal{F}}$ is injective (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008). This implies a Mercer-type decomposition of k,

$$k(x,y) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_m e_m(x) e_m(y), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and the convergence is pointwise (Steinwart and Scovel, 2012). The eigenvalues (σ_m) are assumed to be non-increasing. Moreover, for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we write $e_m^{\mathcal{F}} = \sqrt{\sigma_m} e_m$. Since $I_{\mathcal{F}}$ is injective, $(e_m^{\mathcal{F}})_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}$ (Steinwart and Scovel, 2012). Unless explicitly stated, we assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is dense in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, so that $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. For more intuition, under these assumptions, $f \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\sum_m \sigma_m^{-1}\langle f, e_m\rangle^2_{\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)}$ converges. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$, we define $\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) := k(x_i,x_j)_{i,j\in[N]}$. If $\mathrm{Det}\,\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$, the subspace $\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{Span}\, k(x_i,.)_{i\in[N]}$ is of dimension N; we denote by $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}$ the $\langle .,.\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$-orthogonal projection on $\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})$. Finally, for $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we will often sum over the sets

$$\mathcal{U}_N^m = \{U \subset \mathbb{N}^*, |U| = N,\ m \notin U\}, \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_N = \{U \subset \mathbb{N}^*, |U| = N\}. \tag{5}$$

Finally, define the approximation error

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu;\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{w}) = \|\mu - \sum_{i\in[N]} w_i k(x_i,.)\|_{\mathcal{F}}, \tag{6}$$

where $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$. If $\mathrm{Det}\, \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$, let $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\mu(\boldsymbol{x})$ and define the interpolation error

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu; \boldsymbol{x}) = \|\mu - \sum_{i\in[N]} \hat{w}_i k(x_i, .)\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{7}$$

$$= \|\mu - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \tag{8}$$

2 Related work

This section reviews some results on kernel interpolation to better situate our contributions. The literature on this topic is prolific and cannot be covered in details here. In particular, we start by reviewing results on optimal kernel quadrature, a particular case of kernel interpolation.

2.1 Interpolation for optimal kernel quadrature

Given $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, kernel quadrature deals with approximating the integrals

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} fg \,\mathrm{d}\omega \approx \sum_{i\in[N]} w_i f(x_i), \quad f \in \mathcal{F}, \tag{9}$$

where the weights w_i do not depend on f. In principle, it is easy to control the error uniformly in $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Indeed,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} fg \,\mathrm{d}\omega - \sum_{i\in[N]} w_i f(x_i) \right| \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_g; \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{w}), \tag{10}$$

where $\mu_g = \int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x)k(x, .)\mathrm{d}\omega(x) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} g$ is the so-called *embedding*[1] of g in the RKHS $\mathcal{F}$.

An upper bound on the approximation error of μ_g implies an upper bound on the integration error that is uniform over any bounded subset of $\mathcal{F}$. This observation sparked intense research on the kernel approximation of embeddings μ_g. Among kernel approximation results, we pay a particular attention to interpolation, i.e., approximation with optimal weights. In the sequel, we call *optimal kernel quadrature* the quadrature based on optimal weights $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$ minimizing (1) for a given set of nodes.

Bojanov (1981) proved that, for $g = 1$, the interpolation of μ_g using the uniform grid over $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$ has an error in $\mathcal{O}(N^{-2s})$ if $\mathcal{F}$ is the periodic Sobolev space of order s, and that any set of nodes leads to that rate at least. A similar rate was proved for g not constant (Novak et al., 2015) even though it is only asymptotically optimal in that case.

In the quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) literature, several designs were investigated for $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$, $g = 1$ and $\mathcal{F}$ that may not even be a Hilbert space; see (Dick and Pillichshammer, 2010). In this context, the term *QMC quadrature rule* means a low discrepancy sequence, loosely speaking a "well-spread" set of nodes, along with uniform weights $w_i \equiv 1/N$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a Korobov space of order $s \geq 1$, the Halton sequence of nodes (Halton, 1964) leads to $\mathcal{E}(\mu_1; \boldsymbol{x}, (1/N))^2$ in $\mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{2d}N^{-2})$ and higher-order digital nets converge faster as $\mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{2sd}N^{-2s})$ (Dick and Pillichshammer, 2014)[Theorem 5].

These rates are naturally inherited if the uniform weights are replaced by the respective optimal weights $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$, as observed by Briol et al. (2019). In particular, Briol et al. (2019)

[1] In case $g = 1$, μ_g is classically called the mean-element of the measure $\mathrm{d}\omega$ (Smola et al., 2007).

emphasize that the bound for higher-order digital nets attains the optimal rate in this RKHS. For optimal kernel quadrature based on Halton sequences, this inheritance argument does not explain the fast $\mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{2sd}N^{-2s})$ rates observed empirically by Oettershagen (2017).

Beside the hypercube, optimal kernel quadrature has been considered on the hypersphere equipped with the uniform measure (Ehler et al., 2019), or on $\mathbb{R}^d$ equipped with the Gaussian measure (Karvonen and Särkkä, 2019). In these works, the design construction is adhoc for the space $\mathcal{X}$ and g is usually assumed to be constant. Another approach is offered by optimisation algorithms that we review in Section 2.3. Before that, we clarify the subtle difference between optimal kernel quadrature and kernel interpolation.

2.2 Kernel interpolation beyond embeddings

Besides the approximation of the embeddings μ_g discussed in Section 2.1, theoretical guarantees for the kernel interpolation of a general $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$ are sought *per se*. The Shannon reconstruction formula for bandlimited signals (Shannon, 1948) is implicitly an interpolation by the sinc kernel. The RKHS approach for sampling in signal processing was introduced in (Yao, 1967) for the Hilbert space of bandlimited signals; see also (Nashed and Walter, 1991) for generalizations. Remarkably, in those RKHSs, every $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$ is an embedding μ_g for some $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$: k is a projection kernel of infinite rank. In general, for a trace-class kernel, the subspace spanned by the embeddings μ_g is strictly included in $\mathcal{F}$. More precisely, every μ_g satisfies

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}g\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)} < +\infty. \tag{11}$$

This condition is more restrictive than what is required for a generic μ to belong to $\mathcal{F}$, i.e., $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}} < +\infty$, so that kernel interpolation is more general than optimal kernel quadrature. The proposed approach will permit to deal with any $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$.

Scattered data approximation (Wendland, 2004) is another field where quantitative error bounds for kernel interpolation on $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are investigated; see (Schaback and Wendland, 2006) for a modern review. In a few words, these bounds typically depend on quantities such as the *fill-in distance* $\varphi(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sup_{y\in\mathcal{X}} \min_{i\in[N]} \|y - x_i\|_2$, so that the interpolation error converges to zero as $N \to \infty$ if $\varphi(\boldsymbol{x})$ goes to zero. Any node set can be considered, as long as $\varphi(\boldsymbol{x})$ is small. Using these techniques, Oates and Girolami (2016) proposed another application of kernel interpolation: the construction of functional control variates in Monte Carlo integration. Finally, note that the application of these techniques is restricted to compact domains: the fill-in distance is infinite if $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact, even for "well-spread" sets of nodes.

2.3 Optimization algorithms

Optimization approaches offer a variety of algorithms for the design of the interpolation nodes. De Marchi (2003) and De Marchi et al. (2005) proposed greedily maximizing the so-called *power function*

$$p(x;\boldsymbol{x}) = \left[k(x,x) - k_{\boldsymbol{x}}(x)^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}k_{\boldsymbol{x}}(x)\right]^{1/2}, \tag{12}$$

where $k_{\boldsymbol{x}}(x) = (k(x,x_i))_{i\in[N]}$. This algorithm leads to an interpolation error that goes to zero with N for a kernel of class $\mathcal{C}^2$ (De Marchi et al., 2005). Later, Santin and Haasdonk (2017) proved better convergence rates for smoother kernels. Again, these results assume that the domain $\mathcal{X}$ is compact. Other greedy algorithms were proposed in the context of Bayesian quadrature (BQ) such as Sequential BQ (Huszár and Duvenaud, 2012), or

Frank-Wolfe BQ (Briol et al., 2015). These algorithms sequentially minimize $\mathcal{E}(\mu_g; \boldsymbol{x})$, for a fixed $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. The nodes are thus adapted to one particular μ_g by construction. In general, each step of these greedy algorithms requires to solve a non-convex problem with many local minima (Oettershagen, 2017)[Chapter 5]. In practice, costly approximations must be employed such as local search in a random grid (Lacoste-Julien et al., 2015).

An alternative approach, that is very related to our contribution and has raised a lot of recent interest, is to observe that the squared power function (12) can be upper bounded by the inverse of $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})$ (Schaback, 2005; Tanaka, 2019). Designs that maximize $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})$ are called *Fekete points*; see e.g. (Bos and Maier, 2002; Bos and De Marchi, 2011). Tanaka (2019) proposed to approximate $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})$ using the Mercer decomposition of k, followed by a rounding of the solution of a D-experimental design problem, yet without a theoretical analysis of the interpolation error. Karvonen et al. (2019) proved that for the uni-dimensional Gaussian kernel, the approximate objective function of (Tanaka, 2019) is actually convex. Moreover, Karvonen et al. (2019) analyze their interpolation error; see also Section 4.2. Finally, we emphasize that these algorithms require the knowledge of a Mercer-type decomposition of k so that they cannot be implemented for any kernel; moreover, the approximate objective function may be non-convex in general.

2.4 Random designs

In this section, we survey random node designs with uniform-in-g approximation guarantees for the embeddings μ_g in the RKHS norm. Bach (2017) studied the quadrature resulting from sampling i.i.d. nodes (x_j) from some proposal distribution q. He proved that when the proposal is chosen to be

$$q_\lambda^*(x) \propto \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{\sigma_m}{\sigma_m + \lambda} e_m(x)^2, \tag{13}$$

with $\lambda > 0$, and the number of points N satisfies $N \geq 5 d_\lambda \log(16 d_\lambda / \delta)$ with $d_\lambda = \operatorname{Tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \lambda \boldsymbol{I})^{-1}$, then with probability larger than $1 - \delta$,

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1} \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{N}} \left\| \mu_g - \sum_{j \in [N]} \frac{w_j}{q_\lambda(x_j)^{1/2}} k(x_j, .) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq 4\lambda. \tag{14}$$

The bound in (14) gives a control on the approximation error of μ_g by the subspace spanned by the $k(x_j, .)$, and this control is uniform over g in the unit ball of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. Note that for a fixed value of λ, the upper bound in (14) guarantees that the approximation error is smaller than 4λ. It does not however guarantee that the error goes to zero as N increases since it appears that λ should decrease as N increases. This coupling of N and λ combined with the condition $N \geq d_\lambda \log d_\lambda$ makes it intricate to derive a convergence rate from (14). Moreover, the optimal density q_λ^* is only implicitly available in general through the limit in (13), which makes sampling and pointwise evaluation difficult in practice.

Belhadji et al. (2019) proposed a related kernel-based quadrature, but using nodes sampled from a repulsive joint distribution called a *projection determinantal point process* (DPP); see (Hough et al., 2006) and our Section 3. In particular, the repulsion is characterized by the first eigenfunctions $(e_n)_{n \in [N]}$ of the integration operator $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. The weights $\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}$ are chosen again by minimizing the residual error (1), which gives the uniform bound

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1} \mathcal{E}(\mu_g; \boldsymbol{x})^2 \leq 2(N^2 r_N + o(N^2 r_N)), \tag{15}$$

where $r_N = \sum_{m \geq N+1} \sigma_m$. This result can be improved by further restricting g to be an eigenfunction of $\overline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$, leading to

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in \{e_n;\ n \geq 1\}} \mathcal{E}(\mu_g; \boldsymbol{x})^2 \leq 2(N r_N + o(N r_N)). \tag{16}$$

Now for smooth kernels, such as the Gaussian kernel or the Sobolev kernel with a large regularity parameter, the upper bounds in (15) and (16) do converge to 0 as N goes to $+\infty$. Furthermore, sampling from the recommended projection DPP can be implemented easily, although it still requires the knowledge of the Mercer decomposition of k, unlike the method that we introduce here in Section 3.

Since the bounds in (15) and (16) are uniform-in-g, they also concern interpolation. One downside of the analysis in (Belhadji et al., 2019) is that these upper bounds are rather pessimistic: experimental results suggest faster rates in $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N)$. If one could prove these rates, then kernel quadrature or interpolation using DPPs would reach known lower bounds, which we now quickly survey.

2.5 Lower bounds

When investigating upper bounds for kernel interpolation errors, it is useful to remember existing lower bounds, so as to evaluate the tightness of one's results. In particular, N-widths theory (Pinkus, 2012) implies lower bounds for kernel interpolation errors, which once again show the importance of the spectrum of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

The N-width of $\mathcal{S} = \{\mu_g = \mathbf{\Sigma} g,\ \|g\|_{\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)} \leq 1\}$ with respect to the couple $(\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega), \mathcal{F})$ (Pinkus, 2012, Chapter 1.7) is defined as the square root of

$$d_N(\mathcal{S})^2 = \inf_{\substack{Y \subset \mathcal{F} \\ \dim Y = N}} \sup_{\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1} \inf_{y \in Y} \|\mathbf{\Sigma} g - y\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2. \tag{17}$$

In interpolation, we do use a subspace $Y \subset \mathcal{F}$ spanned by N independent functions $k(x_i, .)$, so that

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1} \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{\Sigma} g; \boldsymbol{x})^2 \geq d_N(\mathcal{S})^2. \tag{18}$$

Applying (Pinkus, 2012, Theorem 2.2, Chapter 4) to the adjoint of the embedding operator $I_{\mathcal{F}}$ Steinwart and Scovel (2012)[Lemma 2.2], it comes $d_N(\mathcal{S})^2 = \sigma_{N+1}$. One may object that some QMC sequences seem to breach this lower bound. For example, in the Korobov space ($d = 2, s \geq 1$), $\sigma_{N+1} = \mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{2s} N^{-2s})$ (Bach, 2017), while the interpolation of μ_g with $g = 1$ using a Fibonacci lattice leads to an error in $\mathcal{O}(\log(N) N^{-2s}) = o(\sigma_{N+1})$ (Bilyk et al., 2012)[Theorem 4]. But this is the rate for one particular μ_g, and it cannot be achieved uniformly in g.

3 Volume sampling and DPPs

In this section, we introduce a repulsive distribution that we call *continuous volume sampling* (VS) and compare it to projection determinantal point processes (DPPs; (Hough et al., 2006)). Both continuous VS and projection DPPs are parametrized using a reference measure $\mathrm{d}\omega$ and a repulsion kernel $\mathfrak{K} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.

3.1 Continuous volume sampling

Definition 1 (Continuous volume sampling)**.** *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_N\} \subset \mathcal{X}$. We say that $\boldsymbol{x}$ follows the volume sampling distribution if $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is a random variable of*

$\mathcal{X}^N$, *the law of which is absolutely continuous with respect to* $\otimes_{i\in[N]}\mathrm{d}\omega$, *and the density writes*

$$f_{\mathrm{VS}}(x_1,\dots,x_N) \propto \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{19}$$

Two remarks are in order. First, under Assumption A, the density f_{VS} in (19) indeed integrates to 1. Indeed, Hadamard's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \otimes \mathrm{d}\omega(\mathrm{x_i}) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \prod_{i\in[N]} k(x_i,x_i) \otimes \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i) \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,x)\mathrm{d}\omega(x)\right)^N < +\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Second, the determinant in (19) is invariant to permutations, so that continuous volume sampling can indeed be seen as defining a random set $\boldsymbol{x} = \{x_1,\dots,x_N\}$.

In the following, we denote, for any symmetric and continuous kernel $\tilde{k}$ satisfying Assumption A,

$$Z_N(\tilde{k}) := \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \operatorname{Det} \tilde{\boldsymbol{K}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \otimes \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i). \tag{21}$$

3.2 Continuous volume sampling as a mixture of DPPs

Definition 1 could be mistaken with the definition of a determinantal point process (DPP; Macchi, 1975). However, the cardinal of a DPP sample is a sum of Bernoulli random variables (Hough et al., 2006), while volume sampling is supported on subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ with cardinality exactly equal to N. This property is convenient for approximation tasks where the number of nodes N is fixed. While it is not a DPP, volume sampling is actually a mixture of DPPs.

Proposition 2. *For* $U \subset \mathbb{N}^*$ *define the projection kernel*

$$\mathfrak{K}_U(x,y) = \sum_{u\in U} e_u(x)e_u(y). \tag{22}$$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, *we have*

$$f_{\mathrm{VS}}(x_1,\dots,x_N) \propto \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u \operatorname{Det}(\mathfrak{K}_U(x_i,x_j))_{(i,j)}, \tag{23}$$

and the normalization constant is equal to

$$Z_N(k) = \mathrm{N}! \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u. \tag{24}$$

The proof of this proposition is given in Appendix B.1. Observe that for every $U \subset \mathcal{U}_N$,

$$(x_1,\dots,x_N) \mapsto \frac{1}{N!} \operatorname{Det}(\mathfrak{K}_U(x_i,x_j))_{(i,j)\in[N]\times[N]}, \tag{25}$$

defines a well-normalized probability distribution on $\mathcal{X}^N$, called the *projection DPP* associated to the marginal kernel $\mathfrak{K}_U$ (Hough et al., 2006). Among all DPPs, only projection DPPs have a deterministic cardinality, equal to the rank of $\mathfrak{K}_U$ (Hough et al., 2006). Interestingly, the largest weight in the mixture (23) corresponds to the projection DPP of marginal kernel $\mathfrak{K}_{[N]}$ proposed in (Belhadji et al., 2019) for kernel quadrature. The following lemma gives an upper bound on this weight δ_N using the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

Lemma 3. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define*

$$\delta_N = \prod_{n\in[N]} \sigma_n \Big/ \sum_{U\in\ \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u. \tag{26}$$

Then for all $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\delta_N \leq \sigma_N / r_N$.

In particular, if the spectrum of k decreases polynomially, then $\delta_N = \mathcal{O}(1/N)$, so that as N grows, volume sampling becomes more different from the projection DPP of Belhadji et al. (2019). In contrast, if the spectrum decays exponentially, then $\delta_N = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

3.3 Sampling algorithms

A projection DPP can be sampled exactly as long as one can evaluate the corresponding projection kernel $\mathfrak{K}$ (Hough et al., 2006). For kernel quadrature (Belhadji et al., 2019), evaluating $\mathfrak{K}$ requires the knowledge of the Mercer decomposition of the RKHS kernel k. The algorithm of Hough et al. (2006) implements the chain rule for projection DPPs, and each conditional is sampled using rejection sampling; see Gautier et al. (2019) for recommendations on proposals. This suggests using the mixture in Proposition 2 to sample from the volume sampling distribution. Again, such an algorithm requires explicit knowledge of the Mercer decomposition of the kernel or at least a decomposition onto an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}$ as in (Karvonen et al., 2019). This is a strong requirement that is undesirable in practice.

The fact that the joint pdf (19) only requires evaluating k pointwise suggests that volume sampling is *fully kernelized*, in the sense that a sampling algorithm should be able to bypass the need for a kernel decomposition, thus making the method very widely applicable. One could proceed by rejection sampling. Yet the acceptance ratio would likely scale poorly with N. A workaround would be to use an MCMC sampler similar to what was proposed in (Rezaei and Gharan, 2019). We leave investigating the efficiency of such an MCMC approach to volume sampling to future work.

4 Main results

In this section, we give a theoretical analysis of kernel interpolation on nodes that follow the continuous volume sampling distribution. We state our main result in Section 4.1, an uniform-in-g upper bound of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2$. We give an upper bound for a general $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$ in Section 4.2.

4.1 The interpolation error for embeddings μ_g

The main theorem of this article decomposes the expected error for an embedding μ_g in terms of the expected errors ϵ_m for eigenfunctions of the kernel.

Theorem 4. *Let $g = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m e_m$ satisfy $\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1$. Then under Assumption A,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2 \epsilon_m, \tag{27}$$

where $\epsilon_m = \sigma_m \left(\sum_{U \in\, \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u \right)^{-1} \sum_{U \in\, \mathcal{U}_N^m} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u$. *In particular, the sequence* $(\epsilon_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ *is non-increasing and*

$$\sup_{\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \epsilon_m = \epsilon_1. \tag{28}$$

Moreover,

$$\epsilon_1 \leq \sigma_N \left(1 + \beta_N\right), \tag{29}$$

where $\beta_N = \min_{M \in [2:N]} [(N - M + 1)\sigma_N]^{-1} \sum_{m \geq M} \sigma_m$.

In other words, under continuous volume sampling, ϵ_1 is a uniform upper bound on the expected squared interpolation error of *any* embedding μ_g such that $\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1$. We shall see in Section 5.1 that $\epsilon_m = \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_{e_m} - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \mu_{e_m}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2$.

Now, for $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, a simple counting argument yields, for $m \geq N_0$, $\epsilon_m \leq \sigma_{N_0}$. Actually, for $m \geq N_0$, $\|\mu_{e_m}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq \sigma_{N_0}$, independently of the nodes.

Inequality (29) is less trivial and makes continuous volume sampling distribution worth of interest: the upper bound goes to 0 as $N \to +\infty$, below the initial error σ_{N_0}. Moreover, the convergence rate is $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N)$, matching the lower bound of Section 2.5 if the sequence $(\beta_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is bounded. In the following proposition, we prove that it is the case as soon as the spectrum decreases polynomially (e.g., Sobolev spaces of finite smoothness) or exponentially (e.g., the Gaussian kernel).

Proposition 5. *If* $\sigma_m = m^{-2s}$ *with* $s > 1/2$ *then*

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ \beta_N \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2s-1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2s-1}\right)^{2s-1}. \tag{30}$$

If $\sigma_m = \alpha^m$, *with* $\alpha \in [0, 1[$, *then*

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ \beta_N \leq \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}. \tag{31}$$

In both cases, the proof uses the fact that

$$\beta_N \leq [(N - M_N + 1)\sigma_N]^{-1} \sum_{m \geq M_N} \sigma_m, \tag{32}$$

for a well designed sequence M_N. For example, if $\sigma_m = m^{-2s}$, we take $M_N = \lceil N/c \rceil$ with $c > 1$; if $\sigma_m = \alpha^m$ we take $M_N = N$. We give a detailed proof in the appendices.

For a general kernel, if an asymptotic equivalent of σ_N is known (Widom, 1963, 1964), it should be possible to give an explicit construction of M_N. Indeed,

$$\beta_N \leq \frac{\sigma_{M_N}}{\sigma_N} + [(N - M_N + 1)\sigma_N]^{-1} \sum_{m \geq N+1} \sigma_m, \tag{33}$$

and M_N should be chosen to control both terms in the RHS. Figure 1 illustrates the upper bound of Theorem 4 and the constant of Proposition 5 in case of the periodic Sobolev space of order $s = 3$. We observe that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ respects the upper bound: it starts from the initial error level σ_m and decreases according to the upper bound for $N \geq m$.

4.2 The interpolation error of any element of $\mathcal{F}$

Theorem 4 dealt with the interpolation of an embedding μ_g of some function $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. We now give a bound on the interpolation error for any $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$. We need the following assumption, which is relatively weak; see Proposition 5 and the discussion that follows.

Assumption B. *There exists $B > 0$ such that $\beta_N \leq B$.*

Theorem 6. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$. Assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}} < +\infty$ for some $r \in [0, 1/2]$. Then, under Assumption B,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu; \boldsymbol{x})^2 \leq (2 + B)\sigma_N^{2r} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sigma_N^{2r}). \tag{34}$$

In other words, the expected interpolation error depends on the smoothness parameter r. For $r = 1/2$, we exactly recover the rate of Theorem 4. In contrast, for $r < 1/2$, the rate $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N^{2r})$ is slower. For $r = 0$, our bound is constant with N. Note that assuming more smoothness ($r > 1/2$) does not seem to improve the rate $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N)$.

Let us comment on this bound in two classical cases. First, consider the uni-dimensional Sobolev space of order s. Assumption B is satisfied by Proposition 5 and the squared error scales as $\mathcal{O}(N^{-4sr})$. Moreover, for this family of RKHSs, $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-r}.\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ can be seen as the norm in the Sobolev space of order $(2r + 1)s$, and we recover a result in (Schaback and Wendland, 2006)[Theorem 7.8] for quasi-uniform designs. By using the norm in the RKHS $\mathcal{F}$ of rougher functions, we upper bound the interpolation error of μ belonging to the smoother RKHS $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^r\, \mathcal{F}$. Second, we emphasize again that our result is agnostic to the choice of the kernel, as long as Assumption B holds. In particular, Theorem 6 applies to the Gaussian kernel: the rate is slower $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N^{2r})$ yet still exponential. Finally, recall that for $f \in \mathcal{F}$

$$|f(x)|^2 = |\langle f, k(x, .)\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}|^2 \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 k(x, x), \tag{35}$$

so that, bounds on the RKHS norm imply bounds on the uniform norm if the kernel k is bounded. Therefore, for $r \in [0, 1/2]$, our result improves on the rate $\mathcal{O}(N^2\sigma_N^{2r})$ of approximate Fekete points (Karvonen et al., 2019).

4.3 Asymptotic unbiasedness of kernel quadrature

As explained in Section 2.1, kernel interpolation is widely used for the design of quadratures. In that setting, one more advantage of continuous volume sampling is the consistency of its estimator. This is the purpose of the following result.

Theorem 7. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_N(f, g) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} fg \,\mathrm{d}\omega - \sum_{i \in N} \hat{w}_i f(x_i) \right). \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle f, e_n\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle g, e_n\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_n^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\right). \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{B}_N(f, g) \to 0$ as $N \to +\infty$.

Compared to the upper bound on the integration error given by (10), the bias term in Theorem 7 takes into account the interaction between f and g. For example, if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\langle f, e_n\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_n\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} = 0$, the quadrature is unbiased for every N. Theorem 7 is a generalization of a known property of regression estimators based on volume sampling in the discrete setting (Ben-Tal and Teboulle, 1990; Derezinski and Warmuth, 2017; Derezinski et al., 2018, 2019).




Figure 1: The value of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m};\boldsymbol{x})^2$ for $m \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ for the periodic Sobolev space $(s=3, d=1)$ compared to the theoretical upper bound (UB) of Theorem 4.

5 Sketch of the proofs

The proof of Theorem 4 decomposes into three steps. First, in Section 5.1, we write $\mathcal{E}(\mu_g;\boldsymbol{x})^2$ as a function of the square of the interpolation errors $\mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m};\boldsymbol{x})^2$ of the embeddings μ_{e_m}. Then, in Section 5.2, we give closed formulas for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m};\boldsymbol{x})^2$ in terms of the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Finally, the inequality (29) is proved using an upper bound on the ratio of symmetric polynomials (Guruswami and Sinop, 2012). The details are given in Appendix B.4.3. Finally, The proofs of Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 are straightforward consequences of Theorem 4. The details are given in Appendix B.9 and Appendix B.10.

5.1 Decomposing the interpolation error

Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ such that $\mathrm{Det}\,\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$. For $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, let the *cross-leverage score* between m_1 and m_2 associated to $\boldsymbol{x}$ be

$$\tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) = e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{37}$$

When $m_1 = m_2 = m$, we speak of the m-th leverage score[2] associated to $\boldsymbol{x}$, and simply write $\tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x})$. By Lemma 17, the m-th leverage score is related to the interpolation error of the m-th eigenfunction $e^{\mathcal{F}}_m$. Indeed,

$$\|e^{\mathcal{F}}_m - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}e^{\mathcal{F}}_m\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} = 1 - \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) \in [0,1]. \tag{38}$$

Similarly, for the cross-leverage score,

$$\langle \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}, \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in [-1,1]. \tag{39}$$

For $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, the interpolation error of the embedding μ_g can be expressed using the (cross-)leverage scores.

[2]Our definition is consistent with the leverage scores used in matrix subsampling (Drineas et al., 2006). Loosely speaking, $\tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the leverage score of the m-th column of the semi-infinite matrix $(e^{\mathcal{F}}_n(x_i))_{(i,n)\in[N]\times\mathbb{N}^*}$.

Lemma 8. *If* $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$, *then,*

$$\mathcal{E}(\mu_g; \boldsymbol{x})^2 = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2 \sigma_n \left(1 - \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) - \sum_{m_1 \neq m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*} g_{m_1} g_{m_2} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}} \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{40}$$

In particular, with probability one, a design sampled from the continuous volume sampling distribution in Definition 1 satisfies (40). Furthermore, we shall see that the expected value of the (cross-) leverage scores has a simple expression.

5.2 Explicit formulas for expected leverage scores

Proposition 9 expresses expected leverage scores in terms of the spectrum of the integration operator.

Proposition 9. *For* $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{\sum\limits_{U \in\, \mathcal{U}_N} \prod\limits_{u \in U} \sigma_u} \sum_{\substack{U \in\, \mathcal{U}_N \\ m \in U}} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u. \tag{41}$$

Moreover, for $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ *such that* $m_1 \neq m_2$, *we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \tag{42}$$

In Appendix B.4, we combine Lemma 8 with Proposition 9. This concludes the proof of Theorem 4 by Beppo Levi's monotone convergence theorem.

It remains to prove Proposition 9. Again, we proceed in two steps. First, our Proposition 10 yields a characterization of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ in terms of the spectrum of three perturbed versions of the integration operator $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Second, we give explicit forms of these spectra in Proposition 11 below. The idea is to express $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m(\boldsymbol{x})^{\mathcal{F}}$ as the normalization constant (24) of a perturbation of the kernel k. The same goes for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Let $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^+$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t^-$ be the integration operators[3] on $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, respectively associated with the kernels

$$k_t(x, y) = k(x, y) + t e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(x) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(y), \tag{43}$$

$$k_t^+(x, y) = k(x, y) + t \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(x) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(x)\right) \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(y) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(y)\right), \tag{44}$$

$$k_t^-(x, y) = k(x, y) + t \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(x) - e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(x)\right) \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(y) - e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(y)\right). \tag{45}$$

By Assumption A, and by the fact that $(e_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, all three kernels also have integrable diagonals (see Assumption A). In particular, they define RKHSs that can be embedded in $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. Moreover, recalling the definition (24) of the normalization constant Z_N of volume sampling, the following quantities are finite

$$\phi_m(t) = Z_N(k_t), \quad \phi_{m_1,m_2}^+(t) = Z_N(k_t^+), \qquad \text{and} \quad \phi_{m_1,m_2}^-(t) = Z_N(k_t^-). \tag{46}$$

Remember that by Proposition 2,

$$\phi_m(t) = N! \sum_{U \in\, \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \,\in\, U} \tilde{\sigma}_u(t), \tag{47}$$

[3] We drop from the notation the dependencies on m, m_1 and m_2 for simplicity.

where $\{\tilde{\sigma}_u(t),\ u \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ is the set of eigenvalues[4] of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$. Similar identities are valid for $\phi^+_{m_1,m_2}(t)$ and $\phi^-_{m_1,m_2}(t)$ with the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ respectively.

Proposition 10. *The functions ϕ_m, $\phi^+_{m_1,m_2}$ and $\phi^-_{m_1,m_2}$ are right differentiable in zero. Furthermore,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{Z_N(k)} \frac{\partial \phi_m}{\partial t}\bigg|_{t=0^+}, \tag{48}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{4Z_N(k)} \left(\frac{\partial \phi^+_{m_1,m_2}}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \phi^-_{m_1,m_2}}{\partial t} \right)\bigg|_{t=0^+}. \tag{49}$$

The details of the proof are postponed to Appendix B.7. We complete this proposition with a description of the spectrum of the operators $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ using the spectrum of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

Proposition 11. *The eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ write*

$$\tilde{\sigma}_u(t) = \begin{cases} \sigma_u & \text{if } u \neq m, \\ (1+t)\sigma_u & \text{if } u = m. \end{cases} \tag{50}$$

Moreover, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ satisfy

$$\{\tilde{\sigma}^+_u(t),\ u \in \mathbb{N}^*\} = \{\tilde{\sigma}^-_u(t),\ u \in \mathbb{N}^*\}. \tag{51}$$

The proof is based on the observation that the perturbations in (43), (44), and (45) only affect a principal subspace of dimension 1 or 2; see Appendix B.6.

Combining the characterization of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})$ given in Proposition 10, and Proposition 11, we prove Proposition 9; see details in Appendix B.8.

6 Conclusion

We deal with interpolation in RKHSs using random nodes and optimal weights. This problem is intimately related to kernel quadrature, though interpolation is more general. We introduced continuous volume sampling (VS), a repulsive point process that is a mixture of DPPs, although not a DPP itself. VS comes with a set of advantages. First, interpretable bounds on the interpolation error can be derived under minimalistic assumptions. Our bounds are close to optimal since they share the same decay rate as known lower bounds. Moreover, we provide explicit evaluations of the constants appearing in our bounds for some particular RKHS (Sobolev, Gaussian). Second, VS provides a fully kernelized approach, which may permit sampling without knowing the Mercer decomposition of the kernel (Rezaei and Gharan, 2019) unlike previous work on random designs. Investigating efficient samplers is deferred to future work.

Volume sampling was originally introduced on a finite domain (Deshpande et al., 2006), and has been used for matrix subsampling for linear regression and low-rank approximations (Derezinski and Warmuth, 2017; Belhadji et al., 2018). Similarly to (Belhadji et al., 2019), our work is another direct connection between subsampling columns of a matrix and the continuous problem of interpolating an element of an RKHS.

[4]For a given value of t, the eigenvalues $\tilde{\sigma}_u(t)$ are not necessarily decreasing in u. We give explicit formulas for these eigenvalues in Proposition 11, and the order satisfied for $t = 0$ is not necessarily preserved for $t > 0$. This does not change anything to the argument since these eigenvalues only appear in quantities such as $\phi_m(t)$ which are invariant under permutation of the eigenvalues.

Compared to (Karvonen et al., 2019), our analysis yields a sharper upper bound while circumventing the analysis of the Lebesgue constant. Yet, it would be interesting to analyze this constant under continuous volume sampling to get an idea of the stability of the algorithm. Another potential extension of this work would be the analysis of interpolation under regularization as in (Bach, 2017).

Acknowledgments

AB acknowledges support from ANR grant BoB (ANR-16-CE23-0003), Région Hauts-de-France, and Centrale Lille. RB acknowledges support from ERC grant Blackjack (ERC-2019-STG-851866).

References

F. Bach. On the equivalence between kernel quadrature rules and random feature expansions. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):714–751, 2017.

A. Belhadji, R. Bardenet, and P. Chainais. A determinantal point process for column subset selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.09771*, 2018.

A. Belhadji, R. Bardenet, and P. Chainais. Kernel quadrature with DPPs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 12907–12917. 2019.

A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. A geometric property of the least squares solution of linear equations. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 139:165–170, 1990.

A. Berlinet and Ch. Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.

D. Bilyk, V. N. Temlyakov, and R. Yu. The L_2 discrepancy of two-dimensional lattices. In *Recent Advances in Harmonic Analysis and Applications*, pages 63–77. Springer, 2012.

B. D. Bojanov. Uniqueness of the optimal nodes of quadrature formulae. *Mathematics of computation*, 36(154):525–546, 1981.

L. P. Bos and S. De Marchi. On optimal points for interpolation by univariate exponential functions. *Dolomites Research Notes on Approximation*, 4(1), 2011.

L. P. Bos and U. Maier. On the asymptotics of Fekete-type points for univariate radial basis interpolation. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 119(2):252–270, 2002.

H. Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

F. X. Briol, C. Oates, M. Girolami, and M. A. Osborne. Frank-Wolfe Bayesian quadrature: Probabilistic integration with theoretical guarantees. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1162–1170, 2015.

F. X. Briol, C. J. Oates, M. Girolami, M. A. Osborne, D. Sejdinovic, et al. Probabilistic integration: A role in statistical computation? *Statistical Science*, 34(1):1–22, 2019.

S. De Marchi. On optimal center locations for radial basis function interpolation: computational aspects. *Rend. Splines Radial Basis Functions and Applications*, 61(3):343–358, 2003.

S. De Marchi, R. Schaback, and H. Wendland. Near-optimal data-independent point locations for radial basis function interpolation. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 23(3):317–330, 2005.

M. Derezinski and M. K. Warmuth. Unbiased estimates for linear regression via volume sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3084–3093, 2017.

M. Derezinski, M. K. Warmuth, and D. J. Hsu. Leveraged volume sampling for linear regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2505–2514, 2018.

M. Derezinski, M. K. Warmuth, and D. J. Hsu. Unbiased estimators for random design regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03411*, 2019.

A. Deshpande and S. Vempala. Adaptive sampling and fast low-rank matrix approximation. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems, and 10th International Conference on Randomization and Computation*, APPROX'06/RANDOM'06, pages 292–303. Springer-Verlag, 2006.

A. Deshpande, L. Rademacher, S. Vempala, and G. Wang. Matrix approximation and projective clustering via volume sampling. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithm*, SODA '06. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2006.

J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer. *Digital nets and sequences: discrepancy theory and quasi–Monte Carlo integration*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer. Discrepancy theory and quasi-Monte Carlo integration. In *A panorama of discrepancy theory*, pages 539–619. Springer, 2014.

P. Drineas, M. W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Sampling algorithms for $\ell 2$ regression and applications. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 1127–1136. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2006.

M. Ehler, M. Gräf, and C. J. Oates. Optimal Monte Carlo integration on closed manifolds. *Statistics and Computing*, 29(6):1203–1214, 2019.

G. Gautier, R. Bardenet, and M. Valko. On two ways to use determinantal point processes for Monte Carlo integration. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 7768—-7777. 2019.

V. Guruswami and A. K. Sinop. Optimal column-based low-rank matrix reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1207–1214. SIAM, 2012.

J. H. Halton. Algorithm 247: Radical-inverse quasi-random point sequence. *Communications of the ACM*, 7(12):701–702, 1964.

T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

J. B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág. Determinantal processes and independence. *Probability surveys*, 3:206–229, 2006.

F. Huszár and D. Duvenaud. Optimally-weighted herding is Bayesian quadrature. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI'12, pages 377–386. AUAI Press, 2012.

T. Karvonen and S. Särkkä. Gaussian kernel quadrature at scaled Gauss-Hermite nodes. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, pages 1–26, 2019.

T. Karvonen, S. Särkkä, and K. Tanaka. Kernel-based interpolation at approximate Fekete points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.07316*, 2019.

A. Kulesza and B. Taskar. Determinantal point processes for machine learning. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(2–3):123–286, 2012.

S. Lacoste-Julien, F. Lindsten, and F. Bach. Sequential kernel herding: Frank-wolfe optimization for particle filtering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.02056*, 2015.

F. M. Larkin. Gaussian measure in Hilbert space and applications in numerical analysis. *The Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics*, pages 379–421, 1972.

O. Macchi. The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. 7:83–122, 03 1975.

A. W. Marcus, D. A. Spielman, and N. Srivastava. Interlacing families II: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the Kadison—Singer problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 327–350, 2015.

M. Z. Nashed and G. G. Walter. General sampling theorems for functions in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, 4(4):363, 1991.

E. Novak, M. Ullrich, and H. Woźniakowski. Complexity of oscillatory integration for univariate sobolev spaces. *Journal of Complexity*, 31(1):15–41, 2015.

C. Oates and M. Girolami. Control functionals for quasi-monte carlo integration. In Arthur Gretton and Christian C. Robert, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 51 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 56–65, Cadiz, Spain, 09–11 May 2016. PMLR.

J. Oettershagen. *Construction of optimal cubature algorithms with applications to econometrics and uncertainty quantification.* PhD Thesis, University of Bonn, 2017.

A. Pinkus. *N-widths in Approximation Theory*, volume 7. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

A. Rezaei and S. O. Gharan. A polynomial time MCMC method for sampling from continuous determinantal point processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5438–5447, 2019.

G. Santin and B. Haasdonk. Convergence rate of the data-independent p-greedy algorithm in kernel-based approximation. *Dolomites Research Notes on Approximation*, 10 (Special_Issue), 2017.

R. Schaback. Multivariate interpolation by polynomials and radial basis functions. *Constructive Approximation*, 21(3):293–317, 2005.

R. Schaback and H. Wendland. Kernel techniques: from machine learning to meshless methods. *Acta numerica*, 15:543–639, 2006.

A. Shadrin. Twelve proofs of the Markov inequality. *Approximation theory: a volume dedicated to Borislav Bojanov*, pages 233–298, 2004.

C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell system technical journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.

B. Simon. *Trace Ideals and Their Applications.* American Mathematical Society, 2005.

A. Smola, A. Gretton, L. Song, and B. Schölkopf. A Hilbert space embedding for distributions. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 13–31. Springer, 2007.

J. M. Steele. *The Cauchy-Schwarz Master Class: An Introduction to the Art of Mathematical Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2004. ISBN 052154677X.

I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1st edition, 2008. ISBN 0387772413.

I. Steinwart and C. Scovel. Mercer's theorem on general domains: on the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constructive Approximation*, 35(3):363–417, 2012.

K. Tanaka. Generation of point sets by convex optimization for interpolation in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. *Numerical Algorithms*, pages 1–31, 2019.

M. Unser. Sampling-50 years after shannon. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 88(4):569–587, 2000.

G. Wahba. *Spline Models for Observational Data*, volume 59. SIAM, 1990.

H. Wendland. *Scattered Data Approximation*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

H. Widom. Asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of certain integral equations. I. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 109(2):278–295, 1963.

H. Widom. Asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of certain integral equations. II. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 17(3):215–229, 1964.

K. Yao. Applications of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces-bandlimited signal models. *Information and Control*, 11(4):429–444, 1967.

H. Zhu, C. K. I. Williams, R. Rohwer, and M. Morciniec. Gaussian regression and optimal finite dimensional linear models. 1997.

A Technical results borrowed from other papers

Thoughout our proof, we use a few technical results from the literature, which we gather here for ease of reference.

A.1 The Jacobi identity

The following proposition is a direct consequence of the rank one-update for determinants, see e.g. (Marcus et al., 2015, Theorem 3.11).

Proposition 12 (Jacobi identity)**.** *Let* $\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$*. If* $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{A} \neq 0$*, then*

$$\partial_t \operatorname{Det}(\boldsymbol{A} + t\boldsymbol{B})|_{t=0} = \operatorname{Det}(\boldsymbol{A}) \operatorname{Tr}(\boldsymbol{A}^{-1}\boldsymbol{B}). \tag{52}$$

In particular, we have

$$\partial_t \operatorname{Det}(\boldsymbol{A} + t\boldsymbol{B})|_{t=0^+} = \operatorname{Det}(\boldsymbol{A}) \operatorname{Tr}(\boldsymbol{A}^{-1}\boldsymbol{B}). \tag{53}$$

A.2 The Markov brothers' inequality

The following proposition is known as the Markov brother's inequality, see e.g. (Shadrin, 2004).

Proposition 13 (Markov brothers)**.** *Let* P *be a polynomial of degree smaller than* N*. Then*

$$\max_{\tau\in[-1,1]} |P'(\tau)| \leq N^2 \max_{\tau\in[-1,1]} |P(\tau)|. \tag{54}$$

We shall actually use a straightforward corollary.

Corollary 14. *Let* P *be a polynomial of degree smaller than* N*. Then*

$$\max_{\tau\in[0,1]} |P'(\tau)| \leq 2N^2 \max_{\tau\in[0,1]} |P(\tau)|. \tag{55}$$

Proof. Define the polynomial $Q(x) = P((x+1)/2)$, so that

$$Q'(x) = \frac{1}{2} P'((x+1)/2), \quad x \in [-1,1]. \tag{56}$$

In particular,

$$\max_{\tau\in[0,1]} |P(\tau)| = \max_{\tau\in[-1,1]} |Q(\tau)|,$$

so that

$$\max_{\tau\in[0,1]} |P'(\tau)| = \max_{\tau\in[-1,1]} 2|Q'(\tau)| \leq 2N^2 \max_{\tau\in[-1,1]} |Q(\tau)| \leq 2N^2 \max_{\tau\in[0,1]} |P(\tau)|. \tag{57}$$

□

A.3 An inequality on the ratio of symmetric polynomials

Recall that, for $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathbb{R}^d$ is naturally embedded in the set of sequences $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}^*}$.

Now, let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ such that $\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_m < +\infty$. By MacLaurin's inequality [5], see e.g. (Steele, 2004, Chapter 12),

$$\forall M \in \mathbb{N}^*, \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_M} \prod_{u\in U} \lambda_u \leq \left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \lambda_m\right)^M < +\infty. \tag{58}$$

In the following, we denote by $p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ the elementary symmetric polynomial of order M on the sequence $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$,

$$p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_M} \prod_{u\in U} \lambda_u. \tag{59}$$

In particular, the following identity relates p_M and p_{M+1}.

$$\forall M \geq 2, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}^*, p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \lambda_m p_{M-1}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\overline{\{m\}}}) + p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\overline{\{m\}}}), \tag{60}$$

where we denote, for $S \subset \mathbb{N}^*$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\overline{S}} = (\lambda_m^{\overline{S}})_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} = (\lambda_m \mathbb{1}_{m\notin S})_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$. Proposition 15 further relates two consecutive elementary polynomials.

Proposition 15 (Theorem 3.1 of Guruswami and Sinop, 2012)**.** *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $L \geq M+1$. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ be a nonincreasing sequence*

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_L. \tag{61}$$

Assume that $\lambda_L > 0$, then

$$\forall M' \leq M, \quad \frac{p_{M+1}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})}{p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda})} \leq \frac{\sum_{m\geq M'+1} \lambda_m}{M+1-M'}. \tag{62}$$

We will actually use an immediate consequence of Proposition 15.

Corollary 16. *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ be a nonincreasing sequence such that $\sum \lambda_m < +\infty$ and $\lambda_m > 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then (62) still holds.*

Proof. Define, for $L \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_L = (\lambda_\ell)_{\ell\in[L]} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L. \tag{63}$$

By Proposition 15,

$$\forall M' \leq M, \ \forall L \geq M+1, \ \frac{p_{M+1}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_L)}{p_M(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_L)} \leq \frac{1}{M+1-M'} \sum_{m=M'+1}^{L} \lambda_m \tag{64}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{M+1-M'} \sum_{m=M'+1}^{+\infty} \lambda_m. \tag{65}$$

Letting $L \to \infty$ allows us to conclude. □

For the last result, recall the definition of the (cross-)leverage scores τ_{m_1,m_2} in (37). We slightly adapt a result by Belhadji et al. (2019) .

[5] The inequality is usually stated for $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Taking limits immediatedly yields (58).

Lemma 17. *Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ satisfy $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$. For $m, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $m_1 \neq m_2$,*

$$\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{66}$$

and

$$\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} = e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{67}$$

In particular,

$$\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \text{ and } |\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})| \text{ are in } [0,1]. \tag{68}$$

Proof. The proof of (66) is given in (Belhadji et al., 2019)[Lemma 4 of Appendix D]. The proof of (67) is straightforward following the same lines. $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}$ is an orthogonal projection with respect to $\langle ., . \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$ and

$$\|e_m^{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \|e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \|e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = 1, \tag{69}$$

so that (68) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. □

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Proposition 2

Proposition 2 states that continuous volume sampling is a mixture of projection determinantal point processes. We adapt a result in (Kulesza and Taskar, 2012, Chapter 5) for finite volume sampling to the infinite-dimensional case. The idea of the proof is to apply the Cauchy-Binet identity to a sequence of kernels of finite rank that approximate k.

First, recall from Section 1 the Mercer decomposition of k,

$$k(x,y) = \lim_{M \to \infty} \sum_{m \in [M]} \sigma_m e_m(x) e_m(y) = \lim_{M \to \infty} k_M(x,y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{70}$$

where kernel k_M has rank M.

Now, let $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, and define $\boldsymbol{K}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) = (k_M(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \in [N]}$. By continuity of the determinant and by (70), it comes

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) = \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{71}$$

By construction,

$$\boldsymbol{K}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{F}_M(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M \boldsymbol{F}_M(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{72}$$

where $\boldsymbol{F}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) = (e_m(x_i))_{(m,i) \in [M] \times [N]}$ and Σ_M is a diagonal matrix containing the first M eigenvalues $(\sigma_m)_{m \in [M]}$ on its diagonal. The Cauchy-Binet identity yields

$$\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\substack{U \subset [M] \\ |U| = N}} \operatorname{Det}^2 (e_u(x_i))_{(u,i) \in U \times [N]} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u. \tag{73}$$

Let now $\lambda_u = \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u$ and $\boldsymbol{E}_U(\boldsymbol{x}) = (e_u(x_i))_{(u,i) \in U \times [N]}$, we combine (71) and (73) to

obtain

$$\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \lim_{M\to\infty} \sum_{\substack{U\subset[M]\\|U|=N}} \lambda_u \operatorname{Det}^2(e_u(x_i))_{(u,i)\in U\times[N]} \tag{74}$$

$$= \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_N} \lambda_u \operatorname{Det}^2(e_u(x_i))_{(u,i)\in U\times[N]} \tag{75}$$

$$= \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_N} \lambda_u \operatorname{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{E}_U(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{E}_U(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \tag{76}$$

$$= \sum_{U\in\mathcal{U}_N} \lambda_u \operatorname{Det}(\mathfrak{K}_U(x_i,x_j))_{i,j\in[N]}, \tag{77}$$

where $\mathfrak{K}_U(x,y) \triangleq \sum_{u\in U} e_u(x)e_u(y)$. Since $\mathfrak{K}_U$ is a projection kernel, writing the determinant as a sum over permutations easily yields, for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_N$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \operatorname{Det}(\mathfrak{K}_U(x_i,x_j))_{i,j\in[N]} \otimes_{i\in[N]} \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i) = N!, \tag{78}$$

see e.g. Lemma 21 in (Hough et al., 2006). Finally, the monotone convergence theorem allows us to conclude

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \otimes_{i\in[N]} \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i) = N! \sum_{\substack{U\subset\mathbb{N}^*\\|U|=N}} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u. \tag{79}$$

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Lemma 3 gives an upper bound on the biggest weight δ_N in the mixture of Proposition 2. The proof is straightforward, as

$$r_N \prod_{\ell\in[N]} \sigma_\ell = \sigma_N \sum_{m\geq N+1} \sigma_m \prod_{\ell\in[N-1]} \sigma_\ell$$

$$\leq \sigma_N \sum_{\substack{U\subset\mathbb{N}^*\\|U|=N}} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u. \tag{80}$$

This immediately yields $\delta_N \leq \sigma_N / r_N$.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 8

Lemma 8 decomposes the interpolation error in terms of (cross-)leverage scores. Let $g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ satisfy $\|g\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \leq 1$. Since $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}$ is an orthogonal projection with respect to $\langle .,. \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$, we have

$$\|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \|\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 - \|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \tag{81}$$

Now, $\mu_g = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} g = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_m} g_m e_m^{\mathcal{F}}$, so that (81) becomes

$$\|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_m g_m^2 - \left\| \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \sqrt{\sigma_m} g_m e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2$$

$$= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_m g_m^2 - \sum_{m_1,m_2} g_{m_1} g_{m_2} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}} \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}. \tag{82}$$

Lemma 17 allows us to recognize leverage scores in (82). Taking out of the second sum in (82) the terms for which $m_1 = m_2$ to put them in the first sum concludes the proof of Lemma 8.

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4

The proof of (27) relies on the identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2 \epsilon_m, \tag{83}$$

and the fact that (ϵ_m) is a non-increasing sequence. We prove these two results in turn, after what we prove (29).

B.4.1 Proof of (83)

Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ such that $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$. Lemma 8 yields

$$\|\mu_g - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2\sigma_m\Big(1-\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big) - \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*\\ m_1\neq m_2}} g_{m_1}g_{m_2}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{84}$$

First, we prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2\sigma_m\Big(1-\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2\sigma_m\Big(1-\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big). \tag{85}$$

By Lemma 17,

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}^*,\ \ g_m^2\sigma_m\Big(1-\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big) \geq 0, \tag{86}$$

so that (85) follows from the Beppo Levi's monotone convergence theorem.

Second, it remains to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*\\ m_1\neq m_2}} g_{m_1}g_{m_2}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \tag{87}$$

Again, Lemma 17 guarantees that, for $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $m_1 \neq m_2$,

$$|g_{m_1}g_{m_2}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq |g_{m_1}g_{m_2}|\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}. \tag{88}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m_1\neq m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*} |g_{m_1}g_{m_2}|\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}} &\leq \left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} |g_m|\sqrt{\sigma_m}\right)^2\\ &\leq \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} g_m^2 \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_m\\ &< +\infty,\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*\\ m_1\neq m_2}} g_{m_1}g_{m_2}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*\\ m_1\neq m_2}} g_{m_1}g_{m_2}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\sqrt{\sigma_{m_2}}\,\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}),$$

but this is equal to zero by Proposition 9.

B.4.2 Proof that (ϵ_m) is nonincreasing

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. By definition,

$$\epsilon_m = \sigma_m \frac{\sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N^m} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u}{\sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u} = \sigma_m \frac{p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m\}}})}{p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}, \tag{90}$$

where we use a notation introduced in Section A.3. This leads to

$$\epsilon_m = \sigma_m \frac{\sigma_{m+1} p_{N-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}) + p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}})}{p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}, \tag{91}$$

and, similarly,

$$\epsilon_{m+1} = \sigma_{m+1} \frac{\sigma_m p_{N-1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}) + p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}})}{p_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}. \tag{92}$$

Taking the ratio, it comes

$$\frac{\epsilon_m}{\epsilon_{m+1}} = \frac{\sigma_m \left(\sigma_{m+1} p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right) + p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right) \right)}{\sigma_{m+1} \left(\sigma_m p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right) + p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right) \right)} \tag{93}$$

$$= \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_{m+1}} \frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right)}}{1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_m} \frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{m,m+1\}}}\right)}} \geq 1, \tag{94}$$

because $1/\sigma_{m+1} \geq 1/\sigma_m$.

B.4.3 Proof of (29)

We have $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_N \epsilon_1 / \epsilon_N \leq \sigma_N \epsilon_1 / \epsilon_N$ since a simple counting argument yields $\epsilon_N \leq \sigma_N$. Along the lines of Section B.4.2,

$$\frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_N} = \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N} \frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}}{1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N} \frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}. \tag{95}$$

Now, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers and the $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is trace-class. Then, by Corollary 16, for $M \in [N-1]$,

$$\frac{p_N\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)}{p_{N-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\overline{\{1,N\}}}\right)} \leq \frac{1}{N-M} \sum_{m \geq M} \sigma_{m+2} = \frac{1}{N+1-(M+1)} \sum_{m+1 \geq M+1} \sigma_{m+2}. \tag{96}$$

Taking $M' = M+1$ concludes the proof of (29).

B.5 Proof of Proposition 5

B.5.1 The case of a polynomially-decreasing spectrum

Assume that $\sigma_m = m^{-2s}$ with $s > 1/2$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $M_N = \lceil N/c \rceil \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, with $c \in [1, N[$. We have

$$\min_{M \in [2:N]} \frac{\sum_{m \geq M} \sigma_{m+1}}{(N - M + 1)\sigma_N} \leq \frac{\sum_{m \geq M_N} \sigma_{m+1}}{(N - M_N + 1)\sigma_N} \tag{97}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{m \geq \lceil N/c \rceil} \sigma_{m+1}}{(N - \lceil N/c \rceil + 1)\sigma_N} \tag{98}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{m \geq \lceil N/c \rceil} \sigma_{m+1}}{(N - N/c + 1)\sigma_N} \tag{99}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{m \geq \lceil N/c \rceil} (m+1)^{-2s}}{(N - N/c + 1)N^{-2s}}. \tag{100}$$

$$\tag{101}$$

Now,

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}^*, \ (m+1)^{-2s} \leq \int_m^{m+1} t^{-2s} \mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{2s-1}(m^{1-2s} - (m+1)^{1-2s}), \tag{102}$$

so that

$$\sum_{m \geq \lceil N/c \rceil} (m+1)^{-2s} \leq \frac{1}{2s-1} \lceil N/c \rceil^{1-2s}. \tag{103}$$

Recall that $2s > 1$, so that

$$\frac{1}{2s-1} \lceil N/c \rceil^{1-2s} \leq \frac{1}{2s-1} (N/c)^{1-2s}, \tag{104}$$

and

$$\min_{M \in [2:N]} \frac{\sum_{m \geq M} \sigma_{m+1}}{(N - M + 1)\sigma_N} \leq \frac{1}{2s-1} \frac{(N/c)^{1-2s}}{(N - N/c + 1)N^{-2s}} \tag{105}$$

$$\leq \frac{c^{2s}}{2s-1} \frac{N}{(cN - N + c)}. \tag{106}$$

Note that c is a free parameter that belongs to $[1, N]$ [6] that we can optimize in the upper bound: $\frac{c^{2s}}{2s-1} \frac{N}{(cN-N+c)}$. For this purpose, denote

$$\phi_N(c) = \frac{c^{2s}}{2s-1} \frac{N}{(cN - N + c)}. \tag{107}$$

For every $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, ϕ_N is differentiable in $]0, +\infty[$ and

$$\phi_N'(c) = \frac{N}{2s-1} \frac{c^{2s-1}}{(cN - N + c)^2} \left((2s-1)(N+1)c - 2sN \right), \tag{108}$$

so that ϕ_N' vanishes in $c_N^* = \frac{2s}{2s-1} \frac{N}{N+1}$; it is negative in $]0, c_N^*[$ and positive in $]c_N^*, +\infty[$. We distinguish three cases:

[6] The inequality in (106) is valid for $c = N$ by continuity.

If $c_N^* < 1$, $N < 2s-1$ and ϕ_N' is positive on $[1,N]$ so that ϕ_N increases in $[1,N]$ and we take $c=1$ in (106):

$$\phi_N(1) = \frac{N}{2s-1} < 1. \tag{109}$$

If $c_N^* \in [1,N]$, c_N^* is the unique minimizer of ϕ_N in $[1,N]$ and we take $c = c_N^*$ in (106) so that:

$$\phi_N(c_N^*) = \left(\frac{2s}{2s-1}\right)^{2s} \left(\frac{N}{N+1}\right)^{2s} \tag{110}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{2s}{2s-1}\right)^{2s} \tag{111}$$

$$\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)^{2s-1}. \tag{112}$$

Finally, if $c_N^* > N$, $N < \frac{1}{2s-1}$, ϕ_N is decreasing in $[1,N]$ and we take $c=N$ in (106) so that:

$$\phi_N(N) = \frac{N^{2s-1}}{2s-1} \leq \frac{1}{2s-1}\left(\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)^{2s-1} \tag{113}$$

$$\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)^{2s-1}. \tag{114}$$

In the three cases, β_N is upper bounded by $\left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{2s-1}\right)^{2s-1}$. The artificial two-factor form of (112) and (114) is there to make limits clearer. In particular, the RHS goes to e as $s \to \infty$.

B.5.2 The case of an exponentially decreasing spectrum

Assume that $\sigma_m = \alpha^m$ with $\alpha \in [0,1[$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and $M_N = N \in \{2,\dots,N\}$. We have

$$\min_{M\in[2:N]} \frac{\sum_{m\geq M}\sigma_{m+1}}{(N-M+1)\sigma_N} \leq \frac{\sum_{m\geq M_N}\sigma_{m+1}}{(N-M_N+1)\sigma_N} \tag{115}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{m\geq N}\sigma_{m+1}}{\sigma_N} \tag{116}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{m\geq N}\alpha^{m+1}}{\alpha^N} \tag{117}$$

$$\leq \alpha^{N+1}\frac{\sum_{m\geq 0}\alpha^m}{\alpha^N} \tag{118}$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}. \tag{119}$$

B.6 Proof of Proposition 11

We start with deriving the spectrum[7] of the trace-class, self-adjoint operator

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_t = \mathbf{\Sigma} + t e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes e_m^{\mathcal{F}}, \tag{120}$$

[7] All the integration operators in this article, and specifically in this section, are self-adjoint and compact. The spectrum of such operators is the union of $\{0\}$ (the essential spectrum) and the set of eigenvalues (Brezis, 2010)[Theorem 6.8] . Yet, the proof of the Mercer decomposition, only involves the set of eigenvalues (Steinwart and Scovel, 2012). For this reason, we use the term "spectrum" to refer to the set of eigenvalues.

where $e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes e_m^{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined by

$$\forall g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega), \;\; e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes e_m^{\mathcal{F}}\, g(\cdot) = e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) \int_{\mathcal{X}} g(y) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(y) \mathrm{d}\omega(y). \tag{121}$$

The two operators $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ and $e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes e_m^{\mathcal{F}}$ are co-diagonalizable in the basis $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$, thus their linear combination $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ diagonalizes in this basis too. In other words, for $u \in \mathbb{N}^*$, e_u is an eigenfunction of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ and

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_t e_u = \mathbf{\Sigma} e_u + t e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \otimes e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(e_u) = (\sigma_u + t\delta_{u,m}\sigma_u) e_u. \tag{122}$$

Therefore, the set $\{\sigma_u(1+t\delta_{u,m}), u \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ is included in the spectrum of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$. Since $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ and correspond to the eigenfunctions of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ associated to the elements of $\{\sigma_u(1 + t\delta_{u,m}), u \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$, then the spectrum of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ is exactly the set $\{\sigma_u(1 + t\delta_{u,m}), u \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$.[8] We now turn to deriving the spectrum of the trace-class, self-adjoint operator $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+$; the case of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^-$ follows the same lines and will be omitted for brevity. We will prove that there exists an orthonormal basis $(f_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ such that every f_m is an eigenfunction of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+$. If $t = 0$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+ = \mathbf{\Sigma}$ and $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*}$ is already an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. We assume in the following that $t > 0$.

Consider the operator Δ_t^+ defined on $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$ by

$$\Delta_t^+ g(\cdot) = t\Big(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot)\Big) \int_{\mathcal{X}} g(y)\Big(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(y) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(y)\Big)\mathrm{d}\omega(y). \tag{123}$$

We can write $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+ = \mathbf{\Sigma} + \Delta_t^+$, but this time, if $t > 0$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ and Δ_t^+ do not commute. In particular, they are not co-diagonalizable, and a more detailed analysis is necessary. First, by construction of Δ_t^+,

$$\Delta_t^+ e_m = 0, \quad m \notin \{m_1, m_2\},$$

so that for any $m \notin \{m_1, m_2\}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ have e_m for eigenfunction, with the same eigenvalue σ_m. Observe that

$$\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega) = \mathrm{Span}(e_{m_1}, e_{m_2}) \oplus \mathrm{Span}(e_m)_{m\notin\{m_1,m_2\}}. \tag{124}$$

Therefore, the rest of the proof consists in completing $(e_m)_{m\notin\{m_1,m_2\}}$ into an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, by finding two orthonormal eigenfunctions of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+$ in $\mathrm{Span}(e_{m_1}, e_{m_2})$. Since we assumed in Section 1 that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are nonzero, we note that $\mathrm{Span}(e_{m_1}, e_{m_2}) = \mathrm{Span}(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}})$. Expressing the new eigenfunctions in terms of $e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}$ and $e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}$ will turn out to be more convenient.

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+ e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) &= \mathbf{\Sigma} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) + t\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot)\right)\left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(y) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(y)\right) e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(y)\mathrm{d}\omega(y) && (125)\\
&= \sigma_{m_1} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) + t\sigma_{m_1}\left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\cdot)\right) && (126)\\
&= (1+t)\sigma_{m_1} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} + t\sigma_{m_1} e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}. && (127)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_t^+ e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(.) = t\sigma_{m_2} e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} + (1+t)\sigma_{m_2} e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}. \tag{128}$$

[8] $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ is self-adjoint, and has no zero eigenvalue by assumption. Thus, any new eigenfunction that is not in our basis needs to be orthogonal to all basis elements, and is thus zero.

Now, let $v = \lambda_1 e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1} + \lambda_2 e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}$, so that, by (127) and (128),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t v &= \lambda_1\Big((1+t)\sigma_{m_1}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1} + t\sigma_{m_1}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\Big) + \lambda_2\Big((1+t)\sigma_{m_2}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} + t\sigma_{m_2}e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}\Big)\\ &= \Big(\lambda_1(1+t)\sigma_{m_1} + \lambda_2 t\sigma_{m_2}\Big)e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1} + \Big(\lambda_2(1+t)\sigma_{m_2} + \lambda_1 t\sigma_{m_1}\Big)e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}, \qquad (129)\end{aligned}$$

Solving for eigenvalues, we look for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t v = \mu v$, or equivalently

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl}(1+t)\sigma_{m_1}\lambda_1 + t\sigma_{m_2}\lambda_2 &=& \mu\lambda_1,\\ t\sigma_{m_1}\lambda_1 + (1+t)\sigma_{m_2}\lambda_2 &=& \mu\lambda_2.\end{array}\right.$$

This is just saying that μ should be an eigenvalue of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix}(1+t)\sigma_{m_1} & t\sigma_{m_2}\\ t\sigma_{m_1} & (1+t)\sigma_{m_2}\end{pmatrix}, \qquad (130)$$

which yields two solutions,

$$\mu^+_1 = (1+t)\frac{\sigma_{m_1}+\sigma_{m_2}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1+t)^2(\sigma_{m_1}-\sigma_{m_2})^2 + 4\sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}t^2}\,, \qquad (131)$$

and

$$\mu^+_2 = (1+t)\frac{\sigma_{m_1}+\sigma_{m_2}}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1+t)^2(\sigma_{m_1}-\sigma_{m_2})^2 + 4\sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}t^2}\,. \qquad (132)$$

These solutions are distinct since $t > 0$, and the corresponding normalized eigenfunctions v^+_1 and v^+_2 are orthogonal with respect to $\langle ., . \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}$ since $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ is self-adjoint. Finally, we define the set of eigenfunctions of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ by the system $(e_m)_{m\notin\{m_1,m_2\}} \cup (v^+_1, v^+_2)$ that is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. Therefore, the spectrum of the compact operator $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ is exactly the set

$$\{\sigma_m,\ m \notin \{m_1, m_2\}\} \cup \{\mu^+_1, \mu^+_2\}. \qquad (133)$$

Along the same lines, one can show that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ restricted to $\mathrm{Span}(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2})$ satisfy

$$\lambda^2 - (1+t)(\sigma_{m_1}+\sigma_{m_2})\lambda - \sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}t^2 = 0. \qquad (134)$$

For $t > 0$, this equation again admits two distinct solutions

$$\hat{\mu}^-_1 = (1+t)\frac{\sigma_{m_1}+\sigma_{m_2}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1+t)^2(\sigma_{m_1}-\sigma_{m_2})^2 + 4\sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}t^2}, \qquad (135)$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}^-_2 = (1+t)\frac{\sigma_{m_1}+\sigma_{m_2}}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(1+t)^2(\sigma_{m_1}-\sigma_{m_2})^2 + 4\sigma_{m_1}\sigma_{m_2}t^2}. \qquad (136)$$

so that the spectrum of $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ is exactly the set

$$\{\sigma_m,\ m \notin \{m_1, m_2\}\} \cup \{\mu^-_1, \mu^-_2\} = \{\sigma_m,\ m \notin \{m_1, m_2\}\} \cup \{\mu^+_1, \mu^+_2\}. \qquad (137)$$

In other words, the two operators $\mathbf{\Sigma}^+_t$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^-_t$ share the same eigenvalues.

B.7 Proof of Proposition 10

B.7.1 The expected value of the m-th leverage score

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. On the one hand, recall that $\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$, so that, by Definition 1,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left(N! \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u \right)^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \otimes_{i \in [N]} \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i). \tag{138}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})\, e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \operatorname{Tr}\left(e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right) \\ &= \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \operatorname{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \right) \\ &= \partial_t \operatorname{Det}(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal)|_{t=0^+}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

where the last line follows from the Jacobi identity of Theorem 12.

On the other hand, for $t > 0$ and with the notation of Section 5.2, let $\boldsymbol{K}_t(\boldsymbol{x}) := (k_t(x_i, x_j))_{i,j \in [N]} = \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal$. Since

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} k_t(x,x)\, \mathrm{d}\omega(\mathrm{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,x)\, \mathrm{d}\omega(\mathrm{x}) + t \int_{\mathcal{X}} e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(x)^2\, \mathrm{d}\omega(\mathrm{x}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_n + t\sigma_m < \infty, \tag{140}$$

Hadamard's inequality yields the integrability of $\psi(., t) : \boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}_t(\boldsymbol{x})$. Finally, observe that

$$\phi_m(t) := Z_N(k_t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \otimes_{i \in [N]} \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i). \tag{141}$$

If we prove that ϕ_m is right differentiable in zero, and that we can justify the interchange of the derivation and the integration operations, we will have equated the right derivative of ϕ_m in zero and (138) using (139); this will achieve proving the first equation in Proposition 10. To this purpose, we need to prove that $t \mapsto \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is right differentiable at zero, it is locally dominated by an integrable function and its derivative is locally dominated by an integrable function. Now, observe that $t \mapsto \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is a polynomial of degree smaller than N, so that it is differentiable, and Corollary 14 yields

$$\max_{\tau \in [0,1]} |\partial_t \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau)| \leq 2N^2 \max_{\tau \in [0,1]} |\psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau)|\,. \tag{142}$$

In other words, to dominate $\tau \mapsto |\partial_t \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau)|$ uniformly on $[0,1]$, it is sufficient to dominate $\tau \mapsto |\psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau)|$ uniformly there. Now, let $\tau \in [0,1]$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{K}_1(\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{K}_\tau(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal - \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \tau e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \tag{143}$$

$$= (1-\tau) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) e_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \in \mathcal{S}_N^+. \tag{144}$$

Thus

$$0 \preceq \boldsymbol{K}_\tau(\boldsymbol{x}) \preceq \boldsymbol{K}_1(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{145}$$

in the Loewner order, so that for any $\tau \in [0,1]$,

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau)| = \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, \tau) = \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}_\tau(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}_1(\boldsymbol{x}) = \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, 1). \tag{146}$$

We conclude by observing that $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \psi(\boldsymbol{x}, 1)$ is integrable on $\mathcal{X}^N$ by Proposition 2, and the fact that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} k_1(x,x) \mathrm{d}\omega(x) < +\infty. \tag{147}$$

B.7.2 The expected value of cross-leverage scores

Let $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $m_1 \neq m_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal . \end{aligned} \tag{148}$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{4Z_N(k)} \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \left(\Psi^+(\boldsymbol{x}) - \Psi^-(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \otimes_{i\in[N]} \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i), \tag{149}$$

where

$$\Psi^+(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \mathrm{Det}\, \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{150}$$

and

$$\Psi^-(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \mathrm{Det}\, \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{151}$$

We proceed as in Section B.7.1 and we use Proposition 12 to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^+(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \partial_t \,\mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal\right)|_{t=0^+} \\ &= \partial_t \,\mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}^+_t(\boldsymbol{x})\right)|_{t=0^+}. \end{aligned} \tag{152}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^-(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \partial_t \,\mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)\left(e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)^\intercal\right)|_{t=0^+} \\ &= \partial_t \,\mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}^-_t(\boldsymbol{x})\right)|_{t=0^+}. \end{aligned} \tag{153}$$

In order to prove that $\phi^+_{m_1,m_2}$ and $\phi^-_{m_1,m_2}$ are right differentiable in zero along with the second equation in Proposition 10, one can follow the same steps as in the end of Section B.7.1. In particular, the interchange of the derivation and the integration operations follows from the same arguments, upon noting that both $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k^+_t(x,x)\mathrm{d}\omega(x)$ and $\int_{\mathcal{X}} k^-_t(x,x)\mathrm{d}\omega(x)$ are finite.

B.8 Proof of Proposition 9

The proof is a straightforward computation now that we have Proposition 10 and Proposition 11.

B.8.1 The expected value of the m-th leverage score

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We have by Proposition 10 and Proposition 2,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{N! \sum\limits_{\substack{U\subset\mathbb{N}^* \\ |U|=N}} \prod\limits_{u\in U} \sigma_u} \frac{\partial \phi_m}{\partial t}|_{t=0^+}, \tag{154}$$

where

$$\phi_m(t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t e^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) e^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal\right) \otimes_{i=1}^N \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i). \tag{155}$$

Now by Proposition 11 and Proposition 2,

$$\phi_m(t) = N! \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \tilde{\sigma}_u(t), \tag{156}$$

where for $u \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\tilde{\sigma}_u(t) = \sigma_u + t\delta_{m,u}\sigma_u$. Therefore,

$$\phi_m(t) = N! \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_N \\ m \in U}} \prod_{u \in U} \tilde{\sigma}_u(t) + N! \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_N \\ m \notin U}} \prod_{u \in U} \tilde{\sigma}_u(t) \tag{157}$$

$$= N!\, \sigma_m(t+1) \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_{N-1} \\ m \notin U}} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u + N! \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_N \\ m \notin U}} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u. \tag{158}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial \phi_m}{\partial t}|_{t=0} = N!\, \sigma_m \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_{N-1} \\ m \notin U}} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u, \tag{159}$$

so that (154) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left(\cancel{N!} \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u \right)^{-1} \cancel{N!}\, \sigma_m \sum_{\substack{U \in \mathcal{U}_{N-1} \\ m \notin U}} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u, \tag{160}$$

which concludes the proof.

B.8.2 The expected value of cross-leverage scores

Let $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $m_1 \neq m_2$. We have by Proposition 10 and Proposition 2,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{4N! \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \sigma_u} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_{m_1,m_2}^+}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial \phi_{m_1,m_2}^-}{\partial t} \right) \Big|_{t=0^+}, \tag{161}$$

where

$$\phi_{m_1,m_2}^+(t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right) \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) + e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right)^{\intercal} \right) \otimes_{i=1}^N \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i), \tag{162}$$

and

$$\phi_{m_1,m_2}^-(t) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^N} \mathrm{Det}\left(\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) + t \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right) \left(e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right)^{\intercal} \right) \otimes_{i=1}^N \mathrm{d}\omega(x_i). \tag{163}$$

Now by Proposition 11, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\phi_{m_1,m_2}^+(t) = N! \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \tilde{\sigma}_u^+(t) = N! \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u \in U} \tilde{\sigma}_u^-(t) = \phi_{m_1,m_2}^-(t). \tag{164}$$

Plugging this back into (161) yields $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1,m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$.

B.9 Proof of Theorem 6

B.9.1 A decomposition result for the error

We start with a lemma.

Lemma 18. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq 1$. Under Assumption B,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu; x)^2 \leq (1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \sum_{m \geq N+1} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2. \tag{165}$$

Proof. Using the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 8 in Section B.3, it comes that, for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ such that $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$,

$$\|\mu - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \Big(1 - \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big) - \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ m_1 \neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \tau_{m_1, m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{166}$$

We want to take expectations in both sides of (166). For the first term in the RHS, we prove, using the same arguments as for the proof of Theorem 4 in Section B.4, that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \Big(1 - \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \Big(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\Big). \tag{167}$$

For the second term in the RHS of (166), we need to justify that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ m_1 \neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau_{m_1, m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\qquad = \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ m_1 \neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1, m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

This can be done using dominated convergence. Indeed, let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in [M] \\ m_1 \neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau_{m_1, m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\qquad = \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in [M] \\ m_1 \neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e_{m_1}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e_{m_2}^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_{m_1, m_2}^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{\substack{m_1,m_2\in[M]\\ m_1\neq m_2}} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \\
&\qquad = \left| \sum_{m_1,m_2\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \\
&\qquad \leq \left| \sum_{m_1,m_2\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1,m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| + \left| \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \\
&\qquad = \left\| \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m} \right\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} + \left| \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \\
&\qquad \leq \left\| \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m} \right\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} + \sum_{m\in[M]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}} \\
&\qquad = 2\|\mu\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} < +\infty. \qquad (170)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (169) and (170), we deduce (168) by the dominated convergence theorem.

Finally, we combine (167) and (168) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} &= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \\
&= \sum_{n\in[N]} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) + \sum_{m\geq N+1} \langle \mu, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}\rangle^2_{\mathcal{F}} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x})\right). \qquad (171)
\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand,

$$\forall m \geq N+1, \quad 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{m}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq 1, \qquad (172)$$

and on the other hand, remember that by Theorem 4, the sequence ϵ_m is non-increasing, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall n \in [N],\ \sigma_n(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}(\boldsymbol{x})) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu_{e_n} - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_{e_n}\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} \qquad (173)\\
&= \epsilon_n \qquad (174)\\
&\leq \epsilon_1, \qquad (175)
\end{aligned}$$

and by (29) in the same theorem one gets

$$\sigma_n(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}(\boldsymbol{x})) \leq (1+\beta_N)\sigma_N, \qquad (176)$$

so that

$$(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}(\boldsymbol{x})) \leq (1+\beta_N)\frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_n}. \qquad (177)$$

Assumption B yields

$$\forall n \in [N],\ \ 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq (1+B)\frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_n}. \qquad (178)$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

B.9.2 The expected value of the interpolation error

If there exists $r \in [0, 1/2]$ such that $\|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}} < +\infty$, we have

$$\sum_{m \geq N+1} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m \geq N+1} \sigma_m^{2r} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{179}$$

$$\leq \sigma_{N+1}^{2r} \sum_{m \geq N+1} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{180}$$

$$\leq \sigma_{N+1}^{2r} \|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2, \tag{181}$$

and

$$(1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = (1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m^{1-2r+2r}} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \tag{182}$$

$$= (1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m^{1-2r}} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{183}$$

$$\leq (1+B) \sigma_N^{2r} \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{184}$$

$$= (1+B) \sigma_N^{2r} \|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2. \tag{185}$$

By Lemma 18, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2$ converges at the slow rate $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N^{2r})$.

On the other hand, if there exists $r > 1/2$ such that $\|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}} < +\infty$, we have

$$(1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = (1+B) \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\sigma_N}{\sigma_m^{1-2r+2r}} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \tag{186}$$

$$\leq (1+B) \sigma_N \sigma_1^{2r-1} \sum_{m \in [N]} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{187}$$

$$\leq (1+B) \sigma_N \sigma_1^{2r-1} \|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2, \tag{188}$$

and

$$\sum_{m \geq N+1} \langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{m \geq N+1} \sigma_m^{2r} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{189}$$

$$\leq \sigma_{N+1}^{2r} \sum_{m \geq N+1} \frac{\langle \mu, e_m^{\mathcal{F}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{\sigma_m^{2r}} \tag{190}$$

$$\leq \sigma_{N+1}^{2r} \|\Sigma^{-r}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2. \tag{191}$$

This time, the bound in Lemma 18 is dominated by its first term, so that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \|\mu - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2$ converges at the faster rate $\mathcal{O}(\sigma_N)$.

B.10 Proof of Theorem 7

B.10.1 Proof of the bias identity

First, recall that, as f and g belong to $\mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) g(x) \, \mathrm{d}\omega(\mathrm{x}) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle f, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle g, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}, \tag{192}$$

thus, in order to prove the result, it is enough to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{i\in[N]} \widehat{w}_i f(x_i) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}^*} \langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{193}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}^N$ such that $\operatorname{Det} \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$. The optimal kernel quadrature weights satisfy

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1}\mu_g(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{194}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i\in N} \widehat{w}_i f(x_i) &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}^{\intercal} f(\boldsymbol{x}) && (195)\\
&= \mu_g(\boldsymbol{x})^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} f(\boldsymbol{x}) && (196)\\
&= \sum_{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sigma_{m_1}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, e_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) && (197)\\
&= \sum_{m_1,m_2\in\mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}). && (198)
\end{aligned}$$

We want to use the dominated convergence theorem to take expectations in (198). Let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$. By Lemma 17 and by the fact that $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}$ is an $\langle .,.\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}$-orthogonal projection, it comes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{m_1,m_2\in[M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^{\intercal}\boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| && (199)\\
&\quad= \left| \sum_{m_1,m_2\in[M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}}\, \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}, \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \right| && (200)\\
&\quad= \left| \left\langle \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{m_1\in[M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1},\ \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{m_2\in[M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \right| && (201)\\
&\quad\le \left| \left\langle \sum_{m_1\in[M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1},\ \sum_{m_2\in[M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \right| && (202)\\
&\quad\le \left\| \sum_{m_1\in[M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}}\langle g, e_{m_1}\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{m_2\in[M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}. && (203)
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\left\| \sum_{m_1 \in [M]} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{m_2 \in [M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{204}$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{m_1 \in [M]} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \left\| \sum_{m_2 \in [M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{205}$$

$$= \left\| \sum_{m_1 \in [M]} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1} \right\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \left\| \sum_{m_2 \in [M]} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{206}$$

$$\leq \left\| \sum_{m_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_{m_1} \right\|_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \left\| \sum_{m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \tag{207}$$

$$< +\infty, \tag{208}$$

since $\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_m} \langle g, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} e_m \in \mathcal{F}$. Dominated convergenve thus yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{209}$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \; \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{210}$$

Using Proposition 9, we continue our derivation as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \sum_{m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_{m_1}} \langle g, e_{m_1} \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \, e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_1}(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_{m_2}(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{211}$$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \sqrt{\sigma_m} \langle g, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_m \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \; \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \, e^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x})^\intercal \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{x})^{-1} e^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{212}$$

$$= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle g, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \sqrt{\sigma_m} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_m \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} \; \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}). \tag{213}$$

Finally, (193) is obtained upon noting that

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}^*, \; \langle f, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} = \sqrt{\sigma_m} \langle f, e^{\mathcal{F}}_m \rangle_{\mathcal{F}}. \tag{214}$$

B.10.2 Proof of the asymptotic unbiasedness of the quadrature

The expected value of the bias writes

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) g(x) \mathrm{d}\omega(x) - \sum_{i \in [N]} \widehat{w}_i f(x_i) \right) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \langle f, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \langle g, e_m \rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \, \tau^{\mathcal{F}}_m(\boldsymbol{x}) \right). \tag{215}$$

Now, by Theorem 4, for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}} \left\| \mu_{e_m} - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})} \mu_{e_m} \right\|^2_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \sigma_N (1 + \beta_N) \leq \sigma_N + \sum_{n \geq N} \sigma_n. \tag{216}$$

Thus

$$0 \leq 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = {\sigma_m}^{-1}\, \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \|\mu_{e_m} - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{x})}\mu_{e_m}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq {\sigma_m}^{-1}\sigma_N + \sum_{n\geq N}\sigma_n, \tag{217}$$

so that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) = \langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}(1 - \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})) = 0. \tag{218}$$

To conclude, it is thus enough to apply the dominated convergence theorem to (215). By Lemma 17, $\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in [0,1]$, so that $1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in [0,1]$. In particular, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$|\langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})\right)| \leq |\langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}\langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}| \tag{219}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\langle f, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}^2 + \langle g, e_m\rangle_{\mathrm{d}\omega}^2\right), \tag{220}$$

which is the generic term of a convergent series as $f, g \in \mathbb{L}_2(\mathrm{d}\omega)$. This concludes the proof.

C More concrete examples of RKHSs

In this section, we illustrate the bound of Theorem 4 and the constants of Proposition 5 on more examples.

C.1 The uni-dimensional periodic Sobolev spaces

Consider the uni-dimensional periodic Sobolev space of smoothness parameter $s \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. The eigenvalues have a polynomial decay; see (Wahba, 1990). We take for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\sigma_m = m^{-2s}$ [9]. For different values of m, Figure 2 illustrates the expected value of the m-th leverage score $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ (left panels) and the expected interpolation error $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ (right panels), both as functions of N. Remember that by Theorem 4:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2 = \sigma_m \left(\sum_{U\in\, \mathcal{U}_N} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u\right)^{-1} \sum_{U\in\, \mathcal{U}_N^m} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u. \tag{221}$$

For numerical simulations, we make the following approximation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2 \approx \sigma_m \left(\sum_{\substack{U\subset[M]\\ |U|=N}} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u\right)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{U\subset[M]\\ |U|=N,\, m\notin U}} \prod_{u\in U} \sigma_u, \tag{222}$$

for an $M \geq N$ sufficiently large. The numerator and denominator of the right hand side of (222) can be calculated using an efficient algorithm for the calculation of the elementary symmetric polynomials (Kulesza and Taskar, 2012)[Algorithm 7].

We observe that for low values of s, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ depends smoothly on N. On the other hand, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ undergoes a sharp transition at $N = m$ for high values of s: the reconstruction of the m-th eigenfunction is almost perfect for N slightly larger than m. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ respects the upper bound of Theorem 4; the constant B of Proposition 5 is small for high values of s and converges to e when $s \to +\infty$.

[9] We drop the potential multiplicities of the eigenvalues by simplicity.

C.2 The uni-dimensional Gaussian spaces

Consider now the RKHS generated by Gaussian kernel and the Gaussian measure. We take for all $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\sigma_m = \alpha^N$ (Zhu et al., 1997), for some $\alpha \in [0, 1[$. Figure 3 illustrates the expected value of the m-th leverage score $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ (left panels) and the expected interpolation error $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ (right panels), both as functions of N, for different values of m and $\alpha \in \{0.7, 0.5, 0.2\}$. The numerical simulation of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ uses again the approximation (222).

We make the same observations on the dependency of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ on N as in the Sobolev case. The rougher the kernel (i.e., the lower the value of α), the smoother the transition of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ as a function of N. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\, \mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m}; \boldsymbol{x})^2$ respects the upper bound of Theorem 4; the constant B of Proposition 5 is small for low values of α and converges to 0 when $\alpha \to 0$.




Figure 2: The expected value of the m-th leverage score $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ (left panels) and the expected interpolation error $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m};\boldsymbol{x})^2$ (right panels), under the distribution of continuous volume sampling, for $m \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ and the uni-variate periodic Sobolev kernel. Rows correspond to increasing values of the smoothness parameter $s = 1,2,3,4,5$.




Figure 3: The expected value of the m-th leverage score $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\tau_m^{\mathcal{F}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ and the expected interpolation error $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{VS}}\,\mathcal{E}(\mu_{e_m};\boldsymbol{x})^2$ under the distribution of continuous volume sampling for $m \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$. Every row corresponds to a uni-dimensional Gaussian space ($\sigma_m = \alpha^m$) with a parameter $\alpha \in \{0.7, 0.5, 0.2\}$.