arXiv:2006.09268v3 [cs.LG] 3 Sep 2021

Metrizing Weak Convergence with Maximum Mean Discrepancies

Carl-Johann Simon-Gabriel CJSG@ETHZ.CH
Institute for Machine Learning
ETH Zürich, Switzerland

Alessandro Barp AB2286@CAM.AC.UK
Department of Engineering
University of Cambridge, Alan Turing Institute, United Kingdom

Bernhard Schölkopf BS@TUE.MPG.DE
Empirical Inference Department
MPI for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany

Lester Mackey LMACKEY@MICROSOFT.COM
Microsoft Research
Cambridge, MA, USA

Abstract

This paper characterizes the maximum mean discrepancies (MMD) that metrize the weak convergence of probability measures for a wide class of kernels. More precisely, we prove that, on a locally compact, non-compact, Hausdorff space, the MMD of a bounded continuous Borel measurable kernel k, whose RKHS-functions vanish at infinity (i.e., $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$), metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures if and only if k is continuous and integrally strictly positive definite ($\int$s.p.d.) over all signed, finite, regular Borel measures. We also correct a prior result of Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (JMLR 2018, Thm. 12) by showing that there exist both bounded continuous $\int$s.p.d. kernels that do not metrize weak convergence and bounded continuous non-$\int$s.p.d. kernels that do metrize it.

Keywords: Maximum Mean Discrepancy, Metrization of weak convergence, Kernel mean embeddings, Characteristic kernels, Integrally strictly positive definite kernels

1. Introduction

Although the mathematical and statistical literature has studied kernel mean embeddings (KMEs) and maximum mean discrepancies (MMDs) at least since the seventies (Guilbart, 1978), the machine learning community re-discovered and applied them only since the late 2000s Smola et al. (2007). A KME with reproducing kernel k is a map from measures μ – in particular probability distributions – to functions f_μ in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) $\mathcal{H}_k$ of k. The RKHS distance between two embeddings then yields a semi-metric d_k on measures, called the maximum mean discrepancy (MMD), which can be used to compare two measures or distributions μ and ν: $d_k(\mu, \nu) := \|f_\mu - f_\nu\|_k$.

Their theoretical tractability and computational flexibility has allowed MMDs to flourish in many areas of machine learning that require comparing probability distributions, such as two-sample testing (compare two discrete distributions Gretton et al. (2012)), sample quality measurement and goodness-of-fit testing (compare a discrete distribution to a reference distribution, as in Chwialkowski et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2016; Gorham and Mackey 2017; Jitkrittum et al. 2017; Huggins and Mackey 2018), generative model fitting (compare distri-

Preprint. Under review. ©2021 Simon-Gabriel et al.

butions of fake and real data; see Dziugaite et al. 2015; Sutherland et al. 2017; Feng et al. 2017; Pu et al. 2017; Briol et al. 2019), de novo sampling and quadrature (Chen et al., 2010; Huszár and Duvenaud, 2012; Liu and Wang, 2016; Chen et al., 2018; Futami et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019), importance sampling (Liu and Lee, 2017; Hodgkinson et al., 2020), and thinning (Riabiz et al., 2020).

For most applications, one seeks a kernel k whose MMD can separate all probability distributions P, Q, meaning that, $d_k(P, Q) = 0$ (if and) only if $Q = P$. Such kernels are said to be *characteristic* (to the set of probability distributions $\mathcal{P}$). If for example we optimize a parametric distribution Q to match a target P by minimizing their MMD $d_k(P, Q)$, it is rather natural to require that it be minimized only if Q perfectly matches P, i.e. $Q = P$. Another natural, but a priori stronger requirement, is that when Q gets closer to P in MMD, for example, if $d_k(Q, P) \to 0$, we would like Q to "truly" converge to P, where "truly" means "for some other standard and/or more familiar notion of convergence".

Although several standard notions may come to mind – convergence in KL-divergence, in total variation or in Hellinger distance –, many are too strong for our purposes which often require handling discrete data. For example, even if $\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{\xi}$, the Dirac masses $\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ will not converge to $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ in total variation or KL-divergence unless $\boldsymbol{x}$ is eventually equal to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Said differently, a sequence of deterministic variables would not converge in total variation unless it was eventually constant. Since in practice MMDs are frequently used to compare samples or empirical (hence discrete) distributions, it comes as no surprise that MMD convergence cannot, in general, ensure these strong types of convergence. Instead we will opt for a standard, yet comparatively weak notion of convergence, known as *weak* or *narrow convergence* or *convergence in distribution*. Specifically, the central question of this paper will be

When is convergence in MMD metric equivalent to weak convergence on $\mathcal{P}$?

In that case, we will say that the kernel k *metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures*. This question lies at the heart of the learning applications described above, as the quality of these inferences depends on the metrization properties of the chosen kernel (Zhu et al., 2018, 2019; Ansari et al., 2019; Li et al., 2017). When the kernel MMD fails to reflect the convergence of distributions, the results are at best inaccurate and at worst invalid.

1.1 Previous results, contributions and paper structure

The aforementioned question was studied as early as 1978 by Guilbart (1978) in his thesis. On separable metric spaces, he characterized the kernels for which weak convergence implies convergence in MMD (Thm.1.D.I). Conversely, he showed that, in some cases, MMD convergence can also imply weak convergence, meaning that there do exist kernels that metrize weak convergence. He provided a concrete recipe to construct such kernels (Thm.1.E.I & Lem.3.E.I) and used it to exhibit some examples. However, Guilbart (1978) did not characterize these kernels, and left most standard kernels (Gaussian, Laplacian, etc.) aside.

These initial results went largely unnoticed by the ML community, and it is only much later, with the emergence and the new applications of MMDs in applied statistics, that the important question of weak convergence metrization re-surfaced. Sriperumbudur et al.

(2010) in particular presented sufficient conditions under which the MMD metrizes weak convergence when the underlying input space is either $\mathbb{R}^d$ (Thm.24) or a compact metric space (Thm.23). Sriperumbudur (2016, Thm.3.2) then considerably improved these results and showed the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Sriperumbudur 2016) *A continuous, bounded, integrally strictly positive definite ($\int$s.p.d.) kernel over a locally compact Polish space $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ metrizes weak convergence.*

Let us explain and discuss this result, for it will help understanding our own results. First, the theorem assumes that the underlying input space is locally compact *and* Polish. Both assumptions taken separately are extremely general: all topological manifolds (f.ex. $\mathbb{R}^d$) and all discrete spaces are locally compact; while all separable, complete, metric spaces are, by definition, Polish, which includes any separable Banach space. This generality made locally compact spaces on the one side and Polish spaces on the other standard alternatives to do general measure and probability theory on. However, when both assumptions get combined, they typically become quite restrictive. A Banach space, for example, is locally compact only if it has finite dimension. Therefore, combining both assumptions yields an important constraint that limits the applicability of the result: one would hope for one or the other, but not both.

Second, $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ means that the RKHS functions f are assumed to be continuous and vanish at infinity, i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$ for which $\sup_{\mathcal{X}\setminus\mathcal{K}} |f| \leq \epsilon$. Many standard kernels satisfy this assumption which is typically easy to verify (see Lem.6 below). This assumption is also rather natural for problems involving finite measures on locally compact spaces $\mathcal{X}$, because the (continuous) dual of $\mathcal{C}_0$ can be identified with the set of finite signed measures on $\mathcal{X}$ (Riesz representation theorem). However, it is often inadequate on Polish spaces, because $\mathcal{C}_0$ can typically be very small. For example, on an infinite dimensional Banach space, $\mathcal{C}_0$ contains only the null function. This suggests that, in a first step, it might be more natural to get rid of the Polish assumption than the locally compact assumption.

Third, the theorem assumes that the kernel is $\int$s.p.d., meaning that its MMD separates all finite signed measures $\mathcal{M}$: for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$, $d_k(\mu, \nu) = 0$ only if $\mu = \nu$. It is easy to see that an MMD that metrizes weak convergence on the set of probability measures $\mathcal{P}$, must separate $\mathcal{P}$. But by assuming that it even separates $\mathcal{M}$, which is bigger than $\mathcal{P}$, Sriperumbudur (2016)'s Thm.2 leaves open the case of any MMD that separates $\mathcal{P}$ but not $\mathcal{M}$.

In 2018, Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018, Thm.12) seemed to finally address all weaknesses mentioned above by characterizing the metrization of weak convergence of probability measures on locally compact spaces as follows.

Claim 2 (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf 2018) *On a locally compact Hausdorff space, a bounded, Borel measurable kernel metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures if and only if it is continuous and characteristic (to the set of probability measures).*

This statement weakens Theorem 1's sufficient condition from separation of $\mathcal{M}$ ($\int$s.p.d. kernel) to separation of $\mathcal{P}$ (characteristic kernel), which, as discussed, immediately yields

the converse direction. It gets rid of the Polish assumption and, surprisingly, also drops the assumption $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$.

Contributions. Unfortunately, Claim 2 turns out to be wrong when the input space $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact. Our main result, Theorem 7, provides a correction under the additional assumption that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Crucially, we find that the compact and non-compact case are inherently different. Metrizing weak convergence on non-compact spaces requires *strictly* stronger conditions, since the MMD needs to separate, not only the probability measures – as in the compact case or in Claim 2 – but all finite signed measures. Put differently, Theorem 7 drops the Polish assumption from Theorem 1 and proves that its converse – which is too strong when $\mathcal{X}$ is compact (see Thm. 5 & Prop. 11) – does hold when $\mathcal{X}$ is non-compact. An important implication is that any $\mathcal{C}_0$ kernel that maps a probability measure to 0 *fails* to metrize weak convergence; in particular, this establishes that large classes of Stein kernels are unable to metrize convergence (see Rem. 8).

Additionally, Corollary 13 shows that Theorem 7 does not hold without the assumption $\mathcal{H}_k \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$, while Corollary 15 provides a *sufficient* condition to metrize weak convergence when $\mathcal{H}_k \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Our results also complete the findings of Chevyrev and Oberhauser (2018), who constructed a counter-example showing that Claim 2 does not hold on Polish spaces. Overall, our findings show that the old quest to characterize weak-convergence metrizing MMDs – which we close under the quite general assumption that $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact and $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ – depends in much more subtle ways on the properties of the underlying space $\mathcal{X}$ (being compact or not, Polish or not, etc.) and the kernel k ($\mathcal{H}_k$ contained in $\mathcal{C}_0$ or not) than was previously thought.

Paper structure. Section 1.2 fixes notations and makes a few important reminders and remarks. Section 2 then extends Sriperumbudur (2016)'s Theorem 1 and gives a general sufficient condition to metrize weak convergence when $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. We then investigate whether this condition is also necessary, first when the input space $\mathcal{X}$ is compact (Sec. 3), where it turns out to be too strong (Thm. 5); then when $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact, but locally compact (Sec. 4), in which case the sufficient condition turns out to be necessary (Thm. 7). We finish with a few results in the general case (Sec. 5), when $\mathcal{H}_k \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$: first a negative result (Cor. 13) showing that the assumption $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ cannot be dropped without replacement; then a result that generalizes the condition $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Section 6 concludes.

1.2 Notation, definitions, reminders

Notations. We use the letter k to denote a (reproducing) kernel (i.e. a positive definite function) over a *locally compact Hausdorff space* $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{H}_k$ denotes its RKHS. $\mathcal{C}_b$ is the space of bounded, continuous and real valued [1] functions f over $\mathcal{X}$. $\mathcal{C}_0$ is its subspace of functions that vanish at infinity, i.e. such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $|f| \leq \epsilon$ on $\mathcal{X} \backslash \mathcal{K}$. We denote its (continuous) dual $(\mathcal{C}_0)'$ by $\mathcal{M}$, which, by the Riesz representation theorem, can be identified with the set of signed, σ-additive, finite, regular Borel measures. We recall that a signed, σ-additive measure μ is said to be *regular* if, for any Borel measurable set $\mathcal{A}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact $\mathcal{K}$ and an open set $\mathcal{O}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{O}$, $|\mu(\mathcal{A}) - \mu(\mathcal{K})| \leq \epsilon$ and $|\mu(\mathcal{O}) - \mu(\mathcal{A})| \leq \epsilon$. $\mathrm{L}(\mu)$ denotes the

1. Our results extend to complex valued functions modulo some obvious slight modifications.

set of μ-integrable functions (i.e. verifying $\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f| \, \mathrm{d}|\mu| < \infty$) and for any such function f we write $\mu(f) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \, \mathrm{d}\mu$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_+$, $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{M}^0$ the subsets of $\mathcal{M}$ consisting of non-negative measures, of probability measures, and of signed measures μ such that $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ respectively.

Definition of KMEs and MMDs. For a continuous, bounded kernel k and any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \|k(.,\boldsymbol{x})\|_k \, \mathrm{d}\mu = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{k(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{x})} \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\boldsymbol{x}) < \infty$. By standard properties of the so-called *Bochner integral* (Schwabik, 2005), the (Bochner-)integral

$$f_\mu(\cdot) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(.,\boldsymbol{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\boldsymbol{x})$$

is a well-defined function in the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_k$ of k, and all functions $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$ are μ-integrable and verify what we call the *Pettis property*: $\mu(f) = \langle f_\mu \, , \, f \rangle_k$. In particular, for any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\langle \mu \, , \, \nu \rangle_k := \langle f_\mu \, , \, f_\nu \rangle_k = \mu \otimes \nu(k) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mu\|_k^2 = \mu \otimes \mu(k) \ ,$$

where $\mu \otimes \nu$ denotes the (tensor) product measure between μ and ν. The maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) $d_k(\mu, \nu)$ between μ and ν is then defined as the RKHS distance between their embeddings:

$$d_k(\mu, \nu) := \|\mu - \nu\|_k = \|f_\mu - f_\nu\|_k \ .$$

Why bounded kernels? In all our results, we will assume that the kernel k is bounded. One may wonder if those results could be generalized to unbounded kernels. To do so, one would need a definition of KMEs and MMDs that allows unbounded kernels. Such generalizations do exist (see f.ex. Def. 1 in Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf 2018), but they all at least require that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathrm{L}(\mu)$ for any embeddable measure μ. But if k is unbounded, then $\mathcal{H}_k$ contains an unbounded function f (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf, 2018, Cor. 3), and therefore, it is easy to construct a probability measure P such that $f \notin \mathrm{L}(P)$. So P does not embed into $\mathcal{H}_k$ and the MMD is not defined over all probability measures and cannot, a fortiori, metrize weak convergence there.

Equivalence of universal, characteristic and $\int$s.p.d. kernels. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a normed set of functions and $\mathcal{D}$ a subset of $\mathcal{M}$. A kernel k is said to be *universal to* $\mathcal{F}$ if $\mathcal{H}_k$ is a dense subset of $\mathcal{F}$. It is *characteristic to* $\mathcal{D}$ – or just *characteristic* when $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{P}$ – if the KME is well-defined and injective over $\mathcal{D}$. It is said to be *integrally strictly positive definite ($\int$s.p.d.) to* $\mathcal{D}$ – or just $\int$*s.p.d.* when $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{M}$ – if its MMD separates all measures in $\mathcal{D}$. It will be useful to remember that a kernel is universal to $\mathcal{F}$ (f.ex. to $\mathcal{C}_0$) if and only if it is characteristic to its dual ($(\mathcal{C}_0)' = \mathcal{M}$) (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf, 2018, Thm.6 & Tab.1). Also, it is characteristic to a set if and only if it is $\int$s.p.d. to that same set (which is almost immediate to see). The distinction between characteristicness and $\int$s.p.d. is mostly due to historical reasons. We advice to simply think in terms of separation of $\mathcal{D}$.

2. Sufficient conditions to metrize weak convergence

We start with a lemma that extends Theorem 1. Its main message is the same: bounded, continuous, $\int$s.p.d. kernels metrize weak convergence of probability measures. But, importantly, it drops the Polish assumption and adds a few interesting details. For one thing, it

shows that weak and MMD convergence also coincide with (the a priori even weaker) vague and weak RKHS convergence. For another, it adds a form of converse: weak convergence implies MMD convergence if *and only if* the kernel is bounded and continuous. Since most usual kernels are bounded and continuous, this lemma also confirms what we mentioned earlier: convergence in MMD is often rather weak and can, at best, metrize weak convergence, but not convergence in total variation or KL divergence (since those are known to be strictly stronger than weak convergence).

Lemma 3 *Let k be an $\int$s.p.d. kernel such that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ and let (P_α) (sequence or net) and P be probability measures. If k is continuous, then the following are equivalent.*

(i)	$\|P_\alpha - P\|_k \to 0$	*(convergence in strong RKHS topology)*
(ii)	$P_\alpha(f) \to P(f)$ *for all* $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$	*(convergence in weak RKHS topology)*
(iii)	$P_\alpha(f) \to P(f)$ *for all* $f \in \mathcal{C}_0$	*(convergence in weak-$*$ or vague topology)*
(iv)	$P_\alpha(f) \to P(f)$ *for all* $f \in \mathcal{C}_b$	*(convergence in weak topology)*

Conversely, if (iv) *implies* (i) *for any probability measures (P_α) and P, then k is continuous.*

When (i) and (iv) are equivalent for all sequences of probability measures, we say that *k metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures.*

Proof Since $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0 \subset \mathcal{C}_b$, (iv) $\Rightarrow$(iii) $\Rightarrow$(ii). Moreover, strong RKHS convergence implies weak RKHS convergence, that is (i) $\Rightarrow$(ii), since $P(f) = \langle P\,,\, f\rangle_k$ for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Now assume k is continuous. If (iv), then the product measures $P_\alpha \otimes P$, $P \otimes P_\alpha$ and $P_\alpha \otimes P_\alpha$ converge weakly to $P \otimes P$ (Berg et al., 1984, Thm. 2.3.3). Hence

$$\|P_\alpha - P\|_k^2 = P_\alpha \otimes P_\alpha(k) + P \otimes P(k) - P_\alpha \otimes P(k) - P \otimes P_\alpha(k) \to 0\ ,$$

i.e. (iv) $\Rightarrow$(i). Summing up so far: (iv) $\Rightarrow$(i) $\Rightarrow$(ii) and (iv) $\Rightarrow$(iii) $\Rightarrow$(ii).

Conversely, assume (ii). Since k is $\int$s.p.d. and $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$, by Cor. 3 and Thm.8 in Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018), $\mathcal{H}_k$ is dense in $\mathcal{C}_0$. And since $\mathcal{P}$ is a bounded subset of the dual $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{C}_0$ (which is a Banach, hence barreled space), by Thm.33.2 in Treves (1967), $\mathcal{P}$ is equicontinuous in vague topology. So, by Prop.32.5 in Treves (1967), (ii) implies vague convergence, i.e. (iii). Cor. 2.4.3 in Berg et al. (1984) then yields (iv). Hence the equivalence of (i) to (iv).

Now assume (iv) $\Rightarrow$(i) on $\mathcal{P}$, and suppose that $\boldsymbol{x} \to \boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \to \boldsymbol{\zeta}$ in $\mathcal{X}$. Then the Dirac point masses $\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\delta_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ converge weakly to $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ and $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$, which, by assumption, implies convergence in RKHS norm. Since the inner product is continuous (for the RKHS norm/topology), we get

$$k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \langle \delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}\,,\, \delta_{\boldsymbol{y}}\rangle_k \to \langle \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\,,\, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}\rangle_k = k(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})\ ,$$

so k is continuous. ■

Remark 4 *The proof shows that* (ii) *and* (iii) *are even equivalent on any bounded subset of $\mathcal{M}$ (Treves, 1967, Prop.32.5) (even without continuity of k) and that* (i)–(iv) *are actually equivalent on any bounded subset of $\mathcal{M}_+$ whenever $P_\alpha(\mathcal{X}) \to P(\mathcal{X})$ (which is always true for probability measures).*

The previous lemma gives sufficient conditions to metrize weak convergence. We now investigate whether they are necessary. To do so, we have to distinguish the case where the input space $\mathcal{X}$ is compact and where the conditions turn out to be too strong, from the one where $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact but not compact (and $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$), where they are necessary.

3. Necessary condition for compact input space $\mathcal{X}$

When the underlying space $\mathcal{X}$ is not just locally compact but compact, the equivalence given in Claim 2 actually turns out to hold: contrary to the general case, here, a continuous kernel only needs to separate the probability measures to also metrize their weak convergence. The reason for this difference is essentially that, because $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, measures cannot diffuse to 0 at infinity (see Section 4).

Theorem 5 *On a compact Hausdorff space, a bounded, measurable kernel metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures if and only if it is continuous and characteristic to $\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof If k metrizes weak convergence, then the RKHS metric needs to separate all probability measures, i.e. k is characteristic to $\mathcal{P}$. And the last sentence of Lem. 3 shows that k is continuous. Conversely, if k is characteristic to $\mathcal{P}$, then the kernel $\kappa := k + 1$ is $\int$s.p.d. (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf, 2018, Thm. 8). Also, since k is continuous, κ is continuous. Thus $\mathcal{H}_\kappa$ is a continuous subspace of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_b = \mathcal{C}_0$ (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf 2018, Cor. 4 and compactness). By Lem. 3, κ metrizes weak convergence on $\mathcal{P}$, and by Thm. 8 of Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018), κ and k induce the same metric on $\mathcal{P}$. ■

What is surprising here is that, on a compact space and for a continuous kernel, it suffices to separate probability measures to also metrize their weak convergence, which, a priori, may have seemed a strictly stronger requirement. We will see that when $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact, this need not be the case.

4. Necessary condition when $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact, non-compact and $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$

Since the condition $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ is at the heart of this section, we would like to remind the reader that, by the following lemma (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf, 2018, Cor. 3), it is satisfied by many standard kernels: Gaussian, Laplacian, Matern, inverse multi-quadratic kernels, etc.

Lemma 6 *$\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ if and only if k is bounded (i.e. $\sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{X}} k(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{x}) < \infty$) and for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, $k(\boldsymbol{x},.) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.*

We now turn to our main theorem, which corrects Claim 2 when $\mathcal{X}$ is non-compact and $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$.

Theorem 7 *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact and that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Then k metrizes weak convergence of probability measures if and only if k is continuous and $\int$s.p.d. (i.e. characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$).*

We see that, contrary to the compact case, it is not enough to separate all probability measures $\mathcal{P}$ to metrize their weak convergence: d_k must separate all finite measures $\mathcal{M}$, which strictly contains $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover, Proposition 11 below confirms that there are indeed kernels that separate $\mathcal{P}$ but not $\mathcal{M}$. Hence, Theorems 5 and 7 show that, surprisingly, the converse of Sriperumbudur's Theorem 1 is generally too restrictive when $\mathcal{X}$ is compact, but does hold when it is not. Also, they confirm that the Polish assumption made in Theorem 1 is superfluous.

Remark 8 (On the significance of Theorem 7) *One advantage of dropping the Polish assumption is that our result covers more sets, especially non complete ones, such as open sets* strictly *contained in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Besides, we believe that dropping unnecessary hypotheses helps clarifying the role of each remaining assumption. However, in our view, the main contribution of Theorem 7 is its converse part, which implies that many popular kernels* fail *to metrize weak convergence. For example, it rules out any RKHS contained in $\mathcal{C}_0$ that maps some probability measure(s) to 0. This has important implications for the Stein kernels adopted in Liu and Wang (2016); Jitkrittum et al. (2017); Gorham and Mackey (2017); Huggins and Mackey (2018); Feng et al. (2017); Pu et al. (2017); Liu and Wang (2016); Chen et al. (2018, 2019); Hodgkinson et al. (2020) which, by design, map a particular target distribution to 0 and which, if one is not careful, will also induce RKHSes in $\mathcal{C}_0$.*

We now turn towards the proof. While it is almost obvious that metrization of weak convergence implies separation of $\mathcal{P}$, showing that it also implies separation of $\mathcal{M}$ will require some work and, in light of Lem. 3, is essentially all that remains to be proven. To do so, we will use the following two lemmata. The first one is a straightforward extension of a basic property of locally compact sets (every *point* has a compact neighborhood) from points to compact sets (*every* compact set has a compact neighborhood). The second shows that when $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact, then the RKHS metric cannot prevent some positive measures from "diffusing" to the null measure. This will imply that if k is not characteristic to all finite measures, one can construct a sequence of probability measures that converges in RKHS norm, but has some of its mass diffusing to 0.

Lemma 9 *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of a locally compact space $\mathcal{X}$. Then there exists an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{K}$ with compact closure. Equivalently, there exist an open set $\mathcal{O}$ and a compact set $\mathcal{K}'$ in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{K}'$.*

Lemma 10 *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact and that k is continuous with $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Then there exists a sequence of probability measures P_n such that $\|P_n\|_k \to 0$. Moreover, for any compact $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$, one can additionally impose that $P_n(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ for all n.*

Proof [Proof of Lem. 9] Since $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact, every point has a compact neighborhood. So let us consider the set of all compact neighborhoods of the points contained in $\mathcal{K}'$. Their interiors form an open cover of $\mathcal{K}'$, and, since $\mathcal{K}'$ is compact, a finite number of them suffices to cover $\mathcal{K}'$. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the finite union of these interiors and $\mathcal{K}'$ the union of their closures (i.e., the union of the corresponding compact supersets). Then $\mathcal{O}$ is open, $\mathcal{K}'$ is compact, and $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{K}'$ as advertised. We finally note that this property is equivalent to the first claim (that there exists an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{K}$ with compact closure) as $\mathcal{O}$

is contained in a compact set if and only if its closure is compact. ■

Proof [Proof of Lem. 10] First we show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any integer $n > 0$, we can construct a sequence of n points $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_n$ in $\mathcal{X}\backslash\mathcal{K}$ such that for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, $|k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)| \leq \epsilon$. We will construct it one point at a time. Choose a point $\boldsymbol{x}_1 \in \mathcal{X}\backslash\mathcal{K}$. By assumption on k, there exists a compact $\mathcal{K}_1 \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that for any point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}\backslash\mathcal{K}_1$, $|k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_1)| \leq \epsilon$. Choose $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ to be also outside of $\mathcal{K}$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}\backslash(\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}_1)$ (non-empty, since $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}_1$ is compact and $\mathcal{X}$ is not). There exists a compact $\mathcal{K}_2 \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that for any point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}\backslash\mathcal{K}_2$, $|k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_2)| \leq \epsilon$. Let $\boldsymbol{x}_3$ be any point in $\mathcal{X}\backslash(\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$ (non empty because $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact). Continue this procedure until point $\boldsymbol{x}_n$. The sequence obviously satisfies the requirement.

Now, for any integer $n > 0$, construct a finite sequence $\boldsymbol{x}_1^{(n)}, \ldots \boldsymbol{x}_n^{(n)}$ such that for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, $|k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)| \leq 1/n$. Define the probability measures $P_n := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(n)}}$. Then all $P_n(\mathcal{K}) = 0$, since all $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}\backslash\mathcal{K}$, and:

$$\|P_n\|_k^2 = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n} k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) \leq \frac{n}{n^2}\|k\|_\infty + \frac{n(n-1)}{n^2}\frac{1}{n} \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \quad ■$$

Proof [Proof of Thm. 7] Lemma 3 yields the "if" part and the continuity of the kernel in the converse. Assume now that k is not characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$. Then there exists a non-zero, finite measure μ such that $f_\mu = 0$. Let μ_+, μ_- be its positive and negative parts respectively – which are mutually singular (Hahn decomposition). By renormalizing μ if needed, we can assume without loss of generality that $\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) \leq \mu_+(\mathcal{X}) = 1$. If $\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) = \mu_+(\mathcal{X})$, then μ_- and μ_+ are two non-equal probability measures that are at RKHS distance 0, hence k does not metrize weak convergence. So, for the sequel, assume that $\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) < \mu_+(\mathcal{X})$.

Now, let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of $\mathcal{X}$ that satisfies $\mu_+(\mathcal{K}) \geq (\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) + \mu_+(\mathcal{X}))/2$, which exists because μ_+ is regular and $\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) < \mu_+(\mathcal{X})$. Select now an open set $\mathcal{O}$ and a compact set $\mathcal{K}'$ satisfying $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{K}'$, which exist by Lemma 9. Then, since $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{O}$, $\mu_+(\mathcal{O}) \geq \mu_+(\mathcal{K})$. Let now P_n be probability measures as in Lemma 10 such that $P_n(\mathcal{K}') = 0$ (and hence $P_n(\mathcal{O}) = 0$) for all n. Consider the sequence of probability measures $\mu_n := \mu_- + (1 - \mu_-(\mathcal{X}))P_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mu_n - \mu_+\|_k &= \|\mu_n - \mu_-\|_k \quad \text{(because } f_{\mu_-} = f_{\mu_+}\text{)} \\ &= (1 - \mu(\mathcal{X}))\|P_n\|_k \quad \longrightarrow \quad 0,\end{aligned}$$

hence μ_n converges to μ_+ in the RKHS metric. But μ_n does not converge weakly to μ_+ since

$$\mu_+(\mathcal{O}) \geq \mu_+(\mathcal{K}) \geq (\mu_-(\mathcal{X}) + \mu_+(\mathcal{X}))/2 > \mu_-(\mathcal{X}) \geq \mu_-(\mathcal{O}) = \mu_n(\mathcal{O}) \ ,$$

which contradicts the Portmanteau lemma ($\limsup_n \mu_n(\mathcal{O}) \not\geq \mu_+(\mathcal{O})$). ■

To prove that the initial claim (Claim 2) is indeed wrong when $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact, it remains to show that being characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$ is not equivalent to being characteristic to $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$, i.e. that there exists a kernel k with $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ that is characteristic to $\mathcal{P}$ but not

to $\mathcal{M}$. We show this under the assumption that there already exists a kernel of $\mathcal{X}$ that is characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$, which is in particular satisfied when $\mathcal{X}$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proposition 11 *If there exists a bounded that is characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$ (with $\mathcal{X}$ compact or non compact), then there also exists a kernel k with $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ that is characteristic to $\mathcal{P}$ but not characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$. In particular, this k does not metrize the weak convergence of probability measures.*

Proof Let κ be any bounded kernel over $\mathcal{X}$ that is $\int$s.p.d., i.e., characteristic to $\mathcal{M}$. $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}_0$ such that $g(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0$ and $g(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$ for any $\boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{\xi}$. Consider $k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) := g(\boldsymbol{x})\kappa(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})g(\boldsymbol{y})$. Then k is a kernel such that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ (Lem. 6) and $f_{\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}$ is the null function, hence $\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_k = 0$, so k is not $\int$s.p.d. But we will now show that k is characteristic to $\mathcal{M}^0$, i.e. to $\mathcal{P}$. Indeed, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^0$ such that $\iint k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \,\mathrm{d}\mu(\boldsymbol{x}) \,\mathrm{d}\mu(\boldsymbol{y}) = 0$. Since the product $g\mu$ is a finite measure and κ is $\int$s.p.d., the previous equality implies that $g\mu$ is the null measure. Since $g > 0$ on any $\boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{\xi}$, for any open set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{X}\backslash\{\boldsymbol{\xi}\}$, $|\mu|(\mathcal{O}) = 0$. Hence the support of μ (well-defined, because μ is regular) is contained in $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}\}$, i.e. μ is proportional to the Dirac point mass in $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Hence, if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^0$, then μ is the null measure. ■

Proposition 11 has two implications. First, it shows that the metrization condition in the non compact case is *strictly* stronger than in the compact case: on compact spaces, some kernels do metrize weak convergence *without* separating all finite signed measures. Second, combining it with Theorem 7 shows that the alleged proof of Claim 2 must be flawed. Another confirmation will be given by point (i) in Corollary 13, with an explicit counter-example constructed in its proof. However, to strengthen our claim, we now explicitly point out the flaw in the proof of Claim 2 by Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018).

4.1 Flaw in the proof of Claim 2 of Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf

The flaw in the proof of Theorem 12 of Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018) (our Claim 2) resides in their auxiliary Lemma 20, which is essentially our Lemma 3, but without the assumption $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$. Their proof essentially consists in saying that, since (P_α) (denoted (μ_α) there) is bounded, it is relatively vaguely compact, so one can extract a subnet (P_β) that converges vaguely to a measure P' (denoted μ' there). They then try to identify the vague limit P' with the MMD- (or weak RKHS-) limit P (denoted μ there) of the original net (P_α), by arguing that weak and vague convergence coincide on $\mathcal{P}$, and that weak convergence implies MMD-convergence. Unfortunately, $\mathcal{P}$ is not closed in $\mathcal{M}$ for the vague topology, so nothing guarantees a priori that $P' \in \mathcal{P}$. And if $P' \notin \mathcal{P}$, then vague convergence to P' does not imply weak convergence to P' (Berg et al., 1984, Thm. 2.4.2), which is why the proof fails – irremediably.

We can go further and exhibit a counter-example for the previous failure, i.e. a bounded, continuous, $\int$s.p.d. kernel and a sequence (P_n) that converges to $P \in \mathcal{P}$ in MMD, but converges vaguely to another measure $P' \neq P$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Indeed, consider the kernel $\kappa := k + 1$ from the proof of Corollary 13(i) below. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ (which exists because $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact) and choose a sequence $(P_n) \subset \mathcal{P}$ as in Lemma 10, i.e. such that $\|P_n\|_k \to 0$ and $P_n(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ for all n. By using the vague compactness of $\mathcal{B}_+ := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+ \,|\, \mu(\mathcal{X}) \leq 1\}$ (Berg et al., 1984, Prop.2.4.6) and extracting a subsequence if needed,

we may assume that (P_n) converges vaguely to a measure $P' \in \mathcal{B}_+$. Applying Urysohn's lemma (Villani, 2010, Thm. I-33) to the compact set $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}\}$ and an open neighborhood $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{K}$ of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, we get a continuous function f whose support is contained in $\mathcal{K}$ and such that $f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 1$. Since $f \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and $P_n(f) = 0 < 1 = f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(f)$, P_n does not converge vaguely to $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, i.e. $P' \neq \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$. Now κ is bounded, continuous and $\int$s.p.d., and induces the same metric than k on $\mathcal{P}$. So, since the KME of k maps the Dirac measure $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ to the null function in $\mathcal{H}_k$ (see proof of Prop.11), we get

$$\|P_n - \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_\kappa = \|P_n - \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\|_k = \|P_n\|_k \to 0 \ .$$

Hence $(P_n) \to \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ in MMD, but (P_n) converges vaguely to a different measure P'.

Remark 12 *The sequence (P_n) converges neither weakly to P' nor weakly to $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, since weak convergence would imply vague and MMD convergence to the same limit, i.e. would imply $P' = \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$. Hence $P'(\mathcal{X}) \neq 1$ (otherwise, vague convergence would imply weak convergence, since both coincide on $\mathcal{P}$ (Berg et al., 1984, Cor. 2.4.3)), and since $P' \in \mathcal{B}_+$, we get $P'(\mathcal{X}) < 1$. So (P_n) illustrates a phenomenon called* mass escaping at infinity*, which vague convergence, contrary to weak convergence, cannot prevent.*

5. General case: $\mathcal{X}$ locally compact, non compact and $\mathcal{H}_k \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$

All previous sections assumed that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ (automatically satisfied when k continuous and $\mathcal{X}$ is compact). So one may naturally wonder whether this assumption could be dropped without replacement or at least extended. Corollary 13 shows that dropping it without replacement is not possible; but Corollary 15 proposes a slight extension.

Corollary 13 *The condition $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$ Theorem 7 cannot be replaced with $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_b$ as, if $\mathcal{X}$ is locally compact but not compact, then*

(i) there exists a bounded continuous kernel that is $\int$s.p.d., but does not metrize the weak convergence of probability measures;
(ii) there exists a bounded, continuous, characteristic (to $\mathcal{P}$) kernel that is not $\int$s.p.d. but metrizes the weak convergence of probability measures.

Remark 14 *Note, however, that* some *kernels with non-vanishing RKHS functions do satisfy the characterization of Theorem 7. For example, Theorem 7 extends to any kernel of the form $k_c = k + c$ for $c > 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_k \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$, since k_c and k induce the same MMD.*

Proof (i) Let k be as in Proposition 11 and consider the new kernel $\kappa := k + 1$. Then κ is $\int$s.p.d. (Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf, 2018, Thm. 8), but κ induces the same metric than k on the set of probability measures $\mathcal{P}$. Hence it does not metrize their weak convergence.

(ii) Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ be a point in $\mathcal{X}$, and k be as in Theorem 7, i.e. a bounded, continuous kernel, with $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{C}_0$, that metrizes weak convergence over $\mathcal{P}$. Then the new kernel $\kappa(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) := \langle \delta_{\boldsymbol{x}} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \, , \, \delta_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \rangle_k$ is not $\int$s.p.d. (since the KME of $\delta_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ is the null function) but it induces the same RKHS metric than k on $\mathcal{P}$, that is $\|P - Q\|_\kappa = \|P - Q\|_k$ for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, hence metrizes weak convergence on $\mathcal{P}$. (Remark: this implies that $\mathcal{H}_\kappa \not\subset \mathcal{C}_0$, which is also easy to check directly.) ■

Let us mention that, in a side remark of Guilbart (1978, p.18), Guilbart already exhibits a theoretical construction of kernels on $\mathbb{R}$ that are $\int$s.p.d. but do not metrize weak convergence. Hence, Claim 2 was actually disproved before being written.

We finish with a slight generalization of Theorem 7 that encompasses some kernels whose RKHS is not contained in $\mathscr{C}_0$. The result builds on the same idea than in the proof of Cor. 13(ii).

Corollary 15 *Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is not compact and that $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathscr{C}_0$. Fix $a \geq 0$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and define*

$$k_P^a(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) := \langle \delta_{\boldsymbol{x}} - P \,,\, \delta_{\boldsymbol{y}} - P \rangle_k + a = (\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}} - P) \otimes (\delta_{\boldsymbol{y}} - P)(k) + a \ .$$

Then k_P^a metrizes weak convergence of probability measures if and only if k is continuous and $\int$s.p.d.

Proof Since $k_P^a(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = k(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) - f_P(\boldsymbol{x}) - f_P(\boldsymbol{y}) + \|P\|_k^2 + a$, for any probability measures $S, T \in \mathcal{P}$, we get

$$\|S - T\|_{k_P^a}^2 = (S - T) \otimes (S - T)(k_P^a) = (S - T) \otimes (S - T)(k) = \|S - T\|_k^2 \ .$$

Hence k and k_P^a define the same metric on $\mathcal{P}$ and Thm. 7 concludes. ■

6. Conclusion

MMDs are at the heart of machine learning solutions to a variety of fundamental tasks including two-sample testing, sample quality measurement and goodness-of-fit testing, learning generative models, de novo sampling and quadrature, importance sampling, and thinning. While these applications benefit from the tractability of MMDs compared to more classical probability metrics, the validity of their results depends critically on the MMD's ability to ensure weak convergence. Simon-Gabriel and Schölkopf (2018) developed their Theorem 12 to provide a complete characterization of weak-convergence metrization for MMDs with bounded continuous kernels. However, our work shows that their characterization was incorrect and provides an alternative result that fully characterizes the weak-convergence metrization of MMDs with bounded $\mathscr{C}_0$ kernels. Surprisingly, we find that the compact and non compact cases are inherently different, the latter requiring *strictly* stronger conditions for the metrization. This suggests that the question of weak-convergence metrization by MMDs is more subtle than was previously thought. Our main results can also be seen as a converse to Sriperumbudur's Theorem 1, which in particular show that many popular kernels, particularly Stein kernels, can *fail* to metrize weak convergence, if one is not careful enough. In that spirit, we hope that our work will inform the selection of appropriate kernels and MMDs in the future and launch new inquiries into the metrization properties of other classes of MMDs.

Acknowledgments

CJSG was supported by the ETH Foundations of Data Science postdoctoral fellowship and is associate fellow of the Center for Learning Systems (ETH/MPI Túbingen). AB was supported by the Department of Engineering at the University of Cambridge, and this material is based upon work supported by, or in part by, the U.S. Army Research Laboratory and the U. S. Army Research Office, and by the U.K. Ministry of Defence and the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) under grant number [EP/R018413/2]. We declare no conflict of interests.

References

Abdul Fatir Ansari, Jonathan Scarlett, and Harold Soh. A characteristic function approach to deep implicit generative modeling. *arXiv:1909.07425*, 2019.

Christian Berg, Jens P. R. Christensen, and Paul Ressel. *Harmonic Analysis on Semigroups Theory of Positive Definite and Related Functions*. Springer, 1984.

Francois-Xavier Briol, Alessandro Barp, Andrew B Duncan, and Mark Girolami. Statistical inference for generative models with maximum mean discrepancy. *arXiv:1906.05944*, 2019.

Wilson Y. Chen, Lester Mackey, Jackson Gorham, François-Xavier Briol, and Chris J. Oates. Stein points. In *ICML*, 2018.

Wilson Ye Chen, Alessandro Barp, François-Xavier Briol, Jackson Gorham, Mark Girolami, Lester Mackey, Chris Oates, et al. Stein point markov chain monte carlo. *arXiv:1905.03673*, 2019.

Yutian Chen, Max Welling, and Alex Smola. Super-samples from kernel herding. In *UAI*, 2010.

Ilya Chevyrev and Harald Oberhauser. Signature moments to characterize laws of stochastic processes. *arXiv:1810.10971*, 2018.

Kacper Chwialkowski, Heiko Strathmann, and Arthur Gretton. A kernel test of goodness of fit. In *NeurIPS*, 2016.

Gintare K. Dziugaite, Daniel M. Roy, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Training generative neural networks via maximum mean discrepancy optimization. In *UAI*, 2015.

Yihao Feng, Dilin Wang, and Qiang Liu. Learning to draw samples with amortized stein variational gradient descent. *arXiv:1707.06626*, 2017.

Futoshi Futami, Zhenghang Cui, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. Bayesian posterior approximation via greedy particle optimization. In *AAAI*, 2019.

Jackson Gorham and Lester Mackey. Measuring sample quality with kernels. In *ICML*, 2017.

Arthur Gretton, Karsten M. Borgwardt, Malte J. Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *JMLR*, 13:723–773, 2012.

Christian Guilbart. *Etude des Produits Scalaires sur l'Espace des Mesures: Estimation par Projections*. PhD thesis, Université des Sciences et Techniques de Lille, 1978.

Liam Hodgkinson, Robert Salomone, and Fred Roosta. The reproducing stein kernel approach for post-hoc corrected sampling. *arXiv:2001.09266*, 2020.

Jonathan Huggins and Lester Mackey. Random feature stein discrepancies. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.

Ferenc Huszár and David Duvenaud. Optimally-weighted herding is bayesian quadrature. In *UAI*, 2012.

Wittawat Jitkrittum, Wenkai Xu, Zoltan Szabo, Kenji Fukumizu, and Arthur Gretton. A linear-time kernel goodness-of-fit test. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.

Chun-Liang Li, Wei-Cheng Chang, Yu Cheng, Yiming Yang, and Barnabas Poczos. MMD GAN: Towards deeper understanding of moment matching network. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.

Qiang Liu and Jason D. Lee. Black-box importance sampling. In *AISTATS*, 2017.

Qiang Liu and Dilin Wang. Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose bayesian inference algorithm. In *NeurIPS*, 2016.

Qiang Liu, Jason Lee, and Michael Jordan. A kernelized Stein discrepancy for goodness-of-fit tests. In *ICML*, 2016.

Yuchen Pu, Zhe Gan, Ricardo Henao, Chunyuan Li, Shaobo Han, and Lawrence Carin. VAE learning via Stein variational gradient descent. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.

Marina Riabiz, Wilson Chen, Jon Cockayne, Pawel Swietach, Steven A Niederer, Lester Mackey, Chris Oates, et al. Optimal thinning of mcmc output. *arXiv:2005.03952*, 2020.

Štefan Schwabik. *Topics in Banach Space Integration*. Number 10 in Series in Real Analysis. World Scientific, 2005.

C.-J. Simon-Gabriel and B. Schölkopf. Kernel Distribution Embeddings: Universal Kernels, Characteristic Kernels and Kernel Metrics on Distributions. *JMLR*, 2018.

Alex Smola, Arthur Gretton, Le Song, and Bernhard Schölkopf. A Hilbert space embedding for distributions. In *ALT*, 2007.

Bharath K. Sriperumbudur. On the optimal estimation of probability measures in weak and strong topologies. *Bernoulli*, 22(3):1839–1893, 2016.

Bharath K. Sriperumbudur, Arthur Gretton, Kenji Fukumizu, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Gert R. G. Lanckriet. Hilbert space embeddings and metrics on probability measures. *JMLR*, 11:1517–1561, 2010.

Dougal J. Sutherland, Hsiao-Yu Tung, Heiko Strathmann, Soumyajit De, Aaditya Ramdas, Alex Smola, and Arthur Gretton. Generative models and model criticism via optimized maximum mean discrepancy. In *ICLR*, 2017.

François Treves. *Topological Vector Spaces, Distributions and Kernels*. Academic Press, 1967.

Cédric Villani. *Intégration et analyse de Fourier*. ENS de Lyon, 2010.

Shengyu Zhu, Biao Chen, Pengfei Yang, and Zhitang Chen. Universal hypothesis testing with kernels: Asymptotically optimal tests for goodness of fit. *arXiv:1802.07581*, 2018.

Shengyu Zhu, Biao Chen, Zhitang Chen, and Pengfei Yang. Asymptotically optimal one-and two-sample testing with kernels. *arXiv:1908.10037*, 2019.