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Abstract

This paper studies Bayesian nonparametric estimation of a binary regression function in a semi-supervised setting. We assume that the features are supported on a hidden manifold, and use unlabeled data to construct a sequence of graph-based priors over the regression function restricted to the given features. We establish contraction rates for the corresponding graph-based posteriors, interpolated to be supported over regression functions on the underlying manifold. Minimax optimal contraction rates are achieved under certain conditions. Our results provide novel understanding on why and how unlabeled data are helpful in Bayesian semi-supervised classification.

1 Introduction

This paper investigates the semi-supervised learning problem of inferring a regression function \( f_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] \) using labeled data \((X_1,Y_1),\ldots,(X_n,Y_n) \sim \mathcal{L}(X,Y)\) and unlabeled data \(X_{n+1},\ldots,X_N \sim \mathcal{L}(X)\). We focus on binary classification, where \(Y\) takes values on \(\{0,1\}\) and \(f_0(x) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x)\) represents the probability with which a feature \(X = x\) belongs to the class labeled by 1. We make a standard manifold assumption \([5, 30, 2, 25, 10]\) and suppose that \(X\) takes values on a hidden manifold \(M\). Using the given features \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N\) we construct, without knowledge of \(M\), a sequence (indexed by \(n\)) of priors over the restriction of \(f_0\) to the features. Our main contribution is to study the contraction of the corresponding interpolated posteriors. In doing so, we lay a frequentist foundation to Bayesian semi-supervised classification, give theoretical insight on the choice of data-driven prior models, and provide novel understanding on why and how unlabeled data are helpful in Bayesian formulations to semi-supervised learning.

The approach to semi-supervised learning that we analyze belongs to the broad class of graph-based methods \([32]\). The unifying idea behind these methods is to employ a graph-Laplacian of the features \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N\) to uncover the geometry of \(M\) and regularize the inference problem. In the Bayesian perspective that we adopt, the graph-Laplacian is used to define the covariance operator of a Gaussian field prior over the features \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N\), which is transformed by a link function to set a prior on \(f_0\) restricted to the given features. Combining the prior with a likelihood function that incorporates the labeled data, we obtain a posterior distribution on regression functions over the \(X_i\)'s, which allows inference for the labels of the unlabeled features. The main contribution of this paper is to study the contraction of this graph-based posterior around \(f_0\) as \(n\) increases. Since \(f_0\) is a function on \(M\), this naturally suggests pushing forward the graph-based posterior to a measure over functions on \(M\), which can be achieved by an interpolation map that extends functions on \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N\) to \(M\). We shall study contraction rates of the pushforward (interpolated) graph-based
posterior for theoretical understanding of the graph-based Bayesian approach to semi-supervised classification.

Our analysis is set in the general posterior contraction framework of \cite{12} and consists of two parts. First, we assume perfect knowledge of $\mathcal{M}$, in which case the unlabeled data are not needed and the problem reduces to a standard binary regression problem on $\mathcal{M}$. This setting can be thought of as a limiting regime where $\mathcal{M}$ has been fully recovered by the unlabeled data. We set a Matérn-type Gaussian field prior (see e.g. \cite{20}), which is the continuum limit of the graph-based priors in the previous paragraph, and obtain posterior contraction rates for Sobolev-type truths. Similarly as \cite{24, 23}, we show that the minimax optimal convergence rate is attained only if the prior regularity matches the regularity of the target function. The novelty of this first partial result is in the study of posterior contraction on manifolds with Matérn-type priors, complementing \cite{5} which studies posterior contraction with heat kernel priors on a manifold setting. Second, we go back to the semi-supervised problem where partial knowledge of $\mathcal{M}$ is acquired through the features $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}$. We show that when $N_n$ grows at a certain polynomial rate with $n$, the interpolated graph posteriors have the same rate of contraction as the posteriors obtained with full knowledge of $\mathcal{M}$. These results imply that optimal contraction rates for semi-supervised learning can be attained provided that sufficiently many unlabeled data are available.

An important related work is \cite{15}, which studies fully-supervised function estimation on large graphs without a continuum limit structure, assuming that the truth changes with the size of the graph. In contrast, we investigate posterior contraction with a fixed truth $f_0$ defined on the underlying manifold $\mathcal{M}$, by analyzing the continuum limit of graph-based priors. Another related line of work is \cite{8, 11}, which established the continuum limit of posterior distributions as the size of the unlabeled data set grows, without increasing the size of the labeled data set. We point out that these papers did not address the question of whether graph-based posteriors contract around the truth. The recent paper \cite{1} studied posterior consistency for a fixed sample size in the small noise limit, whereas we consider the large $n$ limit and further establish posterior contraction rates. Rates of convergence for optimization rather than Bayesian formulations of semi-supervised learning have been established in \cite{4}.

Several works have investigated whether unlabeled data improve the performance of semi-supervised learning \cite{17}, and both positive \cite{19} and negative \cite{2, 25} conclusions have been reached under different settings. Our results provide qualitative and quantitative understanding on why and how much unlabeled data can improve the performance of Bayesian semi-supervised learning under a manifold assumption: a continuum prior over regression functions on $\mathcal{M}$ that achieves optimal contraction rates can be approximated using the unlabeled data, still obtaining rate-optimal convergence provided that $N_n$ grows sufficiently fast with $n$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formalizes our setting and provides the necessary background. Section 3 contains the first part of our analysis, concerning binary regression on a known manifold. Our main results on semi-supervised classification are in Section 4. To streamline our presentation, in Sections 3 and 4 we work under the assumption that the features are uniformly distributed on the underlying manifold. Section 5 shows how to generalize our results to nonuniform marginal density, and Section 6 closes with a discussion of several research directions that stem from our work.
2 Setting and Background

Let \((X, Y)\) be a random vector with \(Y\) taking values on \(\{0, 1\}\). The goal of semi-supervised classification is to estimate the binary regression function

\[ f_0(x) := \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x) \]

given labeled data \((X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)\) i.i.d. \(\mathcal{L}(X, Y)\) and unlabeled data \(X_{n+1}, \ldots, X_N\) i.i.d. \(\mathcal{L}(X)\), where \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N\) are independent from \(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n\). In applications, unlabeled data are often cheaper to collect and, for this reason, typically \(n \ll N\).

We adopt a manifold assumption [19], and suppose that \(\mu := \mathcal{L}(X)\) is supported on an \(m\)-dimensional smooth, connected, compact manifold \(\mathcal{M}\) without boundary embedded in \(\mathbb{R}^d\), with the absolute value of sectional curvature bounded and with Riemannian metric inherited from the embedding. We further assume that \(\mu\) is absolutely continuous with respect to the volume form on \(\mathcal{M}\), with a differentiable density that is bounded above and below by positive constants.

Our analysis in Section 3 sits on the continuum space \(\mathcal{M}\) and builds on the seminal work on posterior contraction with Gaussian field priors [24], which we review here succinctly in our manifold setting. Let \(\Phi : \mathbb{R} \to (0, 1)\) be a link function that is differentiable and invertible, with \(\Phi'/(\Phi(1-\Phi))\) uniformly bounded. These assumptions are satisfied for instance by the logistic function. We then put a prior \(\Pi := \mathcal{L}(f_W)\) on \(f_0\), where \(f_W\) is defined as

\[ f_W(x) := \Phi(W_x), \]

and \(W = (W_x, x \in \mathcal{M}) \sim \pi\) is a Gaussian process on \(\mathcal{M}\) taking values in some Banach space \((\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|_\mathcal{B})\). Practical implementations of this model are overviewed in [28]. The posterior contraction rates can be characterized in terms of the concentration function of \(W\), defined as

\[ \varphi_{w_0}(\varepsilon) := \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|h\|_\mathcal{H}^2 - \log \mathbb{P}(\|W\|_\mathcal{B} < \varepsilon), \quad (2.1) \]

where \(w_0 = \Phi^{-1}(f_0)\) and \(\|\cdot\|_\mathcal{H}\) is the norm of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space for \(W\). The main result of [24] states that if \(w_0\) belongs to the closure of \(\mathcal{H}\) in \(\mathcal{B}\) and \(\varepsilon_n\) satisfies \(\varphi_{w_0}(\varepsilon_n) \leq n\varepsilon_n^2\), then the posterior contracts around \(f_0\) at rate \(\varepsilon_n\). Precisely, for every sufficiently large \(M\),

\[ \mathbb{E}_{\mu}\Pi \left( f : d_n(f, f_0) \geq M\varepsilon_n | \{ (X_i, Y_i) \}_{i=1}^n \right) \overset{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0, \quad (2.2) \]

where \(d_n\) is some suitable discrepancy measure and the expectation is understood to be over the joint distribution of \((X, Y)\) determined by \(\mu\) and \(f_0\). Furthermore, [24][Theorem 2.2] implies that if \(W_n\) is a sequence of Gaussian fields taking values in \(\mathcal{B}\) so that \(10\mathbb{E}\|W_n - W\|^2_\mathcal{B} \leq n^{-1}\), then the sequence of posteriors with respect to \(\Pi_n := \mathcal{L}(\Phi(W_n))\) contracts around \(f_0\) at the same rate \(\varepsilon_n\) as above. Our analysis exploits these two results and can be summarized as follows. In Section 3 we establish posterior contraction rates for a Matérn-type Gaussian prior, which is approximated by a sequence of graph-based priors constructed in Section 4 at a rate of \(n^{-1}\) so that the same posterior contraction rates are attained. To achieve the \(n^{-1}\) approximation rate, \(N_n\) needs to scale polynomially with \(n\). For the purpose of this paper, we shall take \(\mathcal{B}\) as the space \(L^2(\mu)\) and \(d_n\) as the \(L^2(\mu)\)-norm.
3 Binary Regression on $M$

Now we describe the choice of Matérn-type prior under the assumption that $M$ is known. In this case the unlabeled data are unnecessary and the problem reduces to a standard binary regression problem on $M$. For the purpose of exposition, we shall assume that $\mu$ is the uniform distribution on $M$ and the generalization to the nonuniform case will be addressed in Section 5.

We set the prior on $w_0$ to be the Gaussian measure
\[
\pi = \mathcal{N}(0, C_s), \quad C_s = (I - \Delta)^{-s},
\]
where $\Delta$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $M$, $s > 0$ parametrizes the regularity of prior draws, and the fractional order operator $C_s$ is defined spectrally. A random function $W \sim \pi$ admits a Karhunen-Loève expansion
\[
W = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{s}{2}} \xi_i \psi_i, \quad \xi_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),
\]
where $\{(\lambda_i, \psi_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are eigenpairs from the spectral decomposition of $-\Delta$, with $\lambda_i$’s in increasing order. We see that a larger $s$ leads to faster decay of the coefficients and hence more regular sample paths. From Weyl’s law that $\lambda_i \approx i^{2m}$, setting $s > \frac{m}{2}$ makes $\pi$ a well-defined measure on $L^2(\mu)$.

Such priors are closely related to Gaussian fields with Matérn covariance function. An important characterization by Whittle [26, 27] is that a Gaussian Matérn field on $\mathbb{R}^m$ is the statistically stationary solution to the following stochastic partial differential equation:
\[
(\ell^{-2} I - \Delta)^{\alpha + \frac{m}{2}} u(x) = W(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m,
\]
where $W$ is a Gaussian white noise on $\mathbb{R}^m$. The parameters $\ell$ and $\alpha$ specify length scale and regularity respectively. Therefore $\pi$ as defined in (3.1) can be interpreted as the law of a Gaussian Matérn field on $M$ with $s = \alpha + \frac{m}{2}$ whose sample paths are $s - \frac{m}{2}$-regular almost surely. Using the series representation (3.2), the reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ associated with $\pi$ has the following characterization
\[
\mathbb{H} = \left\{ h = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i \psi_i : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i^2 (1 + \lambda_i)^s < \infty \right\} = \left\{ h = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i \psi_i : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i^2 \frac{2^\alpha}{m} < \infty \right\},
\]
where the second equality is due to Weyl’s law.

Now we are ready to state our first result.

Theorem 3.1. Consider the prior $\Pi = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(W))$ on $f_0$, where $W$ is defined in (3.2) with $s > \beta \wedge \frac{m}{2}$. If $\Phi^{-1}(f_0) \in F_{\beta, R}$, where
\[
F_{\beta, R} := \left\{ w = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} w_i \psi_i : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} w_i^2 \frac{2^\beta}{m} \leq R^2 \right\},
\]
then, for $\varepsilon_n \approx \frac{(s - \frac{m}{2}) \wedge \beta}{2}$ and every sufficiently large $M$,
\[
\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \Pi \left( f : \|f - f_0\|_{L^2(\mu)} \geq M \varepsilon_n \mid \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n} \right) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.
\]
Proof. As noted above, it suffices to find \( \varepsilon_n \) so that \( \varphi_{w_0}(\varepsilon_n) \leq n\varepsilon_n^2 \) and we proceed by bounding both terms in (2.1). By (3.2), we have

\[
\log \mathbb{P}\left\{ \|W\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 < \varepsilon^2 \right\} = \log \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-s} \xi_i^2 < \varepsilon^2 \right\} \\
\geq \log \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-\frac{2s}{m}} \xi_i^2 < C\varepsilon^2 \right\} \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{2s}{2m-1}},
\]

where the last inequality follows from [6][Corollary 4.3]. Now in order to approximate \( w_0 = \Phi^{-1}(f_0) \), consider the truncated series \( h = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i \psi_i \). We have

\[
\|h - w_0\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} w_i^2 \leq \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} w_i^2 i^{-\frac{2s}{m}} \leq N^{-\frac{2s}{m}} R^2.
\]

This suggests the choice of \( N \asymp \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{m}{2s}} \). Since \( h \) is a truncated series, \( h \in \mathbb{H} \) and we have

\[
\|h\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^2 (1 + \lambda_i)^{s} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^2 i^{s} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i^2 i^{\frac{2s}{m}} i^{\frac{s-\beta}{m}} \leq CR^2 N^{\frac{2s}{m}(s-\beta)} \asymp \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{m}-2},
\]

where we have used the assumption that \( s > \beta \) in the second to last step. This together with (3.3) gives

\[
\varphi_{w_0}(\varepsilon) \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{2s-m}} + \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{\beta}} - 2,
\]

and

\[
\frac{\varphi_{w_0}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{2s-m}} + \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{\beta}} \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^{\frac{2s}{(s-\beta)/\beta}},
\]

which suggests the choice \( \varepsilon_n \asymp n^{-\frac{(s-\beta)}{2s}} \). The result then follows from [24][Theorem 2.1 & 3.2(i)].

The Sobolev ball \( \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \) with different bases has been studied in [29, 7]. By Weyl’s law we see that \( \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \) is the set of functions \( w \) that satisfy \( \langle w, -\Delta^\beta w \rangle_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \tilde{R}^2 \), representing a \( \beta \)-regular function in the Sobolev sense. It is well known that the minimax optimal rate for estimating a \( \beta \)-regular function is \( n^{-\beta/(2\beta+m)} \). However, we have not found in the literature a result for binary regression problems over the Sobolev ball \( \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \) with eigenfunctions of Laplace-Beltrami as the basis. To make our presentation complete and self-contained, we will show in Appendix B the following minimax lower bound.
Theorem 3.2. Assume $\Phi' > 0$ and that the $L^2(\mu)$-normalized eigenfunctions of $-\Delta$ are uniformly bounded. Then, for $\beta \geq \frac{m}{2}$,

$$\inf \hat{f} \sup f \in \{f : \Phi^{-1}(f) \in F_{\beta,R}\} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{f} - f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \gtrsim n^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta + m}},$$

where the infimum is taken over all estimators $\hat{f} = \hat{f}(\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n)$.

Theorem 3.2 requires uniform boundedness of the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator, which holds for example for flat manifolds [21], and that the target function is not too rough. In such cases, Theorem 3.1 implies that optimal rates of posterior contraction are attained only if $s - \frac{m}{2} = \beta$. Meanwhile, draws from $\pi$ are $s - \frac{m}{2}$-regular in the above sense. This can be seen by observing that a typical sample path as in (3.2) has coefficients $w_i = (1 + \lambda_i)^{-s} \xi_i$ and satisfies, for any $\alpha < s - \frac{m}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-s} \xi_i^{2s} \frac{2s}{m} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-\frac{2s\alpha}{m}} < \infty.$$ 

Hence, optimal rates are attained only if the almost sure regularity of prior $\pi$ draws matches that of $w_0$. Similar observations have been made in [24, 23] for e.g. Gaussian Matérn fields on Euclidean domains. Since $\pi$ is the natural analog of Gaussian Matérn fields on manifolds [18, 20], our findings are intuitively expected.

We have presented results for $s > \beta$ and the case $s \leq \beta$ can be treated similarly. Indeed, in this case $w_0 \in \mathbb{H}$ and inspection of the proof shows that the contraction rate is $n^{-(2s-m)/4s}$, which is always suboptimal since $s - \frac{m}{2} < s \leq \beta$. That is, the prior is always rougher than the truth.

4 Semi-Supervised Classification on $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$

Now we go back to the semi-supervised setting where the manifold is only known through the features $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$, in which case they are used to approximate Gaussian processes on $\mathcal{M}$. In particular, we will construct a sequence of data-driven priors that approximate $\pi$ as defined in (3.1) and study contraction of the corresponding posteriors. This will be achieved by approximating the covariance operator of $\pi$ using graph Laplacians and defining a suitable interpolation procedure, as will be made precise in what follows.

Recall that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we are given labeled data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and unlabeled data $\{X_i\}_{i=n+1}^N$. Define a similarity matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{N_n \times N_n}$ by

$$H_{ij} := \frac{2(m + 2)}{N_n \nu_m \zeta_n^{m+2}} \mathbbm{1}\{|X_i - X_j| < \zeta_n\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean distance in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\nu_m$ is the volume of the $m$-dimensional unit ball, and $\zeta_n$ is the connectivity of the graph to be determined later. Let $\Delta_N := D - H$, where $D$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $D_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} H_{ij}$. The matrix $\Delta_N$ is the unnormalized graph Laplacian, which approximates the Laplace-Beltrami operator (see e.g. [9, 20] and Section 5). Graph Laplacians
have been widely used in semi-supervised learning to regularize the inference problem [31, 32].

Now consider the Gaussian distribution \( \mathcal{N}(0, (I + \Delta_{N_n})^{-s}) \) on \( \mathbb{R}^{N_n} \), whose samples \( \tilde{w}_n \) admit a Karhunen-Loève expansion

\[
\tilde{w}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \left[ 1 + \lambda_i^{(N_n)} \right]^{-\frac{s}{2}} \xi_i \psi_i^{(N_n)}, \quad \xi_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),
\]

(4.2)

where \( \{\lambda_i^{(N_n)}, \psi_i^{(N_n)}\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \) are eigenpairs of \( \Delta_{N_n} \). Since \( \Delta_{N_n} \) is symmetric and positive semidefinite, its eigenvalues are non-negative. If we enumerate the eigenpairs of \( \Delta_{N_n} \) and \( -\Delta \) so that the eigenvalues are in increasing order, we will see later (Theorems A.2 and A.3) that the spectral approximations are only accurate for the first several of them. In other words, \( \lambda_i^{(N_n)} \) and \( \psi_i^{(N_n)} \) give poor approximations to \( \lambda_i \) and \( \psi_i \) for \( i \) large. This motivates considering the following truncated version of (4.2):

\[
w_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_{N_n}} \left[ 1 + \lambda_i^{(N_n)} \right]^{-\frac{s}{2}} \xi_i \psi_i^{(N_n)}, \quad \xi_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),
\]

(4.3)

where \( k_{N_n} \ll N_n \) is a threshold for accurate approximations to be determined later. We define our graph-based prior as \( \Pi_n^{disc} := \mathcal{L}(\Phi(w_n)) \), to be viewed as a measure over \( L^2(\mu_{N_n}) \), where \( \mu_{N_n} \) is the empirical measure of \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \), so that \( w_n \) is also considered as a function over the point cloud. By inspecting (3.2) and (4.3), it is expected that \( w_n \) approximates \( W \) given good control on spectral convergence. These data-driven Gaussian field priors have been used within various intrinsic approaches to Bayesian semi-supervised classification, see e.g. [8, 11]. Note that the above construction does not require any knowledge of the underlying manifold \( \mathcal{M} \) other than its dimension. In the case of unknown dimension, various dimensionality estimation methods have been studied and [30] proposed a plug-in procedure that leads to optimal contraction rates, which we believe can be applied to our setting and leave for future directions.

We remark that there are two sources of randomness in our definition (4.3), coming from both \( \xi_i \)'s and \( X_i \)'s. It is therefore natural to think of our graph-based prior as defined conditioning on the \( X_i \)'s. In other words, \( \Pi_n^{disc} \) should be interpreted as

\[
\Pi_n^{disc}(\cdot \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(w_n) \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}).
\]

The corresponding graph-based posterior should also take into account the randomness of \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \) and has the form

\[
\Pi_n^{disc}(B \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) = \frac{\int_B \Pi_n^{disc}(f_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) \cdot d\Pi_n^{disc}(f_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})}{\int_{L^2(\mu_{N_n})} \Pi_n^{disc}(f_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})},
\]

(4.4)

where

\[
L_{Y_i \mid X_i}(f_n) = f_n(X_i)^{Y_i} [1 - f_n(X_i)]^{1-Y_i},
\]

(4.5)
is the conditional likelihood of \( Y_i | X_i \). The sequence of posteriors (4.4) allows one to infer labels for the unlabeled data \( \{X_i\}_{i=n+1}^{N_n} \) and we are interested in analyzing their contraction around the truth. But notice that (4.4) is again a measure over \( L^2(\mu_{N_n}) \), whereas \( f_0 \) belongs to \( L^2(\mu) \). One possible solution is to study the contraction around the restriction of \( f_0 \) onto \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \), which however makes interpretation difficult as the sequence of truths will then change with \( n \). Therefore a more natural route is to push forward the graph-based posteriors to the continuum as measures over \( L^2(\mu) \) so that we can study their contraction around \( f_0 \). This can be achieved by defining an interpolation map \( \mathcal{I} : L^2(\mu_{N_n}) \rightarrow L^2(\mu) \) that extends a function over \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \) to a function over \( \mathcal{M} \) and considering the pushforward measure \( \mathcal{I}^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(\cdot | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) \). For the purpose of this paper, we shall consider the one-nearest neighbor interpolation \([9, 11]\), defined for a function \( u_n \) on \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \) as

\[
\mathcal{I} u_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} u_n(X_i) \mathbf{1}_{V_i}(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{M},
\]

(4.6)

where

\[
V_i := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{M} : |x - X_i| = \min_{j=1, \ldots, N_n} |x - X_j| \right\}.
\]

Up to a set of ambiguity of \( \mu \)-measure 0, \( \mathcal{I} u_n(x) = u_n(X_i) \), where \( X_i \) is the closest point in Euclidean distance to \( x \) among \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \), and can be thought of as a piecewise constant function on \( \mathcal{M} \). We remark that other choices of \( \mathcal{I} \) are possible, but the one above can be easily computed and does not require full knowledge of \( \mathcal{M} \) if one is only interested in certain given points outside the point cloud, which is favorable for practical considerations.

Analyzing directly the contraction rates of \( \mathcal{I}^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(\cdot | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) \) seems not straightforward due to the interpolation map \( \mathcal{I} \). However, the following observation suggests an alternate route: we can first push forward \( \Pi_n^{\text{disc}} \) to the continuum and then compute the posterior.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( \Pi_n^{\text{cont}} := \mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}} \) be the pushforward of the graph-based prior. Then

\[
\Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(\cdot | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) = \mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(\cdot | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}).
\]

**Proof.** By definition of pushforward measure, it suffices to show that

\[
\Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(B | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) = \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(\mathcal{I}^{-1}(B) | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}),
\]

for any measurable \( B \). The left hand side equals

\[
\Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(B | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}) = \frac{\int_B \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) d\mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})}{\int_{L^2(\mu)} \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})},
\]

(4.7)

where \( L_{Y_i | X_i}(f) = f(X_i)^{Y_i} [1 - f(X_i)]^{1-Y_i} \). Note that pointwise values of \( f \) are well-defined since \( \mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}} \) is supported on \( \mathcal{I}(L^2(\mu_{N_n})) \). By the change-of-variable formula for pushforward measures,

\[
\int_{\mathcal{I}^{-1}(B)} \Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) d\mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})
= \frac{\int_{\mathcal{I}^{-1}(B)} \Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) d\mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})}{\int_{L^2(\mu_{N_n})} \Pi_n^{\text{cont}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}) d\mathcal{I}_n^* \Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(f | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n})},
\]

(4.7)
which equals (4.4) with $B$ replaced by $\mathcal{I}^{-1}(B)$, by noticing that $L_{Y_i|X_i} \circ \mathcal{I}(f_n) = f_n(X_i)^{Y_i}[1 - f_n(X_i)]^{1-Y_i}$ is exactly the conditional likelihood as in (4.5). The result follows.

In other words, we obtain the same distribution regardless of whether the graph-based posterior is first computed and then pushed forward to the continuum or the other way around. Formally we have the following commutative diagram.

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pi_n^{disc} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} \Pi_n^{disc}(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) \\
\mathcal{I} \Pi_n^{disc} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{I} \Pi_n^{disc}(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{I} \Pi_n^{disc}(\cdot | \mathcal{D})
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore it suffices to study contraction rates of $\Pi_n^{cont}(\cdot | \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n})$, where we can apply general results from [13, 24] by analyzing the concentration properties of the priors $\Pi_n^{cont}$. This turns out to be manageable since $\Pi_n^{cont}$ is supported on the same space $L^2(\mu)$ as $\Pi$ and approximates $\Pi$. To see this, first notice that $\Pi_n^{cont} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}(\Phi(w_n)))$, which follows from the fact that

$$
\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{D} \Pi_n^{disc}(B) = \Pi_n^{disc}(\mathcal{I}^{-1}(B)) = \mathbb{P}(\Phi(w_n) \in \mathcal{I}^{-1}(B)) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}(\Phi(w_n)) \in B).
$$

Then observe that $\mathcal{I}(\Phi(w_n)) = \Phi(\mathcal{I}(w_n))$ since $\mathcal{I}$ only depends on the geometry. Indeed, for $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $X_i$ its nearest neighbor, we have

$$
\mathcal{I}(\Phi(w_n))(x) = \Phi(w_n)(X_i) = \Phi(w_n(X_i)) = \Phi(\mathcal{I}(w_n)(x)) = \Phi(\mathcal{I}(w_n))(x).
$$

Lastly, since $\mathcal{I}$ is linear, we see that

$$
W_n := \mathcal{I}w_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_{N_n}} \left[1 + \lambda_i^{(N_n)}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_i \mathcal{I}_\mathcal{D} \psi_i^{(N_n)}, \quad \xi_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),
$$

and therefore $\Pi_n^{cont} = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(W_n))$, where $W_n$ is now a Gaussian field on $\mathcal{M}$ that approximates $W$. This differs from the graph-based prior $\Pi_n^{disc} = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(w_n))$ in that $W_n$ lives in the same space as $W$, whence we can bound the $L^2(\mu)$-norm between them and apply [24][Theorem 2.2], which formally states that if $10\mathbb{E}\|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \leq n^{-1}$, then the sequence of posterior with respect to $\Pi_n^{cont}$ will contract at the same rate as if the prior is fixed as $\Pi$.

The following result gives a high probability bound (with respect to randomness of $X_i$’s) on the approximation error of $W$ by $W_n$ (with respect to the randomness of $\xi_i$’s) under suitable scaling of the graph connectivity $\zeta_{N_n}$ and truncation parameter $k_{N_n}$.

**Lemma 4.2.** Suppose $s > m$ and $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary. Then, for

$$
\zeta_{N_n} \asymp (\log N_n)^{\frac{m}{2}} N_n^{-\frac{m}{2}}, \quad k_{N_n} \asymp \begin{cases} 
N_n^{\frac{1}{2} + \delta m + \frac{1}{2}} & m < s \leq \frac{5}{2} m + \frac{1}{2}, \\
N_n^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{m}{2}} & s > \frac{5}{2} m + \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}
$$
where \( p_m = 3/4 \) for \( m = 1 \) and \( p_m = 1/m \) otherwise, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}_\xi \| W_n - W \|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \begin{cases} 
(\log N_n)^{\frac{m}{4} - \frac{m}{2m+3s+m+2}} N_n^{\frac{m}{2m+3s+m+2}} & m < s \leq \frac{5}{2} m + \frac{1}{2}, \\
(\log N_n)^{\frac{m}{4} - \frac{m}{2m+3s+m+2}} N_n^{\frac{1}{4}} & s > \frac{5}{2} m + \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}
\]
with probability at least \( 1 - O(N_n^{-\gamma}) \) for some \( \gamma > 1 \).

The proof, which we defer to Appendix A, is based on spectral convergence results for graph Laplacians. We illustrate the main idea here. The high probability event is that the point cloud \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n} \) approximates well the underlying manifold in terms of the \( \infty \)-OT distance \( \rho_{N_n} \) between \( \mu_{N_n} \) and \( \mu \). Precisely, it is shown by [9][Theorem 2] that, with probability at least \( 1 - O(N_n^{-\gamma}) \) for some \( \gamma > 1 \),
\[
\rho_{N_n} \lesssim \frac{\left(\log N_n\right)^{p_m}}{N_n^{1/m}}.
\]
Conditioning on this event, it will be shown that the approximation error is dominated by the following quantity
\[
\mathbb{E}_\xi \| W_n - W \|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim k_{N_n}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\delta}{m}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_{N_n}} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \| \mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N_n)} - \psi_i \|_{L^2(\mu)},
\]
and the eigenfunction approximation error is bounded, up to logarithmic factors, by
\[
\| \mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N_n)} - \psi_i \|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \lesssim i^3 \left( \frac{\rho_{N_n}}{\zeta_{N_n}} + \zeta_{N_n} \sqrt{\lambda_i} \right) \lesssim i^3 \left( \frac{\rho_{N_n}}{\zeta_{N_n}} + \zeta_{N_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \right).
\]
For a fixed \( i \) and increasing \( n \), setting \( \zeta_{N_n} \approx \sqrt{\rho_{N_n}} \) we see that the eigenfunction approximation has, up to logarithmic factors, the rate
\[
\| \mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N_n)} - \psi_i \|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim N_n^{-\frac{1}{4m}},
\]
and hence it is expected that (4.9) has the same rate. However, this is only true when \( s \) is large. The reason lies in the fact that we need to deal with the bound (4.10) for \( i = k_{N_n} \) and hence cannot treat \( i \) as fixed. Let \( \delta > 0 \), (4.9) and (4.10) together with Weyl’s law imply
\[
\mathbb{E}_\xi \| W_n - W \|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim k_{N_n}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\delta}{m}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_{N_n}} \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{N_n}}{\zeta_{N_n}} + \zeta_{N_n}} \left( i^{-\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\delta}{2m}} + i^{-\frac{1}{4m}} \right)
\]
\[
\lesssim k_{N_n}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\delta}{m}} + k_{N_n}^{-\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\delta}{2m} + \frac{1}{2m}} \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{N_n}}{\zeta_{N_n}} + \zeta_{N_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_{N_n}} i^{-1-\delta}.
\]
In other words, the factor \( i^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2m}} \) can be countered if \( s \) is large and if \( s > \frac{5}{2} m + \frac{1}{2} \) then the above reduces to \( k_{N_n}^{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\delta}{m}} + \sqrt{\frac{\rho_{N_n}}{\zeta_{N_n}} + \zeta_{N_n}} \), and we get the rate \( N_n^{-\frac{1}{4m}} \) by setting \( \zeta_{N_n} \approx \sqrt{\rho_{N_n}} \) and \( k_{N_n} \) correspondingly.

Now solving for \( N_n \) so that the approximation error in Lemma 4.2 scales as \( n^{-1/2} \), we get our main result.
Theorem 4.3. Consider the sequence of priors \( \Pi_n^{\text{disc}} = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(w_n)) \), where \( w_n \) is defined in (4.3) with \( s > m \wedge \beta \). Suppose the scaling of \( \zeta_{N_n} \) and \( k_{N_n} \) are the same as in Lemma 4.2 and

\[
N_n \asymp \begin{cases} 
(\log n)^{\frac{m^2 p_m (8m + \delta m + 2)}{4s - 2m}} n^{\frac{m (8m + \delta m + 2)}{2s - m}} & m < \frac{n}{2} m + \frac{1}{2}, \\
(\log n)^{m^2 p_m n^{2m}} & s > \frac{n}{2} m + \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \delta > 0 \) is arbitrary. If \( \Phi^{-1}(f_0) \in \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \), then for \( \varepsilon_n \propto n^{-(s - m^2)/2s} \) and every sufficiently large \( M \),

\[
\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \mathcal{I}_{e} \left[ \Pi_n^{\text{disc}} \left( f : \|f - f_0\|_{L^2(\mu)} \geq M \varepsilon_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \right) \right] \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0,
\]

where the expression \( \mathcal{I}_{e} [\Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(B \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n})] \) is understood to be the measure of \( B \) under \( \mathcal{I}_{e}[\Pi_n^{\text{disc}}(\cdot \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n})] \).

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, it suffices to show

\[
\mathbb{E}_{f_0} \Pi_n^{\text{cont}} \left( f : \|f - f_0\|_{L^2(\mu)} \geq M \varepsilon_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \right) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.
\]

Denoting

\[
\Pi_n^{\text{cont}} \left( f : \|f - f_0\|_{L^2(\mu)} \geq M \varepsilon_n \mid \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \right) = F_n(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{N_n}, \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^{n}),
\]

we have

\[
\mathbb{E}_{f_0} F_n = \mathbb{E}_{f_0} [F_n \mid A_n] \mathbb{P}_{f_0}(A_n) + \mathbb{E}_{f_0} [F_n \mid A_n^c] \mathbb{P}_{f_0}(A_n^c) \leq \mathbb{E}_{f_0} [F_n \mid A_n] + \mathbb{P}_{f_0}(A_n^c),
\]

where we have used the fact that \( F_n \leq 1 \) and \( A_n \) is the high probability event in Lemma 4.2. With the above scaling of \( N_n \) we see that conditioning on \( A_n \), \( \mathbb{E}_{\zeta} \|W_n - \bar{W}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim n^{-1/2} \) and hence by [24][Theorem 2.2] we get posterior contraction with the same rate \( \varepsilon_n \) as in Theorem 3.1, i.e.,

\[
\mathbb{E}_{f_0} [F_n \mid A_n] \to 0. \text{ The result follows since } \mathbb{P}_{f_0}(A_n^c) = O(N_n^{-\gamma}) \to 0.
\]

Theorem 4.3 shows that when sufficiently many unlabeled data are available, the interpolated graph-based posteriors contract at the same rate obtained in Theorem 3.1, where the prior is constructed with perfect knowledge of \( \mathcal{M} \). The idea is that if the geometry of \( \mathcal{M} \) is recovered by the unlabeled data at a sufficiently fast rate, we are essentially back in the case where \( \mathcal{M} \) is known. The requirement that \( N_n \) grows polynomially with \( n \) suffices to guarantee such a fast recovery rate. As in Section 3, optimal posterior contraction rates can be attained, but now under the additional condition that \( s > m \) to ensure the convergence of \( W_n \) towards \( \bar{W} \); a similar restriction was required in [8]. This implies that optimal rates can only be attained for functions with regularity \( \beta > m/2 \).

The number of unlabeled data required grows polynomially with respect to the number of labeled data, where the power depends on the intrinsic dimension \( m \). Since \( \delta \) can be chosen arbitrarily small, the sample size for \( s \) close to \( m \) is about \( n^{3m+2} \) and decreases to \( n^{2m} \) as \( s \) approaches \( m/2 \). This implies that when \( \mathcal{M} \) is unknown, we need many more unlabeled data than labeled ones to achieve
the same rate of posterior contraction as when \( M \) is known. We remark that our analysis only gives an upper bound on the sample complexities required and the spectral approximation bounds from [3], which gives better rates for \( m \geq 5 \), can be applied to Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 for improvements. However, we believe that a polynomial dependence with the intrinsic dimension \( m \) in the leading power is necessary to ensure the spectral convergence that our posterior contraction results rely on.

5 Generalization to Nonuniform Marginal Density

We have presented our results under the setting where \( \mu \) is the uniform distribution on \( M \) and now we show formally how to generalize to nonuniform \( \mu \). This time we shall start with the graph-based prior and identify its continuum limit.

Suppose \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^N \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mu \), with a differentiable density \( q \) that is bounded above and below by positive constants. To simplify our presentation, consider a similarity matrix \( H \) defined as in (4.1) with

\[
H_{ij} = N^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{|X_i - X_j| < \zeta_N\},
\]

where we have only kept the necessary ingredients. Let \( \Delta_N = D - H \) be the unnormalized graph Laplacian as above and we have, for \( u \in \mathbb{R}^N \),

\[
\Delta_N u(X_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} H_{ij}[u(X_i) - u(X_j)].
\]

Notice that we can in fact extend \( \Delta_N \) to act on functions on \( M \) by defining, for \( f : M \to \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\Delta_N f(x) = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}\{|x - X_j| < \zeta_N\}[f(x) - f(X_j)].
\]

Now taking expectation of the above quantity with respect to the \( X_i \)'s, we have

\[
\mathbb{E}\Delta_N f(x) = \int_{|x-y|<\zeta_N} [f(x) - f(y)]q(y)dV(y). \tag{5.1}
\]

Since \( M \) is locally homeomorphic to \( \mathbb{R}^m \), to simplify our presentation even further we consider the above integral as if it was defined over \( \mathbb{R}^m \). By Taylor expanding both \( f \) and \( q \) around \( x \), we have

\[
(5.1) = \int_{|x-y|<\zeta_N} \left[ -\nabla f(x)^T(y-x) - \frac{1}{2} (y-x)^T \nabla^2 f(x)(y-x) \right] q(y) + \nabla q(x)^T(y-x)dy + O(\zeta_N^3)
\]

\[
= -q(x) \int_{|x-y|<\zeta_N} \nabla f(x)^T(y-x)dy - q(x) \int_{|x-y|<\zeta_N} \frac{1}{2} (y-x)^T \nabla^2 f(x)(y-x)dy
\]

\[
- \int_{|x-y|<\zeta_N} (y-x)^T \nabla q(x)^T(y-x)dy + O(\zeta_N^3) =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + O(\zeta_N^3).
\]
By symmetry, we see that $I_1 = 0$ and the terms that remain in $I_2, I_3$ correspond to the diagonal of $\nabla^2 f(x)$ and $\nabla f(x) \nabla q(x)^T$, respectively. We have

$$
(5.1) = \left[ -\frac{1}{2} q(x) \Delta f(x) - \nabla f(x) \cdot \nabla q(x) \right] \int_{|x-y| < \zeta_N} |x-y|^2 dy + O(\zeta_N^2).
$$

Hence $\Delta_N$ approximates the weighted Laplace-Beltrami operator $-\Delta_q := -\frac{1}{q} \text{div}(q^2 \nabla)$ up to a multiplicative constant (depending on $N$), which explains the normalization in (4.1). This implies that the corresponding $\pi$ for the case of nonuniform density should have covariance operator $(I - \Delta_q)^{-s}$. Notice that $\Delta_q$ is self-adjoint with respect to the $L^2(\mu)$ inner product and hence admits a spectral decomposition so that we can define $W$ and $W_n$ analogously. Since our analysis is based on series representations and the $L^2(\mu)$-orthogonality of the eigenfunctions, the results in Sections 3 and 4 continue to hold, with the corresponding spectral convergence results for weighted Laplace-Beltrami in [9].

6 Discussion and Future Work

In this paper we have studied Bayesian nonparametric binary regression in a semi-supervised setting and analyzed posterior contraction with respect to a sequence of graph-based data-driven priors. Our analysis shows that if the number of unlabeled data $N_n$ grows at a certain polynomial rate with $n$, the interpolated graph-based posteriors achieve the same rate of contraction as if the underlying manifold was known, and the rate is minimax optimal under certain conditions. Therefore our results suggest that unlabeled data can be helpful for graph-based Bayesian approaches to semi-supervised learning.

We have focused on binary classification and an interesting open problem is the extension to regression and other related graph-based Bayesian inverse problems [14]. For regression the natural discrepancy measure $d_n$ is the empirical norm $\|f\|_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)$ for the fixed design case. It would then be natural to view the priors as measures over the space $L^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ of bounded functions on $\mathcal{M}$, which motivates the development of spectral convergence results in the supremum norm which are, to the best of our knowledge, not available in the literature.

As shown in Theorems 3.1 and 4.3, optimal convergence rates are attained only if the regularity of the prior matches that of the target function, which is often unknown ahead in practice. Therefore another direction for further research is to develop adaptive methods that give optimal convergence rates for all levels of regularity as in [5, 15] by adding a hyper parameter into our prior. In [5] the authors constructed priors using heat kernels on manifolds and obtained optimal rates of posterior contraction up to logarithmic factors. It would be interesting to investigate whether under their same setting exact minimax optimal rates can be attained by modifying our Matérn-type prior.
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A Proof of Lemma 4.2

Proof. Let \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of independent samples from \( \mu \), the uniform distribution on \( \mathcal{M} \).

Let \( \mu_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{X_i} \) be the empirical distribution of \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \) and \( \rho_n \) be the infinite-OT distance between \( \mu_n \) and \( \mu \), given by

\[
\rho_n = \min_{T : T_\sharp \mu = \mu_n} \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\mathcal{M}}(x, T(x)),
\]

where \( d_{\mathcal{M}} \) is the geodesic distance on \( \mathcal{M} \). Here \( T_\sharp \mu = \mu_n \) means \( \mu_n(U) = \mu(U^{-1}(U)) \) for any measurable \( U \), and \( T \) is called a transportation map. The scaling of \( \rho_n \) is characterized by the following result from [9][Theorem 2].

Proposition A.1. For \( \gamma > 1 \), there exists a transportation map \( T_n \) so that with probability \( 1 - O(n^{-\gamma}) \),

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\mathcal{M}}(x, T_n(x)) \lesssim \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{p_m} n^{1/m},
\]

(A.1)

where \( p_m = 3/4 \) if \( m = 2 \) and \( p_m = 1/m \) otherwise.

We remark that \( \rho_n \) represents the resolution of the point cloud and its scaling (A.1) is the building block for the choice of connectivity \( \zeta_n \) that we will see later. However a first message is that we should take \( \zeta_n \gg \rho_n \) to capture the local geometry and we shall assume this scaling from now on. Assuming we are in the event that (A.1) holds, the following results from [20][Theorem 4.4 & 4.5] bound the spectral approximations.

Theorem A.2 (Eigenvalue Approximation). Suppose \( k : = k_n \) is such that \( \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_{k_n}} \ll 1 \) for \( n \) large. Then

\[
\frac{|\lambda_k^{(n)} - \lambda_k|}{\lambda_k} \lesssim \frac{\rho_n}{\zeta_n} + \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_k}.
\]

Theorem A.3 (Eigenfunction Approximation). Let \( \lambda \) be an eigenvalue of \(-\Delta\) with multiplicity \( \ell \), i.e.,

\[
\lambda_{k_n-1} < \lambda_{k_n} = \lambda = \cdots = \lambda_{k_n+\ell-1} < \lambda_{k_n+\ell}.
\]

Suppose that \( \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_{k_n}} \ll 1 \) for \( n \) large. Let \( \psi_{k_n}^{(n)}, \ldots, \psi_{k_n+\ell-1}^{(n)} \) be orthonormal eigenvectors of \( \Delta_n \) associated with eigenvalues \( \lambda_{k_n}^{(n)}, \ldots, \lambda_{k_n+\ell-1}^{(n)} \). Then there exist orthonormal eigenfunctions \( \psi_{k_n}, \ldots, \psi_{k_n+\ell-1} \) of \(-\Delta\) so that, for \( i = k_n, \ldots, k_n+\ell-1 \),

\[
\| \tilde{I} \psi_i^{(n)} - \psi_i \|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \lesssim i^3 \left( \frac{\rho_n}{\zeta_n} + \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_i} \right).
\]

(A.2)
Notice that the spectral bounds are given only for the first $k_n$ eigenpairs, for the reason that we need $\zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_{k_n}} \ll 1$ for meaningful bounds. The interpolation map $\tilde{I} : L^2(\mu_n) \to L^2(\mu)$ is defined as

$$\tilde{I} u_n = u_n \circ T_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_n(X_i) \mathbf{1}_{U_i},$$

where $T_n$ is the transportation map in Proposition A.1 and $U_i = T_n^{-1}(\{X_i\})$. Notice the resemblance with (4.6). Now we bound the difference between $\tilde{I} u_n$ and $I u_n$ to get a similar result as (A.2) for $I$. We need the following result from [9][Lemma 17] that compares the sets $V_i$ and $U_i$.

**Proposition A.4.** In the event that (A.1) holds, we have

$$\max_{i=1, \ldots, n} \frac{\mu(V_i)}{\mu(U_i)} \lesssim \log(n)^{m\rho_n}. \quad (A.3)$$

For the rest of the proof, we shall assume that we are in the realization where (A.1) and (A.3) hold. Following the proof of [9][Theorem 6] we have, for $i = 1, \ldots, k_n$ with $\zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_i} \ll 1$,

$$\|\mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N)} - \psi_i\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \lesssim \lambda_i^{\frac{m+2}{2}} \rho_n + (\log n)^{\frac{m\rho_n}{2}} \|\tilde{I} \psi_i^{(N)} - \psi_i\|_{L^2}$$

$$\lesssim \lambda_i^{\frac{m+2}{2}} \rho_n + (\log n)^{\frac{m\rho_n}{2}} \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_i}$$

$$\lesssim (\log n)^{\frac{m\rho_n}{2}} \zeta_n \sqrt{\lambda_i}. \quad (A.4)$$

Now we are ready to bound the difference between $W_n$ and $W$. To simplify the notation, denote $N := N_n$. Recall that

$$W_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} \left[1 + \lambda_i^{(N)}\right]^{-\frac{\hat{2}}{2}} \xi_i \mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N)},$$

$$W = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{\hat{2}}{2}} \xi_i \psi_i.$$

Consider two intermediate quantities:

$$\tilde{W}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{\hat{2}}{2}} \xi_i \mathcal{I} \psi_i^{(N)},$$

$$\tilde{W} = \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{\hat{2}}{2}} \xi_i \psi_i.$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - \tilde{W}_n\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\tilde{W}_n - \tilde{W}\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \mathbb{E}_\xi \|\tilde{W} - W\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

and it suffices to bound each term. By Lipschitz continuity of $x^{-s/2}$ on $[1, \infty)$,

$$\left|\left[1 + \lambda_i^{(N)}\right]^{-\frac{s}{2}} - \left[1 + \lambda_i\right]^{-\frac{s}{2}}\right| \leq \left|(1 + \lambda_i^{(N)} \land (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{s}{2}-1}\left|\lambda_i^{(N)} - \lambda_i\right|\right| \lesssim \left|(1 + \lambda_i^{(N)} \land (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{s}{2}-1}\lambda_i\left(\frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} + \zeta_N \sqrt{\lambda_i}\right)\right| \lesssim \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} + \zeta_N \sqrt{\lambda_i}.$$ 

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} \left\|1 + \lambda_i^{(N)}\right\|^{-\frac{s}{2}} - \left\|1 + \lambda_i\right\|^{-\frac{s}{2}}\right\|^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} + \zeta_N \sqrt{\lambda_N}\right)^2. \quad (A.5)$$

Secondly,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|\tilde{W} - W\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 = \sum_{i=k_N+1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-s} \lesssim \sum_{i=k_N+1}^{\infty} i^{-\frac{s}{2}} \lesssim \int_{k_N}^{\infty} x^{-\frac{s}{m}} \lesssim k_N x^{-\frac{s}{m}}. \quad (A.6)$$

Lastly, for arbitrary $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - \tilde{W}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{s}{2}} \|\mathcal{L}\psi_i^{(N)} - \psi_i\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim (\log N)^{\frac{m+\delta}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_N} (1 + \lambda_i)^{-\frac{s}{2}} \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} \sqrt{\lambda_i} \lesssim \log(N) \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} k_N^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{m}} \sqrt{\lambda_i} \lesssim \log(N) \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} k_N^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{m}} \sqrt{\lambda_i} \lesssim \log(N) \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} k_N^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{m}} \sqrt{\lambda_i}. \quad (A.7)$$

Combining (A.5), (A.6), (A.7), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim k_N^{\frac{1}{m}} + \log(N) \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} k_N^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{m}} \sqrt{\lambda_N}. \quad (A.8)$$

Now balancing the two terms by setting

$$\zeta_N \asymp \sqrt{\rho_N}, \quad k_N \asymp N^{(s+\delta)/m + \frac{1}{2}},$$

we get, for arbitrary $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim (\log N)^{\frac{m+\delta}{2}} N^{-\frac{m}{2} + \frac{s}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{m}},$$

which shows the first assertion of Lemma 4.2. Notice that if $s > \frac{\delta}{2} m + \frac{1}{2}$, then (A.8) reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim k_N^{\frac{1}{m}} + \log(N) \frac{\rho_N}{\zeta_N} \sqrt{\lambda_N}.$$
and setting
\( \zeta_N \asymp \sqrt{\rho N}, \quad k_N \asymp N^{1/2m}, \)
we get
\[
\mathbb{E}_\xi \| W_n - W \|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim (\log N)^{\frac{m}{2m}} N^{-\frac{1}{2m}},
\]
which shows the second assertion of Lemma 4.2 and completes the proof.

\[ \square \]

B Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. This result can be proved in the same fashion as [16][Theorem 3.2] by considering the \( L^2(\mu) \)-norm. By the general reduction scheme and Fano’s lemma (see e.g. [22][Sections 2.2 & 2.7]), it suffices to construct \( \{ w_i \}_{i=0}^M \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \) so that the induced distributions \( \{ P_i \}_{i=0}^M \), each with density
\[ p_i(x, y) = \Phi(w_i(x)) y [1 - \Phi(w_i(x))]^{1-y} q(x), \quad (B.1) \]
satisfy the following two conditions
\[
\frac{1}{M+1} \sum_{i=1}^M D_{KL}(P_i \parallel P_0) \leq \alpha \log M, \quad \text{(B.2)}
\]
\[
\min_{i \neq j} \| \Phi(w_i) - \Phi(w_j) \|_{L^2(\mu)} \gtrsim n^{-\frac{\theta}{2m+1}}, \quad \text{(B.3)}
\]
for some \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) and \( M \geq 2 \). Let \( N = \lceil n^{\frac{2m}{2m+1}} \rceil \) and for \( \theta \in \{0,1\}^N \) define
\[ w_\theta = \delta N^{-\frac{2\theta + n}{2m}} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i \psi_i. \]
Notice that \( w_\theta \in \mathcal{F}_{\beta,R} \) for \( \delta \) sufficiently small. By the Varshamov-Gilbert bound (see e.g. [22][Lemma 2.9]), there exists \( \{ \theta(i) \}_{i=0}^M \subseteq \{0,1\}^N \) so that \( \theta(0) = (0, \ldots, 0) \) and
\[ \min_{i \neq j} d_h(\theta(i), \theta(j)) \gtrsim N, \]
with \( M \geq 2^{N/8} \), where \( d_h(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N 1 \{ \theta_i \neq \tilde{\theta_i} \} \) is the Hamming distance. Let \( w_i = w_{\theta(i)} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, M \). By (B.1), we have
\[
D_{KL}(P_i \parallel P_j) = \int \left[ \Phi(w_i(x)) \log \frac{\Phi(w_i(x))}{\Phi(w_j(x))} + (1 - \Phi(w_i(x))) \log \frac{1 - \Phi(w_i(x))}{1 - \Phi(w_j(x))} \right] q(x) dV(x).
\]
Consider the function
\[ g_s(t) = \Phi(s) \log \frac{\Phi(s)}{\Phi(t)} + (1 - \Phi(s)) \log \frac{1 - \Phi(s)}{1 - \Phi(t)}. \]
We have
\[ g'_s(t) = \Phi'(t) \left( \frac{\Phi(t)}{\Phi(t)(1 - \Phi(t))} (\Phi(t) - \Phi(s)) \right), \]
and hence
\[ |g_s(t)| = |g_s(t) - g_s(s)| \leq \left\| \frac{\Phi'}{\Phi(1 - \Phi)} \right\|_{\infty} \| \Phi' \|_{\infty} |t - s| \lesssim |t - s|, \]
where the last step follows from uniform boundedness of $\Phi'/\Phi(1 - \Phi)$, which also implies boundedness of $\Phi'$. Then we get
\[ D_{KL}(P_i \parallel P_j) \lesssim \int |w_i(x) - w_j(x)|q(x)dV(x) \leq \sqrt{\int |w_i(x) - w_j(x)|^2 q(x)dV(x)} = ||w_i - w_j||_{L^2(\mu)}, \]
and
\[ D_{KL}(P_i \parallel P_0) \lesssim ||w_i||_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \delta N^{-\frac{\beta}{m}}, \]
where the last quantity is bounded by a constant so that \((B.2)\) holds since $\log M \gtrsim N$. For \((B.2)\), notice that
\[
||w_i - w_j||_{L^2(\mu)} = \delta N^{-\frac{2\beta + m}{2m}} \sqrt{d_{k}(\theta(i), \theta(j))} \gtrsim n^{-\frac{\beta}{2m + \beta}}.
\]
Since we have assumed that $\{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are uniformly bounded,
\[
\max_{i=1, \ldots, M} ||w_i||_{\infty} \lesssim N^{-\frac{2\beta + m}{2m}} N = N^{\frac{m - 2\beta}{2m}},
\]
which is bounded by a constant $K$ since $\beta \geq \frac{m}{2}$. Then since $\Phi' > 0$, we have
\[
||\Phi(w_i) - \Phi(w_j)||_{L^2(\mu)} \gtrsim \sup_{s \in [-K, K]} |\Phi(s)'||w_i - w_j||_{L^2(\mu)} \gtrsim n^{-\frac{\beta}{2m + \beta}}.
\]
\[ \Box \]