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Abstract. In this article, we introduce the novel concept of samplets by transferring the con-
struction of Tausch-White wavelets [33] to the realm of data. This way we obtain a multilevel
representation of discrete data which directly enables data compression, detection of singularities
and adaptivity. Applying samplets to represent kernel matrices, as they arise in kernel based
learning or Gaussian process regression, we end up with quasi-sparse matrices. By thresholding
small entries, these matrices are compressible to $O(N \log N)$ relevant entries, where $N$ is the
number of data points. This feature allows for the use of fill-in reducing reorderings to obtain a
sparse factorization of the compressed matrices. Besides the comprehensive introduction to sam-
plets and their properties, we present extensive numerical studies to benchmark the approach.
Our results demonstrate that samplets mark a considerable step in the direction of making large
data sets accessible for analysis.

1. Introduction

Wavelet techniques have a long standing history in the field of data science. Applications
comprise signal processing, image analysis and machine learning, see for instance [5,7,12,25,26]
and the references therein. Assuming a signal generated by some function, the pivotal idea of
wavelet techniques is the splitting of this function into its respective contributions with respect
to a hierarchy of scales. Such a multiscale ansatz starts from an approximation on a relatively
coarse scale and successively resolves details at the finer scales. Hence, compression and adaptive
representation are inherently built into this ansatz. The transformation of a given signal into its
wavelet representation and the inverse transformation can be performed with linear cost in terms
of the degrees of freedom.

Classically, wavelets are constructed by refinement relations and therefore require a sequence
of nested approximation spaces which are copies of each other, except for a different scaling.
This restricts the concept of wavelets to structured data. Some adaption of the general principle is
possible in order to treat intervals, bounded domains and surfaces, compare [6,9,11,20] for example.
The seminal work [33] by Tausch and White overcomes this obstruction by constructing wavelets
as suitable linear combinations of functions at a given fine scale. In particular, the stability of the
resulting basis, which is essential for numerical algorithms, is guaranteed by orthonormality.

In this article, we take the concept of wavelets to the next level and consider discrete data. To
this end, we modify the construction of Tausch and White accordingly and construct a multiscale
basis which consists of localized and discrete signed measures. Inspired by the term wavelet, we call
such signed measures samplets. Samplets can be constructed such that their associated measure
integrals vanish for polynomial integrands. If this is the case for all polynomials of total degree
less or equal than $q$, we say that the samplets have vanishing moments of order $q + 1$. We remark
that lowest order samplets, i.e. $q = 0$, have been considered earlier for data compression in [28].
When representing discrete data by samplets, then, due to the vanishing moments, there is a fast
decay of the corresponding samplet coefficients with respect to the support size if the data are
smooth. This straightforwardly enables data compression. In contrast, non-smooth regions in the
data are indicated by large samplet coefficients. This, in turn, enables singularity detection and
extraction. However, we emphasize that our construction is not limited to the use of polynomials.
Indeed, it would easily be possible to adapt the construction of samplets to other primitives with
other desired properties.
As a further application of samplets, we consider the compression of kernel matrices as they arise in kernel based machine learning and scattered data approximation, compare [13,22,29,31,34,35]. Kernel matrices are typically densely populated since the underlying kernels are nonlocal. Nonetheless, these kernels are usually asymptotically smooth, meaning that they behave like smooth functions apart from the diagonal. As a consequence, a discretization with respect to a samplet basis with vanishing moments results in quasi-sparse kernel matrices, which means that they can be compressed such that only a sparse matrix remains, compare [3,8,10,27,32]. Especially, it has been demonstrated in [19] that nested dissection, see [14,24], is applicable in order to obtain a fill-in reducing reordering of the matrix. This reordering in turn allows for the rapid factorization of the system matrix by the Cholesky factorization.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, the novel concept of samplets is introduced. The subsequent Section 3 is devoted to the actual construction of samplets and to their properties. The change of basis by means of the discrete samplet transform is the topic of Section 4. In Section 5, we demonstrate the capabilities of samplets for data compression and smoothing for data in one, two and three dimensions. Section 6 deals with the samplet compression of kernel matrices. Especially, we also develop an interpolation based $H^2$-matrix approach in order to efficiently assemble the compressed kernel matrix. Corresponding numerical results are then presented in Section 7. Finally, in Section 8, we state concluding remarks.

2. Samplets

Let $X := \{x_1, \ldots, x_N\} \subset \Omega$ denote a set of points within some region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Associated to each point $x_i$, we introduce the Dirac measure

$$\delta_{x_i}(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x = x_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

With a slight abuse of notation, we also introduce the point evaluation functional

$$(f, \delta_{x_i})_\Omega = \int \Omega f(x) \delta_{x_i}(x) \, dx := \int \Omega f(x) \delta_{x_i}(dx) = f(x_i),$$

where $f \in C(\Omega)$ is a continuous function.

Next, we define the space $V := \text{span}\{\delta_{x_1}, \ldots, \delta_{x_N}\}$ as the $N$-dimensional vector space of all discrete and finite signed measures supported at the points in $X$. An inner product on $V$ is defined by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_V := \sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i v_i, \quad \text{where } u = \sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad v = \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i \delta_{x_i}.$$

Indeed, the space $V$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^N$ endowed with the canonical inner product. Similar to the idea of a multiresolution analysis in the construction of wavelets, we introduce the spaces $V_j := \text{span} \Phi_j$, where

$$\Phi_j := \{\psi_{j,k} : k \in \Delta_j\}.$$  

Here, $\Delta_j$ denotes a suitable index set with cardinality $|\Delta_j| = \dim V_j$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ is referred to as level. Moreover, each basis function $\psi_{j,k}$ is a linear combination of Dirac measures such that

$$\langle \psi_{j,k}, \psi_{j,k'} \rangle_V = 0 \quad \text{for } k \neq k'$$

and

$$\text{diam}(\text{supp} \psi_{j,k}) := \text{diam}(\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_p}\}) \sim 2^{-j/d}.$$  

For the sake of notational convenience, we shall identify bases by row vectors, such that, for $v_j = [v_{j,k}]_{k \in \Delta_j}$, the corresponding measure can simply be written as a dot product according to

$$v_j = \Phi_j v_j = \sum_{k \in \Delta_j} v_{j,k} \psi_{j,k}.$$
Rather than using the multiresolution analysis corresponding to the hierarchy 

\[ V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \cdots \subset V, \]

the idea of samplets is to keep track of the increment of information between two consecutive levels \( j \) and \( j + 1 \). Since we have \( V_j \subset V_{j+1} \), we may decompose

\[ V_{j+1} = V_j \oplus S_j \]

by using the detail space \( S_j \). Of practical interest is the particular choice of the basis of the detail space \( S_j \) in \( V_{j+1} \). This basis is assumed to be orthonormal as well and will be denoted by

\[ \Sigma_j = \{ \sigma_{j,k} : k \in \nabla_j := \Delta_{j+1} \setminus \Delta_j \}. \]

Recursively applying the decomposition (1), we see that the set

\[ \Sigma_J = \Phi_0 \bigcup_{j=0}^{J-1} \Sigma_j \]

forms a basis of \( V_J := V \), which we call a samplet basis.

In order to employ samplets for the compression of data and kernel matrices, we require that the measures \( \sigma_{j,k} \) are localized with respect to the corresponding level \( j \), i.e.

\[ \text{diam}(\text{supp} \sigma_{j,k}) \sim 2^{-j/d}, \]

and that they are stable, i.e.

\[ \langle \sigma_{j,k}, \sigma_{j,k'} \rangle\Sigma = 0 \quad \text{for } k \neq k'. \]

Moreover, an essential ingredient is the vanishing moment condition, meaning that

\[ (p, \sigma_{j,k})\Omega = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{P}_q(\Omega), \]

where \( \mathcal{P}_q(\Omega) \) denotes the space of all polynomials with total degree at most \( q \). We say then that the samplets have \( q+1 \) vanishing moments.

Remark 2.1. The concept of samplets has a very natural interpretation in the context of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, compare [2]. If \( (\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) \) is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with reproducing kernel \( K \), then there holds \( (f, \delta_{x_i})_{\mathcal{H}} = (K(x_i, \cdot), f)_{\mathcal{H}} \). Hence, the samplet \( \sigma_{j,k} = \sum_{\ell=1}^p \beta_{\ell} \delta_{x_{i\ell}} \) can directly be identified with the function

\[ \hat{\sigma}_{j,k} := \sum_{\ell=1}^p \beta_{\ell} K(x_{i\ell}, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}. \]

In particular, it holds

\[ \langle \hat{\sigma}_{j,k}, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 0 \]

for any \( h \in \mathcal{H} \) which satisfies \( h|_{\text{supp } \sigma_{j,k}} \in \mathcal{P}_q(\text{supp } \sigma_{j,k}). \)

3. Construction of samplets

3.1. Cluster tree. In order to construct samplets with the desired properties, especially vanishing moments, cf. [3], we shall transfer the wavelet construction of Tausch and White from [33] into our setting. The first step is to construct subspaces of signed measures with localized supports. To this end, we perform a hierarchical clustering on the set \( X \).

Definition 3.1. Let \( T = (P, E) \) be a tree with vertices \( P \) and edges \( E \). We define its set of leaves as

\[ \mathcal{L}(T) := \{ \nu \in P : \nu \text{ has no sons} \}. \]

The tree \( T \) is a cluster tree for the set \( X = \{ x_1, \ldots, x_N \} \), if the set \( X \) is the root of \( T \) and all \( \nu \in P \setminus \mathcal{L}(T) \) are disjoint unions of their sons.
The level \( j_\nu \) of \( \nu \in T \) is its distance from the root, i.e., the number of son relations that are required for traveling from \( X \) to \( \nu \). The depth \( J \) of \( T \) is the maximum level of all clusters. We define the set of clusters on level \( j \) as

\[
T_j := \{ \nu \in T : \nu \text{ has level } j \}.
\]

Finally, the bounding box \( B_\nu \) of \( \nu \) is defined as the smallest axis-parallel cuboid that contains all its points.

There exist several possibilities for the choice of a cluster tree for the set \( X \). However, within this article, we will exclusively consider binary trees and remark that it is of course possible to consider other options, such as \( 2^d \)-trees, with the obvious modifications. Definition 3.1 provides a hierarchical cluster structure on the set \( X \). Even so, it does not provide guarantees for the sizes and cardinalities of the clusters. Therefore, we introduce the concept of a balanced binary tree.

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( T \) be a cluster tree on \( X \) with depth \( J \). \( T \) is called a balanced binary tree, if all clusters \( \nu \) satisfy the following conditions:

1. The cluster \( \nu \) has exactly two sons if \( j_\nu < J \). It has no sons if \( j_\nu = J \).
2. It holds \( |\nu| \sim 2^{J-j_\nu} \).

A balanced binary tree can be constructed by cardinality balanced clustering. This means that the root cluster is split into two son clusters of identical (or similar) cardinality. This process is repeated recursively for the resulting son clusters until their cardinality falls below a certain threshold. For the subdivision, the cluster’s bounding box is split along its longest edge such that the resulting two boxes both contain an equal number of points. Thus, as the cluster cardinality halves with each level, we obtain \( O(\log N) \) levels in total. The total cost for constructing the cluster tree is therefore \( O(N \log N) \). Finally, we remark that a balanced tree is only required to guarantee the cost bounds for the presented algorithms. The error and compression estimates we shall present later on are robust in the sense that they are formulated directly in terms of the actual cluster sizes rather than the introduced cluster level.

### 3.2. Multiscale hierarchy

Having a cluster tree at hand, we shall now construct a samplet basis on a cluster \( \nu \) of level \( j \). To this end, we create scaling functions \( \Phi^\nu_j = \{ \varphi^\nu_{j,k} \} \) and samplets \( \Sigma^\nu_j = \{ \sigma^\nu_{j,k} \} \) as linear combinations of the scaling functions \( \Phi^\nu_{j+1} \) of \( \nu \)’s son clusters. This results in the refinement relation

\[
[\Phi^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j] := \Phi^\nu_{j+1} Q^\nu_j = \Phi^\nu_{j+1} [Q^\nu_{j,\Phi}, Q^\nu_{j,\Sigma}].
\]

In order to provide both, vanishing moments and orthonormality, the transformation \( Q^\nu_j \) has to be appropriately constructed. For this purpose, we consider an orthogonal decomposition of the moment matrix

\[
M^\nu_{j+1} := \begin{bmatrix}
(x^0, \varphi_{j+1,1})_\Omega & \cdots & (x^0, \varphi_{j+1,|\nu|})_\Omega \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
(x^\alpha, \varphi_{j+1,1})_\Omega & \cdots & (x^\alpha, \varphi_{j+1,|\nu|})_\Omega
\end{bmatrix} = [(x^\alpha, \Phi^\nu_{j+1})_\Omega]|_{|\alpha| \leq q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_q \times |\nu|},
\]

where

\[
m_q := \sum_{\ell=0}^q \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d - 1} \leq (q + 1)^d
\]

denotes the dimension of \( \mathcal{P}_q(\Omega) \).

In the original construction by Tausch and White, the matrix \( Q^\nu_j \) is obtained by a singular value decomposition of \( M^\nu_{j+1} \). For the construction of samplets, we follow the idea form \( \mathbb{I} \), and rather employ the QR decomposition, which has the advantage of generating samplets with an increasing number of vanishing moments. It holds

\[
(M^\nu_{j+1})^T = QR =: [Q^\nu_{j,\Phi}, Q^\nu_{j,\Sigma}] R
\]
Consequently, the moment matrix for the cluster’s own scaling functions and samplets is then given by

\[
\begin{align*}
[M^\nu_{j,\Phi}, M^\nu_{j,\Sigma}] &= \left\langle (\alpha^\nu, (\Phi^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j))_0 \right\rangle_{|\alpha| \leq q} = \left\langle (\alpha^\nu, (\Phi^\nu_{j+1}, Q^\nu_{j+1}, Q^\nu_j, \Sigma))_0 \right\rangle_{|\alpha| \leq q} \\
&= M^\nu_{j+1}[Q^\nu_{j+1}, Q^\nu_j, \Sigma] = R^\nu.
\end{align*}
\]

As \( R^\nu \) is a lower triangular matrix, the first \( k - 1 \) entries in its \( k \)-th column are zero. This corresponds to \( k - 1 \) vanishing moments for the \( k \)-th function generated by the transformation \( Q^\nu_j = [Q^\nu_j, Q^\nu_j, \Sigma] \). By defining the first \( m_q \) functions as scaling functions and the remaining as samplets, we obtain samplets with vanishing moments at least up to order \( q + 1 \). By increasing the polynomial degree to \( \hat{q} \geq q \) at the leaf clusters such that \( m_{\hat{q}} \approx |\nu| \), we can even construct samplets with an increasing number of vanishing moments without any additional cost.

**Remark 3.3.** We remark that the samplet construction using vanishing moments is inspired by the classical wavelet theory. However, it is easily possible to adapt the construction to other primitives of interest.

**Remark 3.4.** Each cluster has at most a constant number of scaling functions and samplets: For a particular cluster \( \nu \), their number is identical to the cardinality of \( \Phi^\nu_{j+1} \). For leaf clusters, this number is bounded by the leaf size. For non-leaf clusters, it is bounded by the number of scaling functions provided from all its son clusters. As there are at most two son clusters with a maximum of \( m_q \) scaling functions each, we obtain the bound \( 2m_q \) for non-leaf clusters. Note that, if \( \Phi^\nu_{j+1} \) has at most \( m_q \) elements, a cluster will not provide any samplets at all and all functions will be considered as scaling functions.

For leaf clusters, we define the scaling functions by the Dirac measures supported at the points \( x_i \), i.e. \( \Phi^\nu_j := \{\delta_{x_i} : x_i \in \nu\} \), to account for the lack of son clusters that could provide scaling functions. The scaling functions of all clusters on a specific level \( j \) then generate the spaces

\[
V_j := \text{span}\{\phi^\nu_{j,k} : k \in \Delta^\nu_j, \nu \in \mathcal{T}_j\},
\]

while the samplets span the detail spaces

\[
S_j := \text{span}\{\sigma^\nu_{j,k} : k \in \nabla^\nu_j, \nu \in \mathcal{T}_j\} = V_{j+1} \ominus V_j.
\]

Combining the scaling functions of the root cluster with all clusters’ samplets gives rise to the samplet basis

\[
\Sigma_N := \Phi^\nu_0 \cup \bigcup_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}} \Sigma^\nu_j.
\]

Writing \( \Sigma_N = \{\sigma_k : 1 \leq k \leq N\} \), where \( \sigma_k \) is either a samplet or a scaling function at the root cluster, we can establish a unique indexing of all the signed measures comprising the samplet basis. The indexing induces an order on the basis set \( \Sigma_N \), which we choose to be level-dependent: Samplets belonging to a particular cluster are grouped together, with those on finer levels having larger indices.

**Remark 3.5.** We remark that the samplet basis on a balanced cluster tree can be computed in cost \( O(N) \), we refer to \[7\] for a proof.

### 3.3. Properties of the samplets

By construction, the samplets satisfy the following properties, which can directly be inferred from the corresponding results in \[21,33\].

**Theorem 3.6.** The spaces \( V_j \) defined in equation \[8\] exhibit the desired multiscale hierarchy

\[
V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \cdots \subset V_J = V,
\]

where the corresponding complement spaces \( S_j \) from \[9\] satisfy \( V_{j+1} = V_j \ominus S_j \) for all \( j = 0, 1, \ldots, J - 1 \). The associated samplet basis \( \Sigma_N \) defined in \[10\] constitutes an orthonormal basis of \( V \). In particular:
Proof. For (13), we used the estimate

\[ \| f, \sigma \|_1 \leq \text{diam}(\nu)^{q+1} \| f \|_{C^{q+1}(\Omega)} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1. \]

The key for data compression and singularity detection is the following estimate which shows that the samplet coefficients decay with respect to the samplet’s level provided that the data result from the evaluation of a smooth function. Therefore, in case of smooth data, the samplet coefficients decay with respect to the samplet’s level provided that the data are singular in the region of the samplet’s support.

Lemma 3.8. The coefficient vector \( \omega_{j,k} \) of the samplet \( \sigma_{j,k} \) on the cluster \( \nu \) fulfills

\[ \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1 \leq \sqrt{\nu}. \]

The same holds for the scaling functions \( \varphi_{j,k} \).

Proof. It holds \( \| \omega_{j,k} \|_{L^2} = 1 \). Hence, the assertion follows immediately from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

\[ \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1 \leq \sqrt{\nu} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_2 = \sqrt{\nu}. \]

Later on, the following bound on the samplets’ coefficients \( \| \cdot \|_1 \)-norm will be essential:

Lemma 3.9. Let \( f \in C^{q+1}(\Omega) \). Then, it holds for a samplet \( \sigma_{j,k} \) supported on the cluster \( \nu \) that

\[ |(f, \sigma_{j,k})_\Omega| \leq \text{diam}(\nu)^{q+1} \| f \|_{C^{q+1}(\Omega)} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1. \]

Proof. For \( x_0 \in \nu \), the Taylor expansion of \( f \) yields

\[ f(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x_0) \frac{(x - x_0)^\alpha}{\alpha!} + R_{x_0}(x). \]

Herein, the remainder \( R_{x_0}(x) \) reads

\[ R_{x_0}(x) = (q + 1) \sum_{|\alpha| = q+1} \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x_0) \frac{(x - x_0)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^{q+1}}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x_0 + s(x - x_0))(1 - s)^q \, ds. \]

In view of the vanishing moments, we conclude

\[ |(f, \sigma_{j,k})_\Omega| = |(R_{x_0}, \sigma_{j,k})_\Omega| \leq \sum_{|\alpha| = q+1} \left\| \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x_0) \right\|_{L^1} \sup_{x \in \nu} \left| \frac{\partial^{q+1}}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x) \right| \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1 \]

\[ \leq \text{diam}(\nu)^{q+1} \| f \|_{C^{q+1}(\Omega)} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1. \]

Here, we used the estimate

\[ \sum_{|\alpha| = q+1} \frac{\alpha^{-q(q+1)}}{\alpha!} \leq 1, \]

which is obtained by choosing \( x_0 \) as the cluster’s midpoint. \( \square \)
4. Discrete Sampllet Transform

In order to transform between the sampllet basis and the basis of Dirac measures, we introduce the discrete sampllet transform and its inverse. To this end, we assume that the data \((x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_N, y_N)\) result from the evaluation of some (unknown) function \(f: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\), i.e.

\[ y_k = f^\Delta = (f, \delta_{x_k})_\Omega. \]

Hence, we may represent the function \(f\) on \(X\) according to

\[ f = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f^\Delta_i \delta_{x_i}. \]

Our goal is now to compute the representation

\[ f = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f^\Sigma_i \sigma_k \]

with respect to the sampllet basis. For sake of a simpler notation, let \(f^\Delta := [f^\Delta_i]_{i=1}^{N}\) and \(f^\Sigma := [f^\Sigma_i]_{i=1}^{N}\) denote the associated coefficient vectors.

![Figure 1. Visualization of the discrete sampllet transform.](image)

The discrete sampllet transform is based on recursively applying the refinement relation (4) to the point evaluations

\[
(f, [\Phi^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j])_\Omega = (f, \Phi^\nu_{j+1}(Q^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j))_\Omega = (f, \Phi^\nu_{j+1})_\Omega[Q^\nu_j, \Phi^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j].
\]

On the finest level, the entries of the vector \((f, \Phi^\nu_0)_\Omega\) are exactly those of \(f^\Delta\). Recursively applying equation (14) therefore yields all the coefficients \((f, \Phi^\nu_j)_\Omega\), including \((f, \Phi^\nu_N)_\Omega\), required for the representation of \(f\) in the sampllet basis, see Figure 1 for a visualization. The complete procedure is formulated in Algorithm 4.1.

**Algorithm 4.1: Discrete sampllet transform**

**Data:** Data \(f^\Delta\), cluster tree \(T\) and transformations \([Q^\nu_j, \Phi^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j]\).

**Result:** Coefficients \(f^\Sigma\) stored as \([f, \Phi^\nu_0]_\Omega^\Sigma\) and \([f, \Sigma^\nu_j]_\Omega^\Sigma\).

**begin**

store \([f, \Phi^\nu_0]_\Omega^\Sigma := \text{transformForCluster}(X)\)

**Function** transformForCluster(\(\nu\))

**begin**

if \(\nu = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}\) is a leaf of \(T\) then

set \(f^\nu_{j+1} := [f^\Delta]_{k=1}^{l}\)

else

for all sons \(\nu'\) of \(\nu\) do

execute transformForCluster(\(\nu'\))

append the result to \(f^\nu_{j+1}\)

set \([f, \Sigma^\nu_j]_\Omega^\Sigma := (Q^\nu_j, \Sigma^\nu_j)^\tau f^\nu_{j+1}\)

return \((Q^\nu_j)^\tau f^\nu_{j+1}\)
Remark 4.1. Algorithm 4.1 employs the transposed version of (14) to preserve the column vector structure of $f^\Delta$ and $f^\Sigma$.

The inverse transformation is obtained by reversing the steps of the discrete samplet transform: For each cluster, we compute $(f, \Phi^\nu_{j+1})_\Omega = (f, [\Phi^\nu_{j}], [\Sigma^\nu_{j}])_\Omega [Q^\nu_{j,\Phi}, Q^\nu_{j,\Sigma}]^T$ to either obtain the coefficients of the son clusters’ scaling functions or, for leaf clusters, the coefficients $f^\Delta$. The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 4.2.

Algorithm 4.2: Inverse samplet transform

Data: Coefficients $f^\Sigma$, cluster tree $T$ and transformations $[Q^\nu_{j,\Phi}, Q^\nu_{j,\Sigma}]$.

Result: Coefficients $f^\Delta$ stored as $[(f, \Phi^\nu)_{\Omega}]^T$.

begin
inverseTransformForCluster($X$, $[(f, \Phi^X)_{\Omega}]^T$)
begin
if $\nu = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{|\nu|}\}$ is a leaf of $T$ then
set $[f^\Delta]_k := [(f, \Phi^\nu_{j+1})_\Omega]^T$
else
for all sons $\nu'$ of $\nu$ do
assign the part of $[(f, \Phi^\nu_{j+1})_\Omega]^T$ belonging to $\nu'$ to $[(f, \Phi^\nu_{j})_{\Omega}]^T$
execute inverseTransformForCluster($\nu'$, $[(f, \Phi^\nu_{j'})_{\Omega}]^T$)
end
end

The discrete samplet transform and its inverse can be performed in linear cost. This result is well known in case of wavelets and was crucial for their rapid development.

Theorem 4.2. The runtime of the discrete samplet transform and the inverse samplet transform are $\mathcal{O}(N)$, each.

Proof. As the samplet construction follows the construction of Tausch and White, we refer to [33] for the details of the proof.

5. Numerical results I

To demonstrate the efficacy of the samplet analysis, we compress different sample data in one, two and three spatial dimensions. For each example, we use samplets with $q+1 = 3$ vanishing moments.

One dimension. We start with two one-dimensional examples. On the one hand, we consider the test function

$$f(x) = \frac{3}{2}e^{-40|x-\frac{1}{2}|} + 2e^{-40|x|} - e^{-40|x+\frac{1}{2}|},$$

sampled at 8192 uniformly distributed points on $[-1, 1]$. On the other hand, we consider a path of a Brownian motion sampled at the same points. The coefficients of the samplet transformed data are thresholded with $10^{-i}||f^\nu||_\infty$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, respectively. The resulting compression ratios and the reconstructions can be found in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively. One readily infers that in both cases high compression rates are achieved at high accuracy. In case of the Brownian motion, the smoothing of the sample data can be realized by increasing the compression rate, corresponding to throwing away more and more detail information. Indeed, due to the orthonormality of the samplet basis, this procedure amounts to a least squares fit of the data.
Two dimensions. As a second application for samplets, we consider image compression. To this end, we use a 2000 × 2000 pixel grayscale landscape image. The coefficients of the samplet transformed image are thresholded with $10^{-i} \|f^E \|_{\infty}$, $i = 2, 3, 4$, respectively. The corresponding results and compression rates can be found in Figure 4. A visualization of the samplet coefficients in case of the respective low compression can be found in Figure 5.

Three dimensions. Finally, we show a result in three dimensions. Here, the points are given by a uniform subsample of a triangulation of the Stanford bunny. We consider data on the Stanford bunny generated by the function

$$f(x) = e^{-20 \|x - p_0\|_2} + e^{-20 \|x - p_1\|_2},$$

where the points $p_0$ and $p_1$ are located at the tips of the bunny’s ears. Moreover, the geometry has been rescaled to a diameter of 2. The plot on the left-hand side of Figure 6 visualizes the sample data, while the plot on the right-hand side shows the dominant coefficients in case of a threshold parameter of $10^{-2} \|f^E \|_{\infty}$.
6. COMPRESSION OF KERNEL MATRICES

6.1. Kernel matrices. The second application of samplets we consider is the compression of matrices arising from positive (semi-) definite kernels, as they emerge in kernel methods, such as scattered data analysis, kernel based learning or Gaussian process regression, see for example [22, 31, 34, 35] and the references therein.

We start by recalling the concept of a positive kernel.

**Definition 6.1.** A symmetric kernel $K: \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is called positive (semi-)definite on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, iff $[K(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j=1}^{N}$ is a symmetric and positive (semi-)definite matrix for all $\{x_1, \ldots, x_N\} \subset \Omega$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. 

**Figure 4.** Different compression rates of the test image.

**Figure 5.** Visualization of the samplet coefficients for the test image.
As a particular class of positive definite kernels, we consider the Matérn kernels given by

\[
k_\nu(r) := 2^{1-\nu} \frac{\sqrt{2\nu r}}{\Gamma(\nu)} K_\nu \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\nu r}}{\ell} \right), \quad r \geq 0, \quad \ell > 0.
\]

Herein, \( K_\nu \) is the modified Bessel function of the second kind of order \( \nu \) and \( \Gamma \) is the gamma function. The parameter \( \nu \) steers for the smoothness of the kernel function. Especially, the analytic squared-exponential kernel is retrieved for \( \nu \to \infty \). Especially, we have

\[
k_{1/2}(r) = \exp \left( -\frac{r}{\ell} \right), \quad k_\infty(r) = \exp \left( -\frac{r^2}{2\ell^2} \right).
\]

A positive definite kernel in the sense of Definition 6.1 is obtained by considering

\[
K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := k_\nu(||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'||_2).
\]

Given the set of points \( X = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N\} \), many applications require the assembly and the inversion of the kernel matrix

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{K} := [K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)]_{i,j=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}
\end{align*}
\]

or an appropriately regularized version

\[
\mathbf{K} + \rho \mathbf{I}, \quad \rho > 0,
\]

thereof. In case that \( N \) is a large number, already the assembly and storage of \( \mathbf{K} \) can easily become prohibitive. For the solution of an associated linear system, the situation is even worse. Fortunately, the kernel matrix can be compressed by employing samplets. To this end, the evaluation of the kernel function at the points \( \mathbf{x}_i \) and \( \mathbf{x}_j \) will be denoted by

\[
(K, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i} \otimes \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j})_{\Omega \times \Omega} := K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j).
\]

Hence, in view of \( V = \{\delta_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \ldots, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_N}\} \), we may write the kernel matrix as

\[
\mathbf{K} = [(K, \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i} \otimes \delta_{\mathbf{x}_j})_{\Omega \times \Omega}]_{i,j=1}^N.
\]

6.2. **Asymptotically smooth kernels.** The essential ingredient for the samplet compression of kernel matrices is the asymptotical smoothness property of the kernel

\[
\frac{\partial^{\lvert \alpha \rvert + \lvert \beta \rvert}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial \mathbf{y}^\beta} K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq c_K \frac{(|\alpha| + |\beta|)!}{r^{|\alpha| + |\beta|} ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}||^{\lvert \alpha \rvert + \lvert \beta \rvert}}, \quad c_K, r > 0,
\]

which is for example satisfied by the Matérn kernels. Using this estimate, we obtain the following result, which is the basis for the matrix compression introduced thereafter.
Lemma 6.2. Consider two samples \( \sigma_{j, k} \) and \( \sigma_{j', k'} \), exhibiting \( q + 1 \) vanishing moments with supporting clusters \( \nu \) and \( \nu' \), respectively. Assume that \( \text{dist}(\nu, \nu') > 0 \). Then, for kernels satisfying (17), it holds that

\[
(K, \sigma_{j, k} \otimes \sigma_{j', k'})_{\Omega \times \Omega} \leq c_{K} \frac{\text{diam}(\nu)^{q+1}}{(d \text{ dist}(\nu_{j, k}, \nu'_{j', k'}))^{2(q+1)}} \cdot \|\omega_{j, k}\|_{1} \cdot \|\omega_{j', k'}\|_{1}.
\]

Proof. Let \( x_{0} \in \nu \) and \( y_{0} \in \nu' \). A Taylor expansion of the kernel with respect to \( x \) yields

\[
K(x, y) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq q} \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial x^{|\alpha|}} K(x_{0}, y) \frac{(x - x_{0})^{\alpha}}{\alpha!} + R_{x_{0}}(x, y),
\]

where the remainder \( R_{x_{0}}(x, y) \) is given by

\[
R_{x_{0}}(x, y) = (q + 1) \sum_{|\alpha| = q + 1} \frac{(x - x_{0})^{\alpha}}{\alpha!} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{\partial^{q+1}}{\partial x^{|\alpha|}} K(x_{0} + s(x - x_{0}), y) (1 - s)^{q} \, ds.
\]

Next, we expand the remainder \( R_{x_{0}}(x, y) \) with respect to \( y \) and derive

\[
R_{x_{0}, y_{0}}(x, y) = (q + 1)^{2} \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| = q + 1} \frac{(x - x_{0})^{\alpha}}{\alpha!} \frac{(y - y_{0})^{\beta}}{\beta!} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{\partial^{q+1}}{\partial x^{|\alpha|} \partial y^{|\beta|}} K(x_{0} + s(x - x_{0}), y_{0} + t(y - y_{0})) (1 - s)^{q} (1 - t)^{q} \, dt \, ds.
\]

We thus arrive at the decomposition

\[
K(x, y) = p_{y}(x) + p_{x}(y) + R_{x_{0}, y_{0}}(x, y),
\]

where \( p_{y}(x) \) is a polynomial of degree \( q \) in \( x \), with coefficients depending on \( y \), while \( p_{x}(y) \) is a polynomial of degree \( q \) in \( y \), with coefficients depending on \( x \). Due to the vanishing moments, we obtain

\[
(K, \sigma_{j, k} \otimes \sigma_{j', k'})_{\Omega \times \Omega} = (R_{x_{0}, y_{0}}, \sigma_{j, k} \otimes \sigma_{j', k'})_{\Omega \times \Omega}.
\]

In view of (17), we thus find

\[
|K_{\Omega \times \Omega}| \leq c_{K} \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| = q + 1} \frac{(|\alpha| + |\beta|)!}{\alpha! \beta!} \left( \|\cdot - x_{0}\|_{2}^{q+1} \cdot |\sigma_{j, k}|_{\Omega} \right) \left( \|\cdot - y_{0}\|_{2}^{q+1} \cdot |\sigma_{j', k'}|_{\Omega} \right).
\]

Next, we have by means of multinomial coefficients that

\[
(|\alpha| + |\beta|)! = \binom{|\alpha| + |\beta|}{|\alpha|} \binom{|\beta|}{|\beta|} \alpha! \beta!,
\]

which in turn implies that

\[
\sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| = q + 1} \frac{(|\alpha| + |\beta|)!}{\alpha! \beta!} = \binom{2(q + 1)}{q + 1} \sum_{|\alpha|, |\beta| = q + 1} \binom{|\alpha|}{|\alpha|} \binom{|\beta|}{|\beta|}
\]

\[
= \binom{2(q + 1)}{q + 1} \cdot d^{2(q + 1)} \leq d^{2(q + 1)} 2^{2(q + 1)}.
\]

Moreover, we use

\[
\|\cdot - x_{0}\|_{2}^{q+1} \cdot |\sigma_{j, k}|_{\Omega} \leq \left( \frac{\text{diam}(\nu)}{2} \right)^{q+1} \|\omega_{j, k}\|_{1},
\]

where

\[
\omega_{j, k} \text{ is given by } \int_{0}^{1} \frac{\partial^{q+1}}{\partial x^{|\alpha|} \partial y^{|\beta|}} K(x_{0} + s(x - x_{0}), y_{0} + t(y - y_{0})) (1 - s)^{q} (1 - t)^{q} \, dt \, ds.
\]

Finally, we have

\[
\|\cdot - x_{0}\|_{2}^{q+1} \cdot |\sigma_{j, k}|_{\Omega} \leq \left( \frac{\text{diam}(\nu)}{2} \right)^{q+1} \|\omega_{j, k}\|_{1}.
\]
and likewise
\[
\| \cdot - y_0 \|_2^{q+1} \| \sigma_{j', k'} \|_1 \leq \left( \frac{\text{diam}(\nu')}{2} \right)^{q+1} \| \omega_{j', k'} \|_1.
\]

Combining all the estimates, we arrive at the desired result \((18)\). □

6.3. Matrix compression. Lemma 6.2 immediately suggests a compression strategy for kernel matrices in samplet representation. We mention that this compression differs from the wavelet matrix compression introduced in \([3]\), since we do not exploit the decay of the samplet coefficients with respect to the level in case of smooth data. This enables us to also consider a non-uniform distribution of the points in \(V\). Consequently, we use on all levels the same accuracy, what is more similar to the setting in \([3]\).

Theorem 6.3. Set all coefficients of the kernel matrix
\[
K^\Sigma := \left( \left[ (\mathcal{K}_j, \sigma_{j,k} \otimes \sigma_{j',k'}) \right] \right)_{j,j',k,k'}
\]
to zero which satisfy
\[
\text{dist}(\nu, \nu') = \eta \max\{ \text{diam}(\nu), \text{diam}(\nu') \}, \quad \eta > 0,
\]
where \(\nu\) is the cluster supporting \(\sigma_{j,k}\) and \(\nu'\) is the cluster supporting \(\sigma_{j',k'}\), respectively. Then, it holds
\[
\| K^\Sigma - K^\Sigma_{\nu,\nu'} \|_F \leq c_K c_{\text{sum}} (\eta dr)^{-2(q+1)} m_q N \sqrt{\log(N)}.
\]
for some constant \(c_{\text{sum}} > 0\), where \(m_q\) is given by \((5)\).

Proof. We first fix the levels \(j\) and \(j'\). In view of \((18)\), we can estimate any coefficient which satisfies \((19)\) by
\[
\| (\mathcal{K}_j, \sigma_{j,k} \otimes \sigma_{j',k'}) \|_1 \leq c_K \left( \min\{ \text{diam}(\nu), \text{diam}(\nu') \} \right)^{q+1} (\eta dr)^{-2(q+1)} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1 \| \omega_{j',k'} \|_1.
\]
If we next set
\[
\theta_{j,j'} := \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_j, \nu' \in \mathcal{T}_{j'}} \left\{ \min\{ \text{diam}(\nu), \text{diam}(\nu') \} \right\},
\]
then we obtain
\[
\| (\mathcal{K}_j, \sigma_{j,k} \otimes \sigma_{j',k'}) \|_1 \leq c_K \theta_{j,j'}^{q+1} (\eta dr)^{-2(q+1)} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1 \| \omega_{j',k'} \|_1
\]
for all coefficients such that \((19)\) holds. In view of \((12)\) and the fact that there are at most \(m_q\) samplets per cluster, we arrive at
\[
\sum_{k,k'} \| \omega_{j,k} \|_1^2 \| \omega_{j',k'} \|_1^2 \leq \sum_{k,k'} |\nu| \cdot |\nu'| = m_q^2 N^2.
\]
Thus, for a fixed level-level block, we arrive at the estimate
\[
\| K^\Sigma_{j,j'} - K^\Sigma_{\nu,\nu'} \|_F^2 \leq \sum_{k,k' : \text{dist}(\nu,\nu') \geq \eta \max\{ \text{diam}(\nu), \text{diam}(\nu') \}} \left( \text{dist}(\nu,\nu') \right)^{q+1} (\eta dr)^{-4(q+1)} m_q^2 N^2.
\]
Finally, summation over all levels yields
\[
\| K^\Sigma - K^\Sigma_{\nu,\nu'} \|_F^2 = \sum_{j,j'} \| K^\Sigma_{j,j'} - K^\Sigma_{\nu,\nu'} \|_F^2 \leq c_K (\eta dr)^{-4(q+1)} m_q^2 N^2 \sum_{j,j'} \theta_{j,j'}^{2(q+1)} \leq c_K^2 c_{\text{sum}} (\eta dr)^{-4(q+1)} m_q^2 N^2 \log N,
\]
which is the desired claim. □
Remark 6.4. In case of uniformly distributed points \( x_i \in X \), we have \( \| K^\Sigma \|_F \sim N \). Thus, in this case we immediately obtain
\[
\frac{\| K^\Sigma - K^\Sigma' \|_F}{\| K^\Sigma \|_F} \leq c_K \sqrt{c_{\text{sum}}(\eta dr)^{-2(q+1)}m_q \log N}.
\]

Theorem 6.5. The matrix consists of only \( \mathcal{O}(m^2 N \log N) \) relevant matrix coefficients provided that the points in \( V \) are uniformly distributed in \( \Omega \).

Proof. We fix \( j, j' \) and assume \( j \geq j' \). In case of uniformly distributed points, it holds \( \text{diam}(v) \sim 2^{-j/v/d} \). Hence, for the cluster \( \nu_{j,k} \), there exist only \( \mathcal{O}([2^{j'}]^{2d}) \) clusters \( \nu_{j,k} \) from level \( j \), which do not satisfy the cut-off criterion \([19]\). Since each cluster contains at most \( m_q \) samples, we hence arrive at
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{J} \sum_{j' \leq j} m_q^2 [2^{j'}2^{j-j'}]^d = m_q^2 \sum_{j=0}^{J} j^{2d} \sim m_q^2 N \log N,
\]
which implies the assertion. \( \square \)

Remark 6.6. The chosen cut-off criterion \([19]\) coincides with the so called admissibility condition used by hierarchical matrices. We particularly refer here to \([17]\), as we will later on rely the \( \mathcal{H}^2 \)-matrix method presented there for the fast assembly of the compressed kernel matrix.

6.4. Compressed matrix assembly. For a given pair of clusters, we can now determine whether the corresponding entries need to be calculated. As there are \( \mathcal{O}(N) \) clusters, na"ively checking the cut-off condition for all pairs would still take \( \mathcal{O}(N^2) \) operations, however. Hence, we require smarter means to determine the non-negligible cluster pairs. For this purpose, we first state the transferability of the cut-off criterion to son clusters, compare \([8]\) for a proof.

Lemma 6.7. Let \( \nu \) and \( \nu' \) be clusters satisfying the cut-off criterion \([19]\). Then, for the son clusters \( \nu_{\text{son}} \) of \( \nu \) and \( \nu'_{\text{son}} \) of \( \nu' \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dist}(\nu, \nu_{\text{son}}') & \geq \eta \max\{\text{diam}(\nu), \text{diam}(\nu_{\text{son}}')\}, \\
\text{dist}(\nu_{\text{son}}, \nu') & \geq \eta \max\{\text{diam}(\nu_{\text{son}}), \text{diam}(\nu')\}, \\
\text{dist}(\nu_{\text{son}}, \nu'_{\text{son}}) & \geq \eta \max\{\text{diam}(\nu_{\text{son}}), \text{diam}(\nu'_{\text{son}})\}.
\end{align*}
\]

The lemma tells us that we may omit cluster pairs whose father clusters already satisfy the cut-off criterion. This will be essential for the assembly of the compressed matrix.

The computation of the compressed kernel matrix can be sped up further by using cluster methods like the fast multipole method, see \([16,30]\), or \( \mathcal{H}^2 \)-matrix techniques, see \([15,17]\). Similarly to \([11,15]\), we shall rely here on \( \mathcal{H}^2 \)-matrices for this purpose. The idea of \( \mathcal{H}^2 \)-matrices is to approximate the kernel interaction for sufficiently distant clusters \( \nu \) and \( \nu' \) in the sense of the admissibility condition \([19]\) by means of the interpolation based \( \mathcal{H}^2 \)-matrix approach. More precisely, given a suitable set of interpolation points \( \{ \xi_t^\nu \}_t \) for each cluster \( \nu \) with associated Lagrange polynomials \( \{ \mathcal{L}_t^\nu(x) \}_t \), we introduce the interpolation operator
\[
I^\nu,\nu'[K](x,y) = \sum_{s,t} K(\xi_s^\nu, \xi_t^\nu') \mathcal{L}_s^\nu(x) \mathcal{L}_t^\nu'(y)
\]
and approximate an admissible matrix block via
\[
K^\Delta_{\nu,\nu'} = [(K, \delta_x \otimes \delta_y)_{\Omega \times \Omega}]_{x \in \nu, y \in \nu'} \approx \sum_{s,t} K(\xi_s^\nu, \xi_t^\nu')[(\mathcal{L}_s^\nu, \delta_x)_{\Omega}]_{x \in \nu'}[(\mathcal{L}_t^\nu', \delta_y)_{\Omega}]_{y \in \nu'} =: V^\nu_{\Delta} S^{\nu,\nu'} (V^{\nu'}_{\Delta})^T.
\]

Herein, the cluster bases are given according to
\[
V^\nu_{\Delta} := [(\mathcal{L}_s^\nu, \delta_x)_{\Omega}]_{x \in \nu}, \quad V^{\nu'}_{\Delta} := [(\mathcal{L}_t^\nu', \delta_y)_{\Omega}]_{y \in \nu'},
\]
while the coupling matrix is given by \( S^{\nu,\nu'} := [K(\xi_s^\nu, \xi_t^\nu')]_{s,t} \).
Directly transforming the cluster bases into their corresponding samplet representation results in a log-linear cost. This can be avoided by the use of nested cluster bases, as they have been introduced for H^2-matrices. For the sake of simplicity, we assume from now on that tensor product polynomials of degree p are used for the kernel interpolation at all different cluster combinations.

As a consequence, the Lagrange polynomials of a father cluster can exactly be represented by those of the son clusters. Introducing the transfer matrices \( T^\text{sum} := [L^\nu (\xi^\text{sum}_t)]_{s,t} \), there holds

\[
L^\nu (x) = \sum_t T^\text{sum}_{s,t} L^\nu_t (x), \quad x \in B^\text{sum}.
\]

Exploiting this relation in the construction of the cluster bases \( V^\nu \) finally leads to

\[
V^\nu = [V^\text{sum}_1, T^\text{sum}_1 ; V^\text{sum}_2, T^\text{sum}_2].
\]

Combining this refinement relation with the recursive nature of the samplet basis, results in the variant of the discrete samplet transform summarized in Algorithm 6.1.

**Algorithm 6.1: Recursive computation of the multiscale cluster basis**

**Data:** Cluster tree \( T \), transformations \([Q^\nu, Q^\nu_{\Sigma}]\), nested cluster bases \( V^\nu \) for leaf clusters and transformation matrices \( T^\text{sum} \) for non-leaf clusters.

**Result:** Multiscale cluster basis matrices \( V^\nu_{\Phi}, V^\nu_{\Sigma} \) for all clusters \( \nu \in T \).

begin

computeMultiscaleClusterBasis(X);

end

**Function** computeMultiscaleClusterBasis(\( \nu \))

begin

if \( \nu \) is a leaf cluster then

store \([V^\nu_{\Phi}, V^\nu_{\Sigma}] := [Q^\nu, Q^\nu_{\Sigma}]^T V^\nu\)

else

for all sons \( \nu' \) of \( \nu \) do

computeMultiscaleClusterBasis(\( \nu' \))

store \([V^\nu_{\Phi}, V^\nu_{\Sigma}] := [Q^\nu, Q^\nu_{\Sigma}]^T V^\nu_{\Phi} ; V^\nu_{\Sigma} ; V^\nu_{\Phi} ; V^\nu_{\Sigma} \]

end

end

Having the multiscale cluster bases at our disposal, the next step is the assembly of the compressed kernel matrix. The computation of the required matrix blocks is exclusively based on the two refinement relations

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K^\Phi^\nu_{\Phi,\nu'} & K^\Phi^\nu_{\nu',\nu'} \\
K^\Sigma^\nu_{\Phi,\nu'} & K^\Sigma^\nu_{\nu',\nu'}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
(K, \Phi^\nu)_{\Omega} \times (K, \Phi^\nu_{\nu'})_{\Omega} \\
(K, \Sigma^\nu)_{\Omega} \times (K, \Sigma^\nu_{\nu'})_{\Omega}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K^\Phi^\nu_{\Phi,\nu'} & K^\Phi^\nu_{\nu',\nu'} \\
K^\Sigma^\nu_{\Phi,\nu'} & K^\Sigma^\nu_{\nu',\nu'}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
(K, \Phi^\nu)_{\Omega} \times (K, \Phi^\nu_{\nu'})_{\Omega} \\
(K, \Sigma^\nu)_{\Omega} \times (K, \Sigma^\nu_{\nu'})_{\Omega}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

We obtain the following function, which is the key ingredient for the computation of the compressed kernel matrix.
Function recursivelyDetermineBlock($\nu, \nu'$)

Result: Approximation of the block $\begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix}$.

begin
  if ($\nu, \nu'$) is admissible then
    return $\begin{bmatrix} V_{\Phi}^\nu & V_{\Sigma}^\nu \end{bmatrix} S_{\nu,\nu'} \begin{bmatrix} (V_{\Phi}^\nu)^\intercal, (V_{\Sigma}^\nu)^\intercal \end{bmatrix}$
  else if $\nu$ and $\nu'$ are leaf clusters then
    return $[Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]^\intercal [K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Phi,\Phi}, K_{\nu,\Sigma}^{\Phi,\Sigma}]$
  else if $\nu'$ is not a leaf cluster and $\nu$ is a leaf cluster then
    for all sons $\nu'_{\text{son}}$ of $\nu$ do
      $\begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu'_{\text{son}},\nu'_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu'_{\text{son}},\nu}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu'_{\text{son}},\nu}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu'_{\text{son}},\nu}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} :=$ recursivelyDetermineBlock($\nu, \nu'_{\text{son}}$)
    return $\begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu,\nu'_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu,\nu'_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu,\nu'_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu,\nu'_{\text{son}}}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} [Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]^\intercal$
  else if $\nu$ is not a leaf cluster and $\nu'$ is a leaf cluster then
    for all sons $\nu_{\text{son}}$ of $\nu$ do
      $\begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} :=$ recursivelyDetermineBlock($\nu_{\text{son}}, \nu'$)
    return $[Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]^\intercal \begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix}$
  else
    for all sons $\nu_{\text{son}}$ of $\nu$ and all sons $\nu'_{\text{son}}$ of $\nu'$ do
      $\begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} :=$ recursivelyDetermineBlock($\nu_{\text{son}}, \nu_{\text{son}}$)
    return $[Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]^\intercal \begin{bmatrix} K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Phi} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} \\ K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Phi,\Sigma} & K_{\nu_{\text{son}},\nu_{\text{son}}}^{\Sigma,\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} [Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]^\intercal$
end

Now, in order to assemble the compressed kernel matrix, we require two nested recursive calls of the cluster tree, which is traversed in a depth first search way. Algorithm 6.2 first computes the lower right matrix block and advances from bottom to top and from right to left. To this end, the two recursive functions setupColumn and setupRow are introduced.

Algorithm 6.2: Computation of the compressed kernel matrix

Data: Cluster tree $T$, multiscale cluster bases $V_{\nu}^\nu, V_{\Sigma}^\nu$ and transformations $[Q_{j,\Phi}^\nu, Q_{j,\Sigma}^\nu]$.
Result: Sparse matrix $K_{\Sigma}^\nu$

begin
  setupColumn($X$)
  store the blocks the remaining blocks $K_{\nu,\nu,X}^\Sigma$ for $\nu \in T \setminus \{X\}$ in $K_{\Sigma}^\nu$(they have already been computed by earlier calls to recursivelyDetermineBlock)
end

The purpose of the function setupColumn is to recursively traverse the column cluster tree, i.e. the cluster tree associated to the columns of the matrix. Before returning, each instance of setupColumn calls the function setupRow, which performs the actual assembly of the compressed matrix.
Algorithm 6.2 has a cost of $O(N \log N)$ and requires an additional storage of $O(N \log N)$ if all stored blocks are directly released when they are not required anymore. We refer to [1] for all the details.

**Remark 6.8.** Algorithm [6.2] has a cost of $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ and requires an additional storage of $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ if all stored blocks are directly released when they are not required anymore. We refer to [1] for all the details.
7. Numerical results II

All computations in this section have been performed on a single node with two Intel Xeon E5-2650 v3 @2.30GHz CPUs and up to 512GB of main memory. In order to obtain consistent timings, only a single core was used for all computations.

**Benchmark problem.** To benchmark the compression of kernel matrices, we consider the exponential kernel

\[ k(x, y) = e^{-10 \frac{\|x - y\|_2}{\sqrt{d}}} \]

evaluated at an increasing number of uniformly distributed random sample points in the hypercube \([-1, 1]^d\) for \(d = 1, 2, 3\). As a measure of sparsity, we introduce the average number of nonzeros per row

\[ \text{anz}(A) := \frac{\text{nnz}(A)}{N}, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \]

where \(\text{nnz}(A)\) is the number of nonzero entries of \(A\). Besides the compression, we also report the fill-in generated by the Cholesky factorization in combination with the nested dissection reordering from [23]. For the reordering and the Cholesky factorization, we rely on MATLAB R2020a while the samplet compression is implemented in C++11 using the Eigen template library for linear algebra operations. For the computations, we consider a polynomial degree of 3 for the \(H^2\)-matrix representation and \(q + 1 = 2\) vanishing moments for the samplets. In addition, we have performed a thresholding of the computed matrix coefficients that were smaller than \(\varepsilon = 10^{-4}\).

![Figure 7. Assembly times (left) and average numbers of nonzeros per row (right) versus the number sample points \(N\) in case of the exponential kernel matrix.](image)

The left-hand side of Figure 7 shows the wall time for the assembly of the compressed kernel matrices. The different dashed lines indicate the asymptotics \(N \log^\alpha N\) for \(\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3\). It can be seen that, for increasing number \(N\) of points and the dimensions \(d = 1, 2, 3\) under consideration, all computation times approach the expected rate of \(N \log N\). The right-hand side of Figure 7 shows the average number of nonzeros per row for an increasing number \(N\) of points. Except for the case of \(d = 1\), where this number even decreases, it becomes constant as expected.

Next, we examine the Cholesky factorization of the compressed kernel matrix. As the largest eigenvalue of the kernel matrix grows proportionally to the number \(N\) of points, while the smallest eigenvalue is given by the ridge parameter, the condition number grows with \(N\) as well. Hence, to obtain a constant condition number for increasing \(N\), the ridge parameter needs to be adjusted accordingly. However, as we are only interested in the generated fill-in and the computation times, we neglect this fact and just fix the ridge parameter to \(\rho = 10\) for all considered \(N\) and \(d = 1, 2, 3\).

---

1The full specifications can be found on https://www.euler.usi.ch/en/research/resources.
3https://eigen.tuxfamily.org/
The obtained results are found in Figure 8. Herein, on the left-hand side, the wall times for the Cholesky factorization of the reordered matrix are found. For $d = 1$ the behavior is a bit peculiar as the average number of nonzeros per row decreases when the number $N$ of points increases. This indicates that the kernel function is already fully resolved up to the threshold parameter on the coarser levels. For $d = 2$, we nearly perfectly observe the expected rate of $N^\frac{3}{2}$ for the Cholesky factorization, while the scaling is approximately like $N^2$ for $d = 3$. On the right-hand side of the same figure, it can be seen that the fill-in remains rather moderate. A visualization of the matrix patterns for the matrix $K_{\Sigma}^\varepsilon + \rho I$, the reordered matrix and the Cholesky factor for $N = 131 072$ points is shown in Figure 9. Each dot corresponds to a block of $256 \times 256$ matrix entries and its intensity indicates the number of nonzero entries, where darker blocks contain more entries than lighter blocks.

Simulation of a Gaussian random field. As our last example, we consider a Gaussian random field evaluated at 100 000 randomly chosen points at the surface of the Stanford bunny. As before, the Stanford bunny has been rescaled to have a diameter of 2. In order to demonstrate that our approach works also for higher dimensions, the Stanford bunny has been embedded into $\mathbb{R}^4$ and randomly rotated to prevent axis-aligned bounding boxes. The polynomial degree for the $H^2$-matrix representation is set to 3 as before and likewise we consider $q + 1 = 2$ vanishing moments. The covariance function is given by the exponential kernel

$$k(x, y) = e^{-25\|x-y\|^2}.$$  

Moreover, we discard all computed matrix entries which are below the threshold of $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. The ridge parameter is set to $\rho = 10^{-2}$. The compressed covariance matrix exhibits $\text{anz}(K_{\Sigma}^\varepsilon) = 5985$ nonzero matrix entries per row on average, while the corresponding Cholesky factor exhibits $\text{anz}(L) = 12010$ nonzero matrix entries per row on average. This is comparable to the benchmark case on the hypercube for $d = 3$. Having the Cholesky factor $L$ at hand, the computation of a realization of the Gaussian random field is extremely fast, as it only requires a simple sparse matrix-vector multiplication of $L$ by a Gaussian random vector and an inverse samplet transform. Four different realizations of the random field projected to $\mathbb{R}^3$ are shown in Figure 10.

8. Conclusion

Samplets provide a new methodology for the analysis of large data sets. They are easy to construct and discrete data can be transformed into the samplet basis in linear cost. In our construction, we deliberately let out the discussion of a level dependent compression of the given data, as it is known from wavelet analysis, in favor of a robust error analysis. We emphasize however that, under the assumption of uniformly distributed points, different norms can be incorporated,
allowing for the construction of band-pass filters and level dependent thresholding. In this situation, also an improved samplet matrix compression is possible such that a fixed number of vanishing moments is sufficient to achieve a precision proportional to the fill distance with log-linear cost.

Besides data compression, detection of singularities and adaptivity, we have demonstrated how samplets can be employed for the compression kernel matrices to obtain an essentially sparse matrix. Having a sparse representation of the kernel matrix, algebraic operations, such as matrix vector multiplications can considerably be sped up. Moreover, in combination with a fill-in reducing reordering, the factorization of the compressed kernel matrices becomes computationally feasible, which allows for the fast application of the inverse kernel matrix on the one hand and the efficient solution of linear systems involving the kernel matrix on the other hand. The numerical results, featuring about $10^6$ data points in up to four dimensions, impressively demonstrate the capabilities of samplets.

A straightforward future research direction is the incorporation of different clustering strategies, such as manifold aware clustering, to optimally resolve lower dimensional manifolds in high dimensional data.
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Figure 10. Four different realizations of a Gaussian random field based on an exponential covariance kernel.
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