

GENERALIZED KERNEL THINNING

Raaz Dwivedi^{1,2}, Lester Mackey³

¹ Department of Computer Science, Harvard University

² Department of EECS, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

³ Microsoft Research New England

raaz@mit.edu, lmackey@microsoft.com

ABSTRACT

The kernel thinning (KT) algorithm of Dwivedi and Mackey (2021) compresses an n point distributional summary into a \sqrt{n} point summary with better-than-Monte-Carlo maximum mean discrepancy for a target kernel \mathbf{k} by leveraging a less smooth square-root kernel. Here we provide four improvements. First, we show that KT applied directly to the target kernel yields a tighter $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\log n/n})$ integration error bound for each function f in the reproducing kernel Hilbert space. This modification extends the reach of KT to any kernel—even non-smooth kernels that do not admit a square-root, demonstrates that KT is suitable even for heavy-tailed target distributions, and eliminates the exponential dimension-dependence and $(\log n)^{d/2}$ factors of standard square-root KT. Second, we show that, for analytic kernels, like Gaussian and inverse multi-quadratic, target kernel KT admits maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) guarantees comparable to square-root KT without the need for an explicit square-root kernel. Third, we prove KT with a fractional α -power kernel \mathbf{k}_α for $\alpha > 1/2$ yields better-than-Monte-Carlo MMD guarantees for non-smooth kernels, like Laplace and Matérn, that do not have square-roots. Fourth, we establish that KT applied to a sum of \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{k}_α (a procedure we call KT+) simultaneously inherits the improved MMD guarantees of power KT and the tighter individual function guarantees of KT on the target kernel. Finally, we illustrate the practical benefits of target KT and KT+ for compression after high-dimensional independent sampling and challenging Markov chain Monte Carlo posterior inference.

1 INTRODUCTION

A core task in probabilistic inference is learning a compact representation of a probability distribution \mathbb{P} . This problem is usually solved by sampling n points independently from \mathbb{P} or, if direct sampling is intractable, generating n points from a Markov chain converging to \mathbb{P} . The benefit of these approaches is that they provide asymptotically exact sample estimates $\mathbb{P}_n f \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)$ for intractable expectations $\mathbb{P}f \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathbb{P}}[f(X)]$. However, they also suffer from a serious drawback: the learned representations are unnecessarily large, requiring n points to achieve $|\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_n f| = \Theta(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ integration error. These inefficient representations quickly become prohibitive for expensive downstream tasks and function evaluations: for example, in computational cardiology, each function evaluation $f(x_i)$ initiates a heart or tissue simulation that consumes 1000s of CPU hours (Niederer et al., 2011; Augustin et al., 2016; Strocchi et al., 2020).

To reduce the downstream computational burden, a standard practice is to *thin* the initial sample by discarding every t -th sample point (Owen, 2017). Unfortunately, standard thinning often results in a substantial loss of accuracy: for example, thinning an i.i.d. or fast-mixing Markov chain sample from n points to $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points increases integration error from $\Theta(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ to $\Theta(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$. Our goal is to produce more accurate compressed representations with provably better-than-i.i.d. integration error.

Problem Setup Given a target distribution \mathbb{P} on a domain \mathcal{X} , a sequence of input points $\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$ in \mathcal{X} , and a function space \mathcal{H} , our first goal is to identify a thinned \mathcal{H} coreset, a point

subsequence \mathcal{S}_{out} of length \sqrt{n} with better-than-i.i.d. integration error, $|\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}f| = o(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$, for each function $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\text{out}} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{out}}} \delta_x$. We will focus our attention on the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) \mathcal{H} associated with an arbitrary kernel \mathbf{k} (Berlinet & Thomas-Agnan, 2011).¹ We additionally measure the quality of our thinned representations in terms of the kernel *maximum mean discrepancy* (MMD, Gretton et al., 2012), defined as the worst-case error between sample and target expectations over the unit ball of \mathcal{H} equipped with RKHS norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{k}}$:

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}) \triangleq \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1} |\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}f|.$$

Our second goal is to produce thinned MMD coresets \mathcal{S}_{out} with $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}) = o(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$. For reference, we collect expressions for several commonly used kernels in Tab. 1.

Kernel thinning The starting point for our work is the recent *kernel thinning* (KT) algorithm of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) which takes as input n points and returns $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points with $o(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ -MMD error thereby beating the Monte Carlo rate. To effectively control $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$, KT uses non-uniform randomness and a less smooth *square-root kernel* \mathbf{k}_{rt} defined as follows (up to an immaterial constant rescaling):

Definition 1 (Square-root kernel) A reproducing kernel \mathbf{k}_{rt} on \mathbb{R}^d is a square-root kernel of \mathbf{k} if

$$\mathbf{k}(x, y) = (2\pi)^d \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}(x, z) \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}(z, y) dz.$$

When the input points are sampled i.i.d. or from a fast-mixing Markov chain on \mathbb{R}^d , Dwivedi & Mackey prove that the KT output has, with high probability, $\mathcal{O}_d(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\log n})$ -MMD $_{\mathbf{k}}$ error for \mathbb{P} and \mathbf{k}_{rt} with bounded support, $\mathcal{O}_d(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log^{d+1} n \log \log n)^{\frac{1}{2}})$ -MMD $_{\mathbf{k}}$ error for \mathbb{P} and \mathbf{k}_{rt} with light tails, and $(n^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{O}_d(n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2\rho}} \sqrt{\log n \log \log n}))$ -MMD $_{\mathbf{k}}$ error for \mathbb{P} and \mathbf{k}_{rt}^2 with $\rho > 2d$ moments.

Our contributions While KT provides superior to Monte Carlo error rate for a range of settings, the algorithm in its original form, required the knowledge of a square-root kernel \mathbf{k}_{rt} to run the algorithm, and establish theoretical guarantees. Here we provide several generalizations. First, we directly analyze the variant of kernel thinning which uses only the target kernel \mathbf{k} . To distinguish the two cases, going forward, we use **root KT** to denote the original kernel thinning algorithm using \mathbf{k}_{rt} , and **target KT** to denote kernel thinning just with \mathbf{k} . Furthermore, we introduce and analyze two other KT variants: (i) **α -power KT**, which uses a generalized power kernel \mathbf{k}_{α} of kernel \mathbf{k} (see Def. 3), and (ii) **KT+**, which uses a sum of \mathbf{k}_{α} and \mathbf{k} . We note that the existence of generalized power \mathbf{k}_{α} is a weaker condition than the existence of \mathbf{k}_{rt} .

We provide several theoretical and practical improvements with kernel thinning. First, we prove that the output of target KT provides $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\log n})$ integration error for any fixed function in the RKHS of **any kernel \mathbf{k} on any domain**. In particular, when the domain is \mathbb{R}^d , our single function guarantee for target KT has explicit constants and is dimension independent. Second, we show that like root KT, even target KT provides $o(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ -MMD $_{\mathbf{k}}$ error with \sqrt{n} points for a wide range of settings. Third, we show that α -power KT provides $o(n^{-1/4})$ -MMD errors for non-smooth kernels which do not admit a square-root kernel. Finally, when \mathbf{k}_{rt} exists, we show that the KT+ inherits the uniform error guarantees of root KT and the tighter individual function guarantees of target KT.

Notation We use $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}} \triangleq \{f \in \mathcal{H} : \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1\}$ to denote the unit ball of the RKHS \mathcal{H} corresponding to kernel \mathbf{k} , and $\mathcal{B}_2(r)$ to denote the Euclidean ball $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|y\|_2 \leq r\}$. Throughout, we will make frequent use of the norm $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x, y} |\mathbf{k}(x, y)|$, and the shorthands $\mathbb{P}_n \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$, $[n] \triangleq \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathbb{R}_+ \triangleq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$, $\mathcal{B}(x; R) \triangleq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\|_2 < R\}$, and $a \wedge b \triangleq \min(a, b)$. The set \mathcal{A}^c denotes the complement of a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = 1$ if $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and 0 otherwise. We say a is of order b and write $a = \mathcal{O}(b)$ or $a \lesssim b$ to denote that $a \leq cb$ for some universal constant c . Throughout, we view the success probability δ as a fixed constant. We use $a = \Omega(b)$ or $a \gtrsim b$ to denote $a \geq cb$ for some universal constant c . We write $a = \Theta(b)$ when $a = \Omega(b)$ and $a = \mathcal{O}(b)$.

¹Common kernel choices for generating and evaluating thinned coresets include Gaussian \mathbf{k} (Chen et al., 2010), Sobolev space \mathbf{k} on $[0, 1]^d$ underlying the QMC L^2 discrepancy (Hickernell, 1998), Stein kernel \mathbf{k} (Riabiz et al., 2020a), and energy distance $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \|x - y\| - \|x\| - \|y\|$ (Mak & Joseph, 2018).

GAUSS(σ) $\sigma > 0$	LAPLACE(σ) $\sigma > 0$	MATÉRN(ν, γ) $\nu > \frac{d}{2}, \gamma > 0$	IMQ(ν, γ) $\nu > 0, \gamma > 0$	SINC-RAD(θ) $\theta \neq 0, d \leq 3$	SINC(θ) $\theta \neq 0$	B-SPLINE ($2\beta+1$) $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$
$\exp\left(-\frac{\ z\ _2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$	$\exp\left(-\frac{\ z\ _2}{\sigma}\right)$	$c_{\nu-\frac{d}{2}}(\gamma\ z\ _2)^{\nu-\frac{d}{2}} \cdot K_{\nu-\frac{d}{2}}(\gamma\ z\ _2)$	$\frac{1}{(1+\ z\ _2^2/\gamma^2)^\nu}$	$\frac{\sin(\theta\ z\ _2)}{\theta\ z\ _2}$	$\prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\sin(\theta z_j)}{\theta z_j}$	$\mathfrak{B}_{2\beta+2}^{-d} \prod_{j=1}^d h_\beta(z_j)$

Table 1: Expressions for commonly used kernels along with a valid range of hyper-parameters. For the kernel \mathbf{k} with name stated in the top row, we provide the expression for $\mathbf{k}(x, x-z) = \kappa(z)$ for $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Each kernel is parameterized to have $\|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty = 1$. Above, $c_b \triangleq \frac{2^{1-b}}{\Gamma(b)}$, K_a denotes the modified Bessel function of the third kind of order a (Wendland, 2004, Def. 5.10), $\mathfrak{B}_\beta \triangleq \frac{1}{(\beta-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \beta/2 \rfloor} (-1)^j \binom{\beta}{j} (\frac{\beta}{2}-j)^{\beta-1}$, and $h \triangleq \otimes^{2\beta+2} \mathbf{1}_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]}$ where $\otimes^\ell f$ denotes the recursive convolution of ℓ copies of f . We note that, by definition, $\text{LAPLACE}(\sigma) = \text{MATÉRN}(\frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{\sigma})$.

Moreover, we use $a = \mathcal{O}_d(b)$, $a \lesssim_d b$, $a = \Omega_d(b)$, $a \gtrsim_d b$ to indicate dependency of constant on d . For point sequences $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ with empirical distributions $\mathbb{Q}_n, \mathbb{Q}'_n$, we overload the MMD notation to write $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{S}) \triangleq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}_n)$ and $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') \triangleq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{Q}_n, \mathbb{Q}'_n)$.

1.1 RELATED WORK

Here we provide a brief review of lower bounds and related work on methods generating high quality coresets (equally weighted point sequences), using thinning or otherwise. For discussion on strategies that try to reduce MMD error by re-weighting (for instance, Bayesian quadrature and cubature methods), we refer the reader to Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Sec. 1). We highlight that other than KT, known theoretical results for all other methods (even allowing for reweighting of points) do not yield a better than Monte Carlo MMD rate when \mathbb{P} and \mathbf{k} have unbounded support, and the kernel \mathbf{k} is infinite-dimensional. The latter condition applies to several commonly used kernels, including Gaussian, Laplace, Matérn, inverse multiquadrics, and B-spline (see Tab. 1 for the kernel expressions).

Lower bounds Phillips & Tai (2020, Thm. 3.1) establish that for any bounded and radial kernel satisfying mild decay and smoothness conditions, any procedure outputting coresets of size $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ must suffer $\Omega(\min(\sqrt{dn}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, n^{-\frac{1}{4}}))$ MMD for some (discrete) target distribution \mathbb{P} . On the other hand, Tolstikhin et al. (2017, Thm. 1) show that under mild conditions on \mathbf{k} , any estimator of \mathbb{P} (even non-coreset estimators) based only on n i.i.d. draws from \mathbb{P} must suffer $\Omega(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ MMD with probability at least $1/4$ for some continuous target \mathbb{P} with infinitely differentiable density. These last two lower bounds hold, for example, for Gaussian, Matérn, and B-spline kernels and apply in particular to any thinning algorithm that compresses n i.i.d. sample points without additional knowledge of \mathbb{P} . Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) showed that for light-tailed \mathbb{P} and \mathbf{k}_{rt} , the MMD error for root KT output matched each of these lower bounds up to factors logarithmic in n and constants depending on d . Here, we show that even target KT provides guarantees matching these lower bounds for several cases when \mathbf{k}_{rt} does not exist.

Points with Monte Carlo rate Many procedures are proven to provide an $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ MMD error with $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points, including as canonical examples i.i.d. sampling Tolstikhin et al. (2017), and sampling from a geometrically ergodic MCMC Dwivedi et al. (2019). While several other procedures have been proposed to find high quality points, the best known theoretical results for all these methods are $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ with $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points. These include: *kernel herding* with infinite-dimensional kernels (Chen et al., 2010), (Lacoste-Julien et al., 2015, Thm. G.1), *greedy sign selection* Karnin & Liberty (2019, Sec. 3.1) *Stein points MCMC* (Chen et al., 2019, Thm. 1), *Stein thinning* (Riabiz et al., 2020a, Thm. 1). On the other hand, some works while providing better than Monte Carlo performance, either do not analyze infinite-dimensional kernels, e.g., Harvey & Samadi (2014), or do not provide a constructive proof of better than Monte Carlo points, e.g., *super-sampling with a reservoir* Paige et al. (2016), *support points convex-concave procedures* Mak & Joseph (2018).

Points with better than Monte Carlo rate The Quasi Monte Carlo literature (Hickernell (1998); Novak & Wozniakowski (2010); Dick et al. (2013)), provides many low discrepancy *quasi-Monte Carlo* (QMC) methods that generate $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points that admit an $\mathcal{O}_d(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log^d n)$ -MMD error when \mathbb{P}

is the uniform distribution on the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$. For the same target, the *online Haar strategy* of Dwivedi et al. (2019) also obtains $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ points with an $\mathcal{O}_d(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log^{2d} n)$ -MMD error. These rates are similar to those established by the earlier work on KT, and the results established here, but are tailored specifically to the uniform distribution on the unit cube.

2 GENERALIZED KERNEL THINNING

Algorithmically, our generalization of kernel thinning Alg. 1 proceeds in two steps: **KT-SPLIT** and **KT-SWAP**. Given a thinning parameter m and a target kernel \mathbf{k} , KT-SPLIT divides the input sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$ into 2^m candidate coresets of size $n/2^m$ in a non-uniform manner using another suitable kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$. Next, the KT-SWAP step adds a baseline coreset to the candidate list (for example, one produced by standard thinning or uniform subsampling), and selects the candidate closest to \mathcal{S}_{in} in terms of $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$, and refines the selected coreset by swapping each input point into the coreset if it offers an improvement in $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$. The original variant of kernel thinning uses $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}$ (and we thus refer to it as root KT), and here we establish theoretical guarantees for more general $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$ with a notable example being $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}$. We note that this generalization does not affect the runtime or storage of kernel thinning, which for any m has the time complexity dominated by $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ evaluations of $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$ and \mathbf{k} , while the space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n \min(d, n))$, achieved by storing the smaller of the input sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ and the kernel matrices $(\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(x_i, x_j))_{i,j=1}^n$ and $(\mathbf{k}(x_i, x_j))_{i,j=1}^n$. Other than the choice of $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$ being more general, the KT-SPLIT and KT-SWAP considered here are identical to Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Alg 1a & 1b), and reproduced for reference in App. A.

Algorithm 1: Generalized Kernel Thinning – Return coreset of size $\lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$ with small $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$

Input: split kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$, target kernel \mathbf{k} , point sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$, thinning parameter $m \in \mathbb{N}$, probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$

$(\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)})_{\ell=1}^{2^m} \leftarrow \text{KT-SPLIT}(\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, m, (\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor})$ // Split \mathcal{S}_{in} into 2^m candidate coresets of size $\lfloor \frac{n}{2^m} \rfloor$

$\mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}} \leftarrow \text{KT-SWAP}(\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, (\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)})_{\ell=1}^{2^m})$ // Select best coreset and iteratively refine

return coreset \mathcal{S}_{KT} of size $\lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$

2.1 SINGLE FUNCTION GUARANTEES FOR GENERALIZED KT-SPLIT

Our first main result, proved in App. B, provides a high probability bound for the integration error of any fixed function in the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\text{split}}$ of kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$ for the output of KT-SPLIT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$.

Theorem 1 (Single function guarantee for generalized KT-SPLIT) Consider KT-SPLIT (Alg. 1a) with kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$, oblivious input point sequence \mathcal{S}_{in} , and probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{n/2}$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \delta_x$ and $\delta^* \triangleq \min_i \delta_i$. If $\frac{n}{2^m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any fixed function $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{split}}$, fixed index $\ell \in [m]$, and scalar $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least p_{sg} conditional to the input \mathcal{S}_{in} , the output coreset $\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)}$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} \triangleq \frac{1}{n/2^m} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)}} \delta_x$ satisfies conditional to the input \mathcal{S}_{in} :

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} f \right| \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}} \cdot \sigma_m \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta'}\right)}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{where } \sigma_m \triangleq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right)}, \quad \|\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(x, x), \quad (2)$$

$$\text{and } p_{\text{sg}} \triangleq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n/2^j} \delta_i - \delta'. \quad (3)$$

Thm. 1 applies in fairly general settings and leads to several important consequences as follows.

(1a) **Implications for \sqrt{n} -KT-SPLIT with target kernel \mathbf{k} :** By choosing $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}$, $m = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n$, $\delta_i = \frac{\delta}{2n}$, and $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{2}$, we find that for any fixed $f \in \mathcal{H}$, and index $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \sqrt{n}\}$, the output coreset $\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)}$ satisfies,

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} f \right| \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{\frac{8}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) \frac{\log(8n/\delta)}{n}}, \quad \|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{k}(x, x),$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, i.e., for a fixed function f , the \sqrt{n} sized coreset $\mathcal{S}^{(m, \ell)}$ provides $\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\log n})$ -integration error. When $|\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}}f| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, triangle inequality yields that $|\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)}f| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\log n})$, leading to a quadratically improved error over the Monte Carlo integration error of $\Omega(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$ with \sqrt{n} i.i.d. points.

- (1b) **High probability bound for known and arbitrary stopping times:** To ensure that the bound (1) holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we can set $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{2}$, and $\delta_i = \frac{\delta}{2n}$ for an apriori known stopping time n and $\delta_i = \frac{\delta}{4(i+1) \log^2(i+1)}$ for an arbitrary oblivious stopping time n .
- (1c) **Guarantees for arbitrary target kernel \mathbf{k} :** Thm. 1 applies to **any** reproducing kernel defined on any space including unbounded kernels on unbounded domains (e.g., energy distance and Stein kernels); kernels with slowly decaying square roots (e.g., sinc kernels); and non-smooth kernels without square roots (e.g., Laplace, Matérn with $\gamma \in (\frac{d}{2}, d]$), and the compactly supported kernels of Wendland (2004) with $s < \frac{1}{2}(d + 1)$). In contrast, the MMD guarantees of Dwivedi & Mackey covered only bounded, smooth \mathbf{k} on \mathbb{R}^d with bounded, Lipschitz, and rapidly-decaying square-roots.
- (1d) **Guarantees for arbitrary target distribution \mathbb{P} :** Thm. 1 guarantees better-than-i.i.d. integration error for a fixed function f under **any** target distribution on \mathbb{R}^d as long as $|\mathbb{P}f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}}f| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. On the other hand, the MMD improvements derived in Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) applied only to distributions with at least d moments (cf. Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 2)).
- (1e) **Dimension-independent bounds:** For bounded \mathbf{k} with $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty} = 1$, the MMD bounds of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) featured exponential dimension dependence in the form of c^d and $(\log n)^{d/2}$, where the constants could depend on the dimension. In contrast, Thm. 1 guarantee is dimension-free, and thereby practically relevant even when d is very large relative to n .
- (1f) **Consequences for KT-SPLIT with square-root kernel \mathbf{k}_{rt} :** When a bounded square-root kernel \mathbf{k}_{rt} (Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Def. 1)) is available, we can apply Thm. 1 with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}$ since any function f in the RKHS of \mathbf{k} also lies in the RKHS of \mathbf{k}_{rt} . This bound with root KT-SPLIT, when compared to the bound (1) admits a multiplicative factor of $\sqrt{\frac{\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}}} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}}$. For the kernels explicitly analyzed in Dwivedi & Mackey (2021), we show in App. G that this factor grows exponentially in dimension for Gaussian and Matérn kernels, and is 1 for B-spline kernels so that the single function guarantee from target KT is better than root KT for all the kernels explicitly considered in the prior work.

2.2 MMD GUARANTEES FOR TARGET KT

We now establish an MMD guarantee for target KT, i.e., generalized KT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}$.

Definition 2 (RKHS covering number) Consider a kernel \mathbf{k} defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with the corresponding RKHS \mathcal{H} , any set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and a scalar $\varepsilon > 0$. We define $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$ as the minimum cardinality over all possible covers $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}}$ (the unit ball of RKHS) that satisfy

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}} \subseteq \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{C}} \{g \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}} : \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h(x) - g(x)| \leq \varepsilon\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon) \triangleq \log \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon). \quad (4)$$

With the definitions in place, our next result provides an MMD guarantee for target KT (i.e., kernel thinning with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}$) in terms of the log-covering number $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$. Its proof based on a union bound argument along with Thm. 1 is provided in App. C.

Theorem 2 (MMD guarantee for target KT) Given a kernel \mathbf{k} , consider target KT, i.e., kernel thinning with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}$ (Alg. 1), oblivious point sequence \mathcal{S}_{in} of size n , probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ with $\delta^* \triangleq \min_i \delta_i$, and thinning parameter m . If $\frac{n}{2m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, and any fixed set \mathcal{A} containing \mathcal{S}_{in} , the output coreset \mathcal{S}_{tKT} is of size $\frac{n}{2m}$, and conditional to the input \mathcal{S}_{in} , we have

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{tKT}}) \leq 2\varepsilon + \frac{2m}{n} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{8}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \cdot \left[\log\left(\frac{4}{\delta'}\right) + \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon)\right]}, \quad (5)$$

with probability at least p_{sg} , where $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ and p_{sg} were defined in (2) and (3) respectively.

Thm. 2 provides MMD guarantees for target KT for an arbitrary target kernel \mathbf{k} as long as an upper bound on its log-covering number $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is available, and, we can choose δ' and δ_i as in remark (1b), to ensure the validity of this guarantee for a finite- or any-time horizon with probability at least $1-\delta$.

- (2a) **MMD guarantee for \sqrt{n} -thinning:** Substituting $m = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n$, $\delta_i = \frac{\delta}{2n}$, $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{2}$, $\varepsilon = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}_2(\mathfrak{R}_{\text{in}})$ for $\mathfrak{R}_{\text{in}} \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \|x\|_2$, we find that with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{tKT}}) \lesssim_{\mathbf{k}, d, \delta} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n} \cdot \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{B}_2(\mathfrak{R}_{\text{in}}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})}. \quad (6)$$

- (2b) **Optimized MMD bound:** The MMD bound (5) is a deterministic bound conditional on the input coreset \mathcal{S}_{in} , and can be thus optimized with respect to the choice of ε and the set \mathcal{A} .
- (2c) **Guarantee for arbitrary target \mathbb{P} :** Applying triangle inequality $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}) + \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}})$, we can also apply Thm. 2 to any target distribution \mathbb{P} .
- (2d) **Improvement over baseline thinning:** The KT-SWAP step in target KT is identical to that in root KT, and it ensures that, deterministically, $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{base}})$ for $\mathcal{S}_{\text{base}}$ a baseline thinned coreset of size $\frac{n}{2^m}$. Therefore, we additionally have $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}) \leq 2 \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}) + \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{base}})$.

In Tab. 2, we summarize the MMD rates for the target KT output for a wide range of settings under different forms of growth conditions on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and the input point radius $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \|x\|_2$. We consider two different growth conditions on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ (i) **LOGGROWTH** ($\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \lesssim_d r^d \log^\omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$), and (ii) **POLYGROWTH** ($\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \lesssim_d r^d \varepsilon^{-\omega}$). We show in Props. 2 and 3 that the LOGGROWTH condition applies to infinitely differentiable analytic kernels, including Gaussian, inverse multiquadric, and sinc kernels, and the POLYGROWTH condition applies to kernels differentiable finitely many times, including Matérn, and B-spline.

Our conditions on $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}}$, arise from four forms of target distribution tail decay: (1) **COMPACT** ($\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \lesssim_d 1$), (2) **SUBGAUSS** ($\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \lesssim_d \sqrt{\log n}$), (3) **SUBEXP** ($\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \lesssim_d \log n$), and (4) **HEAVYTAIL** ($\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \lesssim_d n^{1/\rho}$). The first setting arises with a compactly supported \mathbb{P} , e.g., on the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$; and the other three settings arise in expectation and with high probability when \mathbb{P} has, respectively, sub-Gaussian tails, sub-exponential tails, or ρ moments and \mathcal{S}_{in} is generated i.i.d. from \mathbb{P} .

Substituting these conditions in (6) yields the eight entries of Tab. 2. We, thus, conclude that for a LOGGROWTH kernel, target KT provides an $o(n^{-1/4})$ MMD error for all four settings of \mathbb{P} ; and for a POLYGROWTH kernel, it provides an $o(n^{-1/4})$ MMD error if $\omega < \frac{1}{2}$ for COMPACT, SUBGAUSS, and SUBEXP \mathbb{P} , and if $\omega + 2d/\rho < 1/2$ for HEAVYTAIL \mathbb{P} with tail exponent ρ .

$\mathfrak{R}_{\text{in}} \lesssim_d$	COMPACT \mathbb{P} 1	SUBGAUSS \mathbb{P} $\sqrt{\log n}$	SUBEXP \mathbb{P} $\log n$	HEAVYTAIL \mathbb{P} $n^{1/\rho}$
LOGGROWTH \mathbf{k} $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \lesssim_d r^d \log^\omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{\omega+1}}{n}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{d+\omega+1}}{n}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{2d+\omega+1}}{n}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{\omega+1}}{n^{1-2d/\rho}}}$
POLYGROWTH \mathbf{k} $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \lesssim_d r^d \varepsilon^{-\omega}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{1-\omega}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{d+1}}{n^{1-\omega}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^{2d+1}}{n^{1-\omega}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{1-\omega-2d/\rho}}}$

Table 2: MMD guarantees for target KT under $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}$ growth and \mathbb{P} tail decay. We report the $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}})$ bound of Thm. 2 for target KT with n input points and \sqrt{n} output points, up to constants depending on d, δ, δ' , and $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$. Here $\mathfrak{R}_{\text{in}} \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \|x\|_2$.

Next in Tab. 3, we summarize the MMD rates for target KT and root KT for all kernels displayed in Tab. 1. The results for root KT follow from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021), while the results for target KT are obtained by substituting the covering number bounds from Prop. 3 (that we establish in App. I) in Tab. 1. Overall, we note that besides providing a better than Monte Carlo guarantee for a range of settings without root kernel, target KT also provides comparable guarantees to root KT whenever the latter is defined. We provide more details on derivation in App. J, where we also show that valid α -power kernels for LAPLACE are defined for $\alpha > \frac{d}{d+1}$, and for $\alpha > \frac{d}{2\nu}$ for MATÉRN(ν, γ).

Kernel	Target KT $\text{MMD}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{TKT}})$ \lesssim	Root KT $\text{MMD}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{rKT}})$ \lesssim	KT+ $\text{MMD}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT+}})$ \lesssim
GAUSS(σ)	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{3d}{4}+1}}{\sqrt{n \cdot c_n^d}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$
LAPLACE(σ)	$n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	N/A	$\left(\frac{c_n (\log n)^{1+2d(1-\alpha)}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4\alpha}}$
MATÉRN(ν, γ) $\nu \in (\frac{d}{2}, d]$	$n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	N/A	$\left(\frac{c_n (\log n)^{1+2d(1-\alpha)}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4\alpha}}$
MATÉRN(ν, γ) $\nu > d$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{1-d/(2\nu)}}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$
IMQ(ν, γ) $\nu < \frac{d}{2}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{d+1}}{\sqrt{n}}$	$\min(n^{-\frac{1}{4}}, \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n^{1-d/(4\nu)}}})$	$\frac{(\log n)^{d+1}}{\sqrt{n}}$
IMQ(ν, γ) $\nu \geq \frac{d}{2}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{d+1}}{\sqrt{n}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \sqrt{c_n}}{\sqrt{n}}$
SINC(θ)	$\frac{(\log n)^2}{\sqrt{n}}$	$n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$	$\frac{(\log n)^2}{\sqrt{n}}$
SINC-RAD(θ) $d \leq 3$	$\frac{(\log n)^{d+1}}{\sqrt{n}}$	N/A	N/A
B-SPLINE($2\beta + 1$) $\beta \in 2\mathbb{N}_0$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)}}}$	N/A	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (\beta \geq 2)$
B-SPLINE($2\beta + 1$) $\beta \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{2\beta/(2\beta+1)}}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$

Table 3: MMD guarantees for target KT, root KT, and KT+ for commonly used kernels. For n input points and \sqrt{n} thinned points, we report the MMD bounds from Thm. 2 for target KT, Thm. 4 for KT+ (with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ wherever feasible), and Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 3) for root KT. We report the rates for a SUBGAUSS \mathbb{P} for the Gaussian kernel, a COMPACT \mathbb{P} for the B-SPLINE kernel, and a SUBEXP \mathbb{P} for all other kernels (see Tab. 2 for a definition of the various \mathbb{P}). Here, $c_n \triangleq \log \log n$, and the MMD error is reported up to constants depending on $\mathbf{k}, d, \delta, \alpha$. The KT+ guarantee for LAPLACE row applies with $\alpha > \frac{d}{d+1}$, and for MATÉRN row with $\alpha > \frac{d}{2\nu}$. Best rate is highlighted in blue.

3 KERNEL THINNING+

We now introduce two other instantiations of generalized KT that can leverage a power kernel (with \mathbf{k}_{rt} as a special case) to further improve the MMD guarantees over target KT: (i) power KT with a generalized power kernel in Sec. 3.1 when \mathbf{k}_{rt} is not available, and (ii) KT+ that uses sum of power kernel and target kernel to improve over the MMD guarantee of target KT, while preserving its desirable single function guarantee.

3.1 α -POWER KERNEL THINNING

First, we define a generalization of the square-root kernel (Def. 1) for a shift-invariant kernel. Let \hat{f} denote the generalized Fourier transform (GFT) (Wendland, 2004, Def. 8.9) of $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 3 (α -power kernel) For $\alpha > 0$, and shift-invariant kernels \mathbf{k}_α and \mathbf{k} such that $\mathbf{k}_\alpha(x, y) = \kappa_\alpha(x - y)$ and $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \kappa(x - y)$, we say \mathbf{k}_α is an α -power kernel of \mathbf{k} , if $\widehat{\kappa_\alpha} = \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha$.

We note that that for a shift-invariant kernel \mathbf{k} , Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Prop. 2) implies that \mathbf{k}_{rt} and $\frac{1}{2}$ -power kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ (Def. 3) are identical.

Given the target kernel \mathbf{k} , and its power kernel \mathbf{k}_α , we call the instantiation of generalized KT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_\alpha$ in KT-SPLIT and \mathbf{k} for KT-SWAP as α -power kernel thinning (power KT). To state an

MMD guarantee for power KT, we need additional notation. Define the \mathbf{k}_α and \mathcal{S}_{in} tail radii:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha, n}^\dagger &\triangleq \min\left\{r : \tau_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}(r) \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty}{n}\right\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tau_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}(R) \triangleq \left(\sup_x \int_{\|y\|_2 \geq R} \mathbf{k}_\alpha^2(x, x-y) dy\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha, n} &\triangleq \min\left\{r : \sup_{\substack{x, y: \\ \|x-y\|_2 \geq r}} |\mathbf{k}_\alpha(x, y)| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty}{n}\right\}, \\ \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} &\triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \|x\|_2, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{k}_\alpha, n} \triangleq \min\left(\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}}, n^{1+\frac{1}{d}} \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha, n} + n^{\frac{1}{d}} \frac{\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty}{L_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

and the inflation factor

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}(n, d, \delta, \delta', R) \triangleq 37 \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right)} \left[\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{4}{\delta'}\right)} + 5 \sqrt{d \log\left(2 + 2 \frac{L_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}}{\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty} (\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha, n} + R)\right)} \right],$$

where $L_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}$ denotes the Lipschitz-constant of \mathbf{k}_α , i.e., $|\mathbf{k}_\alpha(x, y) - \mathbf{k}_\alpha(x, z)| \leq L_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha} \|y - z\|_2$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Our next result (with proof in App. D) provides an MMD guarantee for power KT,

Theorem 3 (MMD guarantee for α -power KT) *Consider α -power kernel thinning for some fixed $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, i.e., Alg. 1 with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_\alpha$, an α -power kernel of \mathbf{k} (Def. 3), an oblivious point sequence \mathcal{S}_{in} of size n , probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ with $\delta^* \triangleq \min_i \delta_i$, and thinning parameter m . If $\frac{n}{2^m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any fixed $\delta' \in (0, 1)$ and conditional to the input \mathcal{S}_{in} , the output coreset $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha\text{KT}}$ satisfies*

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\alpha\text{KT}}) \leq \left(\frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} (2 \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha)^{1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{(4\pi)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \tag{8}$$

with probability at least p_{sg} where p_{sg} was defined in (3), and

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha \triangleq \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}(n, d, \delta^*, \delta', \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathbf{k}_\alpha, n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}} \triangleq \max(\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}}, \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha, n/2^m}^\dagger). \tag{9}$$

The proof of Thm. 3 proceeds by first establishing a novel interpolation result (of independent interest) for MMDs, that relates $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$ in terms of $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}$ and $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}$ (Prop. 1). Next, we note that the kernel \mathbf{k}_α itself is $\frac{1}{2}$ -power kernel of $\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}$, and hence we can apply the existing guarantees of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) for root KT for $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}$ -error and L^∞ -error for \mathbf{k}_α with the output of KT-SPLIT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_\alpha$. In fact, Thm. 3 yields the root KT guarantee Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thm. 1) as a special case when we set $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$.

3.2 KERNEL THINNING+

Next, we define KT+, which is defined via a combination of the power kernel \mathbf{k}_α and target kernel \mathbf{k} . Define $\mathbf{k}^\dagger \triangleq \mathbf{k}/\|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty + \mathbf{k}_\alpha/\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty$.² Then the instantiation of generalized KT with \mathbf{k}^\dagger for KT-SPLIT, and \mathbf{k} for KT-SWAP is defined as KT+. The next result shows that KT+ simultaneously provides a high probability dimension independent single function guarantee and an improved MMD error guarantee. See App. E for the proof.

Theorem 4 (Single function & MMD guarantees for KT+) *Given a bounded target kernel \mathbf{k} with a bounded α -power kernel \mathbf{k}_α , consider kernel thinning (Alg. 1) with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}^\dagger$, oblivious point sequence \mathcal{S}_{in} of size n , probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$, and thinning parameter m . If $\frac{n}{2^m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then the intermediate split coreset $\mathcal{S}^{(m, \ell)}$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} \triangleq \frac{1}{n/2^m} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^{(m, \ell)}} \delta_x$, and the final output coreset $\mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}$ satisfy the following, conditional to the input \mathcal{S}_{in} .*

(a) *For any fixed function $f \in \mathcal{H}$, index $\ell \in [m]$ and scalar $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} f \right| \leq \frac{2^m}{n} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{16}{3} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta'}\right)} \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty}, \tag{10}$$

with probability at least p_{sg} (3).

(b) *Given any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, and any fixed set \mathcal{A} containing \mathcal{S}_{in} , we have*

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}) \leq \min \left[\sqrt{2} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{targetKT}}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon), \quad 2^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{powerKT}}(\mathbf{k}_\alpha) \right] \tag{11}$$

with probability at least p_{sg} (3), where $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{targetKT}}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon)$ denotes the right hand side of (5) with $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ replaced by $\|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty$, and $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{powerKT}}(\mathbf{k}_\alpha)$ denotes the right hand side of (8).

²When \mathcal{S}_{in} is known in advance, one can alternatively choose $\mathbf{k}^\dagger \triangleq \mathbf{k}/\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} + \mathbf{k}_\alpha/\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$.




Figure 1: Scatter plots of i.i.d. coresets and coresets obtained from target KT (KT), root KT (KT(rt)), and KT+ with various kernels for 8-component MoG target with equidensity contours of the target underlaid.

Once again, we note that the first term on the right hand side of the display (11) can be optimized over ε and the choice of set \mathcal{A} , similar to the discussion after Thm. 2.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We now provide numerical experiments that complement the methodological and theoretical contributions of our work.

Target distributions We consider three different classes of target distributions: (i) GAUSSIAN TARGET $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$ in $d \in \{2, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$, (ii) M -MIXTURE OF GAUSSIAN TARGET (MoG) $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \mathbf{I}_2)$ with $M \in \{4, 6, 8\}$ component locations $\mu_j \in \mathbb{R}^2$ defined in App. H, and (iii) MCMC TARGET based on data from twelve different experiments conducted by Riabiz et al. (2020a). These include four MCMC chains each for the $d = 4$ -dimensional *Goodwin model* of oscillatory enzymatic control (Goodwin, 1965), and $d = 4$ -dimensional *Lotka-Volterra model* of oscillatory predator-prey evolution (Lotka, 1925; Volterra, 1926), and two chains for a posterior and a tempered posterior for the $d = 38$ -dimensional Hinch model of calcium signalling in cardiac cells (Hinch et al., 2004). We discuss more details on the MCMC set-up in App. H.

Function test-bed To evaluate the single function integration-error, we use the following functions: (a) FIRST MOMENT: $f : x \rightarrow x_1$ (where x_1 denotes the first coordinate of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$), (b) SECOND MOMENT: $f : x \mapsto x_1^2$, (c) a random element of the target kernel RKHS, KERNEL FUNCTION $f : x \mapsto \mathbf{k}(X', x)$ where $X' = 2X$ for $X \sim \mathbb{P}$ (drawn once and fixed across all experiments),³ and (d) a standard numerical integration benchmark test function from the CONTINUOUS INTEGRAND FAMILY (CIF, Genz, 1984), $f_{\text{CIF}} : x \mapsto \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^d a_i |x_i - u_i|)$ for u_i drawn i.i.d. from uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, and $a_i = 1/d$. Settings (a), (b), and (d) test the ability of KT to improve integration even outside of \mathcal{H} . We use \mathbb{P}_{in} and \mathbb{P}_{out} to respectively denote the empirical distributions of the input and output points.

Common settings and error computation To obtain an output coreset of size $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with n input points, we (a) take every $n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -th point for standard thinning, and (b) run kernel thinning (KT) with $m = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n$ using a standard thinning coreset as the base coreset in KT-SWAP. For Gaussian and MoG target we use i.i.d. points as input, and for MCMC targets we use a standard thinned coreset after burn-in as the input (see App. H for more details). We compute errors with respect to \mathbb{P} whenever available in closed form, otherwise resorting to \mathbb{P}_{in} . For i.i.d. input, we use standard thinning to define \mathbb{P}_{out} when computing errors for CIF function (as its integral does not admit a closed form other than the uniform distribution on the unit cube). For each input sample size $n \in \{2^4, 2^6, \dots, 2^{14}\}$ with $\delta_i = \frac{1}{2n}$, we report the mean MMD or function integration error ± 1 standard

³For MCMC experiments, X is drawn from held-out data not used as input to KT.

error across 10 independent replications of the experiment (the standard errors are too small to be visible in all experiments). We also compute the ordinary least squares fit for the log mean error with respect to the log coresets size. We display this fit, and its slope as the empirical decay rate, e.g., an empirical decay rate of $n^{-0.25}$ for the error is denoted when the slope of the best fit is -0.25 .

Results for Gaussian \mathbb{P} For Gaussian target, we use Gaussian kernel with squared kernel bandwidth $\sigma^2 = 2d$, and input sequence i.i.d. from \mathbb{P} . We observe from Fig. 2 that the MMD guarantee for target KT is comparable to root KT, and both variants of KT are significantly superior to i.i.d. points even in 50 and 100 dimensions with as few as 8 points. Moreover for all functions in our test-best target KT provides a significant improvement over i.i.d. points in almost all settings.




Figure 2: Gaussian \mathbb{P} results for target KT, root KT and i.i.d. sampling for $d \in \{2, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$. First row plots the MMD error for target KT (KT), root KT (KT(rt)), and i.i.d. points. The subsequent rows plot respectively, the function integration error for the FIRST MOMENT, the SECOND MOMENT, the KERNEL FUNCTION, and the CIF.

Results for MoG \mathbb{P} In Fig. 1, we visualize the coresets from target KT for GAUSS(4) and B-SPLINE (1), root KT for GAUSS(4), and KT+ with 0.70-power kernel for LAPLACE(2), and KT+ with root kernel for IMQ(0.5, 2). (Note that B-SPLINE (1), and LAPLACE kernels do not admit a square-root.) In all cases, the spatial distribution of the KT output is superior to i.i.d. points, and provides a better approximation of the underlying target (also see Fig. 4). This observation can be quantified via the MMD error plots in Fig. 5 in App. H, where we notice that the MMD error for all variants of KT decays more rapidly than i.i.d. with a rate close to $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ across all settings. These rates match the theoretical rates from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 2) for root KT, and Tab. 3 above for KT and KT+ for the selected kernels.

Results for MCMC targets Since the exact posterior \mathbb{P} is unknown for these experiments, we provide the results with respect to the input distribution \mathbb{P}_{in} (consistent with our theoretical guarantees).

We use $\text{LAPLACE}(\sigma)$ kernel for Goodwin and Lotka-Volterra experiments with 0.81-power kernel in KT+, and $\text{IMQ}(0.5, \frac{1}{\sigma})$ kernel for Hinch experiments with 0.5-power kernel in KT+. Here the kernel bandwidth σ is chosen the popular median heuristic (see, e.g., Garreau et al., 2017): for all n , σ is set to the median distance between all pairs of points in the largest \mathcal{S}_{in} tested. In Fig. 3, we plot one posterior setting from each of the Goodwin, Lotka-Volterra and Hinch models, and observe that that KT+ uniformly improves the MMD error over standard thinning in all settings. Furthermore, it provides a significantly smaller integration error for all four test functions in almost all settings. For the other 9 MCMC settings, we provide the results in Fig. 6 in App. H.




Figure 3: KT+ vs standard thinning (ST) for three MCMC target. The first column plots the MMD error in three MC setting, and the latter columns denote the integration error for our four test functions. See Fig. 6 for the results with other nine MCMC target.

5 CONCLUSION

We generalize the recently introduced (root) kernel thinning algorithm of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) for generating better than Monte Carlo points provably and practically. We provide the first analysis of target KT, namely kernel thinning directly with the target kernel, thereby extending the reach of kernel thinning to a broader range of kernels that do not admit a square-root kernels. Moreover, we established dimension-independent single function error guarantees for arbitrary kernels. We also introduced two new variants of KT, namely power KT and KT+ that provide improved MMD guarantees whenever a less-smooth power kernel is available, while simultaneously providing single function guarantees like target KT.

While highlight that while generalized KT provides unweighted coresets with better than Monte Carlo MMD, its guarantees also extend to any improved reweighting of the output points. In particular, if the downstream inferential task supports weighted coresets, one can optimally reweight \mathbb{P}_{out} to approximate \mathbb{P}_{in} in $\mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{3}{2}})$ time by directly minimizing the MMD. Finally, we note that like the original root KT algorithm, target KT and KT+ have a runtime of n^2 that might be prohibitive for large values of n . An important open question is whether one can substantially improve the runtime of KT without significant degradation of the MMD or single function guarantees.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

RD acknowledges the support by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-2023528 for the Foundations of Data Science Institute (FODSI).

REFERENCES

- Christoph M Augustin, Aurel Neic, Manfred Liebmman, Anton J Prassl, Steven A Niederer, Gundolf Haase, and Gernot Plank. Anatomically accurate high resolution modeling of human whole heart electromechanics: A strongly scalable algebraic multigrid solver method for nonlinear deformation. *Journal of computational physics*, 305:622–646, 2016.
- Necdet Batir. Bounds for the gamma function. *Results in Mathematics*, 72(1):865–874, 2017. doi: 10.1007/s00025-017-0698-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00025-017-0698-0>.
- Alain Berlinet and Christine Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- Wilson Ye Chen, Alessandro Barp, François-Xavier Briol, Jackson Gorham, Mark Girolami, Lester Mackey, and Chris Oates. Stein point Markov chain Monte Carlo. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1011–1021. PMLR, 2019.
- Yutian Chen, Max Welling, and Alex Smola. Super-samples from kernel herding. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI’10, pp. 109–116, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 2010. AUAI Press. ISBN 9780974903965.
- Josef Dick, Frances Y Kuo, and Ian H Sloan. High-dimensional integration: the quasi-Monte Carlo way. *Acta Numerica*, 22:133–288, 2013.
- Raaz Dwivedi and Lester Mackey. Kernel thinning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.05842*, 2021.
- Raaz Dwivedi, Ohad N Feldheim, Ori Gurel-Gurevich, and Aaditya Ramdas. The power of online thinning in reducing discrepancy. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 174(1):103–131, 2019.
- Damien Garreau, Wittawat Jitkrittum, and Motonobu Kanagawa. Large sample analysis of the median heuristic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07269*, 2017.
- Alan Genz. Testing multidimensional integration routines. In *Proc. of international conference on Tools, methods and languages for scientific and engineering computation*, pp. 81–94, 1984.
- Mark Girolami and Ben Calderhead. Riemann manifold Langevin and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73(2):123–214, 2011.
- Brian C Goodwin. Oscillatory behavior in enzymatic control process. *Advances in Enzyme Regulation*, 3: 318–356, 1965.
- Arthur Gretton, Karsten M. Borgwardt, Malte J. Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(25):723–773, 2012.
- Heikki Haario, Eero Saksman, and Johanna Tamminen. Adaptive proposal distribution for random walk Metropolis algorithm. *Computational Statistics*, 14(3):375–395, 1999.
- Nick Harvey and Samira Samadi. Near-optimal herding. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 1165–1182, 2014.
- Fred Hickernell. A generalized discrepancy and quadrature error bound. *Mathematics of computation*, 67(221): 299–322, 1998.
- Robert Hinch, JL Greenstein, AJ Tanskanen, L Xu, and RL Winslow. A simplified local control model of calcium-induced calcium release in cardiac ventricular myocytes. *Biophysical journal*, 87(6):3723–3736, 2004.
- Zohar Karnin and Edo Liberty. Discrepancy, coresets, and sketches in machine learning. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 1975–1993. PMLR, 2019.
- Simon Lacoste-Julien, Fredrik Lindsten, and Francis Bach. Sequential kernel herding: Frank-Wolfe optimization for particle filtering. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 544–552. PMLR, 2015.
- Alfred James Lotka. *Elements of physical biology*. Williams & Wilkins, 1925.
- Simon Mak and V Roshan Joseph. Support points. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2562–2592, 2018.
- Steven A Niederer, Lawrence Mitchell, Nicolas Smith, and Gernot Plank. Simulating human cardiac electrophysiology on clinical time-scales. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 2:14, 2011.

- E Novak and H Wozniakowski. Tractability of multivariate problems, volume ii: Standard information for functionals, european math. *Soc. Publ. House, Zürich*, 3, 2010.
- Art B Owen. Statistically efficient thinning of a Markov chain sampler. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(3):738–744, 2017.
- Brooks Paige, Dino Sejdinovic, and Frank Wood. Super-sampling with a reservoir. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 567–576, 2016.
- Jeff M Phillips and Wai Ming Tai. Near-optimal coresets of kernel density estimates. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 63(4):867–887, 2020.
- Marina Riabiz, Wilson Chen, Jon Cockayne, Pawel Swietach, Steven A Niederer, Lester Mackey, and Chris Oates. Optimal thinning of MCMC output. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03952*, 2020a.
- Marina Riabiz, Wilson Ye Chen, Jon Cockayne, Pawel Swietach, Steven A. Niederer, Lester Mackey, and Chris J. Oates. Replication Data for: Optimal Thinning of MCMC Output, 2020b. URL <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/MDKNWM>. Accessed on Mar 23, 2021.
- Gareth O Roberts and Richard L Tweedie. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 1996.
- Alessandro Rudi, Ulysse Marteau-Ferey, and Francis Bach. Finding global minima via kernel approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11978*, 2020.
- Isaac J Schoenberg. Metric spaces and completely monotone functions. *Annals of Mathematics*, pp. 811–841, 1938.
- Michael L Stein. *Interpolation of spatial data: some theory for kriging*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Ingo Steinwart and Andreas Christmann. *Support vector machines*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- Ingo Steinwart and Simon Fischer. A closer look at covering number bounds for Gaussian kernels. *Journal of Complexity*, 62:101513, 2021.
- Marina Stocchi, Matthias AF Gsell, Christoph M Augustin, Orod Razeghi, Caroline H Roney, Anton J Prassl, Edward J Vigmond, Jonathan M Behar, Justin S Gould, Christopher A Rinaldi, Martin J Bishop, Gernot Plank, and Steven A Niederer. Simulating ventricular systolic motion in a four-chamber heart model with spatially varying robin boundary conditions to model the effect of the pericardium. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 101:109645, 2020.
- Hong-Wei Sun and Ding-Xuan Zhou. Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces associated with analytic translation-invariant Mercer kernels. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 14(1):89–101, 2008.
- Ilya Tolstikhin, Bharath K Sriperumbudur, and Krikamol Muandet. Minimax estimation of kernel mean embeddings. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):3002–3048, 2017.
- Vito Volterra. Variazioni e fluttuazioni del numero d’individui in specie animali conviventi. 1926.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Holger Wendland. *Scattered data approximation*, volume 17. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- Haizhang Zhang and Liang Zhao. On the inclusion relation of reproducing kernel hilbert spaces. *Analysis and Applications*, 11(02):1350014, 2013.
- Ding-Xuan Zhou. Capacity of reproducing kernel spaces in learning theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(7):1743–1752, 2003.

APPENDIX

A	Details of KT-SPLIT and KT-SWAP	14
B	Proof of Thm. 1: Single function guarantee for generalized KT-SPLIT	15
C	Proof of Thm. 2: MMD guarantee for target KT	15
D	Proof of Thm. 3: MMD guarantee for α-power KT	16
E	Proof of Thm. 4: Single function & MMD guarantees for KT+	17
F	Proof of Prop. 1: An interpolation result for MMD	18
G	Sub-optimality of single function guarantees with root KT	19
H	Additional Experimental Results	19
I	Upper bounds on RKHS covering numbers	23
J	Proof of Tab. 3 results	27

A DETAILS OF KT-SPLIT AND KT-SWAP

Algorithm 1a: KT-SPLIT – Divide points into candidate coresets of size $\lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$

Input: kernel $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$, point sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$, thinning parameter $m \in \mathbb{N}$, probabilities $(\delta_i)_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$

$\mathcal{S}^{(j,\ell)} \leftarrow \{\}$ for $j = 0, \dots, m$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^j$ // Empty coresets: $\mathcal{S}^{(j,\ell)}$ has size $\lfloor i/2^j \rfloor$ after round i

$\sigma_{j,\ell} \leftarrow 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j-1}$ // Swapping parameters

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

$\mathcal{S}^{(0,1)}$.append(x_i)

// Every 2^j iterations, add one point from each parent coreset $\mathcal{S}^{(j-1,\ell)}$ to each child $\mathcal{S}^{(j,2\ell-1)}, \mathcal{S}^{(j,2\ell)}$

for ($j = 1$; $j \leq m$ **and** $i/2^j \in \mathbb{N}$; $j = j + 1$) **do**

for $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{j-1}$ **do**

$(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}') \leftarrow (\mathcal{S}^{(j-1,\ell)}, \mathcal{S}^{(j,2\ell-1)})$; $(x, x') \leftarrow \text{get_last_two_points}(\mathcal{S})$

$(p_{\text{swap}}, \sigma_{j,\ell}) \leftarrow \text{Update_params}(\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}', x, x', \sigma_{j,\ell}, \delta_{i/2^j})$

$(x, x') \leftarrow (x', x)$ with probability p_{swap}

$\mathcal{S}^{(j,2\ell-1)}$.append(x); $\mathcal{S}^{(j,2\ell)}$.append(x')

end

end

end

return $(\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)})_{\ell=1}^{2^m}$, candidate coresets of size $\lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$

Update_params ($\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}', x, x', \sigma, \delta$):

$\mathbf{b}^2 \leftarrow \mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(x, x) + \mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(x', x') - 2\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(x, x')$; $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow \max(\mathbf{b}\sigma\sqrt{2\log(4/\delta)}, \mathbf{b}^2)$

$\sigma \leftarrow \sigma + \mathbf{b}^2(1 + (\mathbf{b}^2 - 2\mathbf{a})\sigma^2/\mathbf{a}^2)_+$

$\alpha \leftarrow \mathbf{k}(x', x') - \mathbf{k}(x, x) + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} (\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}(y, x) - \mathbf{k}(y, x')) - 2\sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}'} (\mathbf{k}(z, x) - \mathbf{k}(z, x'))$

$p \leftarrow \min(1, \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha/\mathbf{a})_+)$

return (p, σ)

Algorithm 1b: KT-SWAP – Identify and refine the best candidate coreset

Input: kernel \mathbf{k} , point sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$, candidate coresets $(\mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)})_{\ell=1}^{2^m}$
 $\mathcal{S}^{(m,0)} \leftarrow \text{baseline_thinning}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \text{size} = \lfloor n/2^m \rfloor)$ // Compare to baseline
 $\mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell^*)}$ for $\ell^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{\ell \in \{0,1,\dots,2^m\}} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^{(m,\ell)})$ // Select best candidate coreset
for $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$ **do**
 $\mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}[i] \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}} \text{ with } \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}[i] = z)$
 // Swap out each point in \mathcal{S}_{KT} for best alternative in \mathcal{S}_{in}
end
return \mathcal{S}_{KT} , refined coreset of size $\lfloor n/2^m \rfloor$

B PROOF OF THM. 1: SINGLE FUNCTION GUARANTEE FOR GENERALIZED KT-SPLIT

We prove the theorem for the case $\ell = 1$, and for other indices, the proof can be derived by repeating the arguments. Define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_m \triangleq \mathcal{W}_{1,m} = \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} \mathbf{k} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)} \mathbf{k} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{k}(x, \cdot) - \frac{1}{n/2^m} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^{(m,1)}} \mathbf{k}(x, \cdot).$$

Next, we use the results about an intermediate algorithm, kernel halving (Dwivedi & Mackey, 2021, Alg. 3) that was introduced for the analysis of kernel thinning. Using the arguments from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Sec. 5.2), we conclude that KT-SPLIT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}}$ set as \mathbf{k} and thinning parameter m , is equivalent to repeated kernel halving with kernel \mathbf{k} for m rounds (with no Failure in any rounds of kernel halving). On this event of equivalence, denoted by $\mathcal{E}_{\text{equi}}$, Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Eqns. (50, 51)) imply that the function $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_m \in \mathcal{H}$ is equal in distribution to another random function \mathcal{W}_m , where \mathcal{W}_m is unconditionally sub-Gaussian with parameter

$$\sigma_m = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty} \log(\frac{4}{\delta^*})},$$

that is,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\langle \mathcal{W}_m, f \rangle_{\mathbf{k}})] \leq \exp(\frac{1}{2} \sigma_m^2 \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}^2) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (12)$$

where we note that the analysis of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021) remains unaffected when we replace $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty}$ by $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ in all the arguments. Applying the sub-Gaussian Hoeffding inequality (Wainwright, 2019, Prop. 2.5) along with (12), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\langle \mathcal{W}_m, f \rangle_{\mathbf{k}}\| > t] \leq 2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2} t^2 / (\sigma_m^2 \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}^2)) \leq \delta' \text{ for } t \triangleq \sigma_m \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{2 \log(\frac{2}{\delta'})}.$$

Call this event \mathcal{E}_{sg} . As noted above, conditional to the event $\mathcal{E}_{\text{equi}}$, we also have

$$\mathcal{W}_m \stackrel{d}{=} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_m \implies \langle \mathcal{W}_m, f \rangle_{\mathbf{k}} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)} f,$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. Furthermore, Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Eqn. 48) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{equi}}) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n/2^j} \delta_i$$

Putting the pieces together, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)} f\| \leq t] \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{equi}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\text{sg}}^c) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{equi}}) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\text{sg}}) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n/2^j} \delta_i - \delta' = p_{\text{sg}},$$

as claimed. The proof is now complete.

C PROOF OF THM. 2: MMD GUARANTEE FOR TARGET KT

First, we note that by design, KT-SWAP ensures

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^{(m,1)}),$$

where $\mathcal{S}^{(m,1)}$ denotes the first coreset returned by KT-SPLIT. Thus it suffices to show that $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^{(m,1)})$ is bounded by the term stated on the right hand side of (5). Let $\mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)} \triangleq \frac{1}{n/2^m} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}^{(m,1)}} \delta_x$. By design of KT-SPLIT, $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}})$. Recall the set \mathcal{A} is such that $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

Proof of (5) Let $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{A})$ denote the cover of minimum cardinality satisfying (4). Fix any $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}}$. By the triangle inequality and the covering property (4) of \mathcal{C} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})f \right| &\leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(f - g) \right| + \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \\ &\leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{C}} |\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}}(f - g)| + \left| \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)}(f - g) \right| + \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \\ &\leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{C}} 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} |f(x) - g(x)| + \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon + \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Applying Thm. 1, we have

$$\left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \leq \frac{2^m}{n} \|g\|_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{\frac{8}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right)} \quad (14)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta' - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^{n/2^j} \delta_i = p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. A standard union bound then yields that

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \leq \frac{2^m}{n} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \|g\|_{\mathbf{k}} \sqrt{\frac{8}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) [\log |\mathcal{C}| + \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right)]}$$

probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. Since $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}}$ was arbitrary, and $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and thus $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \|g\|_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1$, we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}^{(m,1)}) &= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \leq 1} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})f \right| \stackrel{(13)}{\leq} 2\varepsilon + \sup_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \left| (\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\text{out}}^{(1)})(g) \right| \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon + \sqrt{\frac{8\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty}}{3}} \cdot \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) [\log |\mathcal{C}| + \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right)]}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$ as claimed.

D PROOF OF THM. 3: MMD GUARANTEE FOR α -POWER KT

KT-SWAP step ensures that

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\alpha \text{KT}}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)}),$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)}$ denotes the first coreset output by KT-SPLIT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}_{\alpha}$. Next, we state a key interpolation result for $\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}$ that relates it to the MMD of its power kernels (Def. 3) (see App. F for the proof).

Proposition 1 (An interpolation result for MMD) *Consider a shift-invariant kernel \mathbf{k} that admits valid α and 2α -power kernels \mathbf{k}_{α} and $\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}$ respectively for some $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Then for any two discrete measures \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} supported on finitely many points, we have*

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) \leq (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{\alpha}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}))^{2 - \frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1}. \quad (15)$$

Given Prop. 1, it remains to establish suitable upper bounds on MMDs of \mathbf{k}_{α} and $\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}$. To this end, first we note that for any reproducing kernel \mathbf{k} and any two distributions \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} , Hölder's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) &= \|(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})\mathbf{k}\|_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = (\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})\mathbf{k} \leq \|\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q}\|_1 \|(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq 2 \|(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let \mathbb{P}_{in} and $\mathbb{P}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)}$ denote the empirical distributions of \mathcal{S}_{in} and $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)}$. Now applying Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thm. 4(b)), we find that

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{\alpha}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)}) \leq \sqrt{2 \|(\mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} - \mathbb{P}_{\alpha}^{(m,1)})\mathbf{k}_{\alpha}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}} \leq \sqrt{2 \cdot \frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_{\alpha}\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\mathbf{k}_{\alpha}}} \quad (16)$$

with probability $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$, where $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}$ was defined in (9). We note that while Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thm. 4(b)) uses $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty$ in their bounds, we can replace it by $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$, and verifying that all the steps of the proof continue to be valid (noting that $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ is deterministic given \mathcal{S}_{in}). Furthermore, Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thm. 4(b)) yields that

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_\alpha^{(m,1)}) \leq \frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{(4\pi)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha \right), \quad (17)$$

with probability $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$, where we have once again replaced the term $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty$ with $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ for the same reasons as stated above. We note that the two bounds (16) and (17) apply under the same high probability event as noted in Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, proof of Thm. 1, eqn. (18)). Putting together the pieces, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_\alpha^{(m,1)}) &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_\alpha^{(m,1)})^{2-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_\alpha^{(m,1)}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \\ &\stackrel{(16,17)}{\leq} \left[2 \cdot \frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha \right]^{1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \left[\frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{(4\pi)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \\ &= \left(\frac{2^m}{n} \|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} (2 \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha)^{1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{(4\pi)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. The proof is now complete.

E PROOF OF THM. 4: SINGLE FUNCTION & MMD GUARANTEES FOR KT+

Proof of part (a) First, we note that the RKHS \mathcal{H} of \mathbf{k} is contained in the RKHS \mathcal{H}^\dagger of \mathbf{k}^\dagger Berlinet & Thomas-Agnan (2011, Thm. 5). Now, applying Thm. 1 with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}^\dagger$ for any fixed function $f \in \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}^\dagger$ and $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{P}_{\text{in}} f - \mathbb{P}_{\text{split}}^{(\ell)} f \right| &\leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}^\dagger} \cdot \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}^\dagger\|_{\infty, \text{in}} \cdot \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right)} \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta'}\right)} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}^\dagger} \cdot \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\frac{16}{3} \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta'}\right)}, \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\frac{16}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta'}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. Here step (i) follows from the inequality $\|\mathbf{k}^\dagger\|_\infty \leq 2$, and step (ii) follows from the inequality $\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}^\dagger} \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty} \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}$, which in turn follows from the standard facts that

$$\|f\|_{\lambda \mathbf{k}} \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}}{\sqrt{\lambda}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{\lambda \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_\alpha} \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \|f\|_{\lambda \mathbf{k}} \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0, f \in \mathcal{H},$$

see, e.g., Zhang & Zhao (2013, Proof of Prop. 2.5) for a proof of step (i), Berlinet & Thomas-Agnan (2011, Thm. 5) for step (ii). The proof for the bound (10) is now complete.

Proof of part (b) Given a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, and a fixed set \mathcal{A} containing \mathcal{S}_{in} , repeating the proof of Thm. 2 with the bound (14) replaced by (10) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}) &\leq 2\varepsilon + \frac{2^m}{n} \sqrt{\frac{16}{3} \|\mathbf{k}\|_\infty \log\left(\frac{4}{\delta^*}\right) \cdot \left[\log\left(\frac{4}{\delta'}\right) + \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon) \right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{targetKT}}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. Let us denote this event by \mathcal{E}_1 .

To establish the other bound, first we note that KT-SWAP step ensures that

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}) \leq \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}^{(m,1)}), \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}^{(m,1)}$ denotes the first coreset output by KT-SPLIT with $\mathbf{k}_{\text{split}} = \mathbf{k}^\dagger$. We can now repeat the proof of Thm. 3, which in turn builds on the proof of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thms. 1, 4). We note we can repeat all the arguments from the proofs of Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Thms. 1, 4)

using the sub-Gaussian tail bound (10), and there by the proof of Thm. 3 with a minor substitution, namely, $\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}$ replaced by $2\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_\infty$. Putting it together with (19), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{KT}+}) &\leq \left(\frac{2^m}{n} 2\|\mathbf{k}_\alpha\|_{\infty, \text{in}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} (2\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha)^{1-\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \left(2 + \sqrt{\frac{(4\pi)^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}} \cdot \mathfrak{R}_{\text{max}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}_\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1} \\ &= 2^{\frac{1}{2\alpha}} \cdot \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{\text{powerKT}}(\mathbf{k}_\alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

with probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. Let us denote this event by \mathcal{E}_2 .

Note that the quantities on the right hand side of the bounds (18) and (20) are deterministic given \mathcal{S}_{in} , and thus can be computed apriori. Consequently, we apply the high probability bound only for one of the two events \mathcal{E}_1 or \mathcal{E}_2 depending on which of the two quantities (deterministically) attains the minimum. Thus overall, the bound (11) holds with probability at least $p_{\text{sg}} - \delta'$. The proof is now complete.

F PROOF OF PROP. 1: AN INTERPOLATION RESULT FOR MMD

For two arbitrary distributions \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} , and any reproducing kernel \mathbf{k} , Gretton et al. (2012, Lem. 4) yields that

$$\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) = \|(\mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q})\mathbf{k}\|_{\mathbf{k}}^2. \quad (21)$$

Let \mathcal{F} denote the generalized Fourier transform (GFT) operator (Wendland (2004, Def. 8.9)). Since $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \kappa(x - y)$, Wendland (2004, Thm. 10.21) yields that

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}^2 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{F}(f)(\omega))^2}{\mathcal{F}(\kappa)(\omega)} d\omega, \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (22)$$

Let $\widehat{\kappa} \triangleq \mathcal{F}(\kappa)$, and consider a discrete measure $\mathbb{D} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \delta_{x_i}$ supported on finitely many points, and let $\mathbb{D}\mathbf{k}(x) \triangleq \sum w_i \mathbf{k}(x_i, x) = \sum w_i \kappa(x_i - x)$. Now using the linearity of the GFT operator \mathcal{F} , we find that for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{D}\mathbf{k})(\omega) &= \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \kappa(x_i - \cdot)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathcal{F}(\kappa(x_i - \cdot)) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i e^{\langle \omega, x_i \rangle}\right) \cdot \widehat{\kappa}(\omega) \\ &= \widehat{D}(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}(\omega) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we used the fact that $\mathcal{F}(\kappa(x_i - \cdot))(\omega) = e^{\langle \omega, x_i \rangle} \widehat{\kappa}(\omega)$,⁴ and used the shorthand $\widehat{D}(\omega) \triangleq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i e^{\langle \omega, x_i \rangle}\right)$ in the last step. Putting together (21) to (23) with $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{P} - \mathbb{Q}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}}^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}(\omega) d\omega \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega) (\widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega))^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} d\omega \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega' \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega)}{\widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega'} (\widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega))^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} d\omega \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega' \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega)}{\widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega'} \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega) d\omega \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega' \right)^{2-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}^{2\alpha}(\omega)}{d} \omega \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{D}^2(\omega') \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha(\omega') d\omega' \right)^{2-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\widehat{D}^2(\omega) \widehat{\kappa}^{2\alpha}(\omega)}{d} \omega \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_\alpha}^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}))^{2-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \cdot (\text{MMD}_{\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}}^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where step (i) makes use of Jensen's inequality and the fact that the function $t \mapsto t^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$ for $t \geq 0$ is concave for $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, and step (ii) follows by applying (24) for kernels \mathbf{k}_α and $\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}$ and noting that by definition $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{k}_\alpha) = \widehat{\kappa}^\alpha$, and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{k}_{2\alpha}) = \widehat{\kappa}^{2\alpha}$. Noting MMD is a non-negative quantity, and taking square-root establishes the claim (15).

⁴The property $\mathcal{F}(\kappa(x_i - \cdot))(\omega) = e^{\langle \omega, x_i \rangle} \widehat{\kappa}(\omega)$ often called the *shifting property*, can be verified directly for GFT using Wendland (2004, Def. 8.9), a change of variable, and noting that $\widehat{\gamma}$ denotes a Fourier transform (in Wendland's notation) for a Schwarz function; and hence $\widehat{\gamma}$ itself satisfies the shifting property (see Wendland (2004, Thm. 5.16(4))).

G SUB-OPTIMALITY OF SINGLE FUNCTION GUARANTEES WITH ROOT KT

Define $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}}$ as the scaled version of \mathbf{k}_{rt} , i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}} \triangleq \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}} / \|\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}\|_{\infty}$ that is bounded by 1. Then [Zhang & Zhao \(2013, Proof of Prop. 2.3\)](#) implies that

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}\|_{\infty}}} \|f\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}}}. \quad (25)$$

And thus we also have $\mathcal{H}_{\text{rt}} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}$ where \mathcal{H}_{rt} and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}$ respectively denote the RKHSs of \mathbf{k}_{rt} and $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}}$.

Next, we note that for any two kernels \mathbf{k}_1 and \mathbf{k}_2 with corresponding RKHSs \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 with $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_2$, in the convention of [Zhang & Zhao \(2013, Lem. 2.2, Prop. 2.3\)](#), we have

$$\frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_2}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_1}} \leq \beta(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2) \leq \sqrt{\lambda(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)} \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (26)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\sqrt{\max_{x \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{in}}} \mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}(x, x)} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}} \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}\|_{\infty}} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}} \stackrel{(25)}{=} \frac{\|f\|_{\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}}}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}} \leq \sqrt{\lambda(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}})}, \quad (27)$$

where in the last step, we have applied the bound (26) with $(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) \leftarrow (\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{H})$ and $(\mathbf{k}_2, \mathcal{H}_2) \leftarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{rt}}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}})$ since $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{rt}} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}$.

Next, we use (27) to the kernels studied in [Dwivedi & Mackey \(2021\)](#) where we note that all the kernels in that work were scaled to ensure $\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty} = 1$ and in fact satisfied $\mathbf{k}(x, x) = 1$. Consequently, the multiplicative factor stated in the discussion after Thm. 1, namely, $\sqrt{\frac{\|\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}}{\|\mathbf{k}\|_{\infty, \text{in}}} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}_{\text{rt}}}}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}}}}$ can be bounded by $\sqrt{\lambda(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}})}$ given the arguments above.

For $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{Gauss}(\sigma)$ kernels, [Zhang & Zhao \(2013, Prop. 3.5\(1\)\)](#) yields that

$$\lambda(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}) = 2^{d/2}.$$

For $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{B-spline}(2\beta + 1)$ with $\beta \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$, [Zhang & Zhao \(2013, Prop. 3.5\(1\)\)](#) yields that

$$\lambda(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}) = 1.$$

For $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{Matérn}(\nu, \gamma)$ with $\nu > d$, some algebra along with [Zhang & Zhao \(2013, Prop 3.1\)](#) yields that

$$\lambda(\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{rt}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\nu)\Gamma((\nu-d)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu-d/2)\Gamma(\nu/2)} \geq 1.$$

H ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

This section provides additional experimental details and results deferred from Sec. 4.

H.1 MIXTURE OF GAUSSIANS EXPERIMENTS

Our mixture of Gaussians target is given by $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \mathbf{I}_d)$ for $M \in \{4, 6, 8\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 &= [-3, 3]^\top, & \mu_2 &= [-3, 3]^\top, & \mu_3 &= [-3, -3]^\top, & \mu_4 &= [3, -3]^\top, \\ \mu_5 &= [0, 6]^\top, & \mu_6 &= [-6, 0]^\top, & \mu_7 &= [6, 0]^\top, & \mu_8 &= [0, -6]^\top. \end{aligned}$$

H.2 MCMC EXPERIMENTS

Our set-up for MCMC experiments follows closely that of [Dwivedi & Mackey \(2021\)](#). For complete details on the targets and sampling algorithms we refer the reader to [Riabiz et al. \(2020a, Sec. 4\)](#).




Figure 4: Scatter plots of i.i.d. coresets, and coresets obtained from target KT (KT), root KT (KT(rt)), and KT+ with various kernels for 8-component mixture of Gaussian targets with equidensity contours of the target underlaid. These plots are from two independent runs different from Fig. 1. See Sec. 4 for more details.

Goodwin and Lotka-Volterra experiments From [Riabiz et al. \(2020b\)](#), we use the output of four distinct MCMC procedures targeting each of two $d = 4$ -dimensional posterior distributions \mathbb{P} : (1) a posterior over the parameters of the *Goodwin model* of oscillatory enzymatic control ([Goodwin, 1965](#)) and (2) a posterior over the parameters of the *Lotka-Volterra model* of oscillatory predator-prey evolution ([Lotka, 1925](#); [Volterra, 1926](#)). For each of these targets, [Riabiz et al. \(2020b\)](#) provide 2×10^6 sample points from the following four MCMC algorithms: Gaussian random walk (RW), adaptive Gaussian random walk (adaRW, [Haario et al., 1999](#)), Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (MALA, [Roberts & Tweedie, 1996](#)), and pre-conditioned MALA (pMALA, [Girolami & Calderhead, 2011](#)).

Hinch experiments [Riabiz et al. \(2020b\)](#) also provide the output of two independent Gaussian random walk MCMC chains targeting each of two $d = 38$ -dimensional posterior distributions \mathbb{P} : (1) a posterior over the parameters of the Hinch model of calcium signalling in cardiac cells ([Hinch et al., 2004](#)) and (2) a tempered version of the same posterior, as defined by [Riabiz et al. \(2020a, App. S5.4\)](#).

We discard the initial burn-in points of each chain using the maximum burn-in period reported in [Riabiz et al. \(2020a, Tabs. S4 & S6, App. S5.4\)](#). Furthermore, we also normalize each Hinch chain by subtracting the post-burn-in sample mean and dividing each coordinate by its post-burn-in sample standard deviation. To obtain an input sequence \mathcal{S}_{in} of length n to be fed into a thinning algorithm, we downsample the remaining points using standard thinning. When applying standard thinning to any Markov chain output, we adopt the convention of keeping the final sample point.

The selected burn-in periods for the Goodwin task were 820,000 for RW; 824,000 for adaRW; 1,615,000 for MALA; and 1,475,000 for pMALA. The respective numbers for the Lotka-Volterra




Figure 5: Kernel thinning vs i.i.d. sampling for MoG target for $M \in \{4, 6, 8\}$ with Gaussian, Laplace, IMQ, and Bspline kernels as discussed in Sec. 4.

task were 1,512,000 for RW; 1,797,000 for adaRW; 1,573,000 for MALA; and 1,251,000 for pMALA.




Figure 6: KT+ vs standard thinning (ST) for MCMC targets. Here we present the results for nine out of twelve MCMC experiments deferred from Sec. 4.

I UPPER BOUNDS ON RKHS COVERING NUMBERS

In this section, we state several results on covering bounds for RKHSs for generic and some specific kernels. These bounds can then be used with Thm. 2 (or Tab. 2) to establish MMD guarantees for the output of kernel thinning as summarized in Tab. 3.

We first state covering number bounds for RKHS associated with generic kernels, that are either (a) analytic, or (b) finitely many times differentiable. These results follow essentially from Sun & Zhou (2008); Steinwart & Christmann (2008), but we provide a proof in App. I.2 for completeness.

Proposition 2 (Covering numbers for analytic and differentiable kernels) *The following results hold true.*

(a) **Analytic kernels:** Suppose that $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \kappa(\|x - y\|_2^2)$ for $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ real-analytic with convergence radius R_κ , that is,

$$\left| \frac{1}{j!} \kappa_+^{(j)}(0) \right| \leq C_\kappa (2/R_\kappa)^j \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad (28)$$

for some constant C_κ , where $\kappa_+^{(j)}$ denotes the right-sided j -th derivative of κ . Then for any set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{A}, \varepsilon) \leq \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A}, r^\dagger/2) \cdot (4 \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2 + 4 \log(16\sqrt{C_\kappa} + 1))^{d+1}, \quad (29)$$

$$\text{where } r^\dagger \triangleq \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{R_\kappa}}{2^d}, \sqrt{R_\kappa + D_\mathcal{A}^2} - D_\mathcal{A}\right), \text{ and } D_\mathcal{A} \triangleq \max_{x, y \in \mathcal{A}} \|x - y\|_2. \quad (30)$$

(b) **Differentiable kernels:** Suppose that for $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the kernel $\mathbf{k} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is s -times continuously differentiable, i.e., all partial derivatives $\partial^{\alpha, \alpha} \mathbf{k} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ exist and are continuous for all multi-indices $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\alpha| \leq s$. Then, for any closed Euclidean ball $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2(r)$ contained in \mathcal{X} and any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2(r), \varepsilon) \leq c_{s,d,\mathbf{k}} \cdot r^d \cdot (1/\varepsilon)^{d/s}, \quad (31)$$

for some constant $c_{s,d,\mathbf{k}}$ that depends only on s, d and \mathbf{k} .

Next, we state several explicit bounds on covering numbers for several popular kernels. See App. I.3 for the proof.

Proposition 3 (Covering numbers for specific kernels) *The following statements hold true.*

(a) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{GAUSS}(\sigma)$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \leq C_{\text{GAUSS},d} \cdot \left(\frac{\log(4/\varepsilon)}{\log \log(4/\varepsilon)} \right)^d \log(1/\varepsilon) \cdot \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } r \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}, \\ (3\sqrt{2}r\sigma)^d & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

$$\text{where } C_{\text{GAUSS},d} \triangleq \binom{4e+d}{d} e^{-d} \leq \begin{cases} 4.3679 & \text{for } d = 1 \\ 0.05 \cdot d^{4e} e^{-d} & \text{for } d \geq 2 \end{cases} \leq 30 \text{ for all } d \geq 1. \quad (33)$$

(b) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{MATÉRN}(\nu, \gamma)$, then for some constant $C_{\text{MATÉRN},\nu,\gamma,d}$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \leq C_{\text{MATÉRN},\nu,\gamma,d} \cdot r^d \cdot (1/\varepsilon)^{d/\nu}. \quad (34)$$

(c) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{IMQ}(\nu, \gamma)$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \leq (1 + \frac{4r}{\tilde{r}})^d \cdot (4 \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2 + C_{\text{IMQ},\nu,\gamma})^{d+1}, \quad (35)$$

$$\text{where } C_{\text{IMQ},\nu,\gamma} \triangleq 4 \log\left(16 \frac{(2\nu+1)^{\nu+1}}{\gamma^{2\nu}} + 1\right), \text{ and } \tilde{r} \triangleq \min\left(\frac{\gamma}{2^d}, \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 4r^2} - 2r\right). \quad (36)$$

(d) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{SINC-RAD}(\theta)$, then for $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{k}(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \varepsilon) \leq (1 + \frac{4r}{\tilde{r}_{\theta,d}})^d \cdot (4 \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2 + 4 \log 17)^{d+1}, \quad (37)$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{r}_{\theta,d} \triangleq \min\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{|\theta|^d}, \sqrt{\frac{12}{\theta^2} + 4r^2} - 2r\right). \quad (38)$$

(e) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{SINC}(\theta)$, then for $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\tilde{r}_{\theta,1}$ as in (38), we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}([-r, r]^d, \varepsilon) \leq d \cdot (1 + \frac{4r}{\tilde{r}_{\theta,1}}) \cdot (4 \log(d/\varepsilon) + 2 + 4 \log 17)^2. \quad (39)$$

(f) When $\mathbf{k} = \text{B-SPLINE}(2\beta + 1)$, then for some universal constant $C_{\text{B-SPLINE}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}([- \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^d, \varepsilon) \leq d \cdot C_{\text{B-SPLINE}} \cdot (d/\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{\beta + \frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (40)$$

I.1 AUXILIARY RESULTS ABOUT RKHS AND EUCLIDEAN COVERING NUMBERS

In this section, we collect several results regarding the covering numbers of Euclidean and RKHS spaces that come in handy for our proofs. These results can also be of independent interest.

We start by defining the notion of restricted kernel and its unit ball (Rudi et al. (2020, Prop. 8)). For $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $|_{\mathcal{X}}$ denotes the restriction operator. That is, for any function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $f|_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f|_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = f(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 4 (Restricted kernel and its RKHS) Consider a kernel \mathbf{k} defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with the corresponding RKHS \mathcal{H} , any set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The restricted kernel $\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y) \triangleq \mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}(x, y) = \mathbf{k}(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{X},$$

and $\mathcal{H}|_{\mathcal{X}}$ denotes its RKHS. For $f \in \mathcal{H}|_{\mathcal{X}}$, the restricted RKHS norm is defined as follows:

$$\|f\|_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}} = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \|h\|_{\mathbf{k}} \quad \text{such that} \quad h|_{\mathcal{X}} = f.$$

Furthermore, we use $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}} \triangleq \{f \in \mathcal{H}|_{\mathcal{X}} : \|f\|_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}} \leq 1\}$ to denote the unit ball of the RKHS corresponding to this restricted kernel.

In this notation, the unit ball of unrestricted kernel satisfies $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}} \triangleq \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathbb{R}^d}}$. Now, recall the RKHS covering number definition from Def. 2. In the sequel, we also use the covering number of the restricted kernel defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon) = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon), \quad (41)$$

that is $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$ denotes the minimum cardinality over all possible covers $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}}$ that satisfy

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}} \subset \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{C}} \{g \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}|_{\mathcal{X}}} : \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h(x) - g(x)| \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

With this notation in place, we now state a result that relates the covering numbers \mathcal{N}^{\dagger} (41) and \mathcal{N} Def. 2.

Lemma 1 (Relation between restricted and unrestricted RKHS covering numbers) We have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{X}) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}, \varepsilon}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X})$$

Proof of Lem. 1 Rudi et al. (2020, Prop. 8(d,f)) imply that there exists a bounded linear extension operator $E : \mathcal{H}|_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ with operator norm bounded by 1, which when combined with Steinwart & Christmann (2008, eqns. (A.38), (A.39)) yields the claim.

Next, we state results that relate RKHS covering numbers for a change of domain for a shift-invariant kernel. We use $\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(x; r) \triangleq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\| \leq r\}$ to denote the r radius ball in \mathbb{R}^d defined by the metric induced by a norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Definition 5 (Euclidean covering numbers) Given a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, a norm $\|\cdot\|$, and a scalar $\varepsilon > 0$, we use $\mathcal{N}_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$ to denote the ε -covering number of \mathcal{X} with respect to $\|\cdot\|$ -norm. That is, $\mathcal{N}_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$ denotes the minimum cardinality over all possible covers $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ that satisfy

$$\mathcal{X} \subset \bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(z; \varepsilon).$$

When $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_q$ for some $q \in [1, \infty]$, we use the shorthand $\mathcal{N}_q \triangleq \mathcal{N}_{\|\cdot\|_q}$.

Lemma 2 (Relation between RKHS covering numbers on different domains) Given a shift-invariant kernel \mathbf{k} , a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d , and any set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon) \leq \left[\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|, \varepsilon}) \right]^{\mathcal{N}_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathcal{X}, 1)}.$$

Proof of Lem. 2 Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ denote the cover of minimum cardinality such that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(z, 1).$$

We then have

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon) \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \prod_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(z, 1), \varepsilon) \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \prod_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}, \varepsilon) \leq \left[\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{B}_{\|\cdot\|}, \varepsilon) \right]^{|\mathcal{C}|},$$

where step (i) follows by applying [Steinwart & Fischer \(2021, Lem. 3.11\)](#),⁵ and step (ii) follows by applying [Steinwart & Fischer \(2021, Lem. 3.10\)](#). The claim follows by noting that \mathcal{C} denotes a cover of minimum cardinality, and hence by definition $|\mathcal{C}| = \mathcal{N}_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathcal{X}, 1)$.

Lemma 3 (Covering number for product kernel) Given $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a reproducing kernel $\kappa : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the product kernel $\mathbf{k} \triangleq \kappa^{\otimes d} : \mathcal{X}^{\otimes 2d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^d \kappa(x_i, y_i) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathcal{X}^{\otimes d} \triangleq \underbrace{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}}_{d \text{ times}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then the covering numbers of the two kernels are related as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes d}, \varepsilon) \leq \left[\mathcal{N}_{\kappa}^{\dagger}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon / (d \|\kappa\|_{\infty}^{\frac{d-1}{2}})) \right]^d. \quad (42)$$

Proof of Lem. 3 Let \mathcal{H} denote the RKHS corresponding to κ . Then the RKHS corresponding to the kernel \mathbf{k} is given by the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k}} \triangleq \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}$ [Berlinet & Thomas-Agnan \(2011, Sec. 4.6\)](#), i.e., for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k}}$, there exists $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d f_i(x_i) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}^{\otimes d}. \quad (43)$$

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{B}_{\kappa}$ denote an ε -cover of \mathcal{B}_{κ} in L^{∞} -norm (Def. 2). Then for each $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $\tilde{f}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{X}} |f_i(z) - \tilde{f}_i(z)| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (44)$$

Now, we claim that for every $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{k}}$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}} \triangleq (\mathcal{C}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon))^{\otimes d}$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}^{\otimes d}} |f(x) - g(x)| \leq d\varepsilon \|\kappa\|_{\infty}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}, \quad (45)$$

which immediately implies the claimed bound (42) on the covering number. We now prove the claim (45). For any fixed $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{k}}$, let f_i, \tilde{f}_i denote the functions satisfying (43) and (44) respectively. Then, we prove our claim (45) with $g = \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{f}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{k}}$. Using the convention $\prod_{k=1}^0 \tilde{f}_k(x_k) = 1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - g(x)| &= \left| \prod_{i=1}^d f_i(x_i) - \prod_{i=1}^d \tilde{f}_i(x_i) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d |f_i(x_i) - \tilde{f}_i(x_i)| \left| \prod_{j=i+1}^d f_j(x_j) \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} \tilde{f}_k(x_k) \right| \\ &\stackrel{(44)}{\leq} d\varepsilon \cdot \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_{\kappa}} \|h\|_{\infty}^{d-1} \leq d\varepsilon \|\kappa\|_{\infty}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the following argument:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h(x) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{X}} h, \kappa(z, \cdot)_{\kappa} \leq \|h\|_{\kappa} \sqrt{\kappa(z, z)} \leq \sqrt{\|\kappa\|_{\infty}} \quad \text{for any } h \in \mathcal{B}_{\kappa}.$$

The proof is now complete.

⁵[Steinwart & Fischer \(2021, Lem. 3.11\)](#) is stated for disjoint partition of \mathcal{X} in two sets, but the argument can be repeated for any finite cover of \mathcal{X} .

Lemma 4 (Relation between Euclidean covering numbers) *We have*

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\mathcal{B}_2(r), 1) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi d}} \cdot \left[\left(1 + \frac{2r}{\sqrt{d}}\right) \sqrt{2\pi e} \right]^d \quad \text{for all } d \geq 1.$$

Proof of Lem. 4 We apply [Wainwright \(2019, Lem. 5.7\)](#) with $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_2(r)$ and $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}_\infty(1)$ to conclude that

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\mathcal{B}_2(r), 1) \leq \frac{\text{Vol}(2\mathcal{B}_2(r) + \mathcal{B}_\infty(1))}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_\infty(1))} \leq \text{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_2(2r + \sqrt{d})) \leq \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)} \cdot (2r + \sqrt{d})^d,$$

where $\text{Vol}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the d -dimensional Euclidean volume of $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\Gamma(a)$ denotes the Gamma function. Next, we apply the following bounds on the Gamma function from [Batir \(2017, Thm. 2.2\)](#):

$$\Gamma(b + 1) \geq (b/e)^b \sqrt{2\pi b} \quad \text{for any } b \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(b + 1) \leq (b/e)^b \sqrt{e^2 b} \quad \text{for any } b \geq 1.1.$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_\infty(\mathcal{B}_2(r), 1) \leq \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi d} (\frac{d}{2e})^{d/2}} \cdot (2r + \sqrt{d})^d \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi d}} \cdot \left[\left(1 + \frac{2r}{\sqrt{d}}\right) \sqrt{2\pi e} \right]^d,$$

as claimed, and we are done.

I.2 PROOF OF PROP. 2: COVERING NUMBERS FOR ANALYTIC AND DIFFERENTIABLE KERNELS

First we apply Lem. 1 so that it remains to establish the stated bounds simply on $\log \mathcal{N}_k^\dagger(\mathcal{X}, \varepsilon)$.

Proof of bound (29) in part (a) The bound (29) for the real-analytic kernel is a restatement of [Sun & Zhou \(2008, Thm. 2\)](#) in our notation (in particular, after making the following substitutions in their notation: $R \leftarrow 1, C_0 \leftarrow C_\kappa, r \leftarrow R_\kappa, \mathcal{X} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}, \tilde{r} \leftarrow r^\dagger, \eta \leftarrow \varepsilon, D \leftarrow D_{\mathcal{A}}^2, n \leftarrow d$).

Proof of bound (31) for part (b): Under these assumptions, [Steinwart & Christmann \(2008, Thm. 6.26\)](#) states that the i -th dyadic entropy number [Steinwart & Christmann \(2008, Def. 6.20\)](#) of the identity inclusion mapping from $\mathcal{H}|_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2(r)}$ to $L_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2(r)}^\infty$ is bounded by $c'_{s,d,\mathbf{k}} \cdot r^s i^{-s/d}$ for some constant $c'_{s,d,\mathbf{k}}$ independent of ε and r . Given this bound on the entropy number, and applying [Steinwart & Christmann \(2008, Lem. 6.21\)](#), we conclude that the log-covering number $\log \mathcal{N}_k^\dagger(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2(r), \varepsilon)$ is bounded by $\ln 4 \cdot (c'_{s,d,\mathbf{k}} r^s / \varepsilon)^{d/s} = c_{s,d,\mathbf{k}} r^d \cdot (1/\varepsilon)^{d/s}$ as claimed.

I.3 PROOF OF PROP. 3: COVERING NUMBERS FOR SPECIFIC KERNELS

First we apply Lem. 1 so that it remains to establish the stated bounds in each part on the corresponding $\log \mathcal{N}_k$.

Proof for GAUSS kernel: Part (a) The bound (32) for the Gaussian kernel follows directly from [Steinwart & Fischer \(2021, Eqn. 11\)](#) along with the discussion stated just before it. Furthermore, the bound (33) for $C_{\text{Gauss},d}$ are established in [Steinwart & Fischer \(2021, Eqn. 6\)](#), and in the discussion around it.

Proof for MATÉRN kernel: Part (b) Since $\text{MATÉRN}(\nu, \gamma)$ is ν -times continuously differentiable [Stein \(2012\)](#), the bound (34) immediately follows from Prop. 3(b).

Proof for IMQ kernel: Part (c) The bounds (35) and (36) follow from [Sun & Zhou \(2008, Ex. 3\)](#), and noting that $\mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{B}_2(r), \tilde{r}/2)$ is bounded by $(1 + \frac{4r}{\tilde{r}})^d$ [Wainwright \(2019, Lem. 5.7\)](#).

Proof for SINC-RAD kernel: Part (d) First, we note that the SINC-RAD kernel is positive definite in $d = \{1, 2, 3\}$ [Schoenberg \(1938\)](#), and thus is a reproducing kernel. Next, we claim that it is an analytic kernel that satisfies the condition (28) of Prop. 2(a) with $\kappa(t) = \text{SINC}(\theta\sqrt{t})$, $R_\kappa = \frac{12}{\theta^2}$, and

$C_\kappa = 1$; and thus applying the bounds (29) and (30) from Prop. 2(a) with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}_2^d(r)$ yields the claimed bound (37) and (38). To verify the condition (28) with the stated parameters, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(t) &= \text{SINC}(\theta\sqrt{t}) = \frac{1}{|\theta|\sqrt{t}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2j+1)!} \cdot (\theta\sqrt{t})^{2j+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2j+1)!} \cdot (\theta\sqrt{t})^{2j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2j+1)!} \cdot \theta^{2j} \cdot t^j\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left| \kappa_+^{(j)}(0) \right| = \frac{1}{(2j+1)!} \cdot \theta^{2j} j! \leq (2/R_\kappa)^j j! \quad \text{for } R_\kappa \triangleq \frac{2}{\theta^2} \cdot \inf_{j \geq 1} ((2j+1)!)^{1/j} = \frac{12}{\theta^2},$$

and we are done.

Proof for SINC kernel: Part (e) For $\mathbf{k} = \text{SINC}(\theta)$, we can write $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^d \kappa_\theta(x_i - y_i)$ for $\kappa_\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\kappa_\theta(t) = \frac{\sin(\theta t)}{\theta t} \stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{\sin(|\theta t|)}{|\theta t|}$, where step (i) follows from the fact that $t \mapsto \sin t/t$ is an even function. Thus, we can apply Lem. 3. Given the bound (42), and noting that $\|\kappa_\theta\|_\infty = 1$, it suffices to establish the univariate version of the bound (39), namely,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{k}}([-r, r], \varepsilon) \leq (1 + \frac{4r}{r_{\theta,1}}) \cdot (4 \log(1/\varepsilon) + 2 + 4 \log 17)^2,$$

which follows directly by substituting $d = 1$ in part(d).

Proof for B-SPLINE kernel: Part (f) For $\mathbf{k} = \text{B-SPLINE}(2\beta + 1)$, we can write $\mathbf{k}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^d \kappa_\beta(x_i - y_i)$ for $\kappa_\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\kappa_\beta(t) = \mathfrak{B}_{2\beta+2}^{-1} \otimes^{2\beta+2} \mathbf{1}_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]}(t)$, and thus we can apply Lem. 3. Given the bound (42), and noting that $\|\kappa_\beta\|_\infty = 1$ (Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Eqn. 107)), it suffices to establish the univariate version of the bound (40), namely,

$$\log \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_\beta}^\dagger([- \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}], \varepsilon) \leq C_{\text{B-SPLINE}} \cdot (1/\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1/2}}, \quad (46)$$

where we abuse notation and use κ_β to denote the univariate B-SPLINE kernel. The bound (46) follows from Zhou (2003, Ex. 4) and using the fact that $\log \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_\beta}^\dagger([- \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}], \varepsilon) = \log \mathcal{N}_{\kappa_\beta}^\dagger([0, 1], \varepsilon)$ since κ_β is shift-invariant.

.

J PROOF OF TAB. 3 RESULTS

Results for target KT column follow by substituting the covering number bounds from Prop. 3 for all the kernels in the appropriate entry in Tab. 2. For the KT+ column, results follow from the first column, and noting the following:

For IMQ(ν, γ) kernel, we use square-root dominating kernel IMQ(ν', γ') which are always defined for appropriate choices of ν', γ' and can be used to obtain a similar guarantee as root KT (see Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, App. K)).

For MATÉRN(ν, γ) kernel, the α -power kernel is given by MATÉRN($a\nu, \gamma$) if $a\nu > \frac{d}{2}$ (a proof of this follows from Def. 3 and Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Eqns (71-72))). Since LAPLACE(σ) = MATÉRN($\frac{d+1}{2}, \sigma^{-1}$), we know its α -power kernel is defined for $a > \frac{d}{d+1}$. Then the various tail radii (7), and the inflation factor (9) for the power Matérn kernel follow from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 3), leading to the entries in the KT+ column for MATÉRN row.

For SINC(θ) kernel, the square-root kernel is SINC(θ) itself (as can be seen by Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Prop.2) and the fact that Fourier transform of SINC is a rectangle function). However, the tail of SINC kernel do not decay fast enough leading to a vacuous bound of $n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ for the root KT (with baseline thinning as i.i.d. thinning as noted in Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Rem. 2)).

For B-SPLINE($2\beta + 1$) kernel, using arguments similar to that in Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab.4), we conclude that the α -power kernel is defined to be B-SPLINE($A + 1$) whenever $A \triangleq 2\alpha\beta + 2\alpha - 1 \in 2\mathbb{N}_0 + 1$. For odd β we can always take $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ as by Dwivedi & Mackey (2021). For even β , we can always choose $\alpha \triangleq \frac{p+1}{\beta+1} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ by taking $p \in \mathbb{N}$ suitably. Whenever the α -power kernel

is defined, we can then apply the various tail radii (7), and the inflation factor (9) for the power B-SPLINE kernel from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 3) to obtain the MMD rates for power KT from Dwivedi & Mackey (2021, Tab. 2), thereby providing the corresponding entry for KT+ in our Tab. 3.