

Infinite-Variate L^2 -Approximation with Nested Subspace Sampling

Kumar Harsha, Michael Gnewuch, and Marcin Wnuk

Abstract We consider L^2 -approximation on weighted reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of functions depending on infinitely many variables. We focus on unrestricted linear information, admitting evaluations of arbitrary continuous linear functionals. We distinguish between ANOVA and non-ANOVA spaces, where, by ANOVA spaces, we refer to function spaces whose norms are induced by an underlying ANOVA function decomposition. In ANOVA spaces, we prove that there is an optimal algorithm to solve the approximation problem using linear information. This way, we can determine the exact polynomial convergence rate of n -th minimal worst-case errors. For non-ANOVA spaces, we also establish upper and lower error bounds. Even though the bounds do not match in this case, they reveal that for weights with a moderate decay behavior, the convergence rate of n -th minimal errors is strictly higher in ANOVA than in non-ANOVA spaces.

1 Introduction

We want to investigate L^2 -approximation on weighted reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHSs) of functions depending on infinitely many variables. For each of those RKHSs, there is a family of weights and a function decomposition, which determine the norm on the space. With the help of the function decomposition, it is possible to represent an infinite-variate function as an infinite sum of functions depending only on finitely many variables.

K. Harsha • M. Gnewuch • M. Wnuk
Institute for Mathematics, Osnabrück University, Albrechtstraße 28a, 49074 Osnabrück, Germany
e-mail: kumar.harsha@uni-osnabrueck.de

M. Gnewuch
e-mail: michael.gnewuch@uni-osnabrueck.de

M. Wnuk
e-mail: marcin.wnuk@uni-osnabrueck.de

In this paper, we focus on linear algorithms that may obtain information about an input function f by evaluating finitely many continuous linear functionals in f . The information cost of such an algorithm is the sum of the cost of all functional evaluations, which, in turn, depends on the underlying function decomposition of the weighted RKHS we are working on. Such a situation has already been studied in [14, 15], where the considered cost model is a generalization of the one introduced in [10] for information consisting only of function evaluation (so-called standard information). In [15], a rather specific approximation problem, called the \mathcal{G} -approximation problem, is analyzed; there, the approximation error is measured in some very special Hilbert space \mathcal{G} . In [14], L^2 -approximation is investigated in full generality, apart from the case that can be reduced to the \mathcal{G} -approximation problem. To describe the results from [14, 15] and from this paper in a more common language, we distinguish two cases of weighted RKHSs: the ones whose underlying function decomposition is an ANOVA decomposition are called ANOVA spaces, whereas the remaining RKHSs are referred to as non-ANOVA spaces (for a rigorous definition, see Section 2.1).

The case of ANOVA spaces was covered by Wasilkowski and Woźniakowski, who in [15] exactly determined the polynomial convergence rates r_∞ of n -th minimal errors (for a definition, see Section 2.2.2). For the non-ANOVA spaces, Wasilkowski was able to derive in [14] a lower bound for r_∞ ; with the help of auxiliary weights, he re-used the constructive results from [15]. He also proved a matching lower bound. Interestingly, it turns out that for slowly decaying weights, the convergence rate in the ANOVA case is superior to the one in the non-ANOVA case, while it stays the same if the weights decrease quickly enough.

In this paper, we consider the nested subspace sampling cost model, which is less generous than the cost model in [14, 15]. For this cost model, we have derived the exact polynomial convergence rate r_∞ of n -th minimal errors in the ANOVA case, see Theorem 2. In the non-ANOVA case, we are able to provide upper and constructive lower bounds on r_∞ , see Propositions 1 and 2. Although these bounds do not match, they show that in some cases the convergence rate in the ANOVA case is higher than the one in the non-ANOVA case, cf. Corollary 2. The reason for that is mainly that the cost of an algorithm may depend on what kind of function decomposition underlies the function space it is defined on. This dependence, unfortunately, prevents us from simply using the embedding machinery developed in [5, 6, 8] to transfer results for ANOVA spaces directly to spaces with a different underlying function decomposition.

Notation For a set \mathbf{u} , we denote by $|\mathbf{u}|$ its cardinality. We use the shorthand $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

2 Function Spaces and Algorithms

For general results on reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS) we refer to [1], and to [7] for results on the function spaces discussed below.

2.1 Weighted Function Spaces

Let $D \neq \emptyset$ be an arbitrary set, Σ a σ -algebra on D , and $\rho : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a probability measure on D . Let $k : D \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a reproducing kernel on D such that

$$H(1) \cap H(k) = \{0\};$$

here and in the whole paper we follow the convention to denote by $H(k)$ the uniquely determined Hilbert space with reproducing kernel k and its norm by $\|\cdot\|_{H(k)}$; in particular $H(1)$ is the space of all constant functions on the corresponding domain D . Put

$$\mathcal{U} := \{\mathbf{u} \subset \mathbb{N} \mid |\mathbf{u}| < \infty\},$$

where $|\mathbf{u}|$ refers to the cardinality of \mathbf{u} . For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ we define $k_{\mathbf{u}} : D^{\mathbb{N}} \times D^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} k(x_j, y_j) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in D^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Since $k_{\mathbf{u}}$ only depends on the variables $x_j, j \in \mathbf{u}$, we may alternatively view it as a function on $D^{\mathbf{u}}$ by putting

$$k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}) := k_{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}})$$

for arbitrary $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in D^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}} := \{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbf{u}} \in D^{\mathbf{u}}$. We use an analogous convention for arbitrary functions on $D^{\mathbb{N}}$ that only depend on variables $x_j, j \in \mathbf{u}$. We denote the RKHS with kernel $k_{\mathbf{u}}$ by $H_{\mathbf{u}} := H(k_{\mathbf{u}})$ and its norm by $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\mathbf{u}}}$; in particular, we have $H_{\emptyset} = H(1)$ due to the convention that an empty product is equal to 1.

For a family $\gamma = \{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}\}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}}$ of non-negative weights, we put

$$\mathcal{U}_{\gamma} := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U} \mid \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} > 0\}.$$

We work with product weights which are given by a decreasing sequence of weights $1 \geq \gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ assigned to all of the variables. Then the weight (or importance) of an interacting set of variables \mathbf{u} is given by $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} = \prod_{j \in \mathbf{u}} \gamma_j$. Moreover, we define

$$\mathfrak{X} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in D^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) < \infty \right\}$$

and the reproducing kernel $K_{\gamma} : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$K_{\gamma}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{X}. \quad (1)$$

We denote the corresponding RKHS by $H_{\gamma} := H(K_{\gamma})$. H_{γ} decomposes into an orthogonal sum of subspaces

$$H_\gamma = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} H(\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} k_{\mathbf{u}}) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} H_{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (2)$$

Note that for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$ we have that $H(\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} k_{\mathbf{u}})$ and $H_{\mathbf{u}}$ are equal as vector spaces, but their norms differ by a factor $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1/2}$. Hence the norm in H_γ is given by

$$\|f\|_{H_\gamma}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \|f_{\mathbf{u}}\|_{H_{\mathbf{u}}}^2,$$

where

$$f = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} f_{\mathbf{u}}, \quad f_{\mathbf{u}} \in H_{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (3)$$

is the uniquely defined function decomposition of f in H_γ .

We assume that

$$M := \int_D k(x, x) d\rho(x) < \infty \quad (4)$$

and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} M^{|\mathbf{u}|} < \infty. \quad (5)$$

From our assumptions (4) and (5) follows that we have the continuous and compact embeddings $H(1+k) \subseteq L^2(D, \rho)$, $H_{\mathbf{u}} \subseteq L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$, and $H_\gamma \subseteq L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})$, see [16]. In particular, the *solution operator* we consider

$$\mathcal{S} : H_\gamma \rightarrow L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}}), \quad f \mapsto f$$

is well-defined and continuous.

Definition 1 (ANOVA kernels) Let $k : D \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a reproducing kernel such that $k(\cdot, x) \in L^2(D, \rho)$ for all $x \in D$. If the kernel satisfies the *ANOVA condition*

$$\int_D k(y, x) d\rho(y) = 0 \quad \forall x \in D, \quad (6)$$

then we call k an *ANOVA kernel*. Otherwise, we call it a *non-ANOVA kernel*.

Remark 1 1. It is easily seen that under the assumptions of Definition 1, the ANOVA condition (6) is equivalent to the condition that $\int_D f(y) \rho(y) = 0$ for all $f \in H(k)$.
2. Consider the reproducing kernel as in (1) based on an ANOVA kernel $k : D \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then for each $f \in H_\gamma$, the function decomposition as in (3) is the infinite-variate ANOVA decomposition, see [2, Remark 2.12]. For instance, it implies that for each $f \in H_\gamma$, for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in D^{\mathbb{N}}$

$$\int_D f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}) d\rho(x_j) = 0 \quad \text{if } j \in \mathbf{u}.$$

Examples of ANOVA spaces include Korobov spaces, see e.g. [12, Appendix A.1] and unanchored Sobolev spaces, see e.g. [12, Appendix A.2.1, A.2.3], [2, Section 5],

and [4, Section 5]. A notable example of non-ANOVA spaces are anchored Sobolev spaces, see e.g. [12, Appendix A.2.2] or [10].

2.2 Algorithms, Cost Models, and Errors

2.2.1 Admissible algorithms and cost

We want to approximate $f \in H_\gamma$ by algorithms using finitely many information evaluations. Since our problem is linear, we may confine ourselves to linear algorithms using arbitrary linear information of the form

$$\mathcal{A}(f) = \sum_{j=1}^n L_{\mathbf{u}_j}(f) \cdot g_j \quad (7)$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g_j \in L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})$, index sets $\mathbf{u}_j \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$, and linear functionals $L_{\mathbf{u}_j} \in H_\gamma^*$ such that $L_{\mathbf{u}_j}|_{H_{\mathbf{v}}} = 0$ if $\mathbf{v} \not\subseteq \mathbf{u}_j$, see [13]. Owing to the Riesz representation theorem, we can define the linear functional $L_{\mathbf{u}_j}$ as inner product with a representer as

$$L_{\mathbf{u}_j}(f) := \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}_j} \rangle_{H_\gamma}, \quad \text{where } \eta_{\mathbf{u}_j} \in \bigoplus_{\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{u}_j} H_{\mathbf{v}}. \quad (8)$$

The worst-case error of the algorithm \mathcal{A} for L^2 -approximation with respect to H_γ is given as

$$e(\mathcal{A}, H_\gamma) := e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}, H_\gamma) := \sup_{\|f\|_{H_\gamma} \leq 1} \|\mathcal{S}(f) - \mathcal{A}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})}.$$

Let us fix a cost function $\$: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ which is non-decreasing. For *nested subspace sampling* (NSS) (see [5, Sect. 5.1] or [2, 3, 9, 11]) we consider a sequence of nested finite index sets

$$\emptyset = \mathbf{v}_0 \subset \mathbf{v}_1 \subset \mathbf{v}_2 \subset \dots, \quad (9)$$

with $\mathbf{v}_i := [i]$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the cost of any information evaluation $L_{\mathbf{u}}(f)$ as in (8) is given by

$$\text{cost}(L_{\mathbf{u}}) = \inf\{\$(|\mathbf{v}_i|) : \mathbf{u} \subseteq \mathbf{v}_i\}.$$

2.2.2 Minimal errors and complexity

For the results in this paper, we work with the NSS cost model unless specified otherwise. On that basis, we define the n -th *minimal error* for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$e(n, H_\gamma) := \inf\{e(\mathcal{A}, H_\gamma) : \mathcal{A} \text{ as in (7) and } \text{cost}(\mathcal{A}) \leq n\}.$$

The approximation problem is said to be *strongly tractable* if and only if there exist non-negative constants $c, \alpha > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$e(n, H_\gamma) \leq c \cdot n^{-\alpha}.$$

In order to quantify convergence rates, we introduce the notion of decay rates. The *polynomial decay rate* of a null sequence of positive reals $\mathbf{x} := \{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by

$$d_{\mathbf{x}} := \text{decay}(\mathbf{x}) = \sup \left\{ p \geq 0 : \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} x_j^{1/p} < \infty \right\}. \quad (10)$$

This leads to the definition of the *polynomial convergence rate of n -th minimal errors*, c.f. [5, Sec 4],

$$r_\infty := r_\infty(H_\gamma) = \text{decay}(\{e(n, H_\gamma)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}), \quad (11)$$

which is the quantity of interest in later sections.

We now introduce complexity concepts which also appear in tractability studies as another perspective on the minimal errors. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be the error demand. The worst case ε -*information complexity*, also referred to as ε -*complexity* of function approximation is defined as, c.f. [15],

$$\text{comp}(\varepsilon, H_\gamma) := \inf \{ \text{cost}(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \text{ as in (7) and } e(\mathcal{A}, H_\gamma) \leq \varepsilon \}.$$

The approximation problem is strongly tractable if and only if there exist non-negative constants $c, \alpha > 0$ such that

$$\text{comp}(\varepsilon, H_\gamma) \leq c \cdot \varepsilon^{-\alpha}.$$

Consequently, the *exponent of tractability* is defined as

$$p_\infty := p_\infty(H_\gamma) = \inf \{ p \geq 0 : \exists C_p > 0 \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \text{comp}(\varepsilon, H_\gamma) \leq C_p \varepsilon^{-p} \}. \quad (12)$$

We can relate the exponent of tractability to the convergence rate of the n -th minimal error as $r_\infty = 1/p_\infty$.

2.2.3 Univariate and Multivariate L^2 -Approximation

The polynomial convergence rate of the n -th minimal error of the univariate approximation problem, according to (11), is denoted by $r_1(H(1+k)) = \text{decay}(\{e(n, H(1+k))\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$.

Consider the univariate solution operator $S : H(1+k) \rightarrow L^2(D, \rho), f \mapsto f$. It follows from (4) that S is compact. This means that the self-adjoint operator $W := S^* \circ S$ is compact and positive definite. Consequently, W has a null sequence of positive eigenvalues $\lambda := \{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with a corresponding set of eigenfunctions $\{\eta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ that form a complete orthonormal system of $H(1+k)$ satisfying

$$W(\eta_j) = \lambda_j \eta_j. \quad (13)$$

Let d_λ denote the decay rate of the eigenvalues λ of W according to (10). Then it is well known that the convergence rate of the n -th minimal errors of the univariate approximation problem is $d_\lambda/2$, see e.g. [13].

Let $S_{\mathbf{u}} : H_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$ be given by $S_{\mathbf{u}}(f) = f$ for all $f \in H_{\mathbf{u}}$. Owing to the tensor product construction of spaces $H_{\mathbf{u}}$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$, the eigenpairs of the operator $W_{\mathbf{u}} := S_{\mathbf{u}}^* \circ S_{\mathbf{u}} : H_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow H_{\mathbf{u}}$ are of product form. In particular, for $\mathbf{u} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\} \in \mathcal{U}$ with $k = |\mathbf{u}|$, and for all $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we define

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} := \prod_{i=1}^k \lambda_{j_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{i=1}^k \eta_{j_i}(x_{u_i}),$$

using the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the univariate operator as in (13). Then

$$W_{\mathbf{u}}(\eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}) = \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}, \quad (14)$$

and $\langle \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{i}}, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} = \delta_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}}$ for $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Using the eigenpairs of $W_{\mathbf{u}}$, we can express the SVD of $S_{\mathbf{u}}$ as

$$S_{\mathbf{u}}(f_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} \langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot \bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} = S_{\mathbf{u}}(\eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}) / \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} \quad (16)$$

form an orthonormal system in $L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$. In the same way as for the spaces $H_{\mathbf{u}}$, we now define a self-adjoint operator for the infinite-variate setting

$$\mathcal{W} := \mathcal{S}^* \circ \mathcal{S} : H_\gamma \rightarrow H_\gamma$$

which is compact and positive definite.

3 ANOVA spaces

For notational clarity, we use K_γ^A and H_γ^A to refer to the infinite-variate ANOVA kernel and the corresponding function space in this section. It is well known that in ANOVA spaces we have, see, e.g. [2],

$$\langle f_{\mathbf{u}}, g_{\mathbf{v}} \rangle_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u} \cup \mathbf{v}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u} \cup \mathbf{v}})} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}, \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}, f_{\mathbf{u}} \in H_{\mathbf{u}}, g_{\mathbf{v}} \in H_{\mathbf{v}}. \quad (17)$$

Lemma 1 *In the ANOVA setting, any linear continuous algorithm $\mathcal{A} : H_\gamma^A \rightarrow L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})$ satisfying $\mathcal{A}(H_{\mathbf{u}}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(H_{\mathbf{u}}) = H_{\mathbf{u}}$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$ also satisfies*

$$\|\mathcal{S}(f) - \mathcal{A}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \|S_{\mathbf{u}}(f_{\mathbf{u}}) - A_{\mathbf{u}}(f_{\mathbf{u}})\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2,$$

where $A_{\mathbf{u}} : H_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$ and $A_{\mathbf{u}}(f) = \mathcal{A}(f)$ for all $f \in H_{\mathbf{u}}$.

Proof The statement follows directly from (3) and (17), using the fact that $\mathcal{S}(f_{\mathbf{u}}) = S_{\mathbf{u}}(f_{\mathbf{u}})$. \square

Analogous to [15], we define an approximation algorithm based on the SVD of $S_{\mathbf{u}}$ from (15). Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and define for $f \in H_{\mathbf{u}}$

$$A_{\mathbf{u}, \delta}^*(f) := \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J(\delta, \mathbf{u})} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot \bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}, \quad (18)$$

where $J(\delta, \mathbf{u}) := \{\mathbf{j} : \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} > \delta\}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}$ is given by (16). We want to combine all the sub-algorithms $A_{\mathbf{u}, \delta}^* : H_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$ for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}$ to attack the approximation problem on H_{γ} . Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be the worst-case error threshold for the infinite-variate problem, and define the set

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\gamma}(\varepsilon) &:= \bigcup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}} \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) : \mathbf{j} \in J(\varepsilon/\sqrt{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}}, \mathbf{u})\} \\ &= \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}, \text{ and } \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} > \varepsilon^2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We now define the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}} : H_{\gamma}^{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}(f) := \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}} A_{\mathbf{u}, \varepsilon/\sqrt{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}}}^*(f_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) \in M_{\gamma}(\varepsilon)} \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot S_{\mathbf{u}}(\eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}). \quad (20)$$

Lemma 2 For any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{\gamma}$ and $\delta > 0$, the algorithm $A_{\mathbf{u}, \delta}^*$ from (18) satisfies $\|S_{\mathbf{u}} - A_{\mathbf{u}, \delta}^*\| \leq \delta$.

Proof Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then using (15) and Bessel's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{\mathbf{u}}(f) - A_{\mathbf{u}, \delta}^*(f)\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{j} \notin J(\delta, \mathbf{u})} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot \bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \right\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \notin J(\delta, \mathbf{u})} \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \left| \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \right|^2 \|\bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2 \leq \delta^2 \sum_{\mathbf{j} \notin J(\delta, \mathbf{u})} \left| \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \right|^2 \leq \delta^2 \|f\|_{H_{\mathbf{u}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows by taking supremum over $f \in H_{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\|f\|_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} = 1$. \square

The next result is reformulated from [15, Theorem 1(i)], and has a straightforward proof.

Corollary 1 In the ANOVA setting, the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ as in (20) achieves a worst case error at most ε .

The following result was mentioned in [15] without a proof, therefore we present it here for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 3 *The operator $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{S}^* \mathcal{S}$ admits the following decomposition over ANOVA spaces*

$$\mathcal{W}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} W_{\mathbf{u}}(f_{\mathbf{u}}) \quad \forall f \in H_\gamma^\Lambda, f = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} f_{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (21)$$

Proof The Definition 1 and the dominated convergence theorem imply that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{W}f)(\mathbf{y}) &= \langle \mathcal{W}(f), K_\gamma(\cdot, \mathbf{y}) \rangle_{H_\gamma^\Lambda} = \langle \mathcal{S}(f), \mathcal{S}(K_\gamma(\cdot, \mathbf{y})) \rangle_{L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})} \\ &= \int_{\mathfrak{X}} K_\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f(\mathbf{x}) d\rho^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathfrak{X}} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}) f(\mathbf{x}) d\rho^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \int_{D^{\mathbf{u}}} k_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}) f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}) d\rho^{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} (W_{\mathbf{u}} f_{\mathbf{u}})(\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{u}}). \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows. \square

Using the eigenpairs from (14) and Lemma 3, we can conclude that the eigenpairs of \mathcal{W} with positive eigenvalues are

$$\{(\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}, \xi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}) : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}\}, \quad (22)$$

with eigenfunctions $\xi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} := \sqrt{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}}} \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}$ normalized in H_γ^Λ . We can now express the solution operator \mathcal{S} using its singular values and the orthonormal system as

$$\mathcal{S}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}} \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}} \sqrt{\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}} \langle f, \xi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_\gamma} \cdot \bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}},$$

where $\bar{\eta}_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}$ is as defined in (16).

The next result is the analogue of [15, Theorem 1(iii)] where it was proven for unrestricted subspace sampling. It can be checked that the proof follows verbatim and the arguments hold irrespective of the cost model.

Theorem 1 *In the nested subspace sampling model, the cost of the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ is minimal amongst all algorithms that achieve a worst case error of at most ε .*

Using the nested sequence from (9), we set for notational convenience

$$V_0 := \{\emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_k := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma : k \in \mathbf{u} \subseteq [k]\} \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.$$

We know that $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ from (20) is the optimal algorithm for the approximation problem in ANOVA function spaces because it achieves an ε worst case error as shown in Corollary 1, and it follows from Theorem 1 that it has minimal cost as well. Therefore, it suffices to compute the cost of $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ to determine the ε -complexity. Let

$$M(\varepsilon, k) := \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) : \mathbf{u} \in V_k, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}, \text{ and } \gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \lambda_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} > \varepsilon^2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad n_k := |M(\varepsilon, k)|. \quad (23)$$

In order to simplify the cost analysis later on, we can rewrite the optimal algorithm from (20) in a multilevel fashion as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} \sum_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) \in M(\varepsilon, k)} \langle f, \eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}} \rangle_{H_{\mathbf{u}}} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\eta_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}}), \quad (24)$$

where $m_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ is the largest number k such that $n_k > 0$.

Lemma 4 *For an error threshold $\varepsilon > 0$, and with the nested subspaces as in (9), the optimal algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ samples from m_ε levels which can be estimated as*

$$m_\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2/p_1} \quad \forall p_1 \in (d_\gamma, \infty),$$

and

$$m_\varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/p_2} \quad \forall p_2 \in (1, d_\gamma).$$

Proof From Definition (10), we have for all $p_1 \in (d_\gamma, \infty)$ and $p_2 \in (1, d_\gamma)$

$$\gamma_j \gtrsim j^{-p_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j \lesssim j^{-p_2}. \quad (25)$$

Using (19), we have $(\{m_\varepsilon + 1\}, 1) \notin M_\gamma(\varepsilon)$ which means $\gamma_{m_\varepsilon+1} \lambda_1 < \varepsilon^2$. Using the lower bound from (25), we get for some $c_1 > 0$

$$c_1 \lambda_1 (m_\varepsilon + 1)^{-p_1} \leq \lambda_1 \gamma_{m_\varepsilon+1} \leq \varepsilon^2 \implies (c_1 \lambda_1)^{1/p_1} \varepsilon^{-2/p_1} \leq m_\varepsilon + 1.$$

Therefore, we get

$$m_\varepsilon \geq (c_1 \lambda_1)^{1/p_1} \varepsilon^{-2/p_1} - 1, \quad (26)$$

and the lower bound from the lemma follows.

To show the remaining upper bound from the lemma, we note that $(\{m_\varepsilon\}, 1) \in M_\gamma(\varepsilon)$ must hold, which is equivalent to the condition $\lambda_1 \gamma_{m_\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^2$. Then using (25) we get for some constant $c_2 > 0$

$$\varepsilon^2 < \lambda_1 \gamma_{m_\varepsilon} \leq c_2 \lambda_1 m_\varepsilon^{-p_2} \implies m_\varepsilon \leq (c_2 \lambda_1)^{1/p_2} \varepsilon^{-2/p_2}, \quad (27)$$

giving us the desired upper bound. \square

We now want to estimate the cardinality of $M(\varepsilon, k)$ as defined in (23). Before we proceed, we introduce the following notation. Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{j}_1), (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{j}_2) \in M(\varepsilon)$ such that $\mathbf{u}_1 \cap \mathbf{u}_2 = \emptyset$, $|\mathbf{u}_1| = k_1$, $|\mathbf{u}_2| = k_2$ and $\mathbf{j}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^{k_1}$, $\mathbf{j}_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{k_2}$. Then, we define $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{j}_2) \times (\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{j}_2) = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j})$ with $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \cup \mathbf{u}_2$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}_1 \cup \mathbf{u}_2}$ such that $j_i = j_{1,i}$ if $i \in \mathbf{u}_1$, and $j_i = j_{2,i}$ if $i \in \mathbf{u}_2$. Moreover, we define $\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k) := \{(k, j) : j \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma_k \lambda_j > \varepsilon^2\}$, and $\overline{n}_k := |\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k)|$.

Let d_γ denote the decay rate of $\{\gamma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. We assume that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma_j^{1/d_\gamma} < 1$. Then from [3, Theorem 5 and Corollary 1], we have for every $\tau \in [1, d_\gamma]$ and every constant $C_\tau > 0$ that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbf{u} \subseteq [k]} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/\tau} C_\tau^{|\mathbf{u}|} \asymp \gamma_k^{1/\tau}. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 5 *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in [m_\varepsilon]$. Then for all $q_1 \in (d_\lambda, \infty)$ and $q_2 \in (1, d_\lambda)$ we have the following properties.*

1. $M(\varepsilon, k+1) = \overline{M}(\varepsilon, k+1) \cup \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ (\{k+1\}, j) \times M\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\gamma_{k+1}\lambda_j}}, \ell\right) \right\}$.
2. $|M(\varepsilon, k+1)| = \left| \overline{M}(\varepsilon, k+1) \right| + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| M\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\gamma_{k+1}\lambda_j}}, \ell\right) \right|$.
3. $\left| \overline{M}(\varepsilon, k) \right| \gtrsim \gamma_k^{1/q_1} \varepsilon^{-2/q_1}$.
4. $\left| \overline{M}(\varepsilon, k) \right| \lesssim \gamma_k^{1/q_2} \varepsilon^{-2/q_2}$.
5. $|M(\varepsilon, k)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in V_k} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/q_2} c(\lambda, q_2)^{|\mathbf{u}|-1}$, where $c(\lambda, q_2) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{1/q_2} < \infty$.
6. $|M(\varepsilon, k)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \gamma_k^{1/q_2}$, if additionally $q_2 \in (1, \min\{d_\lambda, d_\gamma\})$.

Proof Similar to (25), we get for all $q_1 \in (d_\lambda, \infty)$ and $q_2 \in (1, d_\lambda)$ that

$$\lambda_j \gtrsim j^{-q_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j \lesssim j^{-q_2}. \quad (29)$$

We assume that $\varepsilon^2 < \gamma_1 \lambda_1 \leq 1$, since otherwise the set $M(\varepsilon)$ is empty.

1. Let $(\mathbf{u} \cup \{k+1\}, (\mathbf{j}, j_{k+1})) \in M(\varepsilon, k+1)$ where $\emptyset \neq \mathbf{u} \subseteq [k], \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbf{u}}$ and $j_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. Since we have product weights, the definition (23) requires that $\gamma_{\mathbf{u}} \lambda_{\mathbf{j}} > \varepsilon^2 / \gamma_{k+1} \lambda_{j_{k+1}}$. Let $\ell = \max(\mathbf{u})$, then $\mathbf{u} \in V_\ell$ and

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{j}) \in M\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\gamma_{k+1}\lambda_{j_{k+1}}}}, \ell\right).$$

2. Note that the right hand side in statement 1 is a union of disjoint sets.
3. Using the lower bound from (29), and the definition of $\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k)$, we get for some $c_1 > 0$ that

$$c_1 \gamma_k (\overline{n}_k + 1)^{-q_1} \leq \lambda_{\overline{n}_k+1} \gamma_k \leq \varepsilon^2 \implies \overline{n}_k \geq c_1^{1/q_1} \gamma_k^{1/q_1} \varepsilon^{-2/q_1} - 1.$$

4. Using the upper bound from (29), and the definition of $\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k)$, we get for some $c_2 > 0$ that

$$\varepsilon^2 < \gamma_k \lambda_{\overline{n}_k} \leq c_2 \gamma_k \overline{n}_k^{-q_2} \implies \overline{n}_k \leq c_2^{1/q_2} \gamma_k^{1/q_2} \varepsilon^{-2/q_2}.$$

5. We prove this result by induction. For $k = 1$, we have due to statement 4

$$n_1 = |M(\varepsilon, 1)| = \left| \overline{M}(\varepsilon, 1) \right| \lesssim \gamma_1^{1/q_2} \varepsilon^{-2/q_2}.$$

We suppose now that the bound is true for $M(\varepsilon, 1), \dots, M(\varepsilon, k)$. Using statements 2 and 4, we get for some $c_2 > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
|M(\varepsilon, k+1)| &= \left| \overline{M}(\varepsilon, k+1) \right| + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| M \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\gamma_{k+1} \lambda_j}}, \ell \right) \right| \\
&\leq c_2 \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \gamma_{k+1}^{1/q_2} + c_2 \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\gamma_{k+1} \lambda_j}} \right)^{-2/q_2} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in V_\ell} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/q_2} c(\lambda, q_2)^{|\mathbf{u}|-1} \\
&= c_2 \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \gamma_{k+1}^{1/q_2} \left[1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in V_\ell} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/q_2} c(\lambda, q_2)^{|\mathbf{u}|-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_j^{1/q_2} \right] \\
&= c_2 \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \left[\gamma_{k+1}^{1/q_2} + \gamma_{k+1}^{1/q_2} \sum_{\emptyset \neq \mathbf{u} \subseteq [k]} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/q_2} c(\lambda, q_2)^{|\mathbf{u}|} \right] \\
&= c_2 \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in V_{k+1}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1/q_2} c(\lambda, q_2)^{|\mathbf{u}|-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

6. The estimate follows directly by applying (28) to the formula in statement 5.

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2 Let $\$(k) = \Theta(k^s)$ for some $s > 0$. Then the optimal algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}$ as in (20) achieves the following convergence rate using the nested subspace sampling cost model in ANOVA function spaces with product weights

$$r_\infty^A = \min \left\{ \frac{d_\lambda}{2}, \frac{d_\gamma}{2(1+s)} \right\}.$$

Proof Let ε be the desired worst case error, and m_ε be the highest level for our algorithm.

We first show $r_\infty^A \leq \min \left\{ \frac{d_\lambda}{2}, \frac{d_\gamma}{2(1+s)} \right\}$ using $\$(k) = \Omega(k^s)$. Since $\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k) \subset M(\varepsilon, k)$, we get using the lower bound on $|\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k)|$ from statement 3 of Lemma 5, and using (25) that

$$\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \gamma}^{\text{opt}}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} |\overline{M}(\varepsilon, k)| \cdot \$(k) \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2/q_1} \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} \gamma_k^{1/q_1} k^s \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2/q_1} \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{s-p_1/q_1}, \quad (30)$$

where for $\delta > 0$ arbitrarily small, we choose $p_1 = d_\gamma(1 + \delta)$ and $q_1 = d_\lambda(1 + \delta)$. From the last expression in (30), we may distinguish three cases.

1. $d_\gamma/(1+s) > d_\lambda \implies s - p_1/q_1 < -1$: This means we have $\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{s-p_1/q_1} \gtrsim 1$. Consequently, as $q_1 \rightarrow d_\lambda$, we get $r_\infty^A \leq d_\lambda/2$.
2. $d_\gamma/(1+s) = d_\lambda \implies s - p_1/q_1 = -1$: Here we get the estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{-1} \gtrsim 1 + \ln(m_\varepsilon) \gtrsim 1 + \frac{2}{p_1} \ln(1/\varepsilon),$$

where the last relation follows from Lemma 4. Hence, we get $\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}) \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2/q_1}(1 + \ln(1/\varepsilon))$. Since the definition of the exponent of tractability as in (12) ignores the logarithmic terms, we get $r_\infty^A \leq d_\lambda/2$ as $q_1 \rightarrow d_\lambda$.

3. $d_\gamma/(1+s) < d_\lambda \implies s - p_1/q_1 > -1$: In this case, we can use Lemma 4 to get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{s-p_1/q_1} \gtrsim (m_\varepsilon)^{1-p_1/q_1+s} \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2(1-p_1/q_1+s)/p_1},$$

which implies that $\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}) \gtrsim \varepsilon^{-2(1+s)/p_1}$. As $p_1 \rightarrow d_\gamma$, we have $r_\infty^A \leq d_\gamma/2(1+s)$.

We now show that $r_\infty^A \geq \min\left\{r_1, \frac{d_\gamma}{2(1+s)}\right\}$ using $\$(k) \lesssim k^s$. We use (25) and statement 6 from Lemma 5 to get

$$\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}) = \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} |M(\varepsilon, k)| \cdot \$(k) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} \gamma_k^{1/q_2} k^s \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/q_2} \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{s-p_2/q_2}, \quad (31)$$

where for $\delta > 0$ arbitrarily small, we choose $p_2 = d_\gamma(1-\delta)$ and $q_2 = d_\lambda(1-\delta)$. We analyze the last expression in (31) in three cases as in the first part of the proof.

1. $d_\gamma/(1+s) > d_\lambda \implies s - p_2/q_2 < -1$: Then $\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{s-p_2/q_2} \lesssim 1$. Therefore, we may choose $q_2 \rightarrow d_\lambda$ to get $r_\infty^A \geq d_\lambda/2$.
2. $d_\gamma/(1+s) = d_\lambda \implies s - p_2/q_2 = -1$: For this case, we get the estimate $\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{-1} \lesssim 1 + \ln(m_\varepsilon) \lesssim 1 + \frac{2}{p_2} \ln(1/\varepsilon)$, where we used Lemma 4 for the last relation. Consequently, we have $\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2/q_2}(1 + \ln(1/\varepsilon))$. Similarly as in the first part of the proof, we can ignore the logarithmic terms as $q_2 \rightarrow d_\lambda$ to get $r_\infty^A \geq d_\lambda/2$.
3. $d_\gamma/(1+s) < d_\lambda \implies s - p_2/q_2 > -1$: Due to Lemma 4 we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} k^{-p_2/q_2+s} \lesssim m_\varepsilon^{1-p_2/q_2+s} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2(1-p_2/q_2+s)/p_2}.$$

Hence, we get $\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,\gamma}^{\text{opt}}) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2(1+s)/p_2}$ and we may choose $p_2 \rightarrow d_\gamma$ to get $r_\infty^A \geq d_\gamma/2(1+s)$.

This completes the proof. \square

4 Non-ANOVA spaces

Let us now turn to the case where the underlying function decomposition of our Hilbert space H_γ is not of ANOVA-type. We start by proving a lower bound on the convergence rate of n -th minimal errors.

Proposition 1 *Let $\$(k) \gtrsim k^s$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $s > 0$. Then the optimal convergence rate for the algorithms defined as in (7) satisfy in non-ANOVA function spaces*

$$r_\infty \leq \min \left\{ \frac{d_\lambda}{2}, \frac{d_\gamma - 1}{2s} \right\}.$$

Proof The bound $r_\infty \leq d_\lambda/2$ follows from the rate of convergence for the univariate problem.

To show the other part, we adapt the proof strategy from [14, Proposition 4]. Let \mathcal{A}_N be a linear algorithm using finitely many function evaluations, such that $\text{cost}(\mathcal{A}_N) \leq N$. We now choose $L := \sup \{k : \$(k) \leq N\}$. Due to this definition, $V := [L]$ is a superset of all the indices that the algorithm \mathcal{A}_N relies on. Since we assumed that $\$(k) \gtrsim k^s$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $k^s/c^s \leq \$(k)$, implying $L \leq cN^{1/s}$.

Consider a univariate function $h \in H(k)$ such that $\|h\|_{H(k)} = 1$ and $c_1 := \int_D h(x) d\rho(x) \neq 0$, cf. Remark 1. Then define $f^* \in H_\gamma$ as

$$f^*(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{\kappa} \sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j h(x_j); \quad \text{with } \kappa := \sqrt{\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j}.$$

As shown in [14], $\mathcal{A}_N(f^*) = 0$, $\|f\|_{H_\gamma} = 1$, and also

$$\|f^*\|_{L^2(\mathbf{x}, \rho^N)}^2 = \left(\|h\|_{L^2(D, \rho)}^2 - c_1^2 \right) \frac{\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j^2}{\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j} + c_1^2 \sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j.$$

From (10), we have for any arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$ that $\gamma_j \gtrsim j^{-(d_\gamma + \delta/4)}$, and also $\gamma_j \lesssim j^{-(d_\gamma - \delta/2)}$. With this, we can conclude that

$$\frac{\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j^2}{\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j} \gtrsim \frac{\sum_{j=L+1}^{\infty} j^{-2d_\gamma - \delta/2}}{\sum_{j=L+1}^{\infty} j^{-d_\gamma + \delta/2}} \gtrsim L^{-d_\gamma - \delta} \gtrsim N^{-(d_\gamma + \delta)/s}.$$

Similarly, we have that $\sum_{j \notin V} \gamma_j \gtrsim L^{1-d_\gamma - \delta} \gtrsim N^{(1-d_\gamma - \delta)/s}$. From the construction of f^* , we have for the error that

$$e(\mathcal{A}_N; H_\gamma) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H_\gamma}=1} \|f - \mathcal{A}_N(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{x}, \rho^N)} \geq \|f^*\|_{L^2(\mathbf{x}, \rho^N)} \gtrsim N^{(1-d_\gamma - \delta)/2s}.$$

This shows that $r_\infty \leq (d_\gamma - 1)/2s$, and the result follows. \square

For non-ANOVA spaces, Lemma 3 does not hold in general, which means that we cannot express the eigenpairs of $\mathcal{W} : H_\gamma \rightarrow H_\gamma$ in terms of the eigenpairs of $W_{\mathbf{u}}$. For the upper error bound, we need results from [14] which are stated below for the reader's convenience. Let $C_0 := \sup_{f \in H(k)} \frac{\|f\|_{L^2(D, \rho)}}{\|f\|_{H(k)}} < \infty$.

Lemma 6 *For all $c \in (1/d_\gamma, 1)$ it holds that $\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} C_0^{2|\mathbf{u}|} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1-c} < \infty$.*

1. For

$$\widehat{\gamma}_c = \{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{u},c}\}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma}, \quad \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{u},c} := \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{1-c},$$

we define $\phi : H_\gamma \rightarrow H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$, $f \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}}^{-c/2} f_{\mathbf{u}}$. Then ϕ is an isometric isomorphism between H_γ and $H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$. Furthermore, $H_\gamma \subseteq H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$.

2. Let \mathcal{A} be a linear continuous algorithm satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}(H_{\mathbf{u}}) \subseteq L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}}), \quad (32)$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma$. Then we get the upper bound

$$\|\mathcal{S}(f) - \mathcal{A}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})}^2 \leq C_\gamma \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \left\| S_{\mathbf{u}}(\widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}}) - A_{\mathbf{u}}(\widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2 \quad (33)$$

where $C_\gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \gamma_{\mathbf{v}}^c$, $\phi(f) =: \widehat{f} = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}}$ for all $f \in H_\gamma$, and $A_{\mathbf{u}} : H_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})$ such that $A_{\mathbf{u}}(f) = \mathcal{A}(f)$ for all $f \in H_{\mathbf{u}}$.

It is straightforward to check that ϕ defines an isometric isomorphism. $H_\gamma \subseteq H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$ is due to [14, Lemma 2]. The inequality (33) has been derived in the proof of [14, Lemma 2] for any algorithm \mathcal{A} satisfying (32).

Proposition 2 For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, define the set $M_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}(\varepsilon)$ as in (19) and also the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}} : H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c} \rightarrow L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})$ as defined in (20). Then the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}}$ satisfies (32) and $e(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}}, \mathcal{S}, H_\gamma) \leq \varepsilon$. The algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}}$ establishes that

$$r_\infty \geq \min \left\{ \frac{d_\lambda}{2}, \frac{d_\gamma - 1}{2(1+s)} \right\}.$$

Proof Using Lemmas 6 and 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{S}(f) - \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}}(f) \right\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{X}, \rho^{\mathbb{N}})}^2 &\lesssim \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \left\| S_{\mathbf{u}}(\widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}}) - A_{\mathbf{u}, \varepsilon / \sqrt{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{u},c}}}^*(\widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}}) \right\|_{L^2(D^{\mathbf{u}}, \rho^{\mathbf{u}})}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma} \frac{1}{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{u},c}} \left\| \widehat{f}_{\mathbf{u}} \right\|_{H_{\mathbf{u}}}^2 = \varepsilon^2 \left\| \widehat{f} \right\|_{H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}}^2 = \varepsilon^2 \|f\|_{H_\gamma}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, \widehat{\gamma}_c}^{\text{opt}}$ has the same cost in $H_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$ and in its subspace H_γ , since the function space decomposition in both spaces rely on the same family of subspaces $(H_{\mathbf{u}})_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\gamma}$. Let $d_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}$ denote the decay rate of product weights $\widehat{\gamma}_c$. Then from statement 5 of Lemma 5, (31), and the subsequent analysis in Theorem 2, we get

$$r_\infty \geq \min \left\{ \frac{d_\lambda}{2}, \frac{d_{\widehat{\gamma}_c}}{2(1+s)} \right\}.$$

Finally, $d_{\widehat{\gamma}_c} = d_\gamma(1-c) \xrightarrow{c \rightarrow 1/d_\gamma} d_\gamma - 1$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2 *If $1 < d_\gamma < 1 + s$, then the convergence rate of L^2 -approximation in ANOVA spaces is strictly larger than the one in non-ANOVA spaces.*

Proof Under the given condition, the optimal convergence rate of n -th minimal errors in the ANOVA case from Theorem 2 is greater than the largest possible convergence rate in the non-ANOVA case from Proposition 1, i.e. $(d_\gamma - 1)/2s < d_\gamma/2(1 + s)$. \square

As we see from the analysis, the convergence rates from the upper and lower error bounds in the non-ANOVA spaces do not match. In future work, we will consider bridging the gap.

References

1. N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 68:337–404, 1950.
2. J. Baldeaux and M. Gnewuch. Optimal randomized multilevel algorithms for infinite-dimensional integration on function spaces with ANOVA-type decomposition. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52:1128–1155, 2014.
3. J. Dick and M. Gnewuch. Infinite-dimensional integration in weighted Hilbert spaces: anchored decompositions, optimal deterministic algorithms, and higher order convergence. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 14:1027–1077, 2014.
4. J. Dick and M. Gnewuch. Optimal randomized changing dimension algorithms for infinite-dimensional integration on function spaces with ANOVA-type decomposition. *J. Approx. Theory*, 184:111–145, 2014.
5. M. Gnewuch, M. Hefter, A. Hinrichs, and K. Ritter. Embeddings of weighted Hilbert spaces and applications to multivariate and infinite-dimensional integration. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 222:8–39, 2017.
6. M. Gnewuch, M. Hefter, A. Hinrichs, K. Ritter, and G. W. Wasilkowski. Embeddings for infinite-dimensional integration and L_2 -approximation with increasing smoothness. *J. Complexity*, 54:101406, 2019.
7. M. Gnewuch, S. Mayer, and K. Ritter. On weighted Hilbert spaces and integration of functions of infinitely many variables. *J. Complexity*, 30:29–47, 2014.
8. M. Hefter and K. Ritter. On embeddings of weighted tensor product Hilbert spaces. *J. Complexity*, 31:405–423, 2015.
9. F. J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo algorithms for infinite-dimensional integration on \mathbb{R}^N . *J. Complexity*, 26:229–254, 2010.
10. F. Y. Kuo, I. H. Sloan, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. Liberating the dimension. *J. Complexity*, 26:422–454, 2010.
11. T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable subspace sampling and multi-level algorithms. In P. L’Ecuyer and A. B. Owen, editors, *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2008*. Springer, 2009.
12. E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. *Tractability of Multivariate Problems. Vol. 1: Linear Information*. EMS Tracts in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
13. J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. *Information-Based Complexity*. Academic Press, New York, 1988.
14. G. W. Wasilkowski. Liberating the dimension for L_2 -approximation. *J. Complexity*, 28:304–319, 2012.
15. G. W. Wasilkowski and H. Woźniakowski. Liberating the dimension for function approximation. *J. Complexity*, 27:86–110, 2011.
16. Marcin Wnuk. A short note on compact embeddings of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in L^2 for infinite-variate function approximation, 2022.