

A NOTE ABOUT EC- (s, t) -WEAK TRACTABILITY OF MULTIVARIATE APPROXIMATION WITH ANALYTIC KOROBV KERNELS

HEPING WANG

ABSTRACT. This note is devoted to discussing multivariate approximation of continuous functions on $[0, 1]^d$ with analytic Korobov kernels in the worst and average case settings. We only consider algorithms that use finitely many evaluations of arbitrary continuous linear functionals. We study EC- (s, t) -weak tractability under the absolute or normalized error criterion, and obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for $0 < \min(s, t) < 1$ and $\max(s, t) \leq 1$ in the worst case setting and for $s, t > 0$ in the average case setting.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

We approximate multivariate problems $S = \{S_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ by algorithms that use finitely many linear functionals. The information complexity $n(\varepsilon, S_d)$ is defined as the minimal number of linear functionals which are needed to find an approximation to within an error threshold ε .

We consider exponentially-convergent tractability (EC-tractability) of the multivariate problems $S = \{S_d\}$. There are two kinds of tractability based on polynomial-convergence and exponential-convergence. The classical tractability describes how the information complexity behaves as a function of d and ε^{-1} , while the exponentially-convergent tractability (EC-tractability) does as one of d and $(1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})$. Nowadays study of tractability and EC-tractability has become one of the busiest areas of research in information-based complexity (see [16, 17, 18, 4, 6, 19, 22] and the references therein).

We briefly recall the basic EC-tractability notions. Let $S = \{S_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$. We say S is

- *Exponential convergent and strong polynomial tractable (EC-SPT)* iff there exist non-negative numbers C and p such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$n(\varepsilon, S_d) \leq C(1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})^p;$$

- *Exponential convergent and polynomial tractable (EC-PT)* iff there exist non-negative numbers C, p and q such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$n(\varepsilon, S_d) \leq C d^q (1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})^p;$$

- *Exponential convergent and quasi-polynomial tractable (EC-QPT)* iff there exist two constants $C, t > 0$ such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$n(\varepsilon, S_d) \leq C \exp\{t[1 + \ln(1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})](1 + \ln d)\};$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A25, 41A63, 65D15, 65Y20.

Key words and phrases. Exponential convergence tractability; Analytic Korobov kernels.

Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project no. 11671271) and the Beijing Natural Science Foundation (1172004) .

- *Exponential convergent and uniformly weakly tractable (EC-UWT)* iff for all $\alpha, \beta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, S_d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^\alpha + d^\beta} = 0;$$

- *Exponential convergent and weakly tractable (EC-WT)* iff

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, S_d)}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + d} = 0;$$

- *Exponential convergent and (s, t) -weakly tractable (EC- (s, t) -WT)* for positive s and t iff

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, S_d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} = 0.$$

Clearly, EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT is the same as EC-WT, and for $0 < s_1 < s$, $0 < t_1 < t$, EC- (s_1, t_1) -WT \implies EC- (s, t) -WT. We also have

$$\text{EC-SPT} \implies \text{EC-PT} \implies \text{EC-QPT} \implies \text{EC-UWT} \implies \text{EC-WT}.$$

In the definitions of EC-SPT, EC-PT, EC-QPT, EC-UWT, EC-WT, and EC- (s, t) -WT, if we replace $(1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})$ by ε^{-1} , we get the definitions of *strong polynomial tractability (SPT)*, *polynomial tractability (PT)*, *quasi-polynomial tractability (QPT)*, *uniform weak tractability (UWT)*, *weak tractability (WT)*, and *(s, t) -weak tractability $((s, t)$ -WT)*, respectively.

This note is devoted to discussing EC- (s, t) -WT of multivariate approximation with analytic Korobov kernels in the worst and average case settings.

Let $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a non-decreasing sequence of positive numbers, and let $\mathbf{b} = \{b_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive numbers having a positive infimum b_* so that

$$(1.1) \quad 0 < a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_k \leq \dots, \quad \text{and} \quad b_* := \inf_{k \geq 1} b_k > 0.$$

Assume that the analytic Korobov kernel $K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ is of product form,

$$(1.2) \quad K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{k=1}^d K_{1, a_k, b_k}(x_k, y_k), \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

where $K_{1, a, b}$ are univariate analytic Korobov kernels,

$$K_{1, a, b}(x, y) = \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega^{a|\mathbf{h}|^b} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{h}(x - y)), \quad x, y \in [0, 1].$$

Here $\omega \in (0, 1)$ is a fixed positive number, $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $a, b > 0$. Hence, we have

$$(1.3) \quad K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_{\mathbf{h}} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{h} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})), \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

where

$$(1.4) \quad \omega_{\mathbf{h}} = \omega^{\sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_k}},$$

for fixed $\omega \in (0, 1)$ and all $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \sum_{k=1}^d x_k y_k, \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d), \quad \mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

denotes the usual Euclidean inner product.

First we consider the worst case setting. Denote by $H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$ the analytic Korobov space which is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with the reproducing kernel $K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ given by (1.3). Such space $H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$ has been widely used in tractability study (see [3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11]).

We consider multivariate approximation problem $\text{APP} = \{\text{APP}_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is defined via the embedding operator

$$(1.5) \quad \text{APP}_d : H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}) \rightarrow L_2([0,1]^d) \quad \text{with} \quad \text{APP}_d f = f.$$

We approximate APP_d by algorithms that use only finitely many continuous linear functionals on $H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$. A function $f \in H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$ is approximated by an algorithm

$$(1.6) \quad A_{n,d}f = \phi_{n,d}(L_1(f), L_2(f), \dots, L_n(f)),$$

where L_1, L_2, \dots, L_n are continuous linear functionals on $H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$, and $\phi_{n,d} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow L_2([0,1]^d)$ is an arbitrary measurable mapping. The worst case error of approximation by an algorithm $A_{n,d}$ of the form (1.6) is defined as

$$e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})} \leq 1} \|\text{APP}_d f - A_{n,d}f\|_{L_2([0,1]^d)}.$$

The n th minimal worst case error, for $n \geq 1$, is defined by

$$e^{\text{wor}}(n, d) = \inf_{A_{n,d}} e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all algorithms of the form (1.6).

For $n = 0$, we use $A_{0,d} = 0$. We remark that the so-called initial error $e^{\text{wor}}(0, d)$, defined by

$$e^{\text{wor}}(0, d) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})} \leq 1} \|\text{APP}_d f\|_{L_2([0,1]^d)},$$

is equal to 1. In other words, the normalized error criterion and the absolute error criterion coincide.

The information complexity $n(\varepsilon, d)$ is defined by

$$n(\varepsilon, d) = \min\{n : e^{\text{wor}}(n, d) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

The classical tractability of the multivariate problem APP has been investigated and solved completely in [8, 11, 6]. For the EC-tractability of APP, the sufficient and necessary conditions for EC-SPT, EC-PT, EC-QPT, EC-UWT, EC-WT, and EC- (s, t) -WT with $\max(s, t) > 1$ were given in [6]. See the following EC-tractability results of APP:

- EC-SPT holds iff EC-PT holds iff

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k^{-1} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln a_k}{k} > 0.$$

- EC-QTP holds iff

$$\sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^d b_k^{-1}}{1 + \ln d} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1 + \ln k) \ln a_k}{k} > 0.$$

- EC-UWT holds iff

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln a_k}{\ln k} = \infty.$$

- EC- (s, t) -WT with $\max(s, t) > 1$ always holds.

- EC-WT holds iff WT holds iff

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = \infty.$$

However, the authors did not find out the conditions on EC-(s, t)-WT with $\max(s, t) \leq 1$ and $\min(s, t) < 1$ in [6]. In this note, we fill the gap and obtain the sufficient and necessary conditions for EC-(s, t)-WT with $\max(s, t) \leq 1$ and $\min(s, t) < 1$. We use estimates of entropy numbers and technique in [21] to obtain the sufficient conditions for EC-(s, t)-WT. Such method is first used in [10].

Theorem 1.1. *Consider the approximation problem APP in the worst case setting with the sequences \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} satisfying (1.1). Then*

- (i) EC-(1, t)-WT with $t < 1$ holds iff

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln j}{a_j} = 0.$$

- (ii) EC-(s, t)-WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds iff

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{j^{(1-s)/s}}{a_j} = 0.$$

Next we discuss the average case setting. Consider the approximation problem $I = \{I_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$,

$$(1.9) \quad I_d : C([0, 1]^d) \rightarrow L_2([0, 1]^d) \quad \text{with} \quad I_d f = f.$$

The space $C([0, 1]^d)$ of continuous real functions is equipped with a zero-mean Gaussian measure μ_d whose covariance kernel is given by the analytic Korobov kernel $K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$. We approximate $I_d f$ by algorithms $A_{n,d} f$ of the form (1.6) that use n continuous linear functionals on $C([0, 1]^d)$. The average case error for $A_{n,d}$ is defined by

$$e^{\text{avg}}(A_{n,d}) = \left[\int_{C([0, 1]^d)} \|I_d f - A_{n,d} f\|_{L_2([0, 1]^d)}^2 \mu_d(df) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The n th minimal average case error, for $n \geq 1$, is defined by

$$e^{\text{avg}}(n, d) = \inf_{A_{n,d}} e(A_{n,d}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all algorithms of the form (1.6).

For $n = 0$, we use $A_{0,d} = 0$. We obtain the so-called initial error

$$e^{\text{avg}}(0, d) = e^{\text{avg}}(A_{0,d}).$$

The information complexity for I_d can be studied using either the absolute error criterion (ABS), or the normalized error criterion (NOR). Then we define the information complexity $n^{\text{avg}, X}(\varepsilon, d)$ for $X \in \{\text{ABS}, \text{NOR}\}$ as

$$n^{\text{avg}, X}(\varepsilon, d) = \min\{n : e^{\text{avg}}(n, d) \leq \varepsilon CRI_d\},$$

where

$$CRI_d = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } X=\text{ABS}, \\ e^{\text{avg}}(0, d), & \text{for } X=\text{NOR}. \end{cases}$$

The classical tractability of the multivariate problem $I = \{I_d\}$ has been investigated in [12, 13, 2]. For the EC-tractability of I , the sufficient and necessary conditions for EC-SPT, EC-PT, EC-UWT, EC-WT under ABS or NOR were given in [12], see the following EC-tractability results of I :

- For ABS or NOR, EC-SPT holds iff EC-PT holds iff

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k^{-1} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln a_k}{k} > 0.$$

- For ABS or NOR, EC-UWT holds iff

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln a_k}{\ln k} = \infty.$$

- For ABS or NOR, EC-WT holds iff

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = \infty.$$

In this note, we obtain the sufficient and necessary conditions for EC- (s, t) -WT. We use the connection about EC-tractability in the worst and average case settings (see [22, 14]). Such connection was used to study the EC-tractability of multivariate approximation with Gaussian kernel in the average case setting (see [1]). Specially, according to [22, Theorems 3.2 and 4.2] and [14, Theorem 3.2], we have the same results in the worst and average case settings concerning EC-WT, EC-UWT, and EC- (s, t) -WT for $0 < s \leq 1$ and $t > 0$ under ABS.

Theorem 1.2. *Consider the above approximation problem $I = \{I_d\}$ with the sequences \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} satisfying (1.1). Then*

(i) *for ABS or NOR, if $s > 0$ and $t > 1$ then EC- (s, t) -WT always holds;*

(ii) *for ABS or NOR, EC- $(s, 1)$ -WT with $s \geq 1$ holds iff EC-WT holds iff*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \infty;$$

(iii) *for ABS, EC- $(1, t)$ -WT with $t < 1$ holds iff*

$$(1.10) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln j}{a_j} = 0;$$

(iv) *for ABS or NOR, EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds iff*

$$(1.11) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{j^{(1-s)/s}}{a_j} = 0;$$

(v) *for ABS or NOR, EC- (s, t) -WT with $s > 1$ and $t < 1$ holds iff*

$$(1.12) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} j^{1-t} a_j \omega^{a_j} = 0.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give some necessary preliminaries in the worst and average case settings. In Section 3, we give the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For a fixed $\omega \in (0, 1)$, let $K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}$ be the analytic Korobov kernel given by (1.3) with \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} satisfying (1.1). By (1.2) we know that the reproducing kernel Hilbert space $H(K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}})$ is a tensor product of the univariate reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces $H(K_{1, a_j, b_j})$, $j = 1, \dots, d$ with reproducing kernels K_{1, a_j, b_j} , i.e.,

$$H(K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}) = H(K_{1, a_1, b_1}) \otimes H(K_{1, a_2, b_2}) \otimes \dots \otimes H(K_{1, a_d, b_d}).$$

From [16] we know that $e^{\text{wor}}(n, d)$ depends on the eigenpairs of the operator

$$W_d = \text{APP}_d^* \text{APP}_d : H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}) \mapsto H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}),$$

where APP_d is given by (1.5). We have

$$W_d f = \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_{\mathbf{h}} \langle f, e_{\mathbf{h}} \rangle_{H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})} e_{\mathbf{h}}$$

with

$$e_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\omega_{\mathbf{h}})^{1/2} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{x}).$$

This means that $\{(\omega_{\mathbf{h}}, e_{\mathbf{h}})\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ are the eigenpairs of W_d , i.e.,

$$W_d e_{\mathbf{h}} = \omega_{\mathbf{h}} e_{\mathbf{h}}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

and $\{e_{\mathbf{h}}\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is an orthonormal basis for $H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})$.

Let $\{(\lambda_{d,j}, \eta_{d,j})\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the rearrangement of the eigenpairs $\{(\omega_{\mathbf{h}}, e_{\mathbf{h}})\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, such that the eigenvalues $\omega_{\mathbf{h}}$, $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are arranged in decreasing order, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{d,1} \geq \lambda_{d,2} \geq \cdots \lambda_{d,k} \geq \cdots \geq 0.$$

From [16, p. 118] we get that the n th minimal worst case error is

$$e^{\text{wor}}(n, d) = (\lambda_{d,n+1})^{1/2},$$

and it is achieved by the algorithm

$$A_{n,d}^* f = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_{d,k} \langle f, \eta_{d,k} \rangle_{H(K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}})} \eta_{d,k}.$$

Since $\lambda_{d,1} = \omega_0 = \prod_{k=1}^d \lambda(k, 1) = 1$, we get that the normalized error criterion and the absolute error criterion coincide. Then the information complexity $n(\varepsilon, d)$ of APP satisfies

$$n(\varepsilon, d) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid e^{\text{wor}}(n, d) \leq \varepsilon\} = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_{d,n+1} \leq \varepsilon^2\},$$

or equivalently, the number of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{d,j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\omega_{\mathbf{h}}\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of the operator W_d greater than ε^2 . Due to (1.4), we can rewrite the information complexity as

$$\begin{aligned} n(\varepsilon, d) &= \#\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \omega_{\mathbf{h}} = \omega^{\sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_k}} > \varepsilon^2\} \\ (2.1) \quad &= \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_k} < \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\#A$ represents the number of elements in a set A .

Next we can give explicit formulas for the n th minimal average case error $e^{\text{avg}}(n, d)$ and the corresponding n th optimal algorithm, see [16, Section 4.3]. We recall that the space $C([0, 1]^d)$ is equipped with a zero-mean Gaussian measure μ_d whose covariance kernel is given by the analytic Korobov kernel $K_{d,\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$. Let

$$C_{\mu_d} : (C([0, 1]^d))^* \mapsto C([0, 1]^d)$$

denote the covariance operator of μ_d , as defined in [16, Appendix B]. Then the induced measure $\nu_d = \mu_d(I_d)^{-1}$ is a zero-mean Gaussian measure on the Borel sets of $L_2([0, 1]^d)$, with covariance operator $C_{\nu_d} : L_2([0, 1]^d) \mapsto C([0, 1]^d)$ given by

$$C_{\nu_d} = I_d C_{\mu_d} (I_d)^*,$$

where I_d is defined by (1.9), $(I_d)^* : L_2([0, 1]^d) \mapsto (C([0, 1]^d))^*$ is the operator dual to I_d . It is well-known that C_{ν_d} is a self-adjoint nonnegative-definite operator with finite trace on $L_2([0, 1]^d)$ and for any $f \in L_2([0, 1]^d)$,

$$C_{\nu_d} f(x) = \int_{[0, 1]^d} K_{d, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(x, y) f(y) dy.$$

Then $\{(\omega_{\mathbf{h}}, \tilde{e}_{\mathbf{h}})\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ are the eigenpairs of C_{ν_d} with $\tilde{e}_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{x})$, i.e.,

$$C_{\nu_d} \tilde{e}_{\mathbf{h}} = \omega_{\mathbf{h}} \tilde{e}_{\mathbf{h}}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

and $\{\tilde{e}_{\mathbf{h}}\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is an orthonormal basis for $L_2([0, 1]^d)$.

Let $\{\lambda_{d,j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the non-increasing rearrangement of $\{\omega_{\mathbf{h}}\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ just as in the worst case setting. Then the eigenvalues of the covariance operator C_{ν_d} are just $\lambda_{d,j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $\xi_{d,j}$ the corresponding eigenvector of C_{ν_d} with respect to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{d,j}$. Then the n th minimal average case error $e^{\text{avg}}(n, d)$ is (see [16])

$$e^{\text{avg}}(n, d) = \left(\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,k} \right)^{1/2} \geq e^{\text{wor}}(n, d).$$

and it is achieved by the algorithm

$$A_{n,d}^{**} f = \sum_{k=1}^n \langle I_d f, \xi_{d,k} \rangle_{L_2([0, 1]^d)} \xi_{d,k}.$$

The average case information complexity can be studied using either ABS or NOR. Then we define the worst case information complexity $n^{\text{wor}, X}(\varepsilon, d)$ for $X \in \{\text{ABS}, \text{NOR}\}$ as

$$n^{\text{avg}, X}(\varepsilon, d) = \min\{n : e^{\text{avg}}(n, d) \leq \varepsilon CRI_d\},$$

where

$$CRI_d = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } X=\text{ABS}, \\ e^{\text{avg}}(0, d), & \text{for } X=\text{NOR} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } X=\text{ABS}, \\ \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,j} \right)^{1/2}, & \text{for } X=\text{NOR}. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, we have

$$(2.2) \quad n^{\text{avg}, \text{NOR}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq n^{\text{avg}, \text{ABS}}(\varepsilon, d) = n^{\text{avg}, \text{NOR}}((e^{\text{avg}}(0, d))^{-1} \varepsilon, d).$$

We remark that the eigenvalues of the operator W_d or C_{ν_d} are given by

$$\{\lambda_{d,j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\omega_{\mathbf{h}}\}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} = \{\lambda(1, j_1) \lambda(2, j_2) \dots \lambda(d, j_d)\}_{(j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d},$$

where $\lambda(k, 1) = 1$, and

$$\lambda(k, 2j) = \lambda(k, 2j+1) = \omega^{a_k j^{b_k}}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq d.$$

This implies that for any $\tau_0 > 0$ and $\tau > \tau_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{d,j}^{\tau} &= \prod_{k=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda(k, j)^{\tau} = \prod_{k=1}^d \left(1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau a_k j^{b_k}} \right) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^d \left(1 + \omega^{\tau a_k} 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau a_k (j^{b_k} - 1)} \right) = \prod_{k=1}^d \left(1 + \omega^{\tau a_k} H(k, \tau) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$1 \leq H(k, \tau) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau a_k (j^{b_k} - 1)} \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1)} \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau_0 a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1)}.$$

Since

$$\omega^{\tau_0 a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1)} = j^{-\frac{\tau_0 a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1) \ln \frac{1}{\omega}}{\ln j}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau_0 a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1) \ln \frac{1}{\omega}}{\ln j} = \infty,$$

we get that

$$M_{\tau_0} := 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega^{\tau_0 a_1 (j^{b^*} - 1)} < \infty.$$

It follows that for any $\tau > \tau_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.3) \quad \ln 2 \sum_{k=1}^d \omega^{\tau a_k} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \ln(1 + \omega^{\tau a_k}) \leq \ln \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{d,j}^{\tau} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d \ln(1 + \omega^{\tau a_k} H(k, \tau)) \leq \ln(1 + M_{\tau_0} \omega^{\tau a_k}) \leq M_{\tau_0} \sum_{k=1}^d \omega^{\tau a_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the inequality $\ln(1+x) \geq x \ln 2$, $x \in [0, 1]$, and in the last inequality we used the inequality $\ln(1+x) \leq x$, $x > 0$. By (2.3) we have

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{\omega^{a_1} \ln 2}{2} \leq \frac{\ln 2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \omega^{a_k} \leq \ln(e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_{d,j} \right) \leq \frac{M_1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \omega^{a_k} \leq \frac{d M_1 \omega^{a_1}}{2}.$$

3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.2

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we shall use the estimates of entropy numbers of ℓ_p^d -unit balls with ℓ_∞^d -balls. Such method is firstly used in [10].

Let ℓ_p^d ($0 < p \leq \infty$) denote the space \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the ℓ_p^d -norm defined by

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell_p^d} := \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, & 0 < p < \infty; \\ \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|, & p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

The unit ball of ℓ_p^d is denoted by $B\ell_p^d$.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. An ε -net for A is a discrete set of points $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ in \mathbb{R}^d such that

$$A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i + \varepsilon B\ell_\infty^d).$$

The covering number $N_\varepsilon(A)$ is the minimal natural number n such that there is an ε -net for A consisting of n points. Inverse to the covering numbers $N_\varepsilon(A)$ are the (nondyadic) entropy numbers

$$\varepsilon_n(A, \ell_\infty^d) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid N_\varepsilon(A) \leq n\}.$$

Points $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m$ in \mathbb{R}^d are called ε -distinguishable if the ℓ_∞^d distances between any two of them exceeds ε , i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\ell_\infty^d} > \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } i \neq k, \quad 1 \leq i, k \leq m.$$

Let $M_\varepsilon(A)$ be the maximal natural number m such that there is an ε -distinguishable set in A consisting of m points. Then we have (see [15, Chapter 15, Proposition 1.1])

$$M_{2\varepsilon}(A) \leq N_\varepsilon(A) \leq M_\varepsilon(A).$$

For $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $G(A)$ be the grid number of points in A that lie on the grid \mathbb{Z}^d , i.e.,

$$G(A) = \#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^d).$$

In the case $A = B\ell_p^d$, $0 < p < \infty$, the behavior in n and d of the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_n(B\ell_p^d, \ell_\infty^d)$ is completely understood (see [5, 9, 15, 20]). It follows that for $0 < p < \infty$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$(3.1) \quad \ln(N_\varepsilon(B\ell_p^d)) \leq C_p \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{-p} \ln(2d\varepsilon^p), & d\varepsilon^p \geq 1, \\ d \ln(2(d\varepsilon^p)^{-1}), & d\varepsilon^p \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $C(p)$ is depending only on p , but independent of d and ε .

Lemma 3.1. *For $0 < p < \infty$ and $m \geq 1$, we have*

$$(3.2) \quad \ln\left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k|^p \leq m\right\}\right) \leq C_p \begin{cases} m \ln\left(\frac{2d}{m}\right), & d \geq m, \\ d \ln\left(\frac{2m}{d}\right), & m \geq d, \end{cases}$$

where C_p is a constant depending only on p , but independent of d and m .

Proof. We set $A = m^{1/p} B\ell_p^d$. Then

$$G(A) = \#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^d) = \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k|^p \leq m\right\}.$$

For $m \geq 1$, $A \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ is ρ -indistinguishable for any $\rho \in (1/2, 1)$ in A . This means that

$$G(A) \leq M_\rho(A) \leq N_{\rho/2}(A) \leq N_{1/4}(m^{1/p} B\ell_p^d) = N_{m^{-1/p/4}}(B\ell_p^d).$$

By (3.1) we obtain that

$$\ln G(A) \leq \ln\left(N_{m^{-1/p/4}}(B\ell_p^d)\right) \leq C_p \begin{cases} m \ln\left(\frac{2d}{m}\right), & d \geq m, \\ d \ln\left(\frac{2m}{d}\right), & m \geq d. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.1 is proved. \square

Corollary 3.2. *For $0 < p < \infty$ and $m \geq 1$, we have*

$$(3.3) \quad \ln\left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k|^p \leq m\right\}\right) \leq C_p d \left(\ln(2d) + \ln(2m)\right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

(i) Suppose that EC-(1, t)-WT with $t < 1$ holds for APP. We want to show (1.7). It follows that EC-WT holds also and hence $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \infty$. By (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(\varepsilon, d) &= \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_k} < \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\geq \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k| < \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\geq \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k| < \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_d \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&= \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k| \leq m\right\} \\
&= \begin{cases} 3^d, & m \geq d, \\ \sum_{j=0}^m 2^j \binom{d}{j}, & 0 \leq m \leq d, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$m = \left\lceil \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_d \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\rceil - 1.$$

It follows by the inequality

$$\binom{m+d}{m} \geq \max\left\{\left(1 + \frac{m}{d}\right)^d, \left(1 + \frac{d}{m}\right)^m\right\}$$

that for $1 \leq m < d$,

$$(3.4) \quad n(\varepsilon, d) \geq \binom{d}{m} \geq \left(\frac{d}{m}\right)^m.$$

Set $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_d \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_d \ln \omega^{-1}} = d^t$$

for sufficiently large $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have

$$m \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_d \ln \omega^{-1}} = d^t \leq m + 1.$$

This yields

$$\ln \frac{d}{m} \geq \ln d^{1-t} = (1-t) \ln d,$$

and

$$\ln \varepsilon^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d (m+1).$$

Since EC-(1, t)-WT with $t < 1$ holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, d)}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + d^t} \\
&\geq \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m \ln \frac{d}{m}}{\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d (m+1) + (m+1)} \\
&\geq \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1-t) \ln d}{\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d (1 + \frac{1}{m}) + (1 + \frac{1}{m})} \\
&= \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1-t) \ln d}{\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d} \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln d}{a_d} = 0,$$

and hence (1.7).

Next we suppose that (1.7) holds. We want to show that EC-(1, t)-WT with $t < 1$ holds. By (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n(\varepsilon, d) &= \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_k} < \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \leq \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \\
&\leq \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i-1} \mid \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} a_k |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \cdot \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-i+1} \mid \sum_{k=i}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \\
&\leq \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i-1} \mid \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \cdot \#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-i+1} \mid \sum_{k=i}^d |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln n(\varepsilon, d) &\leq \ln \left(\#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i-1} \mid \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \right) \\
&\quad + \ln \left(\#\left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-i+1} \mid \sum_{k=i}^d |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\} \right) \\
&=: \text{term}_1 + \text{term}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.3) we have

$$\text{term}_1 \leq (i-1) \left\{ \ln [2(i-1)] + \ln \left(\frac{2 \ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}} \right) \right\}.$$

We set

$$y = \max(d^t, \ln \varepsilon^{-1}), \quad \delta \in (0, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad i = \min(d+1, 1 + \lfloor y^{1-\delta} \rfloor).$$

Then we have

$$i-1 \leq y^{1-\delta}, \quad \ln \varepsilon^{-1} \leq y \leq \ln \varepsilon^{-1} + d^t,$$

and $y \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\text{term}_1}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + d^t} \leq \frac{\ln(2y^{1-\delta}) + [\ln(4y) - \ln(a_1 \ln \omega^{-1})]}{y^\delta} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $y \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we deal with $term_2$. Note that if $d \leq \lfloor y^{1-\delta} \rfloor$, then $i = d + 1$ and then $term_2 = 0$. Hence we can assume that $d > \lfloor y^{1-\delta} \rfloor$. Then $i \leq d$ and both d and i go to infinity with y , and hence $a_i \rightarrow \infty$.

If $m = \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \geq (d - i + 1)$, then by (3.2) we get

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{term_2}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + dt} \leq \frac{C(d - i + 1) \ln(2t)}{y} \leq \frac{C \ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{y a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \frac{\ln(2t)}{t} \leq \frac{2C}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$, where $t = \frac{m}{d - i + 1} \geq 1$, and in the last inequality we used

$$\ln(2t) \leq t \quad \text{for } t \geq 1.$$

If $m = \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} < 1$, then $term_2 = 0$. We omit this case. If $1 \leq m = \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \leq (d - i + 1)$, then by (3.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{term_2}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + dt} &\leq \frac{Cm \ln\left(\frac{2(d-i+1)}{m}\right)}{y} \leq \frac{2C \ln\left(\frac{2d a_i \ln \omega^{-1}}{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}\right)}{a_i \ln \omega^{-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{2C}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \cdot \frac{\ln 2 + \ln d + \ln a_i + \ln(\ln \omega^{-1})}{a_i}, \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$i = 1 + \lfloor y^{1-\delta} \rfloor \geq y^{1-\delta} \geq d^{t(1-\delta)}.$$

It follows by (1.7) that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln d}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{t(1-\delta)} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln i}{a_i} = 0.$$

We continue to obtain that

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{term_2}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + dt} \leq \frac{2C}{\ln \omega^{-1}} \cdot \frac{\ln 2 + \ln d + \ln a_i + \ln(\ln \omega^{-1})}{a_i} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By (3.5), (3.6), and (3.7), we obtain

$$\frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, d)}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + dt} \leq \frac{term_1 + term_2}{\ln \varepsilon^{-1} + dt} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$. This means that EC-(1, t)-WT with $t < 1$ holds for APP if (1.7) holds. Theorem 1.1 (i) is proved.

(ii) Suppose that EC-(s, t)-WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds for APP. We want to prove (1.8). Set $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_d \in (0, 1)$ for sufficiently large $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_d \ln \omega^{-1}} = \frac{d}{2} \leq m + 1.$$

This gives that

$$\frac{d}{m} \geq 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \ln \varepsilon^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \omega^{-1} a_d (m + 1).$$

Since EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds, by (3.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} \\
&\geq \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m \ln \frac{d}{m}}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d (m+1)\right)^s} \\
&\geq \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^{1-s} \ln 2}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d \left(1 + \frac{1}{m}\right)\right)^s} \\
&= \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{1-s} \ln 2}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\omega} a_d\right)^s} \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^{1-s}}{a_d^s} = 0,$$

and hence (1.8).

Next we suppose that (1.8) holds. We want to show that EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds. Set

$$a_k = k^{\frac{1-s}{s}} \hat{h}(k) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}(k) = \inf_{j \geq k} \hat{h}(j).$$

Then the sequence $\{\tilde{h}(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing and satisfies $\hat{h}(k) \geq \tilde{h}(k)$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{h}(k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{h}(k) = \infty.$$

We put

$$h(1) = \tilde{h}(1), \quad h(k+1) = \min\{(1+1/k)h(k), \tilde{h}(k+1)\}, \quad k = 1, \dots$$

Clearly, we have

$$h(k) \leq (1+1/k)h(k) \quad \text{and} \quad h(k) \leq \tilde{h}(k) \leq \tilde{h}(k+1),$$

which yields that the sequence $\{h(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing. We also note that

$$\hat{h}(k) \geq \tilde{h}(k) \geq h(k)$$

and

$$h(2k) \leq \frac{2k}{2k-1} h(2k-1) \leq \dots \leq \frac{2k}{2k-1} \frac{2k-1}{2k-2} \dots \frac{k+1}{k} h(k) = 2h(k).$$

If ε^{-1} is bounded by a constant M , then by (2.1) and (3.2) we have

$$\frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} \leq \frac{\ln \left(\#\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln M^2}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}\} \right)}{d^t} \leq \frac{CM_0 \ln \frac{2d}{M_0}}{d^t} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where $M_0 = \frac{\ln M^2}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}$. In this case, EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1$ and $t \leq 1$ holds.

Therefore without loss of generality, we may assume that ε^{-1} tends to infinity. By (2.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
n(\varepsilon, d) &\leq \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \sum_{k=1}^d a_k |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\leq \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 \mid \sum_{k=1}^4 |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\quad \cdot \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil}} \mid \sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} \left(\sum_{k=2^{l+1}}^{2^{l+1}} |h_k|^{b_*} \right) a_{2^l} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{\ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\leq \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 \mid \sum_{k=1}^4 |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \\
&\quad \cdot \prod_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} \#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^l} \mid \sum_{k=2^{l+1}}^{2^{l+1}} |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_{2^l} \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln n(\varepsilon, d) &\leq \ln \left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 \mid \sum_{k=1}^4 |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} \ln \left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^l} \mid \sum_{k=2^{l+1}}^{2^{l+1}} |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l \frac{1-s}{s}} \hat{h}(2^l) \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \right) \\
&\leq \ln \left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 \mid \sum_{k=1}^4 |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} \ln \left(\#\left\{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2^l} \mid \sum_{k=2^{l+1}}^{2^{l+1}} |h_k|^{b_*} \leq \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l \frac{1-s}{s}} h(2^l) \ln \omega^{-1}}\right\} \right) \\
(3.8) \quad &=: I_{1,\varepsilon} + \sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} I_{l,\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.2) we have

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{I_{1,\varepsilon}}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} \leq \frac{4C \ln \left(\frac{2 \ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{a_1 \ln \omega^{-1}} \right)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$.

We set

$$m_{l,\varepsilon} = \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l \frac{1-s}{s}} h(2^l) \ln \omega^{-1}}.$$

It is easy to see that the sequence

$$\{d_{l,\varepsilon}\} \equiv \left\{ \frac{m_{l,\varepsilon}}{2^l} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l/s} h(2^l) \ln \omega^{-1}} \right\}$$

satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad 2^{-(1+1/s)} \leq \frac{d_{l+1,\varepsilon}}{d_{l,\varepsilon}} = \frac{h(2^l)}{2^{1/s}h(2^{l+1})} \leq 2^{-1/s} < 1,$$

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} d_{l,\varepsilon} = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_{l,\varepsilon}}{2^l} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad m_{2,\varepsilon} \geq 4 \text{ for sufficiently large } \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

Then there exists an $l_0 \geq 2$ such that

$$(3.11) \quad d_{l_0,\varepsilon} = \frac{m_{l_0,\varepsilon}}{2^{l_0}} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_{l_0+1,\varepsilon} = \frac{m_{l_0+1,\varepsilon}}{2^{l_0+1}} < 1.$$

It follows that

$$(3.12) \quad d_{l,\varepsilon} \leq 2^{(1+1/s)(l_0+1-l)} d_{l_0+1,\varepsilon} \leq 2^{(1+1/s)(l_0+1-l)} \quad \text{for } l \leq l_0,$$

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{1}{d_{l,\varepsilon}} \leq 2^{(1+1/s)(l-l_0)} \frac{1}{d_{l_0,\varepsilon}} \leq 2^{(1+1/s)(l-l_0)} \quad \text{for } l > l_0,$$

and

$$1 \leq (d_{l_0,\varepsilon})^s = \frac{(\ln \varepsilon^{-2})^s}{2^{l_0}(h(2^{l_0}))^s(\ln \omega^{-1})^s} \leq 2^{1+s}.$$

It follows that

$$(3.14) \quad 2^{l_0} \leq \frac{(2 \ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s}{(h(2^{l_0}))^s(\ln \omega^{-1})^s},$$

and $h(2^{l_0})$ tends to ∞ as $\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$.

We note that $I_{l,\varepsilon} = 0$ if $m_{l,\varepsilon} < 1$. By (3.2) we have

$$(3.15) \quad I_{l,\varepsilon} \leq C \begin{cases} m_{l,\varepsilon} \ln\left(\frac{2}{d_{l,\varepsilon}}\right), & d_{l,\varepsilon} \leq 1, \\ 2^l \ln(2d_{l,\varepsilon}), & d_{l,\varepsilon} \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by (3.15), (3.12), (3.13), and (3.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} I_{l,\varepsilon} &\leq \sum_{l=2}^{l_0} C 2^l \ln(2d_{l,\varepsilon}) + \sum_{l=l_0+1}^{\infty} C m_{l,\varepsilon} \ln\left(\frac{2}{d_{l,\varepsilon}}\right) \\ &\leq C \sum_{l=2}^{l_0} 2^l [(1+1/s)(l_0+1-l) + 1] \ln 2 \\ &\quad + C \sum_{l=l_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l \frac{1-s}{s}} h(2^{l_0}) \ln \omega^{-1}} [(1+1/s)(l-l_0) + 1] \ln 2 \\ &\leq C_1 2^{l_0} + C_1 \frac{\ln \varepsilon^{-2}}{2^{l_0 \frac{1-s}{s}} h(2^{l_0}) \ln \omega^{-1}} \leq C_2 2^{l_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (3.14) we have

$$\frac{\sum_{l=2}^{\lceil \log_2 d \rceil - 1} I_{l,\varepsilon}}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} \leq \frac{C_3 2^{l_0}}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s} \leq \frac{C_3 2^s}{(h(2^{l_0}))^s (\ln \omega^{-1})^s} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$. This, combining with (3.8) and (3.9) means that EC- (s, t) -WT with $t \leq 1$ holds for APP if (1.8) holds. Theorem 1.1 is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

According to [14, Theorem 3.1], we know that we have the same results in the worst and average case settings under ABS concerning EC- (s, t) -WT for $0 < s \leq 1$ and $t > 0$.

(i) It follows that EC- (s, t) -WT always holds for $0 < s \leq 1$ and $t > 1$ for ABS. This yields that EC- (s, t) -WT holds for $s > 1$ and $t > 1$ for ABS, and by (2.2) also for NOR. Hence (i) holds.

(ii) If EC- $(s, 1)$ -WT with $s \geq 1$ holds for ABS or NOR, then $(s, 1)$ -WT with $s \geq 1$ holds also for ABS or NOR. It follows from [13, Theorem 5.1] that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \infty$.

On the other hand, if $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \infty$, then EC-WT holds for ABS or NOR and hence, EC- $(s, 1)$ -WT with $s \geq 1$ also holds for ABS or NOR. This completes the proof of (ii).

(iii) EC- $(1, t)$ -WT with $t < 1$ holds for ABS iff (1.10) holds. (iii) is proved.

(iv) If (1.11) holds, then EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1, t \leq 1$ holds for ABS, and also for NOR by (2.2).

On the other hand, assume that EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1, t \leq 1$ holds for ABS or NOR. By (2.2), we know that EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1, t = 1$ holds also for NOR.

Also by (2.2), we have

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{\ln n^{\text{avg,ABS}}(\varepsilon, d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d} = \frac{[\ln(e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)\varepsilon^{-1})]^s + d}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d} \cdot \frac{\ln n^{\text{avg,NOR}}((e^{\text{avg}}(0, d))^{-1}\varepsilon, d)}{[\ln(e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)\varepsilon^{-1})]^s + d}.$$

By (2.4) we have $e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$ iff $\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$(3.17) \quad \frac{[\ln(e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)\varepsilon^{-1})]^s + d}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d} \leq \frac{2^s[\ln(e(0, d))]^s}{d} + \frac{2^s(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d} \leq M_1^s \omega^{sa_1} + 2^s.$$

Since EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1, t = 1$ holds for NOR, we get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n^{\text{avg,NOR}}((e^{\text{avg}}(0, d))^{-1}\varepsilon, d)}{[\ln(e^{\text{avg}}(0, d)\varepsilon^{-1})]^s + d} = 0,$$

which combining with (3.16) and (3.17), yields that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n^{\text{avg,ABS}}(\varepsilon, d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d} = 0.$$

It follows that EC- (s, t) -WT with $s < 1, t = 1$ holds for ABS. Hence (1.11) holds. (iv) is proved.

(v) If EC- (s, t) -WT with $s > 1$ and $t < 1$ holds, then (s, t) -WT with $s > 1$ and $t < 1$ holds. It follows from [1, Theorem 4.7], we have (1.12).

On the other hand, suppose that (1.12) holds. We want to show that (s, t) -WT with $s > 1$ and $t < 1$ holds under ABS or NOR. By (2.2) it suffices to prove that for $s > 1$ and $t < 1$,

$$(3.18) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon^{-1}+d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n^{\text{avg,ABS}}(\varepsilon, d)}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} = 0.$$

It follows from [2, Equation (3.12)] that for any $s_d \in (0, 1/2]$

$$n^{\text{avg,ABS}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{-2(1-s_d)}{s_d}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,k}^{1-s_d} \right)^{\frac{1}{s_d}},$$

where

$$(3.19) \quad u_d := \max(\omega^{a_d}, \frac{1}{2d}), \quad \text{and} \quad s_d := \frac{1}{2} \left(\ln^+ \frac{1}{u_d} \right)^{-1}, \quad d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, if (1.12) holds, then it follows from [2, Equations (3.13) and (3.14)] that

$$(3.20) \quad \ln n^{\text{avg,ABS}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq \frac{2}{s_d} \ln \varepsilon^{-1} + \frac{e^{1/2} M_{1/2}}{s_d} \sum_{k=1}^d u_k,$$

and

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d^t s_d} \sum_{k=1}^d u_k = 0,$$

which means that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{1/2} M_{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^d u_k}{s_d ((\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t)} \leq e^{1/2} M_{1/2} \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^d u_k}{s_d d^t} = 0.$$

In order to prove (3.18), by (3.20) it suffices to prove that for $s > 1$,

$$(3.21) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \ln \varepsilon^{-1}}{s_d ((\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t)} = 0.$$

By (3.19) we have

$$(3.22) \quad \frac{1}{s_d} = 2 \ln^+ \frac{1}{u_d} \leq 2 \ln^+(2d).$$

For $s > 1$, by the Young inequality $ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^{p'}}{p'}$, $a, b \geq 0$, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$ with $p = \frac{1+s}{2}$, $p' = \frac{s+1}{s-1}$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln^+(2d) \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})}{(1 + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} = \lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^{\frac{s+1}{2}}}{p} + \frac{(\ln^+(2d))^{p'}}{p'}}{(\ln \varepsilon^{-1})^s + d^t} = 0,$$

which combining (3.22), gives (3.21). This finishes the proof of (v).

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is completed. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Chen, H. Wang, Average Case tractability of multivariate approximation with Gaussian kernels, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.01302>.
- [2] J. Chen, H. Wang, J. Zhang, Average Case (s, t) -weak tractability of non-homogeneous tensor product problems, to appear in *J. Complexity*.
- [3] J. Dick, P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, H. Woźniakowski, Approximation of analytic functions in Korobov spaces, *J. Complexity* 30 (2014) 2-28.
- [4] J. Dick, G. Larcher, F. Pillichshammer, H. Woźniakowski, Exponential convergence and tractability of multivariate integration for Korobov spaces, *Math. Comp.* 80 (2011) 905-930.
- [5] D. E. Edmunds, H. Triebel, *Function Spaces, Entropy Numbers, Differential Operators*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. 120, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2008.
- [6] C. Irrgeher, P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, H. Woźniakowski, Tractability of multivariate approximation defined over Hilbert spaces with exponential weights, *J. Approx. Theory* 207 (2016) 301-338.

- [7] P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, H. Woźniakowski, Multivariate integration of infinitely many times differentiable functions in weighted Korobov spaces, *Math. Comp.* 83 (2014) 1189-1206.
- [8] P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, H. Woźniakowski, Tractability of multivariate analytic problems, in: P. Kritzer, H. Niederreiter, F. Pillichshammer, A. Winterhof (Eds.), *Uniform Distribution and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods. Discrepancy, Integration and Applications*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2014, pp. 147-170.
- [9] T. Kühn, A lower estimate for entropy numbers, *J. Approx. Theory*, 110 (2001) 120-124.
- [10] T. Kühn, S. Mayer, T. Ullrich, Counting via entropy: new preasymptotics for the approximation numbers of Sobolev embeddings, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 54 (6) (2016) 3625-3647.
- [11] Y. Liu, G. Xu, A note on tractability of multivariate analytic problems, *J. Complexity*, 34 (2016) 42-49.
- [12] Y. Liu, G. Xu, Average case tractability of a multivariate approximation problem, *J. Complexity*, 43 (2017) 76-102.
- [13] Y. Liu, G. Xu, (s, t) -weak tractability of multivariate linear problems in the average case setting, preprint.
- [14] Y. Liu, G. Xu, Y. Dong, EC- (s, t) -weak tractability of multivariate linear problems in the average case setting, preprint.
- [15] G.G.Lorentz, M.V.Golitschek, Y.Makovoz, *Constructive Approximation, Advanced Problems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [16] E. Novak, H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of Multivariate Problems, Volume I: Linear Information*, EMS, Zürich, 2008.
- [17] E. Novak, H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of Multivariate Problems, Volume II: Standard Information for Functionals*, EMS, Zürich, 2010.
- [18] E. Novak, H. Woźniakowski, *Tractability of Multivariate Problems, Volume III: Standard Information for Operators*, EMS, Zürich, 2012.
- [19] A. Papageorgiou, I. Petras, A new criterion for tractability of multivariate problems, *J. Complexity* 30 (2014) 604-619.
- [20] C. Schütt, Entropy numbers of diagonal operators between symmetric Banach spaces, *J. Approx. Theory*, 40 (1984) 121-128.
- [21] I. H. Sloan, H. Woźniakowski, Multivariate approximation for analytic functions with Gaussian kernels, *J. Complexity* 45 (2018) 1-21.
- [22] G. Xu, Exponential convergence-tractability of general linear problems in the average case setting, *J. Complexity* 31 (2015) 617-636.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CAPITAL NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100048, CHINA.
E-mail address: wanghp@cnu.edu.cn.