
KERNEL INTERPOLATION GENERALIZES POORLY

Yicheng Li, Haobo Zhang

Center for Statistical Science, Department of Industrial Engineering, Tsinghua University,
100084, Beijing, China
{liy22, hb21}@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Qian Lin

Center for Statistical Science, Department of Industrial Engineering, Tsinghua University,
100084, Beijing, China
qianlin@tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

One of the most interesting problems in the recent renaissance of the studies in kernel regression might be whether the kernel interpolation can generalize well, since it may help us understand the ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ reported in the literature on deep networks. In this paper, under mild conditions, we show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the generalization error of kernel interpolation is lower bounded by $\Omega(n^{-\varepsilon})$. In other words, the kernel interpolation generalizes poorly for a large class of kernels. As a direct corollary, we can show that overfitted wide neural networks defined on sphere generalize poorly.

Keywords Kernel interpolation · Kernel ridge regression · Generalization · Neural network.

1 Introduction

The ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ that over-parametrized neural networks can interpolate noisy data but also generalize well is widely observed in the literature on neural networks [6, 20, 26]. This observation challenges the traditional ‘bias-variance trade-off’ doctrine in statistical learning theory [25] where models interpolating the noisy data are supposed to generalize poorly. Since [14] illustrated that when the width of neural network tends to infinity, the dynamics of the gradient flow appeared in training the neural network can be approximated by the gradient flow of a kernel regression with respect to the time-invariant neural tangent kernel, we have experienced a renaissance of the studies in the kernel regression. For example, since a number of works [2, 12] showed the wide neural network can overfit any data, whether the neural kernel interpolation can generalize might be one of the most important cornerstones towards a theoretical explanation of the ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’.

Suppose that we have observed the given samples $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ and perform the regression on \mathcal{H} , a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) associated with some kernel k . Traditional result [3, 11] in regularized kernel regression, namely *kernel ridge regression* (KRR), showed that

$$\hat{f}_\lambda = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(x_i))^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the corresponding norm, is minimax optimal if λ is chosen properly according to the sample size; subsequent works [13, 24] have also extended the optimality results to more general settings. In the limiting case where $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the kernel minimum-norm interpolation

$$\hat{f}_{\text{inter}} = \hat{f}_0 = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \text{subject to} \quad f(x_i) = y_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, n). \quad (2)$$

However, few discussion was made about the generalization performance of \hat{f}_{inter} .

Recently, a line of works considered the generalization ability of kernel interpolation in the high dimensional regime where the dimension d of inputs grows with the sample size n . In this regime, the so-called ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ has been discovered and generalization error bounds are provided under certain additional assumptions [4, 18, 19]. On the other hand, under the traditional fixed dimension setting, several works claimed the inconsistency of kernel interpolation. For example, Rakhlin and Zhai [21] showed that the kernel interpolation \hat{f}_{inter} with Laplace kernel is not consistent in odd dimensions; Buchholz [9] then extended the result to kernels associated with Sobolev space H^s for $d/2 < s < 3d/4$ and all (fixed) dimensions; assuming that data are located in uniformly spaced grids, Beaglehole et al. [5] established inconsistency results for a class of shift-invariant periodic kernels with mild spectral assumptions. Since the neural tangent kernels are not included in all the aforementioned situations, it is unclear if these works can help us understand the ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ in neural network.

In this paper, we show that under mild assumptions, the kernel interpolation \hat{f}_{inter} generalizes poorly in fixed dimensions. To be precise, we prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the generalization error

$$\left\| \hat{f}_{\text{inter}} - f^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 = \Omega(n^{-\varepsilon})$$

holds with high probability, where f^* is the underlying regression function. In subsection 2.2, we further illustrate that our class of kernels not only include the aforementioned kernels but also include the neural tangent kernels. In particular, we rigorously show that the overfitted wide neural networks on spheres generalize poorly.

Throughout this paper, we use $L^p(\mathcal{X}, d\mu)$ to represent the Lebesgue L^p spaces, where the corresponding norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$. For a function f on \mathcal{X} , we also define the sup-norm $\|f\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x)|$, which should be distinguished from the L^{∞} -norm. We use the asymptotic notations $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, and $\Omega(\cdot)$. We also denote $a_n \asymp b_n$ iff $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Reproducing kernel Hilbert space

Suppose that ρ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded set. Let μ be the marginal probability measure of ρ on \mathcal{X} . We will also use L^2 for $L^2(\mathcal{X}, d\mu)$ for convenience. We further fix a continuous positive definite kernel k over \mathcal{X} satisfying $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} k(x, x) \leq \kappa^2$. Let \mathcal{H} be the separable reproducing kernel Hilbert space associated with k . It is known [3, 23] that the natural embedding $S_{\mu} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|S_{\mu}\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \kappa$. Moreover, denoting by $S_{\mu}^* : L^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ the adjoint operator of S_{μ} , the operator $T = S_{\mu} S_{\mu}^* : L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ is an integral operator given by

$$(Tf)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y). \quad (3)$$

Then, it is well known [11, 23] that T is self-adjoint, positive and trace-class (thus compact) with trace norm $\|T\|_1 \leq \kappa^2$. Thus, the spectral theorem of compact self-adjoint operators and Mercer’s theorem [23] yield that

$$T = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i \langle \cdot, e_i \rangle_{L^2} e_i, \quad k(x, y) = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i e_i(x) e_i(y), \quad (4)$$

where $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is an index set, $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \in N}$ is the set of positive eigenvalues of T in descending order and e_i is the corresponding eigenfunction. In addition, $\{e_i\}_{i \in N}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\overline{\text{Ran } S_{\mu}} \subseteq L^2$ and $\{\lambda_i^{1/2} e_i\}_{i \in N}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\overline{\text{Ran } S_{\mu}^*} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$.

The eigenvalues λ_i characterize the span of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space and the interplay between \mathcal{H} and μ . We will assume $N = \mathbb{N}$ and impose the following polynomial eigenvalue decay as in the literature [11, 13, 17].

Assumption 1 (Eigenvalue decay). There is some $\beta > 1$ and constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 i^{-\beta} \leq \lambda_i \leq c_2 i^{-\beta} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots), \quad (5)$$

where λ_i is the eigenvalue of T defined in (4).

The decomposition (4) also allows us to introduce the following interpolation spaces [13, 17, 23]. For $s \geq 0$, we define the fractional power $T^s : L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ by

$$T^s(f) = \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i^s \langle f, e_i \rangle_{L^2} e_i \quad (6)$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

and define the interpolation space $[\mathcal{H}]^s$ by

$$[\mathcal{H}]^s = \text{Ran } T^{s/2} = \left\{ \sum_{i \in N} a_i \lambda_i^{s/2} e_i \mid \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 < \infty \right\} \subseteq L^2, \quad (7)$$

which is equipped with the norm

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in N} a_i \lambda_i^{s/2} e_i \right\|_{[\mathcal{H}]^s} = \left(\sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (8)$$

One may easily verify that $[\mathcal{H}]^s$ is also a separable Hilbert space and $\{\lambda_i^{s/2} e_i\}_{i \in N}$ forms an orthonormal basis of it. It is clear that we have $[\mathcal{H}]^0 = \overline{\text{Ran } S_\mu} \subseteq L^2$ and $[\mathcal{H}]^1 = \overline{\text{Ran } S_\mu^*} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, we have compact inclusions $[\mathcal{H}]^{s_1} \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{H}]^{s_2}$ for $s_1 > s_2 \geq 0$.

2.2 The embedding index α_0 of an RKHS

We say \mathcal{H} has an embedding property of order $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ if $[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha$ can be continuously embedded into $L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, d\mu)$, that is, the operator norm

$$\|[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mu)\| = M_\alpha < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Fischer and Steinwart [13, Theorem 9] shows that

$$\|[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mu)\| = \|k_\mu^\alpha\|_{L^\infty}, \quad (10)$$

where $\|k_\mu^\alpha\|_{L^\infty}$ is the L^∞ -norm of the α -power of k given by

$$\|k_\mu^\alpha\|_{L^\infty}^2 = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}, \mu} \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i^\alpha e_i(x)^2. \quad (11)$$

Since we have assumed that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} k(x, x) \leq \kappa^2$, we know that (9) holds for $\alpha = 1$, i.e., any \mathcal{H} associated with a bounded kernel function has the embedding property of order 1. By the inclusion relation of interpolation spaces, it is clear that if \mathcal{H} has the embedding property of order α , then it has the embedding properties of order α' for any $\alpha' \geq \alpha$. Thus, we may introduce the following definition

Definition 2.1. The embedding index α_0 of an RKHS \mathcal{H} is defined by

$$\alpha_0 = \inf \{ \alpha : \|[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mu)\| < \infty \}. \quad (12)$$

It is shown in Steinwart et al. [24] and Fischer and Steinwart [13, Lemma 10] that $\alpha_0 \geq \beta$ and the equality holds if the eigenfunctions are uniformly bounded (i.e. $\sup_{i \in N} \|e_i\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$). Throughout this paper, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 2 (Embedding index). The embedding index $\alpha_0 = 1/\beta$, where β is the eigenvalue decay in (5).

Remark 2.2. Lots of the usual RKHSs satisfy the embedding index condition. We list several examples below:

Example 2.1 (Sobolev spaces). Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and suppose μ is the Lebesgue measure. The Sobolev space $H^s(\mathcal{X})$ (for a definition, see e.g., Adams and Fournier [1]) is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space if $s > d/2$. Moreover, it can be shown [13] that $H^s(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies Assumption 1 with $\beta = 2s/d$, and the interpolation space $[H^s(\mathcal{X})]^\alpha \cong H^{\alpha s}(\mathcal{X})$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem [1], if $\alpha s > d/2$, i.e., $\alpha > d/(2s) = \beta^{-1}$, we have

$$H^{s\alpha} \hookrightarrow C^{0,\theta}(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, d\mu), \quad (13)$$

where $C^{0,\theta}(\mathcal{X})$ is the Hölder space and $0 < \theta < 2\alpha s/d$. It shows that Assumption 2 is satisfied.

Example 2.2 (Translation invariant periodic kernel). Let $\mathcal{X} = [-\pi, \pi]^d$ and μ be the uniform distribution on \mathcal{X} . Suppose that the kernel satisfies $k(x, y) = f(x - y \bmod [-\pi, \pi]^d)$, where we denote $a \bmod [-\pi, \pi] = ((a + \pi) \bmod 2\pi) - \pi \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and $x - y \bmod [-\pi, \pi]^d$ is understood to be element-wise. Then, it is shown in Beaglehole et al. [5] that the Fourier basis $\phi_m(x) = e^{i\langle m, x \rangle}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are eigenfunctions of T . Since $\{\phi_m\}$ are uniformly bounded, Assumption 2 is satisfied.

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Example 2.3 (Dot-product kernel on spheres). Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the unit sphere and assume that μ is the uniform distribution on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Let k be a dot-product kernel, that is, $k(x, y) = f(\langle x, y \rangle)$ for some function f . Then, it is well known [22] that k can be decomposed using the spherical harmonics $Y_{n,l}$ by

$$k(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu_n \sum_{l=1}^{a_n} Y_{n,l}(x) Y_{n,l}(y), \quad (14)$$

where a_n is the dimension of order- n homogeneous harmonic polynomials and μ_n is an eigenvalue of T with multiplicity a_n . Assuming the polynomial eigenvalue decay $\mu_n \asymp n^{-(d-1)\beta}$, it is shown in Zhang et al. [27] that the embedding index $\alpha_0 = 1/\beta$ and thus Assumption 2 holds.

2.3 Kernel ridge regression

Suppose that we have observed n i.i.d. samples $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ from ρ . We denote by $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ the sample inputs and $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$. Thanks to the representer theorem (see e.g., Andreas Christmann [3]), we could solve the optimization problem (1) explicitly:

$$\hat{f}_\lambda(x) = \mathbb{K}(x, X)(\mathbb{K}(X, X) + n\lambda)^{-1}Y = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{K}(x, X)(K + \lambda)^{-1}Y \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbb{K}(x, X) = (k(x, x_1), \dots, k(x, x_n))$, $\mathbb{K}(X, X) = (k(x_i, x_j))_{n \times n}$ and $K = \mathbb{K}(X, X)/n$ is the normalized kernel matrix. Similarly, we also have an explicit formula for the kernel interpolation:

$$\hat{f}_{\text{inter}}(x) = \mathbb{K}(x, X)\mathbb{K}(X, X)^{-1}Y = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{K}(x, X)K^{-1}Y. \quad (16)$$

In the last two decades, the theories of integral operators and empirical processes are utilized to understand the generalization ability of $\hat{f}_\lambda(x)$ from various aspects (e.g., Caponnetto and De Vito [11], Fischer and Steinwart [13], Li et al. [17]). One of the essential steps in these works is an integral operator interpretation of the formula (15). More precisely, they introduced the sampling operator $K_x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by $K_x y = yk(x, \cdot)$, their adjoint operator $K_x^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $K_x^* f = f(x)$ and the sample covariance operator $T_X : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by

$$T_X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{x_i} K_{x_i}^*. \quad (17)$$

With these operators, there is an alternative expression of $\hat{f}_\lambda(x)$:

$$\hat{f}_\lambda = (T_X + \lambda)^{-1}g_Z, \quad (18)$$

where $g_Z = n^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^n K_{x_i} y_i) \in \mathcal{H}$.

3 Theoretical Results

3.1 Main theorem

To state the main theorem, we need two more mild conditions on the kernel k and the noise $y - f_\rho^*(x)$.

Assumption 3. The kernel k is Hölder-continuous, that is, there exists some $s \in (0, 1]$ and $L > 0$ such that

$$|k(x_1, x_2) - k(y_1, y_2)| \leq L\|(x_1, x_2) - (y_1, y_2)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}}^s, \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (19)$$

Assumption 4 (Noise). The conditional variance of the noise satisfies that

$$E_{(x,y) \sim \rho} \left((y - f_\rho^*(x))^2 \mid x \right) \geq \sigma^2 > 0, \quad \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (20)$$

Assumption 3 requires that k is Hölder continuous and Assumption 4 simply requires that the noise is non-vanishing. It is clear that both these assumptions are quite mild. For example, Assumption 3 holds for the Laplacian kernels, RBF kernels, neural tangent kernels, etc.; Assumption 4 holds for the usual regression models $y = f^*(x) + \epsilon$ where ϵ is an independent non-zero noise.

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that the Assumptions 1,2,3 and 4 hold. There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when n is sufficiently large, one has that*

$$E \left(\left\| \hat{f}_{\text{inter}} - f_{\rho}^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X \right) \geq c\sigma^2 n^{-\varepsilon}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ with respect to the random samples.

Though this theorem can not imply that the kernel interpolation is inconsistent, it actually shows that the kernel interpolation generalizes poorly.

3.2 Discussion

The ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ might be one of the most puzzling observations reported in the literature on neural networks. Since [14] introduced the neural tangent kernel, it has become a common strategy to study the wide neural network through analyzing the kernel regression. Thus, the ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ raised a natural question that whether the kernel interpolations, especially the neural tangent kernel interpolation, can generalize well?

There are few works [5, 9, 21] showed that the kernel interpolation generalized poorly in various settings. For example, Rakhlin and Zhai [21] showed that when the dimension d is a fixed odd number, the Laplace kernel interpolation generalizes poorly for random observation with Rademacher noise; [9] considered the regression with respect to the kernel associated with the Sobolev space H^s and showed that the corresponding kernel interpolation generalizes poorly if $d/2 < s < 3d/4$; Beaglehole et al. [5] further showed that the kernel interpolation with respect to the periodical translation invariant kernel generalizes poorly for the grid data. However, to the best of our knowledge, the poor generalization ability of the NTK interpolation has been only obtained for one dimensional grid data in Lai et al. [15].

Theorem 3.1 states that for any kernel k satisfying that the embedding index α_0 of the RKHS associated to k equals to $1/\beta$, the inverse of the eigen-decay rate, the corresponding kernel interpolation generalized poorly. Note that the listed examples in Section 2.2 clearly contains all the kernels appeared in Beaglehole et al. [5], Buchholz [9], Rakhlin and Zhai [21]. Thus, it is clear that our result is more general. Moreover, our result also applies to the neural tangent kernel (NTK) on spheres [7, 8], which is not covered in either of the previous works. Consequently, we could assert that the neural tangent kernel interpolation and the overfitted wide neural network generalized poorly, a statement contradicts to the widely observed ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’. Thus, our result suggests that we may need to explain the ‘benign overfitting phenomenon’ from other perspective.

3.3 Proof sketch

It is clear that the generalization error of kernel ridge regression (including the interpolation case of $\lambda = 0$) is lower bounded by the variance term $V(\lambda)$, i.e.,

$$E \left(\left\| \hat{f}_{\lambda} - f_{\rho}^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X \right) \geq V(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{K}(x, X) (K + \lambda)^{-2} \mathbb{K}(X, x) d\mu(x).$$

Let us rewrite $V(\lambda)$ in the following operator form:

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (T_X + \lambda)^{-1} k(x, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2, n}^2 d\mu(x), \quad (21)$$

where $\|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 = n^{-1} (\sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)^2)$. We then invoke an important observation appeared in [17] which claims that

$$V(\lambda) \approx \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (T + \lambda)^{-1} k(x, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2}^2 d\mu(x) \asymp \frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n} \quad (22)$$

holds for $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-1/2})$.

One of our major technical contributions in this paper is that we can show the above approximation (22) actually holds for $\lambda \asymp n^{-\beta+\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Combining with the elementary observation $V(0) \geq V(\lambda)$, we get the desired claim.

4 Application to neural networks

Suppose that we have observed n i.i.d. samples $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ from ρ . For simplicity, we further assume that the marginal distribution μ of ρ is the uniform distribution on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . We use a two-layer neural

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

network of width m to perform the regression on (x_i, y_i) 's. More precisely, we consider the following two-layer neural network:

$$f(x; \theta) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \sum_{r=1}^m a_r \sigma(w_r^T x), \quad (23)$$

where $\sigma(x) = \max(x, 0)$ is the ReLU activation and $\theta = (w_1, \dots, w_m, a_1, \dots, a_m)$ are the parameters. With θ randomly initialized as $\theta(0)$, we consider the training process given by the gradient flow $\dot{\theta}(t) = -\partial L/\partial \theta$, where the loss function is

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(x_i; \theta))^2. \quad (24)$$

Then, when the network is over-parametrized, namely m is large, the theory of lazy training (see e.g., Lai et al. [15], Lee et al. [16]) shows that the trained network $\hat{f}_t^{\text{NN}}(x) = f(x; \theta(t))$ can be approximated by a kernel gradient method with respect the following neural tangent kernel

$$k_{\text{NT}}(x, y) = \frac{2}{\pi} (\pi - \arccos \langle x, y \rangle) \langle x, y \rangle + \frac{1}{\pi} (1 - \langle x, y \rangle^2)^{1/2}. \quad (25)$$

Particularly, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the network output can be approximated by kernel interpolation. The following result is a corollary of Lai et al. [15, Proposition 3.2].

Proposition 4.1. Suppose that we initialize the neural network symmetrically, i.e., the width $m = 2l$ and independently initialize $a_r(0), w_r(0) \sim N(0, 1)$ and $a_{l+r}(0) = -a_r(0), w_{l+r}(0) = w_r(0)$ for $r = 1, \dots, l$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when m is sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ one has

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left| \hat{f}_t^{\text{NN}}(x) - \hat{f}_{\text{inter}}^{\text{NTK}}(x) \right| = o_m(1), \quad (26)$$

where $\hat{f}_{\text{inter}}^{\text{NTK}}$ is the kernel interpolation with respect to k_{NT} .

Moreover, since k_{NT} is a dot-product kernel satisfying a polynomial eigenvalue decay of $\beta = d/(d-1)$ [8], our assumptions are satisfied as discussed in Example 2.3.

Corollary 4.2. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when n and m are sufficiently large, one has that*

$$E \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \hat{f}_t^{\text{NN}}(x) - f_\rho^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X \right) \geq c\sigma^2 n^{-\varepsilon}$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ with respect to the random samples and initialization.

To the best of our knowledge, such a lower bound for wide neural network has only been proven in Lai et al. [15] for one-dimensional grid data. Our result claims that overfitted wide neural network generalizes poorly on sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , which also suggests more efforts are needed to understand the mystery of generalization of over-parametrized neural networks.

5 Proof

5.1 More preliminaries

In the following, we will denote $h_x = k(x, \cdot)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For a function f , we use $f[X] = (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n))^T$. To simplify the notation, we will use c, C to represent constants, which may change in the context; we will also abbreviate

$$T_\lambda = T + \lambda, \quad T_{X\lambda} = T_X + \lambda.$$

Following Li et al. [17], we consider the sample subspace

$$\mathcal{H}_n = \text{span} \{k(x_1, \cdot), \dots, k(x_n, \cdot)\} \subset \mathcal{H}. \quad (27)$$

Then, it is easy to verify that $\text{Ran } T_X = \mathcal{H}_n$ and K is the representation matrix of T_X under the natural basis $\{k(x_1, \cdot), \dots, k(x_n, \cdot)\}$. Consequently, for any continuous function φ we have

$$\varphi(T_X)\mathbb{K}(X, \cdot) = \varphi(K)\mathbb{K}(X, \cdot). \quad (28)$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

where the left-hand side is understood by applying the operator elementwise. Since from the property of reproducing kernel Hilbert space we have $\langle h_x, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = f(x)$ for $f \in \mathcal{H}$, taking inner product elementwise between (28) and f , we obtain

$$(\varphi(T_X)f)[X] = \varphi(K)f[X]. \quad (29)$$

Moreover, for $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$, we define empirical semi-inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L^2, n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)g(x_i) = \frac{1}{n} f[X]^T g[X], \quad (30)$$

and denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^2, n}^2$ the corresponding empirical semi-norm. Then, Li et al. [17] established the following simple but important connection.

Proposition 5.1. For $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L^2, n} = \langle T_X f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \left\langle T_X^{1/2} f, T_X^{1/2} g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (31)$$

Proof. Notice that $T_X f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)h_{x_i}$, and thus

$$\langle T_X f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i) \langle h_{x_i}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)g(x_i) = \langle f, g \rangle_{L^2, n}.$$

The second inequality comes from the definition of $T_X^{1/2}$. □

5.2 The variance term

The first step of the proof is to lower bound the generalization error by the variance term $V(\lambda)$, whose explicit expression can be derived. This step is elementary and quite standard in the literature, so we omit the proof here.

Proposition 5.2. Under Assumption 4, for any $\lambda \geq 0$, we have

$$E \left\{ \left\| \hat{f}_\lambda - f_\rho^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X \right\} \geq V(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{K}(x, X)(K + \lambda)^{-2} \mathbb{K}(X, x) d\mu(x). \quad (32)$$

The simple but critical observation based on the matrix form in (32) is that

$$(K + \lambda_1)^{-2} \succeq (K + \lambda_2)^{-2} \quad \text{if } \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2,$$

where \succeq represents the partial order of positive semi-definite matrices, and thus we have the following proposition [17].

Proposition 5.3. For $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq 0$, we have $V(\lambda_1) \leq V(\lambda_2)$. Particularly, for any $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$V(0) \geq V(\lambda).$$

This proposition allows us to consider the variance term of slightly bigger λ 's, where concentration results can be established. However, it is still difficult to directly analyze the matrix form. The key is to rewrite the matrix form into the operator form using empirical semi-norm introduced in Li et al. [17].

Lemma 5.4. The variance term in (32) satisfies

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| (T_X + \lambda)^{-1} k(x, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2, n}^2 d\mu(x) \quad (33)$$

Proof. By definition it is obvious that $h_x[X] = \mathbb{K}(X, x)$. From (29), we find that

$$((T_X + \lambda)^{-1} h_x)[X] = (K + \lambda)^{-1} h_x[X] = (K + \lambda)^{-1} \mathbb{K}(X, x),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{K}(x, X)(K + \lambda)^{-2} \mathbb{K}(X, x) &= \frac{1}{n} \left\| (K + \lambda)^{-1} \mathbb{K}(X, x) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left\| ((T_X + \lambda)^{-1} h_x)[X] \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \\ &= \left\| (T_X + \lambda)^{-1} h_x \right\|_{L^2, n}^2. \end{aligned}$$

from the definition (30) of empirical semi-norm. □

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

The operator form (33) allows us to apply concentration inequalities and establish the following two-step approximation [17]. The main difference is that we allow λ to be much smaller than in Li et al. [17].

$$\|(T_X + \lambda)^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2,n}^2 \stackrel{A}{\approx} \|(T + \lambda)^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2,n}^2 \stackrel{B}{\approx} \|(T + \lambda)^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (34)$$

5.3 Approximation B

Let us first consider the approximation B in (34). We first provide norm controls of basis functions $h_x = k(x, \cdot)$ using the embedding condition.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose \mathcal{H} has embedding index α_0 . Let $p, \gamma \geq 0$, $\alpha > \alpha_0$ and $2 - \gamma - \alpha - 2p \leq 0$, then*

$$\|T_\lambda^{-p}h_x\|_{[\mathcal{H}]^\gamma}^2 \leq M_\alpha \lambda^{2-2p-\gamma-\alpha}, \quad \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (35)$$

Proof. Recalling the definition (8) and using Mercer's decomposition (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\lambda^{-p}h_x\|_{[\mathcal{H}]^\gamma}^2 &= \left\| T^{-\gamma/2} T_\lambda^{-p} h_x \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i^{-\gamma/2} (\lambda_i + \lambda)^{-p} \lambda_i e_i(x) e_i \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i^{2-\gamma} (\lambda_i + \lambda)^{-2p} e_i(x)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in N} \left[\lambda_i^{2-\gamma-\alpha} (\lambda_i + \lambda)^{-2p} \right] \lambda_i^\alpha e_i(x)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in N} \lambda^{2-\gamma-\alpha-2p} \lambda_i^\alpha e_i(x)^2 \\ &\leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{2-2p-\gamma-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where last but second inequality uses Proposition A.1 and the final inequality uses that fact that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathcal{X}, \mu} \sum_{i \in N} \lambda_i^\alpha e_i(x)^2 = \|[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mu)\|^2 = M_\alpha^2,$$

which is the consequence of (11) and (10). □

Noticing that the L^∞ -norm of $f \in \mathcal{H}$ can be bounded by

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq M_\alpha^2 \|f\|_{[\mathcal{H}]^\alpha}^2,$$

we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Suppose \mathcal{H} has embedding index α_0 , then the following holds for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathcal{X}$:*

$$\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq M_\alpha^4 \lambda^{-2\alpha}, \quad (36)$$

$$\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 \leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}, \quad (37)$$

$$\|T_\lambda^{-1/2}h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}. \quad (38)$$

Now we can provide the following estimation using concentration inequalities with a covering number argument.

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that the embedding index of \mathcal{H} is α_0 and the Assumption 3 holds. Fix $\alpha > \alpha_0$ and suppose $\lambda = \lambda(n) \rightarrow 0$ satisfies $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-p})$ for some $p < \infty$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, for sufficiently large n (which will depend on δ, p), with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathcal{X}$*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 - R \leq \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2,n}^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 + R,$$

where

$$R = R(\lambda, n) = C \frac{\lambda^{-2\alpha}}{n} \ln n$$

and constant C is independent of δ, n .

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Proof. Let us denote $\mathcal{K}_\lambda = \{T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. By Lemma A.8, we can find an ε -net $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ with respect to sup-norm of \mathcal{K}_λ such that

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq C(\lambda\varepsilon)^{-\frac{2d}{s}}, \quad (39)$$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n)$ will be determined later.

Then, applying Proposition A.4 to \mathcal{F} with the $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ -bound (36), with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\|f\|_{L^2}^2 - R_1 \leq \|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 \leq \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_{L^2}^2 + R_1, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (40)$$

where $R_1 = C\lambda^{-2\alpha}n^{-1} \ln(2|\mathcal{F}|/\delta)$.

Now, since \mathcal{F} is an ε -net of \mathcal{K}_λ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x - f\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon,$$

which implies that

$$\left| \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2} - \|f\|_{L^2} \right| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \left| \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2, n} - \|f\|_{L^2, n} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, from (36) again we know that for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}, \quad \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2, n} \leq M_\alpha \lambda^{-\alpha},$$

which is also true for f since $f \in \mathcal{K}_\lambda$. Using $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)(a + b)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 - \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \right| &\leq 2M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha}, \\ \left| \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2, n}^2 - \|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 \right| &\leq 2M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Without loss of generality we consider only the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2, n}^2 &\leq \|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 + 2M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha} \quad (\text{by (41)}) \\ (\text{by (40)}) &\leq \frac{3}{2}\|f\|_{L^2}^2 + R_1 + 2M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha} \\ (\text{by (41) again}) &\leq \frac{3}{2}\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 + R_1 + 4M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha} \\ &= \frac{3}{2}\|T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 + R_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_2 = Cn^{-1}\lambda^{-2\alpha} \ln(2|\mathcal{F}|/\delta) + 4M_\alpha \varepsilon \lambda^{-\alpha}$. Letting $\varepsilon = n^{-1}$ and applying in (39), the second term in R_2 is infinitesimal to the first one, and we have

$$R_2 \leq C \frac{\lambda^{-2\alpha}}{n} \left(\ln \lambda + \ln n + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \leq C \frac{\lambda^{-2\alpha}}{n} \ln n,$$

since $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-p})$. □

5.4 Approximation A

The following proposition is a slightly modified version of Fischer and Steinwart [13, Lemma 17]. Compared with Li et al. [17, Lemma C.2], it weakens the requirement of λ using the embedding property. A proof is deferred to the appendix.

Proposition 5.8. Suppose \mathcal{H} has embedding index α_0 and Assumption 1 holds. Let $\lambda = \lambda(n) \rightarrow 0$ satisfy $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-1/\alpha_0 + p})$ for some $p > 0$ and fix arbitrary $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + p)$. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when n is sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(T - T_X)T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C \left(\frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \ln n \right)^{1/2}, \quad (42)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant no depending on δ, n, α , and we also have

$$\left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} T_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \sqrt{3}. \quad (43)$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Then, the following lemma improves Li et al. [17, Lemma C.12] and allows λ to be $n^{-\beta+\varepsilon}$ if Assumption 2 is also satisfied.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose \mathcal{H} has embedding index α_0 and Assumption 1 holds. Let $\lambda = \lambda(n) \rightarrow 0$ satisfy $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-1/\alpha_0+p})$ for some $p > 0$ and fix arbitrary $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + p)$. Then, for sufficiently large n , with probability at least $1 - \delta$ it is satisfied that for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\left| \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} - \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \leq C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2},$$

where the constant $C > 0$ do not depend on α, n, δ .

Proof. We begin with

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} - \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right| &\leq \left\| T_X^{1/2} [T_{X\lambda}^{-1} - T_\lambda^{-1}] h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we notice that

$$T_{X\lambda}^{-1} - T_\lambda^{-1} = (T_X + \lambda)^{-1} - (T + \lambda)^{-1} = T_{X\lambda}^{-1} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1}.$$

Next, applying Proposition A.6 and the remark below it, for sufficiently large n , with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-1/2} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha/2} (\ln n)^{1/2},$$

and $\left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} T_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \leq \sqrt{3}$. Now let us decompose

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} \cdot T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} T_\lambda^{1/2} \cdot T_\lambda^{-1/2} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1/2} \cdot T_\lambda^{-1/2} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq \left\| T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \cdot \left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2} T_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \cdot \left\| T_\lambda^{-1/2} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})} \cdot \left\| T_\lambda^{-1/2} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq 1 \cdot \sqrt{3} \cdot C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha/2} (\ln n)^{1/2} \cdot M_\alpha \lambda^{-\alpha/2} \\ &= C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimation in the last inequality comes from (38). \square

5.5 Final proof

Theorem 5.10. *Under Assumptions 1,2,3 and 4, suppose that $\lambda = \lambda(n) \rightarrow 0$ satisfy $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-\beta+p})$ for some $p > 0$. Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when n is sufficiently large, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$\sigma^2 c \frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n} \leq V(\lambda) \leq \sigma^2 C \frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n}, \quad (44)$$

where $c, C > 0$ are absolute constants no depending on δ, n, λ .

Proof. We only prove the lower bound and the upper bound is similar. First, we assert that

$$\left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x \right\|_{L^2, n}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \left\| T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{L^2}^2 - o(\lambda^{-1/\beta}) \quad (45)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for large n . Since it is a direct corollary of Lemma 5.9 and Lemma 5.7, the proof is deferred to the appendix. Then, we have

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x \right\|_{L^2, n}^2 d\mu(x) \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{2n} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\| T_\lambda^{-1} h_x \right\|_{L^2}^2 d\mu(x) - o\left(\frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n}\right).$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

For the integral, applying Mercer’s theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|T_{\lambda}^{-1}h_x\|_{L^2}^2 d\mu(x) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda + \lambda_i}\right)^2 e_i(x)^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda + \lambda_i}\right)^2 = \mathcal{N}_2(\lambda) \geq c\lambda^{-\beta}, \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where the last inequality comes from Proposition A.2. Therefore, we conclude that

$$V(\lambda) \geq \frac{c\sigma^2}{2n}\lambda^{-1/\beta} - o\left(\frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n}\right) \geq c_1\frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n}.$$

□

of Theorem 3.1. Let us choose $\lambda = n^{-\beta+p}$ for some $p > 0$. Then, from Proposition 5.2 and Proposition 5.3, we have

$$E\left(\left\|\hat{f}_{\text{inter}} - f_{\rho}^*\right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X\right) \geq V(0) \geq V(\lambda).$$

Moreover, Theorem 5.10 yields

$$V(\lambda) \geq c\frac{\lambda^{-1/\beta}}{n} = c\sigma^2 n^{-p/\beta}$$

with high probability when n is large. Since $p > 0$ can be arbitrary, we finish the proof. □

Acknowledgement

Authors Yicheng Li and Haobo Zhang contributed equally to this work.

References

- [1] Robert A Adams and John JF Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Elsevier, 2003.
- [2] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization, June 2019.
- [3] Ingo Steinwart (auth.) Andreas Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer-Verlag New York, New York, NY, first edition, 2008. ISBN 0-387-77242-1 0-387-77241-3 978-0-387-77241-7 978-0-387-77242-4. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-77242-4.
- [4] Peter L. Bartlett, Philip M. Long, Gábor Lugosi, and Alexander Tsigler. Benign overfitting in linear regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48):30063–30070, December 2020. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1907378117.
- [5] Daniel Beaglehole, Mikhail Belkin, and Parthe Pandit. Kernel ridgeless regression is inconsistent in low dimensions, June 2022.
- [6] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(32):15849–15854, 2019.
- [7] Alberto Bietti and Francis Bach. Deep equals shallow for relu networks in kernel regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.14397*, 2020.
- [8] Alberto Bietti and Julien Mairal. On the inductive bias of neural tangent kernels. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- [9] Simon Buchholz. Kernel interpolation in Sobolev spaces is not consistent in low dimensions. In Po-Ling Loh and Maxim Raginsky, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Fifth Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 178 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3410–3440. PMLR, July 2022.
- [10] A. Caponnetto and Y. Yao. Cross-validation based adaptation for regularization operators in learning theory. *Analysis and Applications*, 08:161–183, 2010. doi: 10.1142/S0219530510001564.

- [11] Andrea Caponnetto and Ernesto De Vito. Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7(3):331–368, 2007. doi: 10.1007/s10208-006-0196-8.
- [12] Simon S. Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, September 2018.
- [13] Simon-Raphael Fischer and Ingo Steinwart. Sobolev norm learning rates for regularized least-squares algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:205:1–205:38, 2020.
- [14] Arthur Jacot, Franck Gabriel, and Clement Hongler. Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [15] Jianfa Lai, Manyun Xu, Rui Chen, and Qian Lin. Generalization ability of wide neural networks on R, February 2023.
- [16] Jaehoon Lee, Lechao Xiao, Samuel Schoenholz, Yasaman Bahri, Roman Novak, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Jeffrey Pennington. Wide neural networks of any depth evolve as linear models under gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [17] Yicheng Li, Haobo Zhang, and Qian Lin. On the saturation effect of kernel ridge regression. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, February 2023.
- [18] Tengyuan Liang and Alexander Rakhlin. Just interpolate: Kernel "ridgeless" regression can generalize. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3), June 2020. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/19-AOS1849.
- [19] Andrea Montanari and Yiqiao Zhong. The interpolation phase transition in neural networks: Memorization and generalization under lazy training. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(5):2816–2847, 2022.
- [20] Behnam Neyshabur, Ryota Tomioka, and Nathan Srebro. In search of the real inductive bias: On the role of implicit regularization in deep learning. (arXiv:1412.6614), April 2015. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1412.6614.
- [21] Alexander Rakhlin and Xiyu Zhai. Consistency of interpolation with Laplace kernels is a high-dimensional phenomenon, December 2018.
- [22] Alex Smola, Zoltán Ovári, and Robert C. Williamson. Regularization with dot-product kernels. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13, 2000.
- [23] Ingo Steinwart and C. Scovel. Mercer’s theorem on general domains: On the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constructive Approximation*, 35(3):363–417, 2012. doi: 10.1007/S00365-012-9153-3.
- [24] Ingo Steinwart, D. Hush, and C. Scovel. Optimal rates for regularized least squares regression. In *COLT*, pages 79–93, 2009.
- [25] Vladimir Vapnik. *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer science & business media, 1999.
- [26] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization, February 2017.
- [27] Haobo Zhang, Yicheng Li, and Qian Lin. On the optimality of misspecified spectral algorithms, March 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Inequalities

Proposition A.1. For $\lambda > 0$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \frac{t^s}{t + \lambda} \leq \lambda^{s-1}.$$

Proposition A.2. Under Assumption 1, for any $p \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_p(\lambda) = \text{tr} (TT_\lambda^{-1})^p = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda + \lambda_i} \right)^p \asymp \lambda^{-1/\beta}. \quad (47)$$

Proof. Since $c i^{-\beta} \leq \lambda_i \leq C i^{-\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_p(\lambda) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + \lambda} \right)^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C i^{-\beta}}{C i^{-\beta} + \lambda} \right)^p = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{C}{C + \lambda i^\beta} \right)^p \\ &\leq \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{C}{\lambda x^\beta + C} \right)^p dx = \lambda^{-1/\beta} \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{C}{y^\beta + C} \right)^p dy \leq \tilde{C} \lambda^{-1/\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

for some constant C . The lower bound is similar. \square

The following concentration inequality is introduced in Caponnetto and Yao [10].

Lemma A.3. *Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n be n i.i.d. bounded random variables such that $|\xi_i| \leq B$ almost surely, $E(\xi_i) = \mu$, and $E(\xi_i - \mu)^2 \leq \sigma^2$. Then for any $\alpha > 0$, any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i - \mu \right| \leq \alpha \sigma^2 + \frac{3 + 4\alpha B}{6\alpha n} \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \quad (48)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Basing on Lemma A.3, we can obtain the following concentration about L^2 norm [17, Proposition C.9].

Proposition A.4. *Let μ be a probability measure on \mathcal{X} , $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, d\mu)$ and $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq M$. Suppose we have x_1, \dots, x_n sampled i.i.d. from μ . Then, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$\frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{5M^2}{3n} \ln \frac{2}{\delta} \leq \|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|f\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{5M^2}{3n} \ln \frac{2}{\delta}. \quad (49)$$

Proof. Defining $\xi_i = f(x_i)^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\xi_i) &= \|f\|_{L^2}^2, \\ E(\xi_i^2) &= E_{x \sim \mu} (f(x)^4) \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|f\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying Lemma A.3, we get

$$\left| \|f\|_{L^2, n}^2 - \|f\|_{L^2}^2 \right| \leq \alpha \|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|f\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3 + 4\alpha M^2}{6\alpha n} \ln \frac{2}{\delta}.$$

The final result comes from choosing $\alpha = (2M^2)^{-1}$. \square

The following Bernstein type concentration inequality about self-adjoint Hilbert-Schmidt operator valued random variable is commonly used in the related literature [13, 17].

Lemma A.5. *Let H be a separable Hilbert space. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be i.i.d. random variables taking values of self-adjoint Hilbert-Schmidt operators such that $E(A_1) = 0$, $\|A_1\| \leq L$ almost surely for some $L > 0$ and $E(A_1^2) \preceq V$ for some positive trace-class operator V . Then, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \right\| \leq \frac{2LB}{3n} + \left(\frac{2\|V\|B}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \quad B = \ln \frac{4 \operatorname{tr} V}{\delta \|V\|}.$$

A application of Lemma A.5 is the following [13, Lemma 17] and we provide the proof for completeness.

Proposition A.6. *Suppose \mathcal{H} has embedding index α_0 and let $\alpha > \alpha_0$. Then, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, when n is sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{4}{3} u + (2u)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$u = \frac{M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \ln \frac{4\mathcal{N}(\lambda)(\|T\| + \lambda)}{\delta \|T\|}, \quad (51)$$

and $\mathcal{N}(\lambda) = \mathcal{N}_1(\lambda) = \operatorname{tr}(TT_\lambda)$.

Proof. We will prove by Lemma A.5. Let

$$A(x) = T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T_x - T) T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

and $A_i = A(x_i)$. Then, $E(A_i) = 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A_i = T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T_x - T) T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Moreover, since

$$T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_x T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} = T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_x K_x^* T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} = T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_x \left[T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_x \right]^*,$$

from (38) we have

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_x T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} K_x \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H})}^2 = \left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_x \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}. \quad (52)$$

By taking expectation, we also have $\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}$. Therefore, we get

$$\|A\| \leq \left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| + \left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_x T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \leq 2M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} = L.$$

For the second part of the condition, using the fact that $E(B - E(B)) \preceq E(B^2)$ for a self-adjoint operator B , where \preceq denotes the partial order induced by positive operators, we have

$$E(A^2) \preceq E \left(T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_x T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right)^2.$$

Noticing that $T \succeq 0$ and $0 \preceq T_x \preceq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} I$ by (52),

$$A \preceq T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} I T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \preceq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} I,$$

and thus

$$E(A^2) \preceq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} E \left(T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_x T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) = M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} T T_\lambda^{-1} = V.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\| &= M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \|T T_\lambda^{-1}\| = M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda + \lambda_1} = M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \frac{\|T\|}{\|T\| + \lambda} \leq M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \\ \text{tr } V &= M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \text{tr} [T T_\lambda^{-1}] = M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha} \mathcal{N}(\lambda), \\ B &= \ln \frac{4 \text{tr } V}{\delta \|V\|} = \ln \frac{4(\|T\| + \lambda) \mathcal{N}(\lambda)}{\delta \|T\|}. \end{aligned}$$

□

of Proposition 5.8. By Proposition A.2, $\mathcal{N}(\lambda) \leq C \lambda^{-1/\beta}$. Moreover, since $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-1/\alpha_0 + p})$ for some $p > 0$ and $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \frac{M_\alpha^2 \lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \ln \frac{4\mathcal{N}(\lambda)(\|T\| + \lambda)}{\delta \|T\|} \\ &\leq C \frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \left(\ln \lambda^{-1/\beta} + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + C \right) \\ &\leq C \frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \left((1/\alpha_0 - p)\beta^{-1} \ln n + \ln \frac{1}{\delta} + C \right) \\ &\leq C \frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \ln n = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \frac{4}{3} u + (2u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C u^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left(\frac{\lambda^{-\alpha}}{n} \ln n \right)^{1/2}.$$

For the second part, when $u \leq \frac{1}{8}$,

$$\left\| T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} (T - T_X) T_\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{4}{3} u + (2u)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{2}{3}.$$

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

Noticing that $(T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2}T_\lambda^{1/2})^* = T_\lambda^{1/2}T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| T_{X\lambda}^{-1/2}T_\lambda^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})}^2 &= \left\| T_\lambda^{1/2}(T_X + \lambda)^{-1}T_\lambda^{1/2} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left[T_\lambda^{-1/2}(T_X + \lambda)T_\lambda^{-1/2} \right]^{-1} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \left[I - T_\lambda^{-1/2}(T - T_X)T_\lambda^{-1/2} \right]^{-1} \right\| \\ &\leq \left(1 - \left\| T_\lambda^{-1/2}(T - T_X)T_\lambda^{-1/2} \right\| \right)^{-1} \leq 3. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Covering number in reproducing kernel Hilbert space

Let us recall the definition of covering numbers.

Definition A.7. Let $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ be a normed space and $A \subset E$ be a subset. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we say $S \subseteq A$ is an ε -net of A if for any $a \in A$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $\|a - s\|_E \leq \varepsilon$. Moreover, we define the ε -covering number of A to be

$$\mathcal{N}(A, \|\cdot\|_E, \varepsilon) = \inf \{|S| : S \text{ is an } \varepsilon\text{-net of } A\}. \quad (53)$$

Li et al. [17, Lemma C.10] shows the following upper bound of covering numbers of $\mathcal{K}_\lambda = \{T_\lambda^{-1}h_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$.

Lemma A.8. Assuming that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded and $k \in C^{0,s}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ for some $s \in (0, 1]$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}_\lambda, \|\cdot\|_\infty, \varepsilon) \leq C(\lambda\varepsilon)^{-\frac{2d}{s}}, \quad (54)$$

where C is a positive constant not depending on λ or ε .

A.3 Omitted proofs

of Proposition 5.2. Let us denote $K_\lambda = K + \lambda$. Recalling (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_\lambda - f_\rho^* &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-1} Y \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-1} (f_\rho^*[X] + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}) - f_\rho^*(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-1} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-1} f_\rho^*[X] - f_\rho^*(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is the column vector of the noises $\epsilon_i = y_i - f_\rho^*(x_i)$. Since $\epsilon_i | X$ are independent with mean zero and variance $\sigma_{x_i}^2 \geq \sigma^2$, simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\left\| \hat{f}_\lambda - f_\rho^* \right\|_{L^2}^2 \mid X \right) &= E \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} (\hat{f}_\lambda(x) - f_\rho^*(x))^2 d\mu(x) \mid X \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} E \left((\hat{f}_\lambda(x) - f_\rho^*(x))^2 \mid X \right) d\mu(x) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{var} \left(\hat{f}_\lambda(x) \mid X \right) d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-1} E \left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^T \mid X \right) K_\lambda^{-1} \mathbb{K}(X, x) d\mu(x) \\ &\geq \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{K}(x, X) K_\lambda^{-2} \mathbb{K}(X, x) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

Kernel interpolation generalizes poorly

of (45). Let us choose $\alpha > \alpha_0 = 1/\beta$ sufficiently close but fixed. The requirement of α will be seen in the following proof. Then, Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.9 yield that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2}^2 - R \leq \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2, n}^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2}^2 + R, \quad (55)$$

$$\left| \|T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} - \|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \leq S, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (56)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where

$$R = C \frac{\lambda^{-2\alpha}}{n} \ln n, \quad S = C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2}.$$

Consequently, the L^2 -norm bound in (37) and (55) yield

$$\|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2, n} \leq C \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{R} \leq C \lambda^{-\alpha/2} + \sqrt{R} = R_1,$$

which, together with (56), implies

$$\|T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2 \|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}} + S \leq 2R_1 + S.$$

Then, we obtain the approximation of the squared norm

$$\left| \|T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right| \leq S(2R_1 + S). \quad (57)$$

Combining (57) and (55), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2, n}^2 &= \|T_X^{1/2} T_{X\lambda}^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ &\geq \|T_X^{1/2} T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - S(2R_1 + S) \\ &= \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2, n}^2 - S(2R_1 + S) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|T_\lambda^{-1} h_x\|_{L^2}^2 - R - S(2R_1 + S) \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Finally, we show that the error terms in (58) are infinitesimal with respect to the main term $\lambda^{-1/\beta}$. We recall that $\lambda = \Omega(n^{-\beta+p})$ and $\alpha_0 = 1/\beta$, so

$$\lambda^{1/\beta} R = C \frac{\lambda^{1/\beta-2\alpha}}{n} \ln n \leq C n^{2\alpha\beta-2-p(2\alpha-1/\beta)} \ln n$$

and thus $R = o(\lambda^{-1/\beta})$ if we set $\beta^{-1} < \alpha < \beta^{-1} \cdot (2\beta - p)/(2\beta - 2p)$. Also,

$$S = C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2} \leq C \lambda^{-\alpha/2}$$

if $\beta^{-1} < \alpha < \beta^{-1}/(1-p)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{1/\beta} S(2R_1 + S) &= \lambda^{1/\beta} S \left(2C \lambda^{-\alpha/2} + 2\sqrt{R} + S \right) \\ &\leq C \lambda^{1/\beta} \cdot n^{-1/2} \lambda^{-\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2} \cdot \lambda^{-\alpha/2} \\ &= C n^{-1/2} \lambda^{1/\beta - \frac{3}{2}\alpha} (\ln n)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and thus $S(2R_1 + S) = o(\lambda^{-1/\beta})$ if $\beta^{-1} < \alpha < \beta^{-1} \cdot (3\beta - 2p)/(3\beta - 3p)$. \square