

Distributed Learning with Discretely Observed Functional Data

Jiading Liu and Lei Shi

School of Mathematical Sciences and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Contemporary Applied Mathematics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

Emails: jiadingliu1999@gmail.com, leishi@fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

By selecting different filter functions, spectral algorithms can generate various regularization methods to solve statistical inverse problems within the learning-from-samples framework. This paper combines distributed spectral algorithms with Sobolev kernels to tackle the functional linear regression problem. The design and mathematical analysis of the algorithms require only that the functional covariates are observed at discrete sample points. Furthermore, the hypothesis function spaces of the algorithms are the Sobolev spaces generated by the Sobolev kernels, optimizing both approximation capability and flexibility. Through the establishment of regularity conditions for the target function and functional covariate, we derive matching upper and lower bounds for the convergence of the distributed spectral algorithms in the Sobolev norm. This demonstrates that the proposed regularity conditions are reasonable and that the convergence analysis under these conditions is tight, capturing the essential characteristics of functional linear regression. The analytical techniques and estimates developed in this paper also enhance existing results in the previous literature.

Keywords and phrases: Functional linear regression, Distributed spectral algorithm, Sobolev kernels, Convergence analysis, Mini-max optimality

1 Introduction

Recent years have witnessed the precipitous development of functional data analysis (FDA) across various fields, including neuroscience, linguistics, medicine, economics and so on (See [24, 8, 23, 31] and the references therein). Functional linear regression, a pivotal subfield of the FDA, has garnered substantial interest in statistics and machine learning communities. Without loss of generality (and allowing for rescaling when necessary), we assume the domain of the functional covariate to be $\mathcal{T} := [0, 1]$. The square-integrable functions over \mathcal{T} form a Hilbert space, denoted by $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, with the inner product

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} := \int_{\mathcal{T}} g_1(t)g_2(t)dt, \quad \forall g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}).$$

This paper focuses on the functional linear regression model expressed as

$$Y = \langle \beta_0, X \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \epsilon, \tag{1.1}$$

where $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ represents a scalar response, $X \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is a functional covariate, $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the slope function, and ϵ is a zero-mean random noise, which is independent of X and has finite variance. The primary objective of functional linear regression is to estimate β_0 utilizing a training sample set generated by (1.1).

In the context of regression, estimating β_0 directly, rather than using the functional $L_{\beta_0}(\cdot) := \langle \beta_0, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ for prediction, is a typical inverse problem and has attracted widespread attention in the fields of statistical inference and inverse problems (see, e.g., [4, 14, 26, 35]). Moreover, instead of assuming functional covariates are fully observed, this paper adopts a more practical setting by considering functional covariates that are observed only at discrete points. The training sample set in this paper is

$$S := \{(X_i(r_1), X_i(r_2), \dots, X_i(r_m), X_i(r_{m+1}), Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N,$$

where $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ are N independent copies of the random variable (X, Y) , and functional covariates $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are observed at discrete points $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^{m+1}$, with $m \geq 1$ being an integer and $0 \leq r_1 < \dots < r_m < r_{m+1} \leq 1$.

This paper employs the spectral regularization algorithms based on Sobolev kernels to estimate β_0 . We first clarify some notations. The subspace of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ where the weak derivatives up to order $\alpha \geq 1$ remain in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, called the Sobolev space of order α on \mathcal{T} , is given by

$$\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T}) := \left\{ g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid D^k g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}), \forall 0 \leq k \leq \alpha \right\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $D^k g$ denotes the k -th weak derivative of g . The integer parameter α serves as a direct measure of smoothness within $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$. The Sobolev embedding theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 4.12 of [1]) guarantees that $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ is continuously embedded into $\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha-1)}([0, 1])$ for any integer $\alpha \geq 1$, where $\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha-1)}(\mathcal{T})$ represents the space of functions that are $(\alpha-1)$ -times continuously differentiable on \mathcal{T} . If equipped with the standard inner product

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}} := \sum_{k=0}^{\alpha} \int_{\mathcal{T}} D^k g_1(t) D^k g_2(t) dt, \quad \forall g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T}),$$

then $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ becomes a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), known as the standard Sobolev space of order α , with reproducing kernel denoted by $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha}^{std} : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see, e.g., [3]). Let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}}$ represent the norm induced by the standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}}$. Although the standard Sobolev spaces are widely used in previous papers on statistical learning and inverse problems, they have a significant computational drawback: when $\alpha \geq 2$, there is no explicit formula for the reproducing kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha}^{std}$ of standard Sobolev space of order α . Therefore, we consider equipping $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ with an alternative inner product

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}} := & \sum_{k=0}^{\alpha-1} \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} D^k g_1(t) dt \right) \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} D^k g_2(t) dt \right) \\ & + \int_{\mathcal{T}} D^{\alpha} g_1(t) D^{\alpha} g_2(t) dt, \quad \forall g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T}). \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

As a result of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality (see, e.g., [5]), the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}}$ induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}}$ is equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}}$, i.e., there exists $0 < c < C < \infty$, such that $c \|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}} \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}} \leq C \|g\|_{\mathcal{W}_{std}^{\alpha,2}}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$. The

space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ equipped with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}}$ is also an RKHS with reproducing kernel denoted by $\mathcal{K}_\alpha : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This space is called the unanchored Sobolev space of order α to be distinguished from the standard Sobolev spaces. Its reproducing kernel, known as the (unanchored) Sobolev kernel of order α , can be explicitly expressed as (see, e.g., [15]):

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(t, t') := \sum_{k=0}^{\alpha} \frac{B_k(t)B_k(t')}{(k!)^2} + \frac{(-1)^{\alpha+1}}{(2\alpha)!} B_{2\alpha}(|t - t'|), \quad \forall t, t' \in \mathcal{T},$$

where $(B_k)_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the sequence of Bernoulli polynomials. Furthermore, for a non-integer parameter $\alpha > 0$, the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ can be defined via the real interpolation. All details will be demonstrated in Section 2.3.

For clarity and convenience, we fix a parameter $\alpha^* > 1/2$ throughout this paper. Given a family of functions $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ being a filter function indexed by the parameter $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ (see Section 2.4 or [2] for details). Define the empirical operator $G_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\mathbf{x} := \{(X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1}))\}_{i=1}^N$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}(f) := \left(\sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \left\langle f, \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} X_1(r_k), \dots, \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \left\langle f, \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} X_N(r_k) \right)^T$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, where $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}$ is the square root of the unanchored Sobolev kernel \mathcal{K}_{α^*} (see Section 2.2). And define the empirical operator $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} := \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is the adjoint operator of $G_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^*(a) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^m a_i (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_i(r_k), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then we can construct an spectral regularization estimator $\hat{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ with Ψ_λ in $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ to approximate β_0 based on the discretely observed functional data S as:

$$\hat{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}) \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* \mathbf{y}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$ is the 1/2-th power of the integral operator induced by the unanchored Sobolev kernel \mathcal{K}_{α^*} and $\mathbf{y} := (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

The spectral regularization algorithms cover many standard algorithms for functional linear regression, including the Tikhonov regularization algorithm, iterated Tikhonov regularization algorithm, and gradient descent algorithm, and we will illustrate them in Section 2.4.

In addressing the challenges posed by massive datasets, the algorithm (1.4) is hindered by significant algorithmic complexity involving both computational time and memory requirements. To improve computational feasibility for large-scale training databases, we adopt a distributed strategy for implementing algorithm (1.4). This approach entails randomly partitioning the sample set S into M disjoint subsets of equal size, denoted by S_1, \dots, S_M .

Subsequently, applying algorithm (1.4) individually to each subset S_j yields local estimators $\hat{\beta}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$, defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}) \frac{1}{|S_j|} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}^* \mathbf{y}_j,$$

where $|S_j|$ represents the number of elements in S_j , \mathbf{x}_j comprises the discrete samples of X in S_j , and $\mathbf{y}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_j|}$ is a vector containing the samples of Y in S_j . The final distributed estimator is derived by averaging the local estimators $\{\hat{\beta}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}\}_{j=1}^M$, expressed as

$$\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{\beta}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}. \quad (1.5)$$

Implementing the distributed version of algorithm (1.4) substantially mitigates the computational complexity in terms of time and memory, reducing it to approximately $\frac{1}{M^2}$ of the original complexity.

In order to handle the functional covariates observed on discrete sample points, we need to introduce some regularity conditions on the functional covariate X and the slope function β_0 . In the present paper, we assume that the functional covariate and slope function $X, \beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ for the same α^* in algorithms (1.4) and (1.5). Such an assumption requires the functional covariate and slope function to have some sort of continuity and is common when aiming to recover the integral of a function from its discrete observations (see, e.g., [25, 32, 36]). Then the performance of distributed estimator $\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ can be evaluated via the estimation error:

$$\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2. \quad (1.6)$$

The main contributions of our paper are summarized as follows. Under some mild assumptions on the functional covariate X , we establish the upper bounds on the convergence rates of the estimation error (1.6) for different regularity conditions of β_0 . Then, when the functional covariate X satisfies some additional Gaussian property, we establish the upper bounds for the estimation error (1.6) in a global sense, i.e., the upper bounds for the expectation of (1.6). We develop an innovative mathematical analysis by combining the asymptotic analysis techniques and concentration estimates for random operators with bounded arbitrary-order moment, which extends several previous results in published literature and is tight as the rates of upper and lower bounds on the performance of distributed estimators match.

We organize the rest of this paper as follows. In Section 2, we start with an introduction to notations, background, and some preliminary results. In Section 3, we introduce main assumptions and theorems in this paper. In Section 4, we review previous literature and compare our analysis with related results. We leave all proofs to Section 5 and Appendixes.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we will introduce some basic notations and background in our study.

2.1 Basic Notations

We first recall some basic notations in operator theory (see, e.g., [10]). Let $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ be a linear operator, where $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$ and $(\mathcal{H}', \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}'})$ are Hilbert spaces with the corresponding norms $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}'}$. The set of bounded linear operators from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H}' is a Banach space with respect to the operator norm $\|A\|_{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}'} = \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}=1} \|Af\|_{\mathcal{H}'}$, which is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ or $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ if $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}'$. When \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' are clear from the context, we will omit the subscript and simply denote the operator norm as $\| \cdot \|$. Let A^* be the adjoint operator of A such that $\langle Af, f' \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle f, A^*f' \rangle_{\mathcal{H}'}, \forall f \in \mathcal{H}, f' \in \mathcal{H}'$. We say that $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is self-adjoint if $A^* = A$, and positive if A is self-adjoint and $\langle Af, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$. For $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f' \in \mathcal{H}'$, define a rank-one operator $f \otimes f' : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ by $f \otimes f'(h) = \langle f, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} f', \forall h \in \mathcal{H}$. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is compact and positive, Spectral Theorem ensures that there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ in \mathcal{H} consisting of eigenfunctions of A such that $A = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k e_k \otimes e_k$, where the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ (with geometric multiplicities) are non-negative and arranged in decreasing order, and either the set $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is finite or $\lambda_k \rightarrow 0$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for any $r > 0$, we define the r -th power of A as $A^r = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^r e_k \otimes e_k$, which is itself a positive compact operator on \mathcal{H} . An operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ is Hilbert-Schmidt if $\sum_{k \geq 1} \|Ae_k\|_{\mathcal{H}'}^2 < \infty$ for some (any) orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{H} . All Hilbert-Schmidt operators can form a Hilbert space endowed with the inner product $\langle A, B \rangle_{\mathcal{F}} := \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle Ae_k, Be_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}'}$ and we denote the corresponding norm by $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{F}}$. In particular, a Hilbert-Schmidt operator A is compact, and we have the following inequality between its two different norms:

$$\|A\| \leq \|A\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (2.1)$$

For any Hilbert-Schmidt operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and any bounded operator $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the product operators AB and BA are also Hilbert-Schmidt operators satisfying

$$\|AB\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \|A\|_{\mathcal{F}} \|B\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|BA\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \|A\|_{\mathcal{F}} \|B\| \quad (2.2)$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}'$, the rank-one operator $f \otimes g$ is Hilbert-Schmidt with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm

$$\|f \otimes g\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}'}. \quad (2.3)$$

An operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$ is trace class if $\sum_{k \geq 1} \langle (A^*A)^{1/2} e_k, e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ for some (any) orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{H} . All trace class operators constitute a Banach space endowed with the norm $Tr(A) := \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle (A^*A)^{1/2} e_k, e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. For any positive operator $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

$$Tr(A) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle Ae_k, e_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is the Hilbert space of real functions on \mathcal{T} square-integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We denote the corresponding norm of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ induced by the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} f(t)g(t)dt$ by $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$. And we denote by \mathcal{I} the identity operator on $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$.

Without loss of generality, we assume the functional covariate X satisfy $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\|X\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] < \infty$. Then the covariance kernel $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by $\mathcal{C}(s, t) := \mathbb{E}[X(s)X(t)], \forall s, t \in \mathcal{T}$, defines a compact and non-negative operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$

through

$$\mathcal{L}_C(f)(t) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{C}(s,t)f(s)ds, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \text{ and } \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

2.2 Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space

Consider a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ endowed with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. We say that \mathcal{H} is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), if and only if there exists a bivariate function $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is called as the reproducing kernel associated to \mathcal{H} , such that for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathcal{K}(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f, \mathcal{K}(\cdot, t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = f(t). \quad (2.5)$$

To emphasize the relationship between the RKHS \mathcal{H} and its reproducing kernel \mathcal{K} , we rewrite the RKHS as $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and its equipped inner product as $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}}$. The reproducing kernel \mathcal{K} is always symmetric and non-negative.

If the reproducing kernel \mathcal{K} is continuous, then \mathcal{K} can induce a compact, symmetric and non-negative integral operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}(f)(t) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{K}(s,t)f(s)ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}),$$

and following from Mercer's theorem (see, e.g., [19]), \mathcal{K} can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{K}(s,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j e_j(s)e_j(t), \quad \forall s, t \in \mathcal{T},$$

where $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is a non-increasing, non-negative sequences and $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$.

We define the square root of \mathcal{K} as

$$\mathcal{K}^{1/2}(s,t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_j} e_j(s)e_j(t), \quad \forall s, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

One can verify that $\mathcal{K}^{1/2} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T})$ and $\mathcal{K}^{1/2}$ satisfies the following equation:

$$\mathcal{K}(s,t) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{K}^{1/2}(u,s)\mathcal{K}^{1/2}(u,t)du, \quad \forall s, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Then we write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}^{1/2}}, \quad \text{as} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}^{1/2}}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}^{1/2}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}$ denotes the 1/2-th power of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}^{1/2}}$ is the integral operator induced by $\mathcal{K}^{1/2}$. It is well known that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}$ is compact and forms an isomorphism from $\overline{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}}$, the closure of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}$ in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, to the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}$. Thus, for any $f, g \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}}$, there holds

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}f, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}, \quad \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}f \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}f, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{1/2}g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K}}} = \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}. \quad (2.7)$$

2.3 Unanchored Sobolev Spaces

In this subsection, we provide the definition of unanchored Sobolev spaces and review several relevant results from previous studies.

Recall that, the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for a positive integer $\alpha \geq 1$ is defined by (1.2) with the corresponding inner product (1.3). For non-integer $\alpha > 0$, the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ can be defined via the real interpolation. To this end, we introduce the following definition of real interpolation based on K-functional (see, e.g., [28, 30]).

Definition 1 (real interpolation). *Let $(\mathcal{H}_0, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_0})$ and $(\mathcal{H}_1, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_1})$ be two normed spaces. For any element $a \in \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1$ and $t > 0$, we define the K-functional*

$$K(t; a) = \inf_{a=a_0+a_1} \left\{ \|a_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_0} + t \|a_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right\}.$$

For any $0 < \eta < 1$ and any $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ (or for $\eta = 0, 1$ with $q = \infty$), we define the real interpolation space

$$(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)_{\eta, q} := \left\{ a \in \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1 \mid t^{-\eta} K(t; a) \in \mathcal{L}^q \left(\mathbb{R}_+, \frac{dt}{t} \right) \right\}$$

with the norm

$$\|a\|_{(\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)_{\eta, q}} = \|t^{-\eta} K(t; a)\|_{\mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{R}_+, \frac{dt}{t})} = \left(\int_0^\infty \left\{ t^{-\eta} K(t; a) \right\}^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad \forall a \in (\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1)_{\eta, q}.$$

Using Definition 1, the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for any real number $\alpha > 0$ can be defined as:

$$\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T}) = \left(\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}), \mathscr{W}^{[\alpha],2}(\mathcal{T}) \right)_{\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|}, 2}.$$

It is well known that for any $\alpha > 1/2$, the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with a continuous reproducing kernel (see, e.g., [27, 32]) and the following continuous embedding condition holds (see, e.g., [1]):

$$\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{0, \alpha-1/2}(\mathcal{T}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathcal{T}), \quad (2.8)$$

where \hookrightarrow represents the continuous embedding, $\mathcal{C}^{0, \alpha-1/2}$ denotes the Hölder space of order $\alpha - 1/2$ and \mathcal{L}^∞ represents the bounded function space.

In particular, for a positive integer $\alpha > 0$, the reproducing kernel of $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ can be explicitly expressed as

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha(t, t') := \sum_{k=0}^{\alpha} \frac{B_k(t) B_k(t')}{(k!)^2} + \frac{(-1)^{\alpha+1}}{(2\alpha)!} B_{2\alpha}(|t - t'|), \quad \forall t, t' \in \mathcal{T},$$

where $(B_k)_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the sequence of Bernoulli polynomials.

In the rest part of this paper, we fix a parameter $\alpha^* > 1/2$. Consequently, the reproducing property (2.5) and isometric isomorphic property (2.7) hold for the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ and its corresponding Sobolev kernel \mathcal{K}_{α^*} .

2.4 Filter Functions

Noting that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$ is a bounded operator for a fixed parameter $\alpha^* > 1/2$ and that $\mathbb{E} \left[\|X\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] < \infty$, we can denote $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \leq \rho_{\alpha^*}^2 < \infty$.

Then there holds

$$\|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\|^2 \leq \|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X, e_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \leq \rho_{\alpha^*}^2, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an (any) orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$.

We introduce the following definition of filter functions.

Definition 2 (filter functions). *Let $\nu_{\Psi} \geq 1$ be a constant and $\{\Psi_{\lambda} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ be a family of functions. We say $\{\Psi_{\lambda} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ is a filter function with qualification ν_{Ψ} if:*

(1) *There exists a constant $B > 0$, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \frac{3}{2}\rho_{\alpha^*} + \frac{1}{2}]} |(\lambda + t)\Psi_{\lambda}(t)| \leq B, \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

(2) *For any $0 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\Psi}$, there exists a constant $F_{\nu} > 0$ only depending on ν , such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \frac{3}{2}\rho_{\alpha^*} + \frac{1}{2}]} |1 - t\Psi_{\lambda}(t)| t^{\nu} \leq F_{\nu} \lambda^{\nu}, \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

(3) *There exists a constant $D > 0$, such that*

$$\sup_{t \in (\frac{3}{2}\rho_{\alpha^*} + \frac{1}{2}, \infty)} |(\lambda + t)\Psi_{\lambda}(t)| \leq D, \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

For simplicity of notations, we denote $E := \max\{B, D\}$.

In the previous papers, filter functions are typically defined over bounded intervals of t without property (3) (see, e.g., [2, 22]). This is primarily because these studies often assume that empirical operators (such as $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}$ in this paper) are bounded almost everywhere. However, this assumption is inappropriate within the functional linear regression framework, where it is necessary to require that $\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} < \infty$ almost everywhere. This condition excludes the most common case where X is a Gaussian random variable taking values in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$. To avoid making such inappropriate assumptions and to include the most common cases in our analysis, we define the filter functions over and bound them on the infinite interval $[0, \infty)$.

There is a wide variety of algorithms for functional linear regression that satisfy Definition 2, and we list only a few typical examples below.

Example 1 (Tikhonov regularization). *We begin with the Tikhonov regularization algorithm. This algorithm constructs operators in the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ based on the discretely observed data S through*

$$\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \beta(r_k) X_i(r_k) \right)^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \right\}. \quad (2.10)$$

Using the the isometric isomorphism property of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR}$ can also be expressed as $\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR}$ with

$$\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} := \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f \right) (r_k) X_i(r_k) \right)^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\}.$$

Then following from Theorem 6.2.1 in [19], we can solve $\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR}$ explicitly as

$$\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} = (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x})^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^* \mathbf{y},$$

where \mathcal{I} denotes the identity operator on $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^*$ are defined in Section 1.

Therefore, we write

$$\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}^{TR} = \Psi_{\lambda}^{TR}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x}) \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^* \mathbf{y},$$

where $\Psi_{\lambda}^{TR}(t) = (\lambda + t)^{-1}$, $\forall t \in [0, \infty)$, $\forall \lambda \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to show that $\{\Psi_{\lambda}^{TR} \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ satisfies Definition 2 with $\nu_{\Psi} = 1$, $F_{\nu} = 1$ for any $0 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\Psi} = 1$, and $B = D = 1$.

Example 2 (iterated Tikhonov regularization). *The second example is an improved version of the Tikhonov regularization algorithm, named the iterated Tikhonov regularization algorithm. Let integer $s \geq 1$ be the total number of iterations. The r -th ($1 \leq r \leq s$) iteration of iterated Tikhonov regularization algorithm establishes estimators through*

$$\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r}^{ITR,s} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \beta(r_k) X_i(r_k) \right)^2 + \lambda \|\beta - \hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r-1}^{ITR,s}\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \right\},$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r-1}^{ITR,s}$ is the estimator given by the $r-1$ -th iteration of iterated Tikhonov regularization algorithm and $\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,0}^{ITR,s} = 0$.

Following from the same arguments in Example 1, we have $\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r}^{ITR,s} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r}^{ITR,s}$, $\forall 1 \leq r \leq s$, with $\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,0}^{ITR,s} = 0$ and

$$\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r}^{ITR,s} = \hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r-1}^{ITR,s} + (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x})^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^* \left(\mathbf{y} - \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x} \left(\hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,r-1}^{ITR,s} \right) \right), \quad \forall 1 \leq r \leq s.$$

Then noting that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x} = \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^* \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}$, we can explicitly solve the final estimator of iterated Tikhonov regularization algorithm as

$$\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,s}^{ITR,s} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,s}^{ITR,s} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^s (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,x})^{-k} \lambda^{k-1} \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,x}^* \mathbf{y}.$$

Therefore, we write

$$\hat{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda,s}^{ITR,s} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \Psi_{\lambda}^{ITR,s}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}) \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}^* \mathbf{y},$$

where

$$\Psi_{\lambda}^{ITR,s}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^s (\lambda+t)^{-k} \lambda^{k-1} = \frac{(\lambda+t)^s - \lambda^s}{t(\lambda+t)^s}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty), \forall \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

One can verify that $\{\Psi_{\lambda}^{ITR,s} \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ satisfies Definition 2 with $\nu_{\Psi} = s$, $F_{\nu} = 1$ for any $0 \leq \nu \leq \nu_{\Psi} = s$, and $B = D = s$.

Example 3 (gradient flow). Let

$$\mathcal{E}_S(\beta) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \beta(r_k) X_i(r_k) \right)^2, \quad \forall \beta \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T}),$$

be the empirical loss.

The gradient flow algorithm constructs estimators by solving the gradient flow equation:

$$\frac{d\hat{\beta}_r^{GF}}{dt} = -\nabla \mathcal{E}_S \left(\hat{\beta}_r^{GF} \right), \forall r \geq 0, \quad \hat{\beta}_0^{GF} = 0,$$

where $\nabla \mathcal{E}_S \left(\hat{\beta}_r^{GF} \right)$ denotes the gradient of $\mathcal{E}_S(\beta)$ for $\beta = \hat{\beta}_r^{GF}$ (see, e.g., [34]). Following from the isometric isomorphic property of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, we write $\hat{\beta}_r^{GF} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_r^{GF}$, $\forall r \geq 0$ with $\hat{f}_0^{GF} = 0$. Then imitating the proof of Proposition 2.2 of [34] and using the reproducing property of $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$, we have

$$\nabla \mathcal{E}_S \left(\hat{\beta}_r^{GF} \right) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}^* \left(\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}} \left(\hat{f}_r^{GF} \right) - \mathbf{y} \right), \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Let $\lambda = 1/r$ be the regularization parameter. Then noting that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}$, we can solve the gradient flow equation in closed-form as

$$\hat{\beta}_r^{GF} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_r^{GF} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \Psi_{\lambda}^{GF}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}) \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*,\mathbf{x}}^* \mathbf{y}, \quad \forall r > 1,$$

where

$$\Psi_{\lambda}^{GF}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1 - e^{-rt}}{t} = \frac{1 - e^{-t/\lambda}}{t}, & \forall t > 0, \forall \lambda \in (0, 1), \\ \frac{1}{\lambda}, & t = 0, \forall \lambda \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

One can verify that $\{\Psi_{\lambda}^{GF} \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ satisfies Definition 2 with $\nu_{\Psi} = \infty$, $F_{\nu} = (\nu/e)^{\nu}$ for any $0 \leq \nu < \infty$, and $B = D = 1$.

2.5 Distributed Spectral Regularization Algorithms

In this subsection, we introduce notations used in the distributed spectral regularization algorithms.

We denote the sample set

$$\mathbf{x} := \{(X_i(r_1), X_i(r_2), \dots, X_i(r_m), X_i(r_{m+1}))\}_{i=1}^N$$

which consists of the discrete samples of X in S . Then we define an empirical operator $G_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ based on \mathbf{x} as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}(f) \\ & := \left(\sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \left\langle f, \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(r_k) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} X_1(r_k), \dots, \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \left\langle f, \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(r_k) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} X_N(r_k) \right)^T \end{aligned}$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$. The adjoint operator of $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}$, denote by $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^*(a) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^m a_i (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_i(r_k), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

And we define the empirical operator $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} & := \frac{1}{N} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} \\ & = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_i(r_k) \right] \otimes \left[\sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_i(r_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of simplicity, we define

$$\mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}) := \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_i(r_k), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

Thus, we express $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}$ as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}).$$

The spectral regularization estimator based on the unanchored Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ (with Sobolev kernel \mathcal{K}_{α^*}) and a filter function $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ is defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}) \frac{1}{N} G_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}}^* \mathbf{y},$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Recall that $S = \cup_{j=1}^M S_j$ with $S_j \cap S_k = \emptyset$ for $j \neq k$ and $|S_j| = \frac{N}{M}$. For any $1 \leq j \leq M$, we denote the local sample sets as

$$\mathbf{x}_j := \{(X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1})) : (X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1}), Y_i) \in S_j\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{y}_j := \{Y_i : (X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1}), Y_i) \in S_j\}.$$

Using these notations, the local spectral regularization estimator on each subset S_j can be computed as $\hat{\beta}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ with

$$\hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \Psi_\lambda \left(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j} \right) \frac{1}{|S_j|} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}^* \mathbf{y}_j, \quad (2.11)$$

where the local empirical operator $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j} : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j} := \frac{1}{|S_j|} \sum_{i: (X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1})) \in \mathbf{x}_j} \mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}) \otimes \mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}),$$

and the local empirical operator $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}^* : \mathbb{R}^{|S_j|} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}^*(a) := \sum_{i: (X_i(r_1), \dots, X_i(r_{m+1})) \in \mathbf{x}_j} a_i \mathcal{S}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_j|}.$$

Then the distributed spectral regularization estimator $\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ can be computed as $\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \bar{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ with

$$\bar{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}. \quad (2.12)$$

3 Main Results

In this section, we first introduce main assumptions of our paper. Then based on these assumptions, we present our theoretical lower and upper bounds on the estimation error of the distributed spectral regularization estimator (1.5).

3.1 Assumptions

To establish the optimal upper and lower bounds for the estimation errors, we need to impose some mild assumptions on the slope function β_0 , the functional covariate X , the random noise ϵ and the sampling scheme. We begin with the regularity condition of the slope function β_0 . To this end, we define operators $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \dagger} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2}$. Note that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \right)^* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \dagger} = \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \right)^* \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2}.$$

It is obvious that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, \mathcal{T}_{α^*} and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \dagger}$ are all compact. Then according to the singular value decomposition theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 4.3.1 in [19]), we have the following expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_{\alpha^*, j} \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \otimes \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \\ \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \dagger} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_{\alpha^*, j} \varphi_{\alpha^*, j} \otimes \varphi_{\alpha^*, j}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sqrt{\mu_{\alpha^*, j}} \varphi_{\alpha^*, j} \otimes \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \sqrt{\mu_{\alpha^*, j}} \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \otimes \varphi_{\alpha^*, j}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a positive and decreasing sequence, $\{\phi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\varphi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are two orthonormal sets of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) = \text{Ker}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,\dagger}) = \{0\}$. Under this assumption, $\{\phi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\varphi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are two orthonormal bases of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$. In other cases, similar results can be obtained by following the same proof procedure as outlined in our paper, only more tedious. We additionally assume that the sequence $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ is summable.

Assumption 1 (regularity condition of slope function). *The slope function β_0 in functional linear regression model (1.1) satisfies $\beta_0 = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f_0$ with*

$$f_0 = \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta g_0 \text{ for some } 0 \leq \theta < \infty \text{ and } g_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}). \quad (3.2)$$

According to the isometric isomorphism property of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, Assumption 1 implies that $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for whatever $0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2$. Furthermore, denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2}$ the inverse operator of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, Assumption 1 implies that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} \beta_0$ belongs to the range space of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta$ expressed as

$$\text{ran} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta =: \left\{ f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}) : \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\langle f, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2}{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\theta}} < \infty \right\},$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j})\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1). Then there holds $\text{ran} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta_1} \subseteq \text{ran} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta_2}$ as $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2$. The regularity of functions in $\text{ran} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta$ is measured by the decay rate of its expansion coefficients in terms of $\{\phi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$. Condition (3.2) means that $\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} \beta_0, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2$ decays faster than the 2θ -th power of the eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} . Larger parameter θ will result in faster decay rates, and thus indicate higher regularity of β_0 . We will discuss Assumption 1 further in Section 4.

We impose the following assumption on random noise.

Assumption 2 (noise condition). *The random noise ϵ in the functional linear regression model (1.1) is independent of X satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2] \leq \sigma^2$.*

We also need to impose the following assumption on the algorithm setting.

Assumption 3 (sampling scheme). *The discrete sample points $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^{m+1}$ in algorithms (1.4) and (1.5) satisfy $r_1 < \dots < r_{m+1}$, $r_1 = 0$ and $r_{m+1} = 1$ for some integer $m \geq 1$, and there exists a constant C_d such that $r_{k+1} - r_k \leq \frac{C_d}{m}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq m$.*

Assumption 3 guarantees our sampling scheme is not far from equally-spaced sampling and accommodates both random and fixed sampling schemes. A notable example of this assumption is that: suppose the sample points are generated randomly from a distribution with the density function $\omega : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\min_{s \in [0,1]} \omega(s) > 0$, then Assumption 3 is satisfied with high probability (see, for instance, [33]).

The different theoretical upper bounds for the estimation error (1.6) in our paper are based on the following two different regularity conditions of the functional covariate X , respectively.

Assumption 4 (regularity condition of functional covariate I). *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$, such that for any $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\langle X, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right] \leq \rho \left[\mathbb{E} \langle X, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^2] \leq \kappa^2 \quad (3.4)$$

Condition (3.3) has been introduced in [6, 35] showing that the linear functionals of X have bounded kurtosis. In particular, one can verify that condition (3.3) is satisfied with $\rho = 3$ when X is a Gaussian random variable in $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$.

Assumption 5 (regularity condition of functional covariate II). *X is a centered Gaussian random variable in $\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying condition (3.4) with $\kappa > 0$.*

As stated before, Assumption 5 is covered by Assumption 4, thus an enhanced version. One could relax Assumption 5 to the case that X is a sub-Gaussian random variable without essentially changing the proof in this paper. Our proof only requires that the linear functionals of X have bounded arbitrary-order moments.

3.2 Mini-max Lower Bounds

Assumption 1 and 2 are sufficient to establish mini-max lower bounds for the estimation error. However, it is also necessary to assume that the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} (and $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*,\dagger}$) satisfy a polynomial decay condition. To this end, for two positive sequences $\{a_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{b_j\}_{j \geq 1}$, we write $a_j \lesssim b_j$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of j such that $a_j \leq cb_j, \forall j \geq 1$. Additionally, we write $a_j \asymp b_j$ if and only if $a_j \lesssim b_j$ and $b_j \lesssim a_j$. For convenience, we write $\beta_0 \in \text{ran} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta \right\}$ in the scenarios where β_0 satisfies regularity condition (3.2).

Theorem 1 (mini-max lower bound). *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta < \infty$, Assumption 2 is satisfied with $\sigma > 0$ and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \asymp j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Then there holds*

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\beta}_{\tilde{S}}} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \hat{\beta}_{\tilde{S}} - \beta_0 \right\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \geq \gamma N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right\} = 1, \quad (3.5)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\beta_0 \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying $\beta_0 \in \text{ran} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta$ and the infimum is taken over all possible predictors $\hat{\beta}_{\tilde{S}} \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ based on the fully observed sample set $\tilde{S} = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ consisting of N independent copies of (X, Y) .

3.3 Upper Bounds

We next consider the upper bounds of estimation errors and show that the rate of lower bound established in Theorem 1 can be achieved by the spectral regularization estimator $\bar{\beta}_{\tilde{S}, \alpha^*, \lambda}$ in (1.5).

Under Assumption 1, 2, 3 and 4 and a polynomial decay condition of the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$, we can give the following theorem which provides the upper bound for the convergence rate of estimation error (1.6). To this end, we denote by $o(a_j)$ a little-o sequence of $\{a_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ as $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} o(a_j)/a_j = 0$.

Theorem 2 (upper bound I). *Let $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ be a filter function satisfying Definition 2 with qualification $\nu_\Psi \geq 1$. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$, Assumption 2, 3 and 4 are satisfied and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*, j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*, j} \lesssim j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Then there holds*

$$\lim_{\Gamma \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \Gamma N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right\} = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

provided that $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $m \geq N^{\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}}$ and $M \leq o\left(\min\left\{N^{\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}, N^{\frac{1-p+2\theta}{2(1+2\theta+p)}}\right\}\right)$,

where the supremum is taken over all $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying $\beta_0 \in \text{ran} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta$ with $0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2$.

Under Assumption 5, an enhanced version of Assumption 4, and the other assumptions of Theorem 2, we can establish the following strong upper bound in expectation for the estimation error (1.6).

Theorem 3 (upper bound II). *Let $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ be a filter function satisfying Definition 2 with qualification $\nu_\Psi \geq 1$. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$, Assumption 2, 3 and 5 are satisfied and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*, j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*, j} \lesssim j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Then there holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \right] \lesssim N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}, \quad (3.7)$$

provided that $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $1/m \leq o\left(N^{-\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}} \log^{-\frac{2}{2\alpha^*-1}} N\right)$ and $M \leq o\left(N^{\frac{1+2\theta-p}{1+2\theta+p}} \log^{-1} N\right)$.

4 Discussions and Comparisons

In this section, we will first discuss Assumption 1, and then compare our analysis with some related results.

4.1 Discussions on Assumption 1

For any two bounded self-adjoint operators A_1 and A_2 on $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, we write $A_1 \preceq A_2$, if $A_2 - A_1$ is nonnegative, and $A_1 \succeq A_2$, if $A_1 - A_2$ is nonnegative. Suppose that β_0 satisfies Assumption 1 with $0 \leq \theta < \infty$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \preceq \delta_1 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{r_1}$ for some $\delta_1 > 0$ and $r_1 \geq 0$. Then according to Theorem 3 in [9], we have $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta = \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}\right)^\theta \preceq \delta_1^\theta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{(1+r_1)\theta}$, and thus there exists $g_0^* \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, such that $\beta_0 = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{(1+r_1)\theta}(g_0^*)$. In reverse, suppose that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \succeq \delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{r_2}$ and $\beta_0 = \delta_2^\tau \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{(1+r_2)\tau}(g_0^*)$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$, $r_2 \geq 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$. Then also from Theorem 3 in [9], we have $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\tau = \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}\right)^\tau \succeq \delta_2^\tau \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{(1+r_2)\tau}$, and thus there exists $g_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ such that β_0 satisfies Assumption 1 with $\theta = \tau$.

Our further discussion on Assumption 1 relies on the interpolation space (or power space). Following from the singular value decomposition theorem, the compact and symmetric operator $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}$ can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}} = \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda_{\alpha^*, j} e_{\alpha^*, j} \otimes e_{\alpha^*, j},$$

where $\{\lambda_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{e_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions.

We define the interpolation space (or power space) $[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^r$ for any $0 \leq r \leq 1$ as

$$[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^r := \text{Ran} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{r/2} \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j \lambda_{\alpha^*,j}^{r/2} e_{\alpha^*,j} \mid \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

One can verify that for any $0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq 1$, the embedding $[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^{r_2} \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^{r_1}$ exists and is compact. Noting that $\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ is dense in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ and recalling the isometric isomorphic property of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, we have $[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^0 = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ and $[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^1 = \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$. Besides, Theorem 4.6 of [29] shows that for any $0 < r < 1$,

$$[\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^r = \left(\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T}) \right)_{r,2} = \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*r,2}(\mathcal{T}).$$

Then Combined with the previous discussion, we can draw the conclusions:

1. Suppose that β_0 satisfies Assumption 1 with $0 \leq \theta < \infty$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \preceq \delta_1 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{r_1}$ for some $\delta_1 > 0$ and $r_1 \geq 0$. Then we have $\beta_0 \in [\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^{(1+r_1)\theta} = \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*(1+r_1)\theta,2}(\mathcal{T})$.
2. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}} \succeq \delta_2 \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{r_2}$ and $\beta_0 \in [\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})]^{(1+r_2)\tau} = \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*(1+r_2)\tau,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\delta_2 > 0$, $r_2 \geq 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$. Then we have Assumption 1 is satisfied with $\theta = \tau$.

4.2 Comparisons with Related Results

There are only a few works studying functional linear regression with discretely observed data, among which the most recent paper [32] is notable. Authors of [32] establish finite sample upper bounds for the prediction error of constrained least squares estimator using the most flexible model which involves functional response, both functional and vector covariates, and discrete sampling. Although our paper only considers the scalar response case, we believe the techniques of our paper can be used to study the functional response case without essential changes. For further comparison, we first give the following proposition which can be derived in the context of our paper by the techniques of [32].

Proposition 1. *Suppose that the slope function $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$, Assumption 2 is satisfied and additionally ϵ is a Gaussian random variable, Assumption 3 and 4 are satisfied, and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \asymp j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. The constrained least squares estimator based on the training sample set S is given by*

$$\tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta} := \underset{\beta \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T}), \|\beta\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}} \leq C_\beta}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \beta(r_k) X_i(r_k) \right)^2 \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $C_\beta > 0$ is a parameter to be chosen. If we take $C_\beta = C \sqrt{\log(N)N^{-1}}$ for some sufficiently large constant C , then the following upper bound holds with probability at least $1 - N^{-4}$:

$$\mathcal{R}(\tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta}) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0) \lesssim \log(N) \left(m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} + N^{-\frac{1}{1+p}} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta}) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0)$ represents the excess prediction risk of $\tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta}$, defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta}) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0) := \mathbb{E} \left[Y - \langle X, \tilde{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,C_\beta} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[Y - \langle X, \beta_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right].$$

According to the well-know equivalence between Tikhonov regularization algorithm and constrained least squares algorithm (see, e.g., [18]), one can verify that the algorithm (4.1) with parameter $C_\beta > 0$ is equivalent to the algorithm (2.10) with some $\lambda > 0$. The techniques of [32] are not applicable for deriving upper bounds for the estimation error, while the techniques developed by our paper are sufficient to establish upper bounds for the excess prediction risk. Noting that

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{R}(\bar{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda}) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0)] = \mathbb{E} [\langle X, \bar{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda} - \beta_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2] = \left\| \mathcal{L}_C^{1/2} (\bar{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\lambda} - \beta_0) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2,$$

and that

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_C^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^2 = \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_C \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^2 \leq 1,$$

the following corollary can be obtained by using the same arguments as in Theorem 3 with the filter function taken as $\{\Psi_\lambda^{TR} \mid \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$, which is given in Example 1 (Tikhonov regularization).

Corollary 1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, Assumption 2, 3 and 5 are satisfied and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \lesssim j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Then there holds*

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{R}(\bar{\beta}_{S,\alpha^*,\Psi_\lambda^{TR}}) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0)] \lesssim N^{-\frac{1+2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}, \quad (4.3)$$

provided that $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $1/m \leq o\left(N^{-\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}} \log^{-\frac{2}{2\alpha^*-1}} N\right)$ and $M \leq o\left(N^{\frac{1+2\theta-p}{1+2\theta+p}} \log^{-1} N\right)$.

Using the same arguments as in Theorem 1, we can establish the following lower bound for the excess prediction risk.

Corollary 2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, Assumption 2 is satisfied and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \asymp j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Then there holds*

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\beta}_S} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{R}(\hat{\beta}_S) - \mathcal{R}(\beta_0) \geq \gamma N^{-\frac{1+2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right\} = 1, \quad (4.4)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying $\beta_0 \in \text{ran} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta$ and the infimum is taken over all possible predictors $\hat{\beta}_S \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}(\mathcal{T})$ based on the fully observed sample set $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$.

The upper bound of (4.3) attains the rate of lower bound given by (4.4) and is thus optimal. Proposition 1 and Corollary 1 are compared as follows. First, (4.3) in Corollary 2 establishes upper bounds for distributed estimators under the most common noise assumption that the noise has zero mean and bounded variance, while (4.2) in Proposition 1 establishes upper bounds for non-distributed estimators with an additional, more specific assumption that the noise is a Gaussian random variable. Second, (4.3) in Corollary 1 establishes upper

bounds under various regularity conditions of β_0 characterized by Assumption 1, while (4.2) in Proposition 1 only provides upper bounds under condition $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ which corresponds to Assumption 1 with $\theta = 0$. Third, under the condition $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}(\mathcal{T})$, the upper bound of (4.2) in Proposition 1 achieves the optimal convergence rates up to a logarithmic factor with the requirement that $m \geq N^{\frac{2}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+p)}}$, while the upper bound of (4.3) in Corollary 1 achieves the optimal convergence rates with a slightly higher requirement that $1/m \leq o\left(N^{-\frac{2}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+p)}} \log^{-\frac{2}{2\alpha^*-1}} N\right)$.

5 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we first derive the upper bounds presented in Theorem 2 and 3. Then we establish the mini-max lower bound in Theorem 1.

5.1 Deriving Upper Bounds

For any $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$, define the event

$$\mathcal{U}_j = \left\{ \mathbf{x}_j : \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \geq 1/2 \right\},$$

and denote its complement by \mathcal{U}_j^c . Let $\mathcal{U} = \cup_{j=1}^M \mathcal{U}_j$ be the union of the above events. Then the complement of \mathcal{U} is given by $\mathcal{U}^c = \cap_{j=1}^M \mathcal{U}_j^c$. Hereafter, let $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}}$ denote the indicator function of the event \mathcal{E} and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{E}}]$. We first give the following estimation

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j})^{-1} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} \right\| \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_j^c} \\ &= \left\| \left(\mathcal{I} - (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right)^{-1} \right\| \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_j^c} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_j}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^k \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_j^c} \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} = 2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where inequality (*) follows from expanding the inverse operator in Neumann series.

The following lemma provides an upper bound for the expectation of the estimation error $\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2$ on the event \mathcal{U}^c .

Lemma 1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied. Then for any partition number $M \geq 1$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] + \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where $f_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is given by Assumption 1.

Proof. Recall that $\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \bar{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ with $\bar{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$. Then under Assumption 1 and following from the isometric isomorphism property (2.7), we write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right].$$

When $M \geq 2$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M (\hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{j \neq k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0, \hat{f}_{S_k, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] \mathbb{P}(\cap_{j=2}^M \mathcal{U}_j^c) \\
&\quad + \frac{M(M-1)}{M^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0, \hat{f}_{S_2, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_2^c} \right] \mathbb{P}(\cap_{j=3}^M \mathcal{U}_j^c) \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] + \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (i) follows from the binomial expansion, equality (ii) uses the fact that $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_2^c} \cdots \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_M^c}$ and that for $1 \leq j \neq k \leq M$, $(\hat{f}_{S_j, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_j^c}$ is independent of $(\hat{f}_{S_k, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_k^c}$, and inequality (iii) is from

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0, \hat{f}_{S_2, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_2^c} \right] = \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2.$$

When $M = 1$, (5.2) is obvious.

We have completed the proof of Lemma 1. \square

In the rest part of the proof, our main task is to estimate the two terms on the right hand side of (5.2). For simplicity of notations, we denote

$$n := |S_1| = \frac{N}{M} \quad \text{and} \quad \{(X_{1,i}(r_1), \dots, X_{1,i}(r_{m+1}), Y_{1,i})\}_{i=1}^n := S_1. \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore, we write

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}^*(a) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we define $\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) := \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_{1,i}(r_k)$. Then for the first term on the right hand side of (5.2), recalling the expressions of $\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda}$ and

using the triangular inequality, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] = \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} \mathbf{y}_1 - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left(\langle X_{1,i}, \beta_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \epsilon_{1,i} \right) - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \leq \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right], \tag{5.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\epsilon_{1,i} := Y_{1,i} - \langle X_{1,i}, \beta_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) &:= \left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2; \\
\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) &:= \left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2; \\
\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) &:= \left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2; \\
\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) &:= \left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2
\end{aligned}$$

While for the second term on the right hand side of (5.2), noting that ϵ is a zero-mean random variable independent of X and that the event \mathcal{Q}_1 is only related to \mathbf{x}_1 , using the triangular inequality, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left(\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \epsilon_{1,i} \right) - f_0 \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&= \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right], \tag{5.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where terms $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ are defined by (5.4) and inequality (\dagger) uses Jensen's inequality.

We next provide upper bounds for the terms $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)]$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}]$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}]$ by proving the following lemma. To this end, define the effective dimension with respect to α^* as

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}}. \quad (5.6)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are positive eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} (with geometric multiplicities) arranged in decreasing order. The effective dimension is widely used in the convergence analysis of kernel ridge regression (see, [7, 13, 20, 38]).

Lemma 2. *Let $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ be a filter function satisfying Definition 2 with qualification $\nu_\Psi \geq 1$. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$ and $g_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, Assumptions 2 is satisfied with $\sigma > 0$, 3 with $C_d > 0$ and 4 is satisfied with $\rho, \kappa > 0$. Then for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, there holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)] \leq 2\rho\kappa^4 E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^\theta \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}] \leq F_\theta^2 \lambda^{2\theta} \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{2\theta}, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)] \leq \kappa^2 \sigma^2 E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}, \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}] \leq 2E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda)}{N}, \quad (5.10)$$

where ρ_{α^*} is a constant given by (2.9), $C_{\alpha^*} = C_{\alpha^*} C_d^{\alpha-1/2}$ is a constant depending on α^* defined by Lemma 10, C_1 and C_2 are constants given by Lemma 8.

Proof. We begin with the first inequality (5.7). Recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

While for the term $\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|^2$, noting that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}$ is a finite-rank non-negative operator (with rank at most $n = |S_1|$), we write

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \otimes \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j},$$

where $\{\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a non-negative and decreasing sequence in which at most n numbers are positive and $\{\hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$. As $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ is a filter function satisfying Definition 2, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} f \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle f, \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \Psi_\lambda^2(\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}) (\lambda + \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j})^2 \right\} \tag{5.11} \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} E^2 \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^\infty \langle f, \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} = E^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (\dagger) is from Definition 2.

Then using the triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)] \\
&\leq 2E^2 \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2E^2 \lambda^{-2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\| f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} 2E^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^\theta \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{-2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (\dagger) follows from Assumption 1 and (2.9).

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, recalling that $\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) = \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_{1,i}(r_k)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \left| \langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \left| \left\langle \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k) X_{1,i}(r_k) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, f \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right| \right\} \tag{5.12} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \left| \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f(r_k) X_{1,i}(r_k) - \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f(t) X_{1,i}(t) dt \right| \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} C_1 C_{\alpha^*} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (i) follows from the fact that $\langle \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}(\cdot, r_k), f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2}} f(r_k) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f(r_k)$, inequality (ii) uses Assumption 3, Lemma 10 and that for any $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ satisfying $\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} = 1$, there holds

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f(\cdot) X_{1,i}(\cdot) \right\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}} \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} C_1 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} f \right\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} C_1 \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}} = C_1 \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}},$$

where inequality (i) follows from (5.44) in Lemma 8 and equality (ii) uses (2.7).

And then for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} &\leq \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + C_2 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} C_1 C_{\alpha^*} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}} + C_2 \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*}) \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where inequalities (i) and (iii) follow from (5.44) in Lemma 8, inequality (ii) uses (2.7).

Combining the above estimates, we write

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \leq 2E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^\theta \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^4 \right].$$

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^4 \right] &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right]^2 \\ &= \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \rho \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &= \rho \left[\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^2 = \rho \left[\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^2 \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} \rho \left[\mathbb{E} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \right]^2 \stackrel{(v)}{\leq} \rho \kappa^4, \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1) and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2}$ denotes the inverse operator of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, equality (i) is from (2.7), inequality (ii) uses Hölder inequality, inequality (iii) follows from (3.3) in Assumption 4, equality (iv) is also from (2.7) and inequality (v) is due to (3.4) in Assumption 4.

Therefore, we write

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}] \leq 2\rho\kappa^4 E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^\theta \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1},$$

This completes the proof of inequality (5.7).

We next turn to prove the second inequality (5.8). Recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and noting that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1)$, we write

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \langle \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} f_0 - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{I} \right) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality $(*)$ follows from Assumption 1.

While for the term $\left\| \left(\Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{I} \right) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}$, if we write

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \otimes \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}$$

same as in (5.11), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left(\Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{I} \right) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\Psi_\lambda (\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}) \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} - 1 \right)^2 \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j}^{2\theta} \left\langle f, \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \\
&\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} 2 \sup_{\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}=1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} F_\theta^2 \lambda^{2\theta} \left\langle f, \hat{\phi}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} = F_\theta^2 \lambda^{2\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (\dagger) follows from Definition 2 and the fact that on the event \mathcal{Q}_1^c (recalling the expression of the event \mathcal{Q}_1^c), for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and any integer $j \geq 1$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, j} &\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}\| \leq \|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\| + \|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\| \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}\| + \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \\
&\leq \rho_{\alpha^*} + \frac{\lambda + \rho_{\alpha^*}}{2} \leq \frac{3\rho_{\alpha^*}}{2} + \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_2 (\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c}] \leq F_\theta^2 \lambda^{2\theta} \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \lambda^{2\theta},$$

We have completed the proof of inequality (5.8).

We next prove the third inequality (5.9). Recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_3 (S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and that $n = N/M$, noting that ϵ is a mean-zero random variable independent of X , we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_3 (S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \left(\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_{1,i}^2] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sigma^2 \lambda^{-2} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sigma^2 E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathscr{W}_{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \right] \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \kappa^2 \sigma^2 E^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} \frac{M}{N},$$

where inequality (i) is due to Assumption (2), inequality (ii) follows from (5.11) and (5.12), inequality (iii) uses (3.4) in Assumption 4.

We have obtained the inequality (5.9).

Finally, we prove the fourth inequality (5.10). Recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and that $n = N/M$, also noting that ϵ is a mean-zero random variable independent of X , we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c} \right] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{1,i}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{-1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\quad \times \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c} \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &= 2E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &= 2E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*, j}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j}} = 2E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda)}{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1), $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda)$ is the effective dimension given by (5.6), inequality (i) is due to Assumption 2, inequality (ii) uses (5.11) and the fact that following from (5.1), there holds

$$\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{-1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c}}^2 = \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{-1} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{1/2} \right\|_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathscr{U}_1^c}}^2 \leq 2$$

We have gotten inequality (5.10). The proof of Lemma 2 is then completed. \square

The following lemma estimates the probability of event \mathscr{U}_1 . Recall that \mathscr{U}_1 is defined as

$$\mathscr{U}_1 = \left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 : \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \geq 1/2 \right\}.$$

Lemma 3. *Suppose that Assumption 4 is satisfied. Then for any $\lambda > 0$, there holds*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{U}_1) \leq c_3 \left(\lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda)}{N} \right), \quad (5.15)$$

where c_3 is a constant that will be specified in the proof.

Proof. Recalling the notation (5.3), using the triangular inequality, we write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^2 \right]$$

$$\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{D}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)\right], \quad (5.16)$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) &:= \left\| (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|; \\ \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) &:= \left\| (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

For the term $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)\right]$, recalling that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1),$$

and using the triangular inequality, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)\right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) (\lambda\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \lambda^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\right] \\ &\leq \lambda^{-2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\right] \\ &\leq \lambda^{-2} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \left(\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\right] \\ &\quad + \lambda^{-2} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \left(\mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2\right] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \lambda^{-2} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 + \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (ii) uses the relationship (2.1), inequality (iii) is due to (2.2) and inequality (iii) follows from (2.3).

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have estimated $\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ in (5.12) as

$$\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \leq C_1 C_{\alpha^*} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}},$$

and we can estimate the terms $\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ and $\left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ as

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} C_2 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} C_2 \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} C_2^2 \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} &\leq \left\| \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &\leq \left(C_2 + C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \right) \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}} \leq (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*}) \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where inequalities (i) and (iii) follow from (5.44) in Lemma 8, equality (i) uses (2.7).

Therefore we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] &\leq 4C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*,2}}^4 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 4\rho\kappa^4 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

where inequality (*) follows from (5.13).

For the term $\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)]$, noting that for any $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right] = 0,$$

and using the relationship (2.1), we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \phi_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_k} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \rho \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &= \rho \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_k} \langle \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \phi_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \langle \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \phi_{\alpha^*,k}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \\ &= \rho \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}} \frac{\mu_k}{\lambda + \mu_k} = \rho \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j})\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1), inequality (i) is from the fact that for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, $L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}$ is a zero-mean random variable, inequality (ii) uses Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and inequality (iii) applies (3.3) in Assumption 4.

Therefore, we write

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \leq \rho \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda)}{n}. \quad (5.18)$$

Recalling that $n = N/M$ and combining (5.16), (5.17) and (5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] + 2\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_2^2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \\ & \leq 8\rho\kappa^4 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + 2\rho \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda)}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Then using Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}_1) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 : \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \geq 1/2 \right\} \right) \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 32\rho\kappa^4 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + 8\rho \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda)}{N} \leq c_3 \left(\lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M \mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}^2(\lambda)}{N} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we define $c_3 := 32\rho\kappa^4 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 + 8\rho$. That's the desired result. \square

The following lemma provides an estimate of $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda)$ under the polynomial decaying condition of the eigenvalues.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ satisfy $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \lesssim j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$, then*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda) \lesssim \lambda^{-p}, \quad \forall 0 < \lambda \leq 1. \quad (5.20)$$

The proof of Lemma 4 can be found in [16, 17, 20].

We have established all necessary preliminaries to prove Theorem 2. Before proceeding with the proof, we will introduce the notations $o_{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ for the sake of simplicity. For a sequence of random variables $\{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, we write $\xi_j \leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ if

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\xi_k| \geq d) = 0, \quad \forall d > 0.$$

We write $\xi_j \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ if

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(|\xi_j| \geq D) = 0.$$

Additionally, suppose that there exists a positive sequence $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$. Then we write $\xi_j \leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(a_j)$ if $\xi_j/a_j \leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and $\xi_j \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(a_j)$ if $\xi_j/a_j \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Proof of Theorem 2. In the proof, we let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$. We first decompose the estimation error $\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2$ as

$$\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 = \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}} + \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c}. \quad (5.21)$$

For the term $\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}}$, following from (5.15) in Lemma 3 and (5.20) in Lemma 4, we write

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}}] = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_j) = M\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_1) \lesssim M\lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M^2\lambda^{-2p}}{N}.$$

Then using Markov's inequality, we write

$$\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(M\lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M^2\lambda^{-2p}}{N} \right) \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2. \quad (5.22)$$

For the term $\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c}$, following from (5.2), (5.4) and (5.5), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] &\leq \left(2 + \frac{4}{M} \right) \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c}] \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{M} \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c}] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then using (5.7), (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) in Lemma 2 and (5.20) in Lemma 4, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \right] \lesssim \lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \lambda^{-1} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda)}{N} \lesssim \lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{\lambda^{-1-p}}{N}$$

Combining the above estimate with Markov's inequality, we write

$$\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}^c} \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{\lambda^{-1-p}}{N} \right). \quad (5.23)$$

Therefore, combining (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23) yields

$$\left[1 - \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(M\lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M^2\lambda^{-2p}}{N} \right) \right] \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{\lambda^{-1-p}}{N} \right).$$

Then taking $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $m \geq N^{\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}}$ and $M \leq o \left(\min \left\{ N^{\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}, N^{\frac{1-p+2\theta}{2(1+2\theta+p)}} \right\} \right)$, we have

$$M\lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{M^2\lambda^{-2p}}{N} \leq o(1),$$

and

$$\lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{\lambda^{-1-p}}{N} \lesssim N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}},$$

and thus

$$\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{Y}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\Gamma \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \Gamma N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right\} = 0,$$

provided that $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $m \geq N^{\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}}$ and $M \leq o\left(\min\left\{N^{\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}, N^{\frac{1-p+2\theta}{2(1+2\theta+p)}}\right\}\right)$.

We have completed the proof of Theorem 2. \square

We next turn to prove Theorem 3. We first propose the following lemma to bound the expectation of estimation error $\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2$. The proof of this lemma can be obtained by imitating the proof of Lemma 1.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied. Then for any partition number $M \geq 1$, there holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\bar{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - \beta_0\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] + \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2, \quad (5.24)$$

where $f_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$ is given by Assumption 1.

Following from the same arguments of (5.4) and (5.5), we can bound the two terms on the right hand side of (5.24) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] \\ & = \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1} \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] + \frac{4}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{f}_{S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda} - f_0 \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] \\ & = 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

where the terms $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$, $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$, $\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ are defined by (5.4).

We have estimated $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right]$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right]$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_3(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \right]$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1^c} \right]$ in Lemma 2 under Assumption 1, 2, 3 and 4. As previously stated, Assumption 5 is an enhanced version of Assumption 4. Consequently, Lemma 2 also establishes the upper bounds for these terms when Assumption 4 is enhanced to Assumption 5. The following lemma provide upper bounds for the remaining two terms $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1} \right]$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1} \right]$.

Lemma 6. Let $\{\Psi_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ be a filter function satisfying Definition 2 with qualification $\nu_\Psi \geq 1$. Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied with $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$ and $g_0 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{T})$, Assumptions 2 is satisfied with $\sigma > 0$, 3 with $C_d > 0$ and 4 is satisfied with $\kappa > 0$. Then for any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \leq E^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^{2\theta} \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_1) \quad (5.27)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \leq E^2 \sigma^2 \text{trace}^2(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) \lambda^{-1} \frac{M}{N} \mathbb{P}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{U}_1), \quad (5.28)$$

where ρ_{α^*} is a constant given by (2.9) and $\text{trace}(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{\alpha^*, j}$ denotes the trace of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} .

Proof. We start with the first inequality (5.27). Recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1),$$

we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1) \langle \mathcal{S}_{1,i}(\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}, \mathbf{x}_1), f_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - f_0 \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \left(\Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{I} \right) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta(g_0) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{I} \right\|^2 \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^\theta(g_0) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} E^2 \rho_{\alpha^*}^{2\theta} \|g_0\|_{\mathcal{L}^2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_1), \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) uses Assumption 1, inequality (ii) follows from (2.9) and (5.11).

This completes the proof of inequality (5.27).

For the second inequality (5.28), recalling the expression of $\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda)$ and noting that ϵ is a mean-zero random variable independent of X , we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \epsilon_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_{1,i}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sigma^2 \lambda^{-2} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1})^{1/2} \right\|^2 \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} E^2 \sigma^2 \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^2 \mathbb{P}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{U}_1),$$

where inequality (i) is due to Assumption 2, inequality (ii) follows from (5.11) and inequality (iii) uses Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^4 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 3 \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right] \\ &= 3 \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j_2=1}^{\infty} \mu_{\alpha^*,j_1} \mu_{\alpha^*,j_2} = \text{trace}^2(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1), inequality (i) uses Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, inequality (ii) is due to the facts that for any mean-zero Gaussian random variable ω , we have $\mathbb{E}[\omega^4] = 3[\mathbb{E}\omega^2]^2$ and that following from Assumption 5, $\left\{ \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} \right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are mean-zero Gaussian random variables.

Then recalling that $n = N/M$, we write

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{U}_1^c}] \leq E^2 \sigma^2 \text{trace}^2(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) \lambda^{-1} \frac{M}{N} \mathbb{P}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{U}_1).$$

We have gotten (5.28). The proof of Lemma 6 is then finished. \square

Our further estimation of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_1)$ under Assumption 5 relies on the following lemma. Recall that \mathcal{U}_1 is defined as

$$\mathcal{U}_1 = \left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 : \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \geq 1/2 \right\}.$$

Lemma 7. *Suppose that Assumption 5 is satisfied. Then there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_1) &\leq 2 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ \frac{N}{M \mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}, \frac{N}{M \mathcal{N}(\lambda)} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \exp \left(-c_3 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^* + 1}}, \frac{1}{\lambda^{-1} m^{-\alpha^* + 1/2}} \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\lambda)$ is the effective dimension given by (5.6), c_2 and c_3 are universal constants.

Proof. Recalling (5.3) and the expression of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}$, we first write

$$\left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \leq \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}, \alpha^*, \lambda) + \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda),$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) &:= \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|; \\ \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) &:= \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_1) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 : \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*, \mathbf{x}_1} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\| \geq 1/2 \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4\}) + \mathbb{P}(\{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4\}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

For the term $\mathbb{P}(\{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4\})$, we aim to apply Lemma 12 to give an estimation. We define

$$\mathcal{Q}_i := \frac{1}{n} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Then for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Q}_i] = \frac{1}{n} (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right] (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} = 0. \quad (5.31)$$

And using the relationship (2.1), we write

$$\mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}_i \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}. \quad (5.32)$$

For any integer $\ell \geq 2$ and any any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we bound $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{Q}_i\|_{\mathcal{F}}^\ell]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{Q}_i\|_{\mathcal{F}}^\ell \right] \quad (5.33) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\| (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} (L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}) (\lambda \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*})^{-1/2} \right\|_{\mathcal{F}}^{2\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, k}} \left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right)^\ell \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left[\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{k_\ell=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j_1}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, k_1}} \left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j_1}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \cdots \times \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j_\ell}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, k_\ell}} \left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j_\ell}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k_\ell} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right\} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left[\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j_1}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, k_1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j_1}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k_1} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right\}^{\frac{1}{\ell}} \times \cdots \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{j_\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, j_\ell}} \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*, k_\ell}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j_\ell}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k_\ell} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right\}^{\frac{1}{\ell}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1), inequality (i) is from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, inequality (ii) uses Hölder inequality. It remains to estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \left(L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes L_K^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right], \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } \forall 1 \leq j, k < \infty.$$

To this end, we first give the following estimate for the higher-order moment of a Gaussian random variable. Suppose ω is a mean-zero Gaussian random variable. Then for any integer $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\omega^{4t}] \stackrel{(i)}{=} (4t-1)!! [\mathbb{E}\omega^2]^{2t} \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2^{2t} (2t)! [\mathbb{E}\omega^2]^{2t} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} 2^{4t} (t!)^2 [\mathbb{E}\omega^2]^{2t}, \quad (5.34)$$

where equality (i) is due to the recursive equation that $\mathbb{E}[\omega^k] = (k-1)\mathbb{E}[\omega^2]\mathbb{E}[\omega^{k-2}]$, $\forall k \geq 2$, inequality (ii) follows from the calculation that $(4t-1)!! \leq (4t)!! = 2^{2t}(2t)!$ and inequality (iii) uses the fact that $(2t)! = (2t-1)!!(2t)!! \leq 2^{2t}(t!)^2$ which is from $(2t-1)!! \leq (2t)!!$ and $(2t)!! = 2^t t!$.

When $j \neq k$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^\ell \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^\ell = 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \mu_{\alpha^*, j}^\ell \mu_k^\ell,
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) uses Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and inequality (ii) follows from (5.34) with $t = \ell$ as $\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ and $\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, k} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ are mean-zero Gaussian random variables.

When $j = k$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*, j}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \mu_{\alpha^*, j} \right)^{2\ell} \right] \\
&= 2^{2\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*, j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} - \frac{1}{2} \mu_{\alpha^*, j} \right)^{2\ell} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} 2^{2\ell-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}(\phi_{\alpha^*,j}), \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{2\ell} \right] + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\ell} \right) \\
&= 2^{2\ell-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right] + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\ell} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2^{2\ell-1} \left(2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \right]^{2\ell} + \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\ell} \right) \leq 2^{6\ell} (\ell!)^2 \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\ell},
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) uses Jensen's inequality and inequality (ii) follows from (5.34) with $t = \ell$ as $\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2}$ is a mean-zero Gaussian random variable.

Combining the above two estimates, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j, k < \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} X_{1,i} - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*} \right) \phi_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,k} \right\rangle^{2\ell} \right] \leq 2^{6\ell} (\ell!)^2 \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^\ell \mu_k^\ell. \quad (5.35)$$

Then combining (5.33) and (5.35), we have for any $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathcal{Q}_i\|_{\mathcal{F}}^\ell \right] &\leq 2^{2\ell} \ell! \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,j_1}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j_1}} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,k_1}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,k_1}} \dots \sum_{j_\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,j_\ell}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,j_\ell}} \frac{\mu_{\alpha^*,k_\ell}}{\lambda + \mu_{\alpha^*,k_\ell}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= 2^{3\ell} \ell! \frac{\mathcal{N}^\ell(\lambda)}{n^\ell} \leq \frac{\ell!}{2} 2^{3\ell+1} \frac{\mathcal{N}^\ell(\lambda)}{n^\ell}. \quad (5.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $n = N/M$ and that the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{F})$ is a Hilbert space, (5.31) and (5.36) imply that we can apply Lemma 12 with $H = 2 \frac{M\mathcal{N}(\lambda)}{N}$, $b_1^2 = \dots = b_n^2 = 2^7 \frac{M^2\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}{N^2}$, $B_n^2 = b_1^2 + \dots + b_n^2 = 2^7 \frac{M\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}{N}$ and $x = 1/4$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathcal{D}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4\}) &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\leq} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{x}_1 : \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}_i \right\|_{\mathcal{F}} \geq 1/4 \right\} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ \frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}, \frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}(\lambda)} \right\} \right), \quad (5.37)
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote $c_2 := 1/4^2 (2^8 + 1.62)$, inequality (\dagger) follows from (5.32).

For the term $\mathbb{P}(\{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4\})$, we will apply Lemma 11 to give a result. Following from the same argument of the proof of (5.17), we have

$$\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \leq 2C_1 C_{\alpha^*} (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*}) \lambda^{-1} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha^*,2}}.$$

Then for any integer $\ell \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \right|^\ell \right] \\
&\leq 2^{\ell-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{D}_1^\ell(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \right] + 2^{\ell-1} [\mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)]^\ell \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} 2^\ell \left[\mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_1^{4\ell}(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} 2^\ell C_1^\ell C_{\alpha^*}^\ell (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^\ell \lambda^{-\ell} m^{-\alpha^*\ell+1/2} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha^*,2}}^{4\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (5.38)
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) is from Hölder inequality, inequality (ii) uses Jensen's inequality.

While for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathscr{W}_{\alpha^*,2}}^{4\ell} \right] &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right)^{2\ell} \right] \quad (5.39) \\
&= \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_{2\ell}=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \cdots \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_{2\ell}} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right] \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_{2\ell}=1}^{\infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{2\ell}} \cdots \left[\mathbb{E} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_{2\ell}} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^{4\ell} \right]^{\frac{1}{2\ell}} \\
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \sum_{j_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{j_{2\ell}=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_1} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right] \cdots \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j_{2\ell}} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right] \\
&= 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right) \right]^{2\ell} = 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i} \right\|_{\mathscr{L}^2}^2 \right]^{2\ell} \\
&\stackrel{(iv)}{=} 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \left[\mathbb{E} \|X_{1,i}\|_{\mathscr{W}_{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \right]^{2\ell} \stackrel{(v)}{\leq} 2^{4\ell} (\ell!)^2 \kappa^{4\ell},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\{(\mu_{\alpha^*,j}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j})\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1) and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2}$ denotes the inverse operator of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2}$, equality (i) is from (2.7), inequality (ii) uses Hölder inequality, inequality (iii) follows from (5.34) with $t = \ell$ as $\left\{ \left\langle \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{-1/2} X_{1,i}, \phi_{\alpha^*,j} \right\rangle_{\mathscr{L}^2} \right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are mean-zero Gaussian random variables, equality (iv) is also from (2.7) and inequality (v) is due to Assumption 5.

Combining (5.38) and (5.39) yields that for any integer $\ell \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) - \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)] \right|^\ell \right] \leq \frac{\ell!}{2} 2^{2\ell+1} \kappa^\ell C_1^\ell C_{\alpha^*}^\ell (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^\ell \lambda^{-\ell} m^{-\alpha^* \ell + \ell/2}.$$

Noting $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda)$ is a non-negative random variable, the above estimation implies that we can apply Lemma 11 with $b^2 = 2^5 \kappa^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2 \lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}$, $H = 4\kappa C_1 C_{\alpha^*} (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*}) \lambda^{-1} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2}$ and $x = 1/4$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \lambda) \geq 1/4) &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \frac{x^2}{2b^2}, \frac{2x}{H} \right\} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-c_3 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}}, \frac{1}{\lambda^{-1} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2}} \right\} \right), \quad (5.40)
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $c_3 := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2^{11} \kappa^2 C_1^2 C_{\alpha^*}^2 (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})^2}, \frac{1}{2^4 \kappa C_1 C_{\alpha^*} (C_2^2 + C_1 C_{\alpha^*})} \right\}$.

Finally, combining (5.30), (5.37) and (5.40) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{A}_1) \leq 2 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ \frac{N}{M \mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}, \frac{N}{M \mathcal{N}(\lambda)} \right\} \right) + 2 \exp \left(-c_3 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^{-2} m^{-2\alpha^*+1}}, \frac{1}{\lambda^{-1} m^{-\alpha^*+1/2}} \right\} \right).$$

We have gotten (5.29), and the proof of Lemma 7 is then completed. \square

Now we are in the position to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $0 \leq \theta \leq \nu_\Psi$ and take $\lambda = N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\theta+p}}$, $1/m \leq o\left(N^{-\frac{2+2\theta}{(2\alpha^*-1)(1+2\theta+p)}} \log^{-\frac{2}{2\alpha^*-1}} N\right)$ and $M \leq o\left(N^{\frac{1+2\theta-p}{1+2\theta+p}} \log^{-1} N\right)$. Following from (5.20) in Lemma 4, we have

$$\frac{M\mathcal{N}(\lambda)}{N} \lesssim \frac{M\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}{N} \leq o(\log^{-1} N),$$

and

$$\lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} \leq \lambda^{-1}m^{-\alpha^*+1/2} \leq o(\log^{-1} N).$$

Then following from (5.29) in Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-2\theta}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_1) &\leq 2\lambda^{-2\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{c_2}{2} \min\left\{\frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}, \frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}(\lambda)}\right\}\right) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda^{-2\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{c_3}{2} \min\left\{\lambda^2m^{2\alpha^*-1}, \lambda m^{\alpha^*-1/2}\right\}\right) \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-1}\mathbb{P}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{Q}_1) &\leq \sqrt{2}\lambda^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{c_2}{2} \min\left\{\frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}^2(\lambda)}, \frac{N}{M\mathcal{N}(\lambda)}\right\}\right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{2}\lambda^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{c_3}{2} \min\left\{\lambda^2m^{2\alpha^*-1}, \lambda m^{\alpha^*-1/2}\right\}\right) \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

These together with (5.27) and (5.28) in Lemma 6 yield

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1}\right] \lesssim \lambda^{2\theta} \quad (5.41)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{F}_4(S_1, \alpha^*, \Psi_\lambda) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}_1}\right] \lesssim \frac{M}{N}, \quad (5.42)$$

Recalling that $n = N/M$, using (5.20) in Lemma 4, Combining (5.24), (5.25), (5.26), (5.41) and (5.42) with (5.7), (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) in Lemma 2, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\hat{\beta}_{S, \alpha^*, \lambda} - \beta_0\right\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \lambda^{-1}\frac{\mathcal{N}(\lambda)}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \lesssim \lambda^{2\theta} + \lambda^{-2}m^{-2\alpha^*+1} + \frac{\lambda^{-1-p}}{N} \lesssim N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have completed the proof of Theorem 3. \square

5.2 Establishing Lower Rates

In this subsection, we will establish the lower bounds presented in Theorem 1. There is already a standard procedure to establish minimax lower bounds based on Fano's method. We follow the same procedure as in our previous paper [21] to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Recall that $\{\mu_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a positive and decreasing sequence of eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} satisfying $\mu_{\alpha^*,j} \asymp j^{-1/p}$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. That is, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mu_{\alpha^*,j+1} \leq \mu_{\alpha^*,j} \text{ and } cj^{-1/p} \leq \mu_{\alpha^*,j} \leq \frac{1}{c}j^{-1/p}, \quad \forall j \geq 1. \quad (5.43)$$

It is sufficient to consider the case that ϵ is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance σ^2 and independent of X , i.e., $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Then Assumption 2 is satisfied with $\sigma > 0$.

Take $J = \lceil aN^{\frac{p}{1+p+2\theta}} \rceil$, which denotes the smallest integer larger than $aN^{\frac{p}{1+p+2\theta}}$ with some constant $a > 8$ to be specified later. The well-known Varshamov-Gilbert bound (see, e.g., [11]) guarantees that there exists a set $\Lambda = \{\iota^{(1)}, \dots, \iota^{(L)}\} \subset \{-1, 1\}^J$ such that

$$L = |\Lambda| \geq \exp(J/8)$$

and

$$\|\iota - \iota'\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^J |\iota_j - \iota'_j| \geq J/2$$

for any $\iota \neq \iota'$ with $\iota, \iota' \in \Lambda$. Given $0 \leq \theta < +\infty$, define

$$\beta_i = \sum_{j=J+1}^{2J} \frac{1}{\sqrt{J}} \iota_{j-J}^{(i)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{\theta} \phi_{\alpha^*,j} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta}(g_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, L,$$

where $\{\phi_{\alpha^*,j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ are the eigenfunctions given by the singular value decomposition of \mathcal{T}_{α^*} in (3.1), and $g_i = \sum_{j=J+1}^{2J} \frac{1}{\sqrt{J}} \iota_{j-J}^{(i)} \phi_{\alpha^*,j}$ satisfies $\|g_i\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = 1$. Then $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^L$ satisfy Assumption 1 with $0 \leq \theta < \infty$.

For any $1 \leq i_1 \neq i_2 \leq L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_{i_1} - \beta_{i_2}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha^*,2}}^2 &= \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta}(g_{i_1} - g_{i_2}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\alpha^*,2}}^2 \stackrel{(i)}{=} \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta}(g_{i_1} - g_{i_2}) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=J+1}^{2J} \frac{1}{J} \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{2\theta} \left(\iota_{j-J}^{(i_1)} - \iota_{j-J}^{(i_2)} \right)^2 \\ &\geq \mu_{\alpha^*,2J}^{2\theta} \frac{2}{J} \sum_{j=J+1}^{2J} \left| \iota_{j-J}^{(i_1)} - \iota_{j-J}^{(i_2)} \right| \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \mu_{\alpha^*,2J}^{2\theta} \frac{2}{J} \frac{J}{2} \stackrel{(iii)}{\geq} c^{2\theta} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} J^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where equality (i) is due to (2.7), inequalities (ii) and (iii) are from (5.43). For any $1 \leq i \leq L$, denote by $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^L$ the joint probability distributions of (X, Y) with $Y = \langle X, \beta_i \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2} + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Then for $\forall 1 \leq i_1 \neq i_2 \leq L$, the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL-divergence) between P_{i_1} and P_{i_2} can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{kl}(P_{i_1} \| P_{i_2}) &= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} (\beta_{i_1} - \beta_{i_2}) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{C}}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}}^{1/2} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{\theta}(g_{i_1} - g_{i_2}) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\alpha^*}^{1/2+\theta}(g_{i_1} - g_{i_2}) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=J+1}^{2J} \frac{1}{J} \mu_{\alpha^*,j}^{1+2\theta} \left| \iota_{j-J}^{(i_1)} - \iota_{j-J}^{(i_2)} \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \mu_{\alpha^*, J}^{1+2\theta} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \frac{2}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}} J^{-\frac{1+2\theta}{p}},$$

where equality (i) is from (3.1), inequalities (ii) and (iii) are due to (5.43). Recalling that $J = \lceil aN^{\frac{p}{1+p+2\theta}} \rceil$, following from a direct application of Fano's method (see, [11] or Lemma 13 in [21]), the above two estimates imply that there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\hat{\beta}_S} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \hat{\beta}_S - \beta_0 \right\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \frac{c^{2\theta}}{4} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} J^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} \geq \frac{c^{2\theta}}{4} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} a^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+p+2\theta}} \right\} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{\frac{2N}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}} J^{-\frac{1+2\theta}{p}} + \log 2}{\log L} \geq 1 - \frac{\frac{2N}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}} J^{-\frac{1+2\theta}{p}} + \log 2}{J/8} \\ & \geq 1 - a^{-\frac{1+2\theta+p}{p}} \frac{16}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}} N^{1-\frac{p}{1+2\theta+p} \cdot \frac{1+2\theta+p}{p}} - \frac{8 \log 2}{aN^{\frac{p}{1+p+2\theta}}} \\ & = 1 - a^{-\frac{1+2\theta+p}{p}} \frac{16}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}} - \frac{8 \log 2}{a} N^{-\frac{p}{1+p+2\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\beta}_S} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \hat{\beta}_S - \beta_0 \right\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \frac{c^{2\theta}}{4} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} a^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+p+2\theta}} \right\} = 1 - a^{-\frac{1+2\theta+p}{p}} \frac{16}{\sigma^2 c^{1+2\theta}}$$

and then

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\beta}_S} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \hat{\beta}_S - \beta_0 \right\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \frac{c^{2\theta}}{4} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} a^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+p+2\theta}} \right\} = 1.$$

Taking $\gamma = c^{2\theta} 2^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} a^{-\frac{2\theta}{p}} / 4$, we have

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\beta}_S} \sup_{\beta_0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \hat{\beta}_S - \beta_0 \right\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha^*, 2}}^2 \geq \gamma N^{-\frac{2\theta}{1+2\theta+p}} \right\} = 1.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Appendix A. Sobolev Inequalities

The following lemma provides some well-known Sobolev inequalities in the unanchored Sobolev spaces (see, e.g., [12]).

Lemma 8. *Suppose that $\beta, \gamma \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$. Then there exists constant $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\|\beta\gamma\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}} \leq C_1 \|\beta\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}} \|\gamma\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\beta\|_{\mathscr{L}^2} \leq C_2 \|\beta\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}}. \quad (5.44)$$

The following lemma is a direct result of the continuous embedding condition (2.8).

Lemma 9. *Suppose that $\beta \in \mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$. Then there exists a constant $\tilde{C}_\alpha > 0$ only depending on α such that*

$$\sup_{t, t' \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{|\beta(t) - \beta(t')|}{|t - t'|^{\alpha-1/2}} < \tilde{C}_\alpha \|\beta\|_{\mathscr{W}^{\alpha, 2}}. \quad (5.45)$$

The following lemma shows that the Riemann sum of a function $\beta \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$ at the discrete sample points $\{r_k\}_{k=1}^{m+1}$ satisfying Assumption 3 can approximate the integral of β . The proof of this lemma can be found in [32].

Lemma 10. *Suppose that $\beta \in \mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$ and Assumption 3 is satisfied with $C_d > 0$, then there holds*

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{T}} \beta(t) dt - \sum_{k=1}^m (r_{k+1} - r_k) \beta(r_k) \right| \leq C_\alpha \|\beta\|_{\mathcal{W}^{\alpha,2}} m^{-\alpha+1/2}, \quad (5.46)$$

where $C_\alpha := \tilde{C}_\alpha C_d^{\alpha-1/2}$ is a constant depending on α .

Appendix B. Some Technical Lemmas

The following lemma establishes upper bound for deviation probability of a positive random variable with bounded arbitrary-order moment.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that a random variable $V \geq 0$ satisfy the condition*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| V - \mathbb{E}[V] \right|^\ell \right] \leq \frac{\ell!}{2} b^2 H^{\ell-2}, \quad \ell \geq 2.$$

Then for any $x \geq 0$, there holds

$$\mathbb{P}(V \geq x) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ \frac{x^2}{2b^2}, \frac{2x}{H} \right\} \right).$$

Proof. Following the similar argument as in Lemma 3.18 of [11], we get $V - \mathbb{E}[V]$ is $(2b^2, \frac{H}{2})$ -sub-exponential. Combining this with Proposition 3.15 of [11] completes the proof. \square

The following lemma provides upper bound for tail probability of the sum of random variables in a Hilbert space with bounded arbitrary-order moment. The proof of it can be seen in [37].

Lemma 12. *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space endowed with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Suppose a finite sequence of independent random elements $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_i] &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^\ell \right] &\leq \frac{\ell!}{2} b_i^2 H^{\ell-2}, \quad \ell \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B_n^2 = b_1^2 + \dots + b_n^2$. Then for any $x > 0$, there holds

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_n\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq x) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{x^2}{2(B_n^2 + 1.62xH)} \right).$$

Acknowledgments

The work described in this paper is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China [Grants No.12171039] and the Shanghai Science and Technology Program [Project No. 21JC1400600]. The corresponding author is Lei Shi.

References

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. Elsevier, 2003.
- [2] F. Bauer, S. V. Pereverzev, and L. Rosasco. On regularization algorithms in learning theory. *Journal of Complexity*, 23(1):52–72, 2007.
- [3] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [4] G. Blanchard and N. Mücke. Optimal rates for regularization of statistical inverse learning problems. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 18(4):971–1013, 2018.
- [5] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [6] T. T. Cai and M. Yuan. Minimax and adaptive prediction for functional linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(499):1201–1216, 2012.
- [7] A. Caponnetto and E. De Vito. Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 7(3):331–368, 2007.
- [8] K. Chen, P. Delicado, and H. G. Müller. Modelling function-valued stochastic processes, with applications to fertility dynamics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(1):177–196, 2017.
- [9] X. Chen, B. Tang, J. Fan, and X. Guo. Online gradient descent algorithms for functional data learning. *Journal of Complexity*, 70:101635, 2022.
- [10] J. B. Conway. *A Course in Operator Theory*. American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [11] J. Duchi. Lecture notes for statistics 311/electrical engineering 377. https://stanford.edu/class/stats311/Lectures/full_notes.pdf, 2016.
- [12] L. C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [13] S. Fischer and I. Steinwart. Sobolev norm learning rates for regularized least-squares algorithms. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(205):1–38, 2020.
- [14] A. Goldenshluger and S. V. Pereverzev. Adaptive estimation of linear functionals in Hilbert scales from indirect white noise observations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 118(2):169–186, 2000.
- [15] C. Gu and C. Gu. *Smoothing Spline ANOVA Models*. Springer, 2013.
- [16] Z. C. Guo, S. B. Lin, and D. X. Zhou. Learning theory of distributed spectral algorithms. *Inverse Problems*, 33(7):074009, 2017.
- [17] Z. C. Guo and L. Shi. Optimal rates for coefficient-based regularized regression. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 47(3):662–701, 2019.
- [18] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, J. H. Friedman, and J. H. Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer, 2009.

- [19] T. Hsing and R. Eubank. *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with An Introduction to Linear Operators*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- [20] S. B. Lin, X. Guo, and D. X. Zhou. Distributed learning with regularized least squares. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):3202–3232, 2017.
- [21] J. Liu and L. Shi. Statistical optimality of divide and conquer kernel-based functional linear regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(155):1–56, 2024.
- [22] S. Lu, P. Mathé, and S. V. Pereverzev. Balancing principle in supervised learning for a general regularization scheme. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 48(1):123–148, 2020.
- [23] A. Petersen, S. Deoni, and H. G. Müller. Fréchet estimation of time-varying covariance matrices from sparse data, with application to the regional co-evolution of myelination in the developing brain. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13(1):393–419, 2019.
- [24] J. O. Ramsay and B. W. Silverman. *Functional Data Analysis, 2nd ed.* Springer, New York, 2005.
- [25] G. Raskutti, M. Wainwright, and B. Yu. Minimax-optimal rates for sparse additive models over kernel classes via convex programming. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(13):389–427, 2012.
- [26] M. Reimherr, B. Sriperumbudur, and H. B. Kang. Optimal function-on-scalar regression over complex domains. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 17(1):156–197, 2023.
- [27] G. Sarazin, A. Marrel, S. da Veiga, and V. Chabridon. New insights into the feature maps of sobolev kernels: application in global sensitivity analysis. <https://cea.hal.science/cea-04320711>, 2023.
- [28] Y. Sawano. *Theory of Besov Spaces*. Springer, 2018.
- [29] I. Steinwart and C. Scovel. Mercer’s theorem on general domains: On the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constructive Approximation*, 35:363–417, 2012.
- [30] L. Tartar. *An introduction to Sobolev Spaces and Interpolation Spaces*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [31] S. Tavakoli, D. Pigoli, J. A. D. Aston, and J. S. Coleman. A spatial modeling approach for linguistic object data: Analyzing dialect sound variations across great britain. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(527):1081–1096, 2019.
- [32] D. Wang, Z. Zhao, Y. Yu, and R. Willett. Functional linear regression with mixed predictors. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(266):1–94, 2022.
- [33] Y. X. Wang, A. Smola, and R. Tibshirani. The falling factorial basis and its statistical applications. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 730–738. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2014.
- [34] Y. Yao, L. Rosasco, and A. Caponnetto. On early stopping in gradient descent learning. *Constructive Approximation*, 26(2):289–315, 2007.

- [35] M. Yuan and T. T. Cai. A reproducing kernel Hilbert space approach to functional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3412–3444, 2010.
- [36] M. Yuan and D. X. Zhou. Minimax optimal rates of estimation in high dimensional additive models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(6):2564 – 2593, 2016.
- [37] V. V. Yurinskii. Exponential inequalities for sums of random vectors. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 6(4):473–499, 1976.
- [38] Y. Zhang, J. Duchi, and M. Wainwright. Divide and conquer kernel ridge regression: A distributed algorithm with minimax optimal rates. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3299–3340, 2015.