

# MULTI- AND INFINITE-VARIATE INTEGRATION AND $L^2$ -APPROXIMATION ON HILBERT SPACES WITH GAUSSIAN KERNELS

M. GNEWUCH, K. RITTER, AND R. RÜSSMANN

**ABSTRACT.** We study integration and  $L^2$ -approximation in the worst-case setting for deterministic linear algorithms based on function evaluations. The underlying function space is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with a Gaussian kernel of tensor product form. In the infinite-variate case, for both computational problems, we establish matching upper and lower bounds for the polynomial convergence rate of the  $n$ -th minimal error. In the multivariate case, we improve several tractability results for the integration problem. For the proofs, we establish the following transference result together with an explicit construction: Each of the computational problems on a space with a Gaussian kernel is equivalent on the level of algorithms to the same problem on a Hermite space with suitable parameters.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider integration and  $L^2$ -approximation of functions  $f: \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $d$  variables in the cases  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $d = \infty$ , where the underlying measure  $\mu$  is the  $d$ -fold product of the univariate standard normal distribution  $\mu_0$ . The functions  $f$  are assumed to be elements of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space  $H(M)$  with a reproducing kernel  $M$  of tensor product form with domain  $\mathfrak{X} := \mathfrak{X}(M)$ . For  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  the domain is given by  $\mathfrak{X} := \mathbb{R}^d$  (and  $\mu$  is the  $d$ -dimensional standard normal distribution), while for  $d = \infty$  the domain  $\mathfrak{X}$  is a proper subset of the sequence space  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  with  $\mu(\mathfrak{X}) = 1$ . This setting, with  $\mu_0$  as before or with  $\mu_0$  being the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ , is frequently studied in the literature on multivariate or infinite-variate integration and approximation.

Throughout this paper, we use the following notation. We put  $J := \{1, \dots, d\}$  if  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $J := \mathbb{N}$  if  $d = \infty$ , and  $h_\nu$  denotes the univariate Hermite polynomial of degree  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , normalized in  $L^2(\mu_0)$ .

We study two particular kinds of reproducing kernels. Primarily, we are interested in Gaussian kernels

$$L_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \prod_{j \in J} \exp(-\sigma_j^2 \cdot (x_j - y_j)^2)$$

with  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{X}(L_\sigma)$ , which are specified by sequences  $\sigma := (\sigma_j)_{j \in J}$  of shape parameters  $\sigma_j > 0$ . Additionally, we consider Hermite kernels

$$K_\beta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \prod_{j \in J} \left( \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \beta_j^\nu \cdot h_\nu(x_j) \cdot h_\nu(y_j) \right)$$

with  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{X}(K_\beta)$ , which are specified by sequences  $\beta := (\beta_j)_{j \in J}$  of base parameters  $0 < \beta_j < 1$ . See Section 2 for the study of the function spaces  $H(L_\sigma)$  and  $H(K_\beta)$  and, in the case  $d = \infty$ , of the corresponding domains  $\mathfrak{X}(L_\sigma)$  and  $\mathfrak{X}(K_\beta)$ . Here we only mention the following monotonicity properties: If  $\sigma \leq \sigma'$ , then  $\mathfrak{X}(L_{\sigma'}) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(L_\sigma)$  and the restriction  $f \mapsto f|_{\mathfrak{X}(L_{\sigma'})}$  defines a continuous mapping from  $H(L_\sigma)$  to  $H(L_{\sigma'})$ ; analogously, if  $\beta \leq \beta'$ , then  $\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta'}) \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(K_\beta)$  and the restriction  $f \mapsto f|_{\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta'})}$  defines a continuous mapping from  $H(K_\beta)$  to  $H(K_{\beta'})$ .

For both kernels,  $M := L_\sigma$  and  $M := K_\beta$ , and for both problems, integration and  $L^2$ -approximation, we analyze deterministic linear algorithms that are based on a fixed number of function evaluations in the worst-case setting on the unit ball in  $H(M)$ . Concerning the definition of cost we distinguish two cases: For finite  $d$  the cost per function evaluation at any point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$  is one, the most natural choice, so that the worst-case cost of an algorithm is equal to the number of function evaluations. For  $d = \infty$  it is widely accepted that the analogous definition of cost is too generous and non-predictive for computational practice. Therefore we employ the unrestricted subspace sampling model, which has been introduced in Kuo et al. (2010) to define the worst-case cost of algorithms for computational problems on spaces of functions of infinitely many variables. Accordingly, function evaluation is only permitted at points  $\mathbf{x} := (x_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathfrak{X}$  with finitely many non-zero components  $x_j$ , and  $\text{cost}(\mathbf{x})$ , the cost for the evaluation at  $\mathbf{x}$ , depends non-decreasingly on the number of non-zero components. The worst-case setting is presented in detail in Section 3.

A key quantity in the analysis is the  $n$ -th minimal error  $e_n(M)$  for integration and for  $L^2$ -approximation, which is, roughly speaking, the smallest worst-case error on the unit ball in  $H(M)$  that can be achieved by any algorithm with worst-case cost at most  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In this framework integration and  $L^2$ -approximation on  $H(L_\sigma)$  with  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  are studied in Fasshauer et al. (2012), Kuo and Woźniakowski (2012), Kuo et al. (2017), Karvonen and Särkkä (2019), and Karvonen et al. (2021), see also Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018). On  $H(K_\beta)$  with  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  these problems are studied in Irrgeher et al. (2015) and in Irrgeher et al. (2016b), see also Irrgeher et al. (2016a). Actually, the kernels  $K_\beta$ , which define spaces  $H(K_\beta)$  of functions of infinite smoothness, are only particular elements of the broader class of Hermite kernels, which may also define spaces of functions of finite smoothness. Here we refer to Irrgeher and Leobacher (2015), Dick et al. (2018), and Leobacher et al. (2023) for results on integration and  $L^2$ -approximation with  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For  $d = \infty$  we are not aware of results on integration and  $L^2$ -approximation on spaces with Gaussian kernels, while spaces with Hermite kernels, including the kernels  $K_\beta$ , have been studied for both problems in Gnewuch et al. (2024).

Numerous models in probability theory are ultimately based on a sequence of independent random variables, and in every such model expectations may be represented as integrals with respect to product measures. This motivates the study of integration of functions  $f$  defined on the sequence space  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  or subspaces thereof. Let us mention, for instance, the Lévy-Ciesielski (or Brownian bridge) representation of Brownian motion, which is based on an independent sequence of standard normally distributed random variables and thus leads to the measure  $\mu$  that is studied in this paper. In this setting, the results derived in this paper may potentially be used to compute expectations of smooth functionals of Brownian motion.

In this paper we first of all establish a transference result for integration and a transference result for  $L^2$ -approximation, which yield for each of these problems and suitably related spaces  $H(L_\sigma)$  and  $H(K_\beta)$  the equivalence on the level of algorithms. The transference results only require that

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^2 < \infty,$$

which is trivially satisfied in the case  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the proofs we employ a particular isometric isomorphism between Hilbert spaces with Gaussian and with Hermite kernels, see Theorem 2.7, which is due to Gnewuch et al. (2022).

For integration with any  $d$  the transference result reads as follows. Assume that the shape and base parameters are related by

$$1 - \beta_j = \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma_j^2}$$

for every  $j \in J$ . Moreover, let  $e_0(M)$  denote the norm of the integration functional on  $H(M)$ . Then for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a bijection  $A \mapsto B$  on the set of all  $n$ -point quadrature formulas such that

$$e(A, L_\sigma) = e_0(L_\sigma) \cdot e(B, K_\beta)$$

for the worst-case errors  $e(A, L_\sigma)$  and  $e(B, K_\beta)$  of  $A$  on the unit ball in  $H(L_\sigma)$  and of  $B$  on the unit ball in  $H(K_\beta)$ . See Theorem 4.3. The bijection is given explicitly in Remark 4.4, and the worst-case cost of  $A$  and  $B$  coincide also in the case  $d = \infty$ . Consequently, the minimal errors satisfy

$$e_n(L_\sigma) = e_0(L_\sigma) \cdot e_n(K_\beta)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For  $L^2$ -approximation with any  $d$  an analogous transference result is established in Theorem 5.1 and Remark 5.2, assuming that the shape and base parameters are related by

$$1 - \beta_j = \frac{2}{1 + (1 + 8\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}}$$

for every  $j \in J$ .

Let  $d = \infty$ . We combine the transference results with known results for the decay of the minimal errors  $e_n(K_\beta)$  from Gnewuch et al. (2024) to determine the decay of the minimal errors  $e_n(L_\sigma)$ . For any non-increasing sequence  $\mathbf{e} := (e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive real numbers its decay is given by

$$(1.2) \quad \text{decay}(\mathbf{e}) := \sup\{\tau > 0: \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (e_n \cdot n^\tau) < \infty\}$$

with the convention that  $\sup \emptyset := 0$ . Put

$$\rho := \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(1/\sigma_j^2)}{\ln(j)},$$

and assume that (1.1) is satisfied, which implies  $1 \leq \rho \leq \infty$ . Under a very mild assumption on the cost function  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \text{cost}(\mathbf{x})$ , see (4.15), we obtain

$$\text{decay}((e_n(L_\sigma))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1),$$

see Theorem 4.14 for integration and Theorem 5.4 for  $L^2$ -approximation. Algorithms showing that the polynomial decay rate of the minimal errors  $e_n(L_\sigma)$  is at

least  $(\rho - 1)/2$  are obtained by applying the transference results to properly chosen multivariate decomposition methods on the spaces  $H(K_\beta)$ , see Section 4.4.

Now, we turn to the case  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the sequel we survey known results from the literature together with the findings from this paper for the integration problem. To this end we fix sequences  $(\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\beta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of shape parameters and base parameters, respectively, and we either have  $M_d := L_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d)}$  for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  or  $M_d := K_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)}$  for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

At first, we note that exponential convergence of  $e_n(M_d)$  holds for every fixed dimension  $d$ : For every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad e_n(M_d) \leq \exp(-c \cdot n^{1/d})$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . For  $d = 1$  we have a matching lower bound, i.e., there exists a constant  $c' > 0$  such that

$$(1.4) \quad e_n(M_1) \geq \exp(-c' \cdot n)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . For  $d \geq 2$  it is only known that

$$(1.5) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (e_n(M_d) \cdot \exp(c \cdot n^p)) = \infty$$

for all  $p > 1/d$  and  $c > 0$ .

For Hermite kernels all of these results have been established in Irrgeher et al. (2015). For Gaussian kernels the situation is as follows: The upper bound (1.3) is due to Kuo et al. (2017) and Karvonen et al. (2021) under the additional assumptions  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \sigma_j < 1/2$  and  $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_d$ , respectively; from the latter one can easily deduce (1.3) in full generality. The lower bound (1.4) follows from Theorem 4.6 and improves the lower bound from Kuo et al. (2017), which is super-exponentially small in  $n$ . Moreover, (1.5) is due to Kuo et al. (2017) in the case  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \sigma_j < 1/2$ , and the monotonicity property mentioned above immediately yields (1.5) in full generality.

Next, we discuss tractability results, which deal with the information complexity  $n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d)$  with  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  for the normalized error criterion. Roughly speaking,  $\varepsilon \mapsto n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d)$  is the inverse function to  $n \mapsto e_n(M_d)/e_0(M_d)$ . Concerning tractability, the exponential convergence (1.3) suggests to control the behavior of  $\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d))$  as  $d + \varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$  in terms of  $\ln(\varepsilon^{-1})$  and a power of  $d$ , which leads to the following definition, see Kuo et al. (2017). Exponential convergence  $(t, \kappa)$ -weak tractability, for short EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT, holds for  $(M_d)_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  if

$$\lim_{d + \varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d))}{d^t + \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})^\kappa} = 0.$$

At first, we address the case  $(t, \kappa) = (1, 1)$ , where we put  $\gamma_j := \sigma_j$  in the Gaussian case and  $\gamma_j := \beta_j$  in the Hermite case and assume that  $(\gamma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is non-increasing to obtain the following result: EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT is equivalent to  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_j = 0$ . For Hermite kernels  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \beta_j = 0$  has been established as a necessary condition in Irrgeher et al. (2015) and as a sufficient condition in Irrgeher et al. (2016b). For Gaussian kernels a characterization of EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT has not been available. Under the additional assumption that  $\sigma$  is bounded by a constant less than  $1/2$ , it was known that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = 0$  is a necessary condition, while exponential convergence of the shape parameters towards zero had been established as sufficient condition, see Kuo et al. (2017).

To study the case  $t > 1$  and  $\kappa > 0$  we put  $\gamma_j := \sigma_j$  in the Gaussian case and  $\gamma_j := 1/(1 - \beta_j)$  in the Hermite case to obtain the following result: If  $(\gamma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is polynomially bounded, then EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT holds for all  $t > 1$  and  $\kappa > 0$ . See Theorems 4.10 and 4.12 for more general results that permit exponentially growing shape parameters  $\sigma_j$  and exponentially shrinking gaps  $1 - \beta_j$  for the base parameters  $\beta_j$ . For Hermite kernels the case  $t > 1$  has not been studied before, and for Gaussian case it was only known that EC- $(t, 1)$ -WT holds for all  $t > 1$  and  $\kappa \geq 1$ , if  $\sigma$  is non-increasing and bounded by a constant less than  $1/2$ , see Kuo et al. (2017).

We close the introduction with some remarks concerning our notation. For any sequence  $\omega := (\omega_j)_{j \in J}$  with  $\omega_j \geq 0$  for every  $j \in J$  we use  $\ell^2(\omega)$  to denote the corresponding weighted  $\ell^2$ -space, i.e.,

$$(1.6) \quad \ell^2(\omega) := \left\{ (x_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{R}^J : \sum_{j \in J} \omega_j \cdot x_j^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

Let  $\tau := (\tau_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $x := (x_j)_{j \in J}$  be sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ . We put  $\tau x := (\tau_j x_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $\tau^z := (\tau_j^z)_{j \in J}$  if  $\tau$  is positive, i.e.,  $\tau_j > 0$  for every  $j \in J$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{1} - \tau := (1 - \tau_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . If  $\tau$  is positive and  $\sum_{j \in J} |\tau_j - 1| < \infty$  then

$$(1.7) \quad \tau_* := \prod_{j \in J} \tau_j > 0.$$

For any Hilbert space  $H(M)$  with reproducing kernel  $M$  we use  $\|\cdot\|_{H(M)}$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H(M)}$  to denote the corresponding norm and scalar product, respectively.

## 2. THE FUNCTION SPACES

In this paper we study two different types of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHSs), namely spaces with Gaussian kernels and spaces with a particular kind of Hermite kernels. For Gaussian and for Hermite kernels tensor products are used to proceed from the univariate case  $d = 1$  to the multivariate case  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and the infinite-variate case  $d = \infty$ . In this section we mainly present known results from Steinwart et al. (2006), see also Steinwart and Christmann (2008) and Minh (2010), and from Gnewuch et al. (2022), most importantly a particular one-to-one correspondence between both types of RKHSs. For basic facts about RKHSs and their kernels we refer to Aronszajn (1950) and Paulsen and Raghupathi (2016).

**2.1. Univariate Gaussian Kernels.** The univariate Gaussian kernel  $\ell_\sigma$  with shape parameter  $\sigma > 0$  is defined by

$$\ell_\sigma(x, y) := \exp(-\sigma^2 \cdot (x - y)^2)$$

for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Despite a different use in stochastic analysis, the Hilbert space  $H(\ell_\sigma)$  will be called a Gaussian space throughout this paper.

For the analysis of Gaussian spaces we refer to Steinwart et al. (2006), see also Steinwart and Christmann (2008, Sec. 4.4). In particular, each function  $f \in H(\ell_\sigma)$  is the real part of an entire function  $g$  restricted to the real line, where  $g$  belongs to the complex reproducing kernel Hilbert space with kernel  $\ell_\sigma$  extended to  $\mathbb{C}$  in

the obvious way. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(y)|^2 &= \langle f, \ell_\sigma(\cdot, x) - \ell_\sigma(\cdot, y) \rangle_{H(\ell_\sigma)}^2 \\ &\leq \|f\|_{H(\ell_\sigma)}^2 \cdot \|\ell_\sigma(\cdot, x) - \ell_\sigma(\cdot, y)\|_{H(\ell_\sigma)}^2 \\ &= 2 \|f\|_{H(\ell_\sigma)}^2 \cdot (1 - \ell_\sigma(x, y)) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , the functions from  $H(\ell_\sigma)$  are bounded. No Gaussian space contains any non-zero polynomial, and obviously  $\ell_\sigma$  is translation-invariant, i.e.,  $\ell_\sigma(x, y) = \ell_\sigma(x - y, 0)$ . Moreover, we have the following monotonicity property of Gaussian spaces:

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \Rightarrow H(\ell_{\sigma_1}) \subsetneq H(\ell_{\sigma_2})$$

with a non-compact continuous identical embedding of norm  $\sqrt{\sigma_2/\sigma_1}$ .

**2.2. Univariate Hermite Kernels.** Let  $0 < \alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \dots$  with

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_\nu^{-1} \cdot \nu^{-1/2} < \infty.$$

Then

$$k(x, y) := \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} \alpha_\nu^{-1} \cdot h_\nu(x) \cdot h_\nu(y),$$

which is well defined for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , yields a reproducing kernel. The mapping  $k$  and the corresponding Hilbert space  $H(k)$  are called a Hermite kernel and a Hermite space, respectively.

For the analysis of Hermite spaces we refer to Irrgeher and Leobacher (2015), Gnewuch et al. (2022), and Leobacher et al. (2023). In particular,

$$(2.2) \quad H(k) = \left\{ \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} c_\nu \cdot h_\nu : c_\nu \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} \alpha_\nu \cdot c_\nu^2 < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad \|f\|_{H(k)}^2 = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} \alpha_\nu \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \cdot h_\nu d\mu_0 \right)^2$$

for  $f \in H(k)$ . Consequently, every Hermite space contains all polynomials. Hermite kernels are not translation invariant, since  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} k(x, x) = \infty$ .

In the present paper we consider Hermite spaces with

$$\alpha_\nu := \beta^{-\nu}$$

for  $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with a parameter  $0 < \beta < 1$ , which will be called the base parameter of the kernel  $k_\beta$  given by

$$k_\beta(x, y) := \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} \beta^\nu \cdot h_\nu(x) \cdot h_\nu(y)$$

for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . The elements of  $H(k_\beta)$  are real analytic functions, and we have the following monotonicity property of Hermite spaces, which follows immediately from (2.2) and (2.3):

$$(2.4) \quad \beta_1 < \beta_2 \Rightarrow H(k_{\beta_1}) \subsetneq H(k_{\beta_2})$$

with a compact continuous identical embedding of norm one.

**2.3. Tensor Products of Gaussian Kernels.** In this paper we study  $d$ -fold tensor products of Gaussian kernels and of Hermite kernels. For the Gaussian kernels we consider a sequence  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := (\sigma_j)_{j \in J}$  of shape parameters, i.e.,  $\sigma_j > 0$ .

In addition to the weighted  $\ell^2$ -space  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ , see (1.6), we also consider the space  $\ell^\infty$  of all bounded sequences in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The following observation will be used in the study of the domains of tensor products of Gaussian and of Hermite kernels in the case  $d = \infty$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *For every positive sequence  $\boldsymbol{\omega} := (\omega_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j < \infty$  we have*

$$\ell^\infty \subsetneq \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\omega})) = 1.$$

*Proof.* The first statement obviously holds true, and the second statement follows from

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j \cdot x_j^2 d\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} x_j^2 d\mu_0(x_j) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j < \infty,$$

which implies that  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j \cdot x_j^2 < \infty$  holds for  $\mu$ -almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

For every sequence  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  and  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^J$  we define

$$(2.5) \quad \tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \prod_{j \in J} \ell_{\sigma_j}(x_j, y_j) = \exp\left(-\sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^2 \cdot (x_j - y_j)^2\right)$$

with the convention that  $\exp(-\infty) := 0$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *For every sequence  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ , we have  $H(\tilde{L}_\sigma) \subseteq L^2(\mu)$  with a compact identical embedding.*

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = 1$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^J$ , the kernel  $\tilde{L}_\sigma$  has finite trace, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^J} \tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) < \infty.$$

The latter implies the statement of the lemma, see, e.g., Steinwart and Scovel (2012, Lemma 2.3).  $\square$

The summability property

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^2 < \infty$$

will play an important role in the sequel. For  $d < \infty$  this property is trivially satisfied and  $\mathbb{R}^d = \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ . In subsequent sections, we consider integration and  $L^2$ -approximation, which are trivial if (2.6) does not hold, see Lemma 2.3 and Remark 3.2.

In any case, due to Lemma 2.2, the integration functional  $f \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^J} f d\mu$  is well-defined and continuous on  $H(\tilde{L}_\sigma)$ , and its representer  $h \in H(\tilde{L}_\sigma)$  is given by

$$(2.7) \quad h(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}} \tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\mu(\mathbf{y}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}.$$

**Lemma 2.3.** *For every sequence  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ , with  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j^2 = \infty$  we have  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}} f d\mu = 0$  for all  $f \in H(\tilde{L}_\sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* We obtain for the norm of the representer  $h$  of integration, cf. (2.7), that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{H(\tilde{L}_\sigma)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ell_{\sigma_j}(x_j, y_j) d\mu_0(x_j) d\mu_0(y_j) \\ &= \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second last identity follows from Kuo et al. (2017, Eqn. (1.5)) (or can be calculated directly). Consequently, we have  $h(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and the integration functional on  $H(\tilde{L}_\sigma)$  is trivial.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *For every sequences  $\sigma$  fulfilling (2.6), the following holds true:*

- (i) *We have  $\mu(\ell^2(\sigma^2)) = 1$ .*
- (ii) *We have  $\tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = 0$  and  $h(\mathbf{z}) = 0$  for  $\mathbf{y} \in \ell^2(\sigma^2)$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^J \setminus \ell^2(\sigma^2)$ .*

*Proof.* We establish (i) and (ii) in the non-trivial case  $d = \infty$ .

Naturally, Lemma 2.1 yields (i).

Now let  $\mathbf{y} \in \ell^2(\sigma^2)$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \ell^2(\sigma^2)$ . Obviously,  $\tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = 0$ . Furthermore, (i) and identity (2.7) yield for  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \ell^2(\sigma^2)$  that

$$h(\mathbf{z}) = \int_{\ell^2(\sigma^2)} \tilde{L}_\sigma(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) d\mu(\mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

$\square$

Let now  $\sigma$  be a sequence that satisfies (2.6). For  $d = \infty$  we prefer to replace the full Cartesian product  $\mathbb{R}^N$  in the definition of  $\tilde{L}_\sigma$  by the proper subset  $\ell^2(\sigma^2)$  of full measure. Lemma 2.4 reveals that this restriction has no impact on the results for integration and  $L^2$ -approximation, while it simplifies the presentation substantially. See Gnewuch et al. (2022, Sec. 4.2) for further results on different domains for  $\tilde{L}_\sigma$  in the case  $d = \infty$ .

For every  $d$  the mapping

$$L_\sigma := \tilde{L}_\sigma|_{\ell^2(\sigma^2) \times \ell^2(\sigma^2)}$$

and the Hilbert space  $H(L_\sigma)$  are called a Gaussian kernel and, despite a different use in stochastic analysis, a Gaussian space, respectively. Accordingly,  $H(L_\sigma)$  consists of real-valued functions on the domain

$$\mathfrak{X}(L_\sigma) := \ell^2(\sigma^2).$$

**2.4. Tensor Products of Hermite Kernels.** For the study of tensor products of Hermite kernels we consider a sequence  $\beta := (\beta_j)_{j \in J}$  of base parameters, i.e.,  $0 < \beta_j < 1$ . Observe that

$$(2.8) \quad k_{\beta_j}(x, x) \geq 1$$

for all  $j \in J$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , since  $h_0 = 1$ .

For every sequence  $\beta$  with

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j < \infty$$



we define the Hermite kernel  $K_{\beta}$  by

$$K_{\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \prod_{j \in J} k_{\beta_j}(x_j, y_j)$$

for  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta})$  with the maximal domain

$$\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^J : \prod_{j \in J} k_{\beta_j}(x_j, x_j) < \infty\}.$$

If  $d < \infty$  then (2.9) is trivially satisfied and  $\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta}) = \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Given (2.9), we have*

- (i)  $\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta}) = \ell^2(\beta)$  and  $\mu(\ell^2(\beta)) = 1$ ,
- (ii)  $H(K_{\beta}) \subseteq L^2(\mu)$  with a compact identical embedding.

*Proof.* Assume that (2.9) is satisfied. We establish (i) in the non-trivial case  $d = \infty$ . See Gnewuch et al. (2022, Prop. 3.18) for a general result that yields  $\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta}) = \ell^2(\beta)$ . Lemma 2.1 implies  $\mu(\ell^2(\beta)) = 1$ , see also Gnewuch et al. (2022, Prop. 3.10) for a general result.

By orthogonality of the Hermite polynomials we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} k_{\beta_j}(x_j, x_j) d\mu_0(x_j) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0} \beta_j^{\nu} = (1 - \beta_j)^{-1}.$$

Hence we may use (2.8) and (2.9) to obtain

$$\int_{\ell^2(\beta)} K_{\beta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^J} \prod_{j \in J} k_{\beta_j}(x_j, x_j) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in J} (1 - \beta_j)^{-1} < \infty,$$

i.e., the kernel  $K_{\beta}$  has finite trace. The latter implies (ii), see, e.g., Steinwart and Scovel (2012, Lemma 2.3).  $\square$

The Hilbert space  $H(K_{\beta})$ , which due to Lemma 2.5 consists of real-valued functions on the domain

$$\mathfrak{X}(K_{\beta}) = \ell^2(\beta),$$

is called a Hermite space. This domain is a the proper subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  of full measure in the case  $d = \infty$  and the full Cartesian product  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in the case  $d < \infty$ .

**2.5. The Isometric Isomorphism.** As we will see, the relation

$$(2.10) \quad 1 - \beta_j = \frac{2}{1 + (1 + 8\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}}$$

for every  $j \in J$  is of key importance. First of all, we note that (2.10) defines a bijection between the set of shape parameters  $\sigma_j > 0$  and the set of base parameters  $0 < \beta_j < 1$ .

**Remark 2.6.** Consider the case  $d = \infty$ , and assume that (2.10) is satisfied for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = 0$  or  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \beta_j = 0$ , then  $\beta_j \asymp \sigma_j^2$  and therefore  $\ell^2(\sigma^2) = \ell^2(\beta)$  as vector spaces. Moreover, (2.6) and (2.9) are equivalent. We conclude that (2.10) defines a bijection between the set of square-summable sequences of shape parameters  $\sigma_j > 0$  and the set of summable sequences of base parameters  $0 < \beta_j < 1$ .

Let  $\mathbf{c} := (c_j)_{j \in J}$  be a positive sequence with  $\sum_{j \in J} \omega_j < \infty$  for  $\omega_j := |c_j - 1|$ . We define  $\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}: \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow [0, \infty[$  by

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \exp\left(-\sum_{j \in J} \frac{c_j^2 - 1}{4} \cdot x_j^2\right) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\omega}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{c}\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{c}^{-1}\mathbf{x}$  define bijections on  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ . We define a linear mapping  $Q_{\mathbf{c}}$  on the space of all functions  $f: \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$Q_{\mathbf{c}}f(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{c}_*^{1/2} \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot f(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x})$$

for  $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ ; cf. (1.7) for the definition of  $\mathbf{c}_*$ .

See Gnewuch et al. (2022, Thm. 5.8) for the following result<sup>1</sup>.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. Moreover, assume that (2.10) and*

$$(2.11) \quad c_j = (1 + 8\sigma_j^2)^{1/4}$$

*are satisfied for every  $j \in J$ . Then  $Q_{\mathbf{c}}$  defines an isometric isomorphism on  $L^2(\mu)$  and between  $H((1 - \beta)_* K_{\beta})$  and  $H(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$ .*

By definition, the value of  $Q_{\mathbf{c}}f$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  is determined by the value of  $f$  at  $\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x}$ . The analogous property for  $Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}$  reads as follows.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. Moreover, assume that (2.11) is satisfied for every  $j \in J$ . Then we have  $\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$  on  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$  and*

$$Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{c}_*^{1/2} \varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{c}^{-1}\mathbf{x})} \cdot f(\mathbf{c}^{-1}\mathbf{x})$$

*for all  $f: \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ .*

*Proof.* We only have to verify that  $\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$  on  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$ . In the non-trivial case  $d = \infty$  the latter follows from  $c_j^2 - 1 \asymp \sigma_j^2$ , which holds due to (2.6) and (2.11).  $\square$

### 3. THE WORST-CASE SETTING

$L^2$ -approximation and integration on Gaussian and on Hermite spaces will be studied within the following framework, where  $\mathfrak{X} := \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$  and  $M := L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$  under the assumption (2.6) or  $\mathfrak{X} := \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  and  $M := K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  under the assumption (2.9). Recall that  $\mu(\mathfrak{X}) = 1$  and  $H(M) \subseteq L^2(\mu)$  in both cases, see Lemmata 2.2, 2.4.(i), and 2.5.

For  $L^2$ -approximation of functions  $f \in H(M)$  we consider linear sampling methods

$$(3.1) \quad A(f) := \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot a_i$$

with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , nodes  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathfrak{X}$ , and coefficients  $a_i \in L^2(\mu)$ . As error criterion we consider the worst-case error of  $A$  on the unit ball in  $H(M)$ , which is defined by

$$e(A, M) := \sup_{\|f\|_{H(M)} \leq 1} \|f - A(f)\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

<sup>1</sup>Instead of  $k_{\beta_j}$  and  $K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , the kernels  $(1 - \beta_j)k_{\beta_j}$  and their tensor product are studied in Gnewuch et al. (2022).

For integration of functions  $f \in H(M)$  we consider quadrature formulas

$$(3.2) \quad A(f) := \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot a_i$$

with  $n$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i$  as before, but with coefficients  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . The worst-case error of  $A$  on the unit ball in  $H(M)$  is defined by

$$e(A, M) := \sup_{\|f\|_{H(M)} \leq 1} |I(f) - A(f)|,$$

where

$$I(f) := \int_{\mathfrak{X}} f d\mu.$$

The worst-case cost of an algorithm  $A$  of the form (3.1) or (3.2) is defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \text{cost}(A) := \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cost}(\mathbf{x}_i),$$

where  $\text{cost}: \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty[ \cup \{\infty\}$  denotes the cost of a single function evaluation,

Of course, the most natural choice of the cost function is  $\text{cost}(\mathbf{x}) := 1$  for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$ , which means that the functions from  $H(M)$  may be evaluated anywhere in the domain  $\mathfrak{X}$  at a constant cost one. We will use this model throughout the paper in the case  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mathfrak{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ . In the case  $d = \infty$ , where  $J = \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathfrak{X}$  is an infinite-dimensional space, we employ the unrestricted subspace sampling model, which has been introduced in Kuo et al. (2010). This model is based on a non-decreasing cost function  $\$: \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow [1, \infty[$  in the following way. For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  the number of active variables is defined by

$$\text{Act}(\mathbf{x}) := \#\{j \in \mathbb{N}: x_j \neq 0\},$$

and the evaluation of any function  $f \in H(M)$  is permitted at any point  $\mathbf{x}$  for which  $\text{Act}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite; in this case the corresponding cost is given by  $\$(\text{Act}(\mathbf{x}))$ . We add that  $\text{Act}(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$  already implies  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$ .

Accordingly, we define

$$(3.4) \quad \text{cost}(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \$(\text{Act}(\mathbf{x})) & \text{if } \text{Act}(\mathbf{x}) < \infty, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$ .

As the key quantity, we study the  $n$ -th minimal worst-case error, which is defined by

$$(3.5) \quad e_n(M) := \inf\{e(A, M): \text{cost}(A) \leq n\}$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n = 0$  the corresponding quantity is

$$e_0(M) := e(A, M)$$

with  $A := 0$ , i.e.,

$$e_0(M) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H(M)} \leq 1} \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$$

for  $L^2$ -approximation and

$$e_0(M) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H(M)} \leq 1} |I(f)|$$

for integration.

For  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  explicit formulas are available for the norm of the embedding of  $H(M)$  into  $L^2(\mu)$ , see Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018) and Irrgeher et al. (2016b), and for the norm of the integration functional on  $H(M)$ , see Kuo et al. (2017) and Irrgeher et al. (2015). In the following lemma we cover the case  $d = \infty$ , too.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If (2.6) is satisfied then*

$$e_0(L_\sigma) = \prod_{j \in J} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\left(1 + (1 + 8\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}\right)^{1/2}}$$

for  $L^2$ -approximation and

$$e_0(L_\sigma) = \prod_{j \in J} \frac{1}{(1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/4}}$$

for integration. If (2.9) is satisfied then

$$e_0(K_\beta) = 1$$

for  $L^2$ -approximation and for integration.

*Proof.* We use the tensor product structure of the embedding of  $H(M)$  into  $L^2(\mu)$  and of the integration functional on  $H(M)$ , see Gnewuch et al. (2022, Sec. A.4–A.6) for a general account in the case  $d = \infty$ , together with the known results for  $d = 1$ . First of all,

$$e_0^2(\ell_{\sigma_j}) = \frac{2}{1 + (1 + 8\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}} < 1$$

for  $L^2$ -approximation, see, e.g., Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018, Eqn. (10)), and

$$e_0^4(\ell_{\sigma_j}) = \frac{1}{1 + 4\sigma_j^2} < 1$$

for integration, see Kuo et al. (2017, Eqn. (1.5)), while  $e_0(k_{\beta_j}) = 1$  for  $L^2$ -approximation and for integration, see Irrgeher et al. (2016b, p. 104) and Irrgeher et al. (2015, p. 385), respectively. Consequently,

$$e_0(M) = \prod_{j \in J} e_0(m_j)$$

with  $m_j := \ell_{\sigma_j}$  or with  $m_j := k_{\beta_j}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** Consider the reproducing kernel  $\tilde{L}_\sigma$  on the domain  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , as in (2.5). If (2.6) is not satisfied, we still have  $H(\tilde{L}_\sigma) \subseteq L^2(\mu)$  due to Lemma 2.2. However, in this case, integration is trivial, see Lemma 2.3. Similarly, one can show that the  $L^2$ -approximation operator is trivial.

It is well-known that in the worst-case setting non-adaptive linear algorithms of the form (3.1) for  $L^2$ -approximation and (3.2) for integration are optimal within the class of all deterministic algorithms based on function values and with information cost at most  $n$ ; for more details see Traub et al. (1988).

## 4. INTEGRATION

In what follows, we derive new results for integration and  $L^2$ -approximation on Gaussian and Hermite spaces. This will be done by transferring known results from Hermite spaces with the help of the isometric isomorphism from Section 2.5 to Gaussian spaces and vice versa. Since the actual transference mechanisms for integration and  $L^2$ -approximation differ significantly, we discuss both applications separately in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

Throughout this section,  $\sigma := (\sigma_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $\beta := (\beta_j)_{j \in J}$  denote sequences of shape parameters and base parameters, respectively. Initially, we do not impose any summability requirements on  $\sigma$  or  $\beta$ . For the integration problem, an appropriate relation between  $\sigma_j$  and  $\beta_j$ , which is different from (2.10), will be determined later, see (4.4).

**4.1. The Transference Result.** For any positive sequence  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^J$  we define  $t_\tau: \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^J$  by  $t_\tau(\mathbf{x}) := \tau^{-1}\mathbf{x}$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\tau := (\tau_j)_{j \in J}$  denote a positive sequence with  $\sum_{j \in J} |\tau_j - 1| < \infty$ . The image measure  $t_\tau\mu$  of  $\mu$  with respect to  $t_\tau$  has the density  $\tau_* \cdot \varphi_\tau^2$  with respect to  $\mu$ .*

*Proof.* To establish the statement of the lemma, it suffices to show for an arbitrary cylinder set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^J$  that  $t_\tau\mu(A) = \int_A \tau_* \cdot \varphi_\tau^2 d\mu$ .

In the case  $d < \infty$  any cylinder set is of the form  $A := A_1 \times \dots \times A_d$  with measurable sets  $A_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(\tau_j A_j) &= (2\pi)^{-1/2} \cdot \int_{\tau_j A_j} \exp(-x_j^2/2) dx_j \\ &= \tau_j \cdot \int_{A_j} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right) d\mu_0(x_j), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$t_\tau\mu(A) = \mu(t_\tau^{-1}(A)) = \prod_{j=1}^d \mu_0(\tau_j A_j) = \tau_* \cdot \int_A \varphi_\tau^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}),$$

which in turn yields the claim.

In the case  $d = \infty$  we put  $J_0 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \tau_j < 1\}$ . Using the monotone convergence theorem we obtain

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}} \varphi_\tau^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}} \exp\left(-\sum_{j \in J_0} \frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in J_0} \tau_j^{-1} < \infty.$$

For  $d = \infty$  any cylinder set is of the form  $A := A_1 \times \dots$  with measurable sets  $A_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , where  $A_j = \mathbb{R}$  for  $j > j_0$ . For every  $j_1 > j_0$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} t_\tau\mu(A) &= \prod_{j=1}^{j_1} \mu_0(\tau_j A_j) = \prod_{j=1}^{j_1} \left( \tau_j \cdot \int_{A_j} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right) d\mu_0(x_j) \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{j_1} \tau_j \cdot \int_A \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{j_1} \frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we have

$$\exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{j_1} \frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right) \leq \exp\left(-\sum_{j \in J_0} \frac{\tau_j^2 - 1}{2} \cdot x_j^2\right)$$

for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Thus, due to (4.1), the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$t_{\tau}\mu(A) = \tau_* \cdot \int_A \varphi_{\tau}^2(\mathbf{x}) d\mu(\mathbf{x}),$$

which in turn establishes the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{c} := (c_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $\tau := (\tau_j)_{j \in J}$  denote positive sequences with  $\sum_{j \in J} |c_j - 1| < \infty$  and  $\sum_{j \in J} |\tau_j - 1| < \infty$ . If*

$$(4.2) \quad \tau_j^2 = \frac{c_j^2 + 1}{2}$$

for every  $j \in J$  then we have

$$(4.3) \quad I(Q_{\mathbf{c}}f \circ t_{\tau}) = \frac{\tau_*}{\mathbf{c}_*^{1/2}} \cdot I(f)$$

for every  $f \in L^1(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* By definition,

$$Q_{\mathbf{c}}f \circ t_{\tau} = \mathbf{c}_*^{1/2} \cdot (\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} \circ t_{\tau}) \cdot (f \circ t_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}) = \left(\mathbf{c}_*^{1/2} \cdot (\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} \circ t_{\mathbf{c}}) \cdot f\right) \circ t_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}.$$

Note that  $\sum_{j \in J} \omega_j < \infty$  for  $\omega_j := |c_j^{-1}\tau_j - 1|$ . Lemma 4.1 implies

$$I(Q_{\mathbf{c}}f \circ t_{\tau}) = \frac{\tau_*}{\mathbf{c}_*^{1/2}} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^J} (\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} \circ t_{\mathbf{c}}) \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}^2 \cdot f d\mu$$

for every  $f: \mathbb{R}^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(\varphi_{\mathbf{c}} \circ t_{\mathbf{c}}) \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}^2 \cdot f \in L^1(\mu)$ .

Lemma 2.1 yields  $\mu(\ell^2(\omega)) = 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \ell^2(\omega)$ . We have  $\varphi_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  and, since  $\omega_j \asymp |c_j - 1|$ , we also have  $\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(t_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x})) > 0$ . Since

$$-\ln(\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(t_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \varphi_{\mathbf{c}^{-1}\tau}^2(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{j \in J} \frac{x_j^2}{4c_j^2} \cdot (c_j^2 - 1 + 2(\tau_j^2 - c_j^2)),$$

we conclude that (4.3) is satisfied for every  $f \in L^1(\mu)$  if  $c_j^2 - 1 = 2(c_j^2 - \tau_j^2)$  for every  $j \in J$ . The latter is equivalent to (4.2) for every  $j \in J$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. Moreover, assume that*

$$(4.4) \quad 1 - \beta_j = \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma_j^2},$$

$$(4.5) \quad c_j = (1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/2},$$

$$(4.6) \quad \tau_j = (1 + 2\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}$$

are satisfied for every  $j \in J$ . For every quadrature formula  $A$  with nodes from  $\ell^2(\sigma^2)$  and

$$B(f) := \frac{\mathbf{c}_*^{1/2}}{\tau_*} \cdot A(Q_{\mathbf{c}}f \circ t_{\tau})$$

we have

$$e(A, L_{\sigma}) = (1 + 4\sigma^2)_*^{-1/4} \cdot e(B, K_{\beta}).$$

*Proof.* At first, we only assume that (2.6) is satisfied. We alter the shape parameters of the Gaussian kernel  $L_\sigma$ . To this end, let  $\tau := (\tau_j)_{j \in J}$  denote any positive sequence with  $\sum_{j \in J} |\tau_j - 1| < \infty$ . Obviously,  $\sum_{j \in J} (\tau_j \sigma_j)^2 < \infty$ . Recall that  $t_\tau$  defines a bijection on  $\ell^2(\sigma^2)$ . Since

$$L_{\tau\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{j \in J} \ell_{\tau_j \sigma_j}(x_j, y_j) = \prod_{j \in J} \ell_{\sigma_j}(\tau_j x_j, \tau_j y_j) = L_\sigma(\tau \mathbf{x}, \tau \mathbf{y})$$

for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^2(\sigma^2)$ , the spaces  $H(L_{\tau\sigma})$  and  $H(L_\sigma)$  are isometrically isomorphic via  $f \mapsto f \circ t_\tau$ . Consequently,

$$e(A, L_\sigma) = \sup_{\|f\|_{H(L_{\tau\sigma})} \leq 1} |I(f \circ t_\tau) - A(f \circ t_\tau)|.$$

Next, we apply Theorem 2.7 with  $\tau\sigma$  instead of  $\sigma$ , which leads to

$$(4.7) \quad 1 - \beta_j = \frac{2}{1 + (1 + 8(\tau_j \sigma_j)^2)^{1/2}}$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad c_j = (1 + 8(\tau_j \sigma_j)^2)^{1/4},$$

instead of (2.10) and (2.11). Assume that (4.7) and (4.8) are satisfied for every  $j \in J$ . Since  $\sum_{j \in J} (\tau_j \sigma_j)^2 < \infty$ , we obtain  $\sum_{j \in J} \beta_j < \infty$  by Remark 2.6, which in turn ensures that  $K_\beta$  is well-defined. Let  $Q := Q_c$ . Then  $Q|_{H(K_\beta)}$  is an isomorphism from  $H(K_\beta)$  to  $H(L_{\tau\sigma})$  with

$$\|Qf\|_{H(L_{\tau\sigma})}^2 = \|f\|_{H((1-\beta)_* K_\beta)}^2 = (1 - \beta)_*^{-1} \cdot \|f\|_{H(K_\beta)}^2$$

for every  $f \in H(K_\beta)$ . We conclude that

$$e(A, L_\sigma) = (1 - \beta)_*^{1/2} \cdot \sup_{\|f\|_{H(K_\beta)} \leq 1} |I(Qf \circ t_\tau) - A(Qf \circ t_\tau)|.$$

Finally, we apply Lemma 4.2, noting that the unique solution of (4.2) and (4.8) with  $\tau_j > 0$  is given by (4.5) and (4.6). In the sequel, we assume that (4.4), (4.5), and (4.6) are satisfied, in addition to (2.6). We use

$$(\tau_j \sigma_j)^2 = (1 + 2\sigma_j^2)\sigma_j^2$$

to obtain

$$1 + 8(\tau_j \sigma_j)^2 = (1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^2.$$

It follows that (4.7) is satisfied, too, and obviously,  $\sum_{j \in J} |\tau_j - 1| < \infty$  as well as  $\sum_{j \in J} |c_j - 1| < \infty$ . Lemma 4.2 yields

$$e(A, L_\sigma) = (1 - \beta)_*^{1/2} \cdot \frac{\tau_*}{c_*^{1/2}} \cdot \sup_{\|f\|_{H(K_\beta)} \leq 1} \left| I(f) - \frac{c_*^{1/2}}{\tau_*} \cdot A(Qf \circ t_\tau) \right|.$$

We use

$$\frac{\tau_j}{c_j^{1/2}} = \frac{(1 + 2\sigma_j^2)^{1/2}}{(1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/4}},$$

to obtain

$$(1 - \beta_j)^{1/2} \frac{\tau_j}{c_j^{1/2}} = \frac{1}{(1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/4}}$$

and therefore

$$(1 - \beta)_*^{1/2} \cdot \frac{\tau_*}{c_*^{1/2}} = (1 + 4\sigma^2)_*^{-1/4}. \quad \square$$

**Remark 4.4.** Let the assumptions from Theorem 4.3 be satisfied. For a quadrature formula  $A$  on the Gaussian space  $H(L_\sigma)$  according to (3.2) with nodes from  $\ell^2(\sigma^2)$  the quadrature formula  $B$  on the Hermite space  $H(K_\beta)$  according to Theorem 4.3 is easily determined explicitly. Let

$$e_j := \left( \frac{1 + 4\sigma_j^2}{1 + 2\sigma_j^2} \right)^{1/2}$$

for every  $j \in J$ . Then, for  $f: \ell^2(\sigma^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$Bf = e_* \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{y}_i) \cdot b_i,$$

with  $\mathbf{y}_i \in \ell^2(\sigma^2)$  and  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\mathbf{y}_i := e\mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and} \quad b_i := \varphi_c(\tau^{-1}\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot a_i.$$

It is easily verified that  $(\mathbf{x}_i, a_i) \mapsto (\mathbf{y}_i, b_i)$  defines a bijection on the set  $\ell^2(\sigma^2) \times \mathbb{R}$  of pairs of nodes and coefficients. Furthermore,

$$\text{cost}(A) = \text{cost}(B).$$

Indeed, this equation is trivially satisfied with  $\text{cost}(A) = n$  for  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for  $d = \infty$  it follows from  $\text{Act}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \text{Act}(\mathbf{y}_i)$ , which, in turn, is a consequence of  $e_j \neq 0$  for all  $j \in J$ .

**Corollary 4.5.** Assume that (2.6) and (4.4) are satisfied. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\frac{e_n(L_\sigma)}{e_0(L_\sigma)} = \frac{e_n(K_\beta)}{e_0(K_\beta)} = e_n(K_\beta).$$

i.e., the normalized  $n$ -th minimal errors for integration on Gaussian spaces and on the corresponding Hermite spaces, related by (4.4), coincide.

*Proof.* We combine Theorem 4.3 and Remark 4.4 to obtain

$$e_n(L_\sigma) = (1 + 4\sigma^2)_*^{-1/4} \cdot e_n(K_\beta)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Use Lemma 3.1 to establish the desired result.  $\square$

**4.2. Functions of a Single Variable.** Let us mention prior work concerning integration on  $H(\ell_\sigma)$  and on  $H(k_\beta)$ , where explicit upper bounds for the worst-case error  $e(A, M)$  of particular quadrature formulas  $A$  and explicit lower bounds for  $e_n(M)$  are obtained. Of course, these upper bounds immediately yield upper bounds for minimal errors. Gauss-Hermite rules are analyzed in Irrgeher et al. (2015) on Hermite spaces and in Kuo and Woźniakowski (2012) as well as Kuo et al. (2017) on Gaussian spaces. Moreover, scaled Gauss-Hermite rules are studied in Karvonen et al. (2021) on Gaussian spaces. Lower bounds for the  $n$ -minimal errors have been established in Irrgeher et al. (2015) for Hermite spaces and in Kuo et al. (2017) for Gaussian spaces.

In the following we combine these results in the best possible way with the transference result established in Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 4.5.



**Theorem 4.6.** *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(\sigma) &:= 2^{-1} \cdot (1 + 4\sigma^2)^{-1/4}, \\ C_2(\sigma) &:= \pi^{-1/4} \cdot (1 + 2\sigma^2)^{-1/2}, \\ C(\beta) &:= \pi^{-1/4} \cdot (1 - \beta^2)^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

*For every shape parameter  $\sigma > 0$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the  $n$ -th minimal error  $e_n(\ell_\sigma)$  for integration on the Gaussian space  $H(\ell_\sigma)$  satisfies*

$$C_1(\sigma) \cdot \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{1 + 2\sigma^2} \right)^{2n} \cdot (n+1)^{-2} \leq e_n(\ell_\sigma) \leq C_2(\sigma) \cdot \left( \frac{2\sigma^2}{1 + 2\sigma^2} \right)^n \cdot n^{-1/4}.$$

*For every base parameter  $0 < \beta < 1$  and every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the  $n$ -th minimal error  $e_n(k_\beta)$  for integration on the Hermite space  $H(k_\beta)$  satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right)^{2n} \cdot (n+1)^{-2} \leq e_n(k_\beta) \leq C(\beta) \cdot \beta^n \cdot n^{-1/4}.$$

*Proof.* The upper bound for  $e_n(\ell_\sigma)$  follows immediately from Karvonen et al. (2021, Thm. 2.5), and the lower bound for  $e_n(k_\beta)$  is established in Irrgeher et al. (2015, Thm. 2).

Assume that

$$1 - \beta = \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma^2}.$$

First of all, Corollary 4.5 and Lemma 3.1 yield

$$e_n(\ell_\sigma) = (1 + 4\sigma^2)^{-1/4} \cdot e_n(k_\beta).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\beta = \frac{2\sigma^2}{1 + 2\sigma^2}$$

and

$$1 - \beta^2 = \frac{1 + 4\sigma^2}{(1 + 2\sigma^2)^2}.$$

Consequently, the upper bound for  $e_n(k_\beta)$  follows from the upper bound for  $e_n(\ell_\sigma)$  and the lower bound for  $e_n(\ell_\sigma)$  follows from the lower bound for  $e_n(k_\beta)$ .  $\square$

The lower bound for  $e_n(\ell_\sigma)$  from Theorem 4.6 improves the lower bound from Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 4.1), which is super-exponentially small in  $n$ , while the upper bound for  $e_n(k_\beta)$  from Theorem 4.6 only slightly improves the upper bound from Irrgeher et al. (2015, Prop. 1). Obviously, the upper and lower bounds from Theorem 4.6 are not tight at all.

**4.3. Functions of Finitely Many Variables.** In this section we study the multivariate case  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , where upper bounds for the minimal errors  $e_n(M)$  have been established in Kuo et al. (2017) and Karvonen et al. (2021) for Gaussian spaces as well as in Irrgeher et al. (2015) and Irrgeher et al. (2016b) for Hermite spaces. In all three papers, the upper bounds are obtained by quadrature formulas that are full tensor products of suitable univariate quadrature formulas, which have already been mentioned in Section 4.2. For lower bounds and for the study of tractability concepts we refer to Kuo et al. (2017) and Irrgeher et al. (2015).

4.3.1. *Exponential Convergence.* At first, we consider the case of  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  being fixed, and thus (2.6) and (2.9) are trivially satisfied for any choice of parameters  $\sigma_j$  and  $\beta_j$ , respectively.

Let either  $M := L_\sigma$  or  $M := K_\beta$ . Motivated by Theorem 4.6, we study whether there exist constants  $C_1, C_2, p > 0$  fulfilling

$$(4.9) \quad e_n(M) \leq C_1 \cdot \exp(-C_2 \cdot n^p)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this case, we say that exponential convergence is achieved for the integration problem on  $H(M)$  and

$$p^*(M) := \sup\{p \geq 0 : \exists C_1, C_2 > 0 \forall n \in \mathbb{N} : e_n(M) \leq C_1 \cdot \exp(-C_2 \cdot n^p)\}$$

is the most relevant quantity.

Exponential convergence has been studied by Kuo et al. (2017) and Karvonen et al. (2021) for Gaussian spaces, as well as by Irrgeher et al. (2015) for Hermite spaces. We present a moderate generalization of the result for Gaussian spaces, together with a proof that employs the transference mechanism.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Exponential convergence is achieved for the integration problem on  $H(L_\sigma)$  with*

$$p = 1/d = p^*(L_\sigma).$$

*Proof.* After a possibly necessary reordering of the univariate kernels, the shape parameters satisfy  $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_d$ , which implies  $\beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_d$  for the base parameters given by (4.4). Thus we may employ Irrgeher et al. (2015, Thm. 1.1) in the specific case  $\omega := 1/e$  as well as  $a_j := \ln(1/\beta_j)$  and  $b_j := 1$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , which yields exponential convergence on  $H(K_\beta)$  with  $p^*(K_\beta) = 1/d$ . Furthermore, (4.9) is satisfied for  $M = K_\beta$  in the extremal case  $p = 1/d$ , see Irrgeher et al. (2015, Thm. 4).

Corollary 4.5 implies that (4.9) holds for  $M = K_\beta$  if and only if it holds for  $M = L_\sigma$  with  $C_1$  being replaced by  $C_1 \cdot e_0(L_\sigma)$ , but with  $C_2$  and  $p$  unchanged. Thus, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

Theorem 4.7 has been established in Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 1.1) under the additional assumption

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \sigma_j^2 < 1/2,$$

while the general case has been left open for future research. In the case

$$\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_d > 0$$

the exponential convergence on  $H(L_\sigma)$  with  $p = 1/d$  follows directly from Karvonen et al. (2021, Cor. 2.11).

Alternatively to the transference mechanism, the following monotonicity property allows to establish Theorem 4.7 in full generality and working exclusively with Gaussian spaces. Suppose that  $\sigma^{(1)} \leq \sigma^{(2)}$ , i.e.,  $\sigma_j^{(1)} \leq \sigma_j^{(2)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Using (2.1) we conclude that  $H(L_{\sigma^{(1)}}) \subseteq H(L_{\sigma^{(2)}})$  with a continuous identical embedding. Therefore we obtain  $p^*(L_\sigma) \leq 1/d$  for every  $\sigma$  from Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 1.1.(b)), and exponential convergence with  $p = 1/d$  for every  $\sigma$  from Karvonen et al. (2021, Cor. 2.11).

**4.3.2. Exponential Convergence Weak Tractability.** Exponential convergence has been studied alongside uniform exponential convergence and several notions of tractability in Irrgeher et al. (2015), Irrgeher et al. (2016b), and Kuo et al. (2017). In this paper, the setting is specified by arbitrary sequences  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta} := (\beta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of shape parameters  $\sigma_j > 0$  and base parameters  $0 < \beta_j < 1$ . For every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  we put  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_d := (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_d := (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)$ , and we consider either  $M_d := L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_d}$  for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  or  $M_d := K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_d}$  for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

By definition, we have uniform exponential convergence if there exists a constant  $p > 0$  with the following property: For every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that

$$e_n(M_d) \leq C_1 \cdot \exp(-C_2 \cdot n^p)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For all sequences  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ , Theorem 4.7 excludes uniform exponential convergence, and the lack of this property excludes exponential convergence polynomial tractability, see Kuo et al. (2017, p. 832). We are thus led to the study of a weaker tractability concept, which is discussed in the following.

For  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  the information complexity for the absolute and the normalized error criterion are defined by

$$n^{\text{abs}}(\varepsilon, M_d) := \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : e_n(M_d) \leq \varepsilon\}$$

and

$$n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d) := \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : e_n(M_d)/e_0(M_d) \leq \varepsilon\},$$

respectively. Lemma 3.1 yields  $n^{\text{abs}}(\varepsilon, M_d) \leq n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d)$ , with equality if  $M_d$  is a Hermite kernel.

Let  $t \geq 1$  and  $\kappa > 0$ . By definition, exponential convergence  $(t, \kappa)$ -weak tractability, for short EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT, holds for  $(M_d)_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the normalized error criterion, if

$$\lim_{d+\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, M_d))}{d^t + (\ln(\varepsilon^{-1}))^\kappa} = 0.$$

For Hermite spaces, the case  $t = \kappa = 1$  is studied in Irrgeher et al. (2015) as well as Irrgeher et al. (2016b), while for Gaussian spaces, the case  $t \geq 1$  and  $\kappa \geq 1$  is studied in Kuo et al. (2017).

First, we give a necessary condition and a sufficient condition for EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT in the case of Gaussian spaces and the normalized error criterion. For non-increasing shape parameters the two conditions coincide and hence we even obtain a characterization of this tractability property.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  be a sequence of shape parameters. If EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT holds for  $(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the normalized error criterion, then we have*

$$\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j = 0.$$

*If  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is non-increasing and*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_j = 0,$$

*then EC- $(1, 1)$ -WT holds for  $(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the normalized error criterion.*

*Proof.* For both statements, we make use of corresponding results for Hermite spaces, similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.7. Therefore, let  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  be the sequence of base parameters given by (4.4).

For the first statement, suppose that  $\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j > 0$  holds. Then, we also have  $\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_j > 0$ , which means there exists a constant sequence  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  of base parameters

such that  $\beta$  is bounded from below by  $\tilde{\beta}$ . Thus, we may use Irrgeher et al. (2015, Thm. 1.3) in the specific case  $\omega := 1/e$  as well as  $a_j := \ln(1/\beta_j)$  and  $b_j := 1$ , which shows that EC-(1, 1)-WT does not hold for  $(K_{\tilde{\beta}_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Further, for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  we have identical embeddings of  $H(K_{\tilde{\beta}_d})$  into  $H(K_{\beta_d})$  of norm one, cf. (2.4), which implies  $e_n(K_{\tilde{\beta}_d}) \leq e_n(K_{\beta_d})$  for all  $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, EC-(1, 1)-WT does not hold for  $(K_{\beta_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Together with Corollary 4.5, this shows the claim.

To show the second statement, we assume that  $\sigma$  is non-increasing and converges to 0. Then,  $\beta$  is also non-increasing and converges to 0. Thus, by Irrgeher et al. (2016b, Thm. 3), again in the specific case  $\omega := 1/e$  as well as  $a_j := \ln(1/\beta_j)$  and  $b_j := 1$ , we have that EC-(1, 1)-WT holds for  $H(K_{\beta_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Again by Corollary 4.5, this shows the claim.  $\square$

Theorem 4.8 improves the previously best known sufficient condition for EC-(1, 1)-WT for Gaussian spaces, namely, that the sequence of shape parameters is non-increasing and converges to 0 exponentially fast, see Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 1.1(e)). On the other hand, the necessity of  $\sigma$  converging to 0 was already known under the additional assumptions that the boundedness condition

$$(4.10) \quad \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j^2 < 1/2$$

is satisfied and  $\sigma$  is non-increasing, see Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 1.1(f)). We remark that the first result for Hermite spaces we have used in the proof, Irrgeher et al. (2016b, Thm. 3), is fully constructive. Therefore, via the transference principle, the sufficient condition in Theorem 4.8 is also obtained constructively.

Our next goal is to study EC-( $t, k$ )-WT in the case  $t > 1$ . As an intermediary step, we derive a new upper bound for  $\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, L_{\sigma_d}))$  with an explicit dependence on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $d$ , and  $\sigma$ . For  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  we put

$$h(d) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d \leq 2, \\ \ln(\ln(d)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 4.9.** *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, L_{\sigma_d})) \leq C \cdot \left( dh(d) + d \ln(\ln(\varepsilon^{-1})) + \sum_{j=1}^d (\ln(\sigma_j))^+ \right)$$

for every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1/3]$ , and every sequence  $\sigma := (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of shape parameters.

*Proof.* Put

$$\zeta_j := \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \right).$$

From Karvonen et al. (2021, Thm. 2.10) we get

$$e_N(L_{\sigma_d}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d (1 + 2\sigma_j^2)^{-1/2} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d (1 + 4\sigma_i^2)^{-1/4} \cdot \exp(-n_j \zeta_j)$$

for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(n_1, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  with  $N := \prod_{j=1}^d n_j$ . Together with Lemma 3.1 this implies

$$\frac{e_N(L_{\sigma_d})}{e_0(L_{\sigma_d})} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d (1 + 2\sigma_j^2)^{-1/2} \cdot (1 + 4\sigma_j^2)^{1/4} \cdot \exp(-n_j \zeta_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \exp(-n_j \zeta_j).$$

Choosing

$$n_j := \left\lceil \frac{\ln(d/\varepsilon)}{\zeta_j} \right\rceil$$

we obtain  $\exp(-n_j \zeta_j) \leq \varepsilon/d$  and therefore  $n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, L_{\sigma_d}) \leq N$ , i.e.,

$$(4.11) \quad n(\varepsilon, d) := n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, L_{\sigma_d}) \leq \prod_{j=1}^d \left( \frac{\ln(d/\varepsilon)}{\zeta_j} + 1 \right),$$

cf. Kuo et al. (2017, Eqn. (3.9)).

For  $z \geq 0$  we define

$$\varphi(z) := \ln(1 + z),$$

and we put  $\tau := \ln(d/\varepsilon) \geq 0$  as well as

$$J_1 := \{j \in \{1, \dots, d\} : \tau \leq 2\zeta_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 := \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus J_1.$$

Clearly,  $\varphi(z) \leq z$  for every  $z \geq 0$  and  $\varphi(z) \leq 3 \ln(z)$  if  $z > 2$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(n(\varepsilon, d)) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \ln(\tau/\zeta_j + 1) \leq \sum_{j \in J_1} \tau/\zeta_j + 3 \sum_{j \in J_2} \ln(\tau/\zeta_j) \\ &\leq 2d + 3 \sum_{j \in J_2} \ln(\tau/\zeta_j). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we assume that  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1/3]$ , so that  $\ln(\tau) \geq \ln(\ln(3)) > 0$ . With  $c_1 := 2/\ln(\ln(3)) + 3$  we obtain

$$(4.12) \quad \ln(n(\varepsilon, d)) \leq c_1 d \ln(\tau) + 3 \sum_{j \in J_2} \ln(1/\zeta_j).$$

Let us consider the particular case that

$$\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j \geq 2.$$

We put

$$\psi(y) := \ln(1 + 1/(2y^2))$$

for  $y \geq 2$ , so that  $\zeta_j = \psi(\sigma_j)$ . Since  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y^2 \cdot \psi(y) = 1/2$ , we have

$$c_2 := \inf_{y \geq 2} y^2 \cdot \psi(y) \in ]0, 1/2].$$

With  $c_3 := 2 + \ln(1/c_2)/\ln(2)$  we obtain

$$\ln(1/\psi(y)) \leq \ln(y^2/c_2) = \ln(y) \cdot (2 + \ln(1/c_2)/\ln(y)) \leq c_3 \ln(y)$$

for every  $y \geq 2$ . Consequently,

$$\sum_{j \in J_2} \ln(1/\zeta_j) = \sum_{j \in J_2} \ln(1/\psi(\sigma_j)) \leq c_3 \sum_{j=1}^d \ln(\sigma_j).$$

Together with (4.12), this implies

$$\ln(n(\varepsilon, d)) \leq c_1 d \ln(\tau) + 3c_3 \sum_{j=1}^d \ln(\sigma_j).$$

Observe that the upper bound in (4.11) is a monotonically increasing function in each of the variables  $\sigma_j$ . For any sequence of shape parameters we therefore have

$$\ln(n(\varepsilon, d)) \leq c_1 d \ln(\tau) + 3c_3 \sum_{j=1}^d \ln(\max(\sigma_j, 2)).$$

Since

$$\ln(\max(\sigma_j, 2)) \leq (\ln(\sigma_j))^+ + 1,$$

we obtain

$$\ln(n(\varepsilon, d)) \leq c_1 d \ln(\tau) + 3c_3 d + 3c_3 \sum_{j=1}^d (\ln(\sigma_j))^+.$$

Finally, there exists a constant  $c_4 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\tau) &= \ln(\ln(d) + \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})) \leq \ln(2 \max(\ln(d), \ln(\varepsilon^{-1}))) \\ &\leq c_4 \ln(\max(\ln(d), \ln(\varepsilon^{-1}))) \leq c_4 (h(d) + \ln(\ln(\varepsilon^{-1}))) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1/3]$ .  $\square$

Next, we present a sufficient condition for EC- $(t, k)$ -WT to hold for some  $t > 1$  and every  $\kappa > 0$ .

**Theorem 4.10.** *If there exist  $c, \alpha \geq 0$  such that the shape parameters satisfy*

$$\sigma_j \leq \exp(cj^\alpha)$$

*for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we have EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT for  $(L_{\sigma_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the normalized and the absolute error criterion for every  $t > \alpha + 1$  and every  $\kappa > 0$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to consider the normalized error criterion. We apply the upper bound for

$$n(\varepsilon, d) := n^{\text{norm}}(\min(\varepsilon, 1/3), L_{\sigma_d}) \geq n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, L_{\sigma_d}).$$

from Theorem 4.9. Clearly, we have

$$\lim_{d+\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d h(d) + d \ln(\ln(\max(\varepsilon^{-1}, 3)))}{d^t + \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})^\kappa} = 0$$

even for  $t > 1$ , so it suffices to show

$$\lim_{d+\varepsilon^{-1} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d (\ln(\sigma_j))^+}{d^t + \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})^\kappa} = 0$$

for  $t > \alpha + 1$ . This is indeed true, since

$$\sum_{j=1}^d (\ln(\sigma_j))^+ \leq \sum_{j=1}^d c j^\alpha \leq c d^{\alpha+1}.$$

$\square$

Theorem 4.10 extends the result established in Kuo et al. (2017, Thm. 1.1.(h)), where the boundedness condition (4.10) is shown to imply EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT for every  $t > 1$  and every  $\kappa \geq 1$  under the additional assumption that  $\sigma$  is non-increasing. Theorem 4.10 yields, in particular, that the latter already holds if  $(\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is polynomially bounded.

Next, we apply the transference result to obtain new results for Hermite spaces, where the normalized and the absolute error criterion coincide.

At first, corresponding to Theorem 4.9, we provide a new upper bound for  $\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, K_{\beta_d}))$  with an explicit dependence on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $d$ , and  $\beta$ .

**Theorem 4.11.** *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\ln(n^{\text{norm}}(\varepsilon, K_{\beta_d})) \leq C \cdot \left( dh(d) + d \ln(\ln(\varepsilon^{-1})) - \sum_{j=1}^d \ln(1 - \beta_j) \right)$$

for every  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $\varepsilon \in ]0, 1/3]$ , and every sequence  $\beta := (\beta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  of base parameters in  $(0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Since (4.4) implies  $2\sigma_j^2 < 1/(1 - \beta_j)$ , the statement follows from Corollary 4.5 and Theorem 4.9.  $\square$

Next, corresponding to Theorem 4.10, we give a sufficient condition for EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT to hold for some  $t > 1$  and every  $\kappa > 0$  in the case of Hermite spaces.

**Theorem 4.12.** *If there exist  $c, \alpha \geq 0$  such that the base parameters satisfy*

$$\beta_j \leq 1 - \exp(-cj^\alpha)$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we have EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT for  $(K_{\beta_d})_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the normalized error criterion for every  $t > \alpha + 1$  and every  $\kappa \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* The assumption on the shape parameters  $\beta_j$  implies  $-\ln(1 - \beta_j) \leq cj^\alpha$ . Thus we may proceed as in the proof of Theorem 4.10 to verify the claim.  $\square$

**Remark 4.13.** On the one hand, rather mild assumptions on the shape parameters or the base parameters imply EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT for every  $t > 1$  regardless of choice of  $\kappa$ , see Theorems 4.10 and 4.12. On the other hand, in the case  $t = 1$ , much stronger properties are required even for EC- $(t, 1)$ -WT to hold, see Theorem 4.8 and Irrgeher et al. (2015, Thm. 1.3). We add that necessary conditions for EC- $(t, \kappa)$ -WT are only known in the case  $t = 1$  and  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ .

**4.4. Functions of Infinitely Many Variables.** In this section, we consider the case  $d = \infty$ . For  $M = L_\sigma$  or  $M = K_\beta$ , we study the decay

$$(4.13) \quad \text{dec}(M) := \text{decay}((e_n(M))_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$$

of the  $n$ -th minimal worst-case errors, see (1.2). Note that a lower bound for  $\text{dec}(M)$  corresponds to an upper bound for the  $n$ -th minimal errors  $e_n(M)$  and vice versa. Our goal is to determine  $\text{dec}(L_\sigma)$ , and to this end we put

$$(4.14) \quad \rho := \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(1/\sigma_j^2)}{\ln(j)}.$$

Note that (2.6) implies  $\rho \geq 1$ , see, e.g., Gnewuch et al. (2019, Lemma B.3).

Recall that  $\$(m)$  denotes the cost of evaluating a function  $f: \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  at any point  $\mathbf{x}$  with exactly  $m$  non-zero components, see Section 3. We assume that there exist  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that

$$(4.15) \quad c_1 \cdot m \leq \$(m) \leq \exp(c_2 \cdot m)$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Theorem 4.14.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. The polynomial decay rate of  $n$ -th minimal errors of integration on the Gaussian space  $H(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$  is*

$$\text{dec}(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1).$$

*Proof.* Consider the sequence  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  of base parameters given by (4.4). Corollary 4.5 immediately yields

$$(4.16) \quad \text{dec}(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = \text{dec}(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

and thus it suffices to show  $\text{dec}(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1)$ . This has already been established in Gnewuch et al. (2024) for an arbitrary sequence  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  of base parameters such that  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_j < \infty$ . Indeed, put  $r_j := -\log_2(\beta_j)$ . After a possibly necessary reordering of the kernels, we have  $r_1 = \inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} r_j$ . Then the weights  $\beta_j^{-\nu} = 2^{r_j \cdot \nu}$  with  $\nu, j \in \mathbb{N}$  are exponentially growing Fourier weights in the sense of Gnewuch et al. (2024, Sec. 2.1). Hence we obtain from Gnewuch et al. (2024, Cor. 4.10) that the polynomial decay rate of  $n$ -th minimal errors of integration on the Hermite space  $H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  is

$$\text{dec}(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\rho} - 1),$$

where

$$\tilde{\rho} := \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_j \cdot \ln(2)}{\ln(j)}.$$

Given (4.4) we have  $\beta_j \asymp \sigma_j^2$ , and therefore

$$\rho = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(1/\beta_j)}{\ln(j)} = \tilde{\rho}. \quad \square$$

Algorithms that yield  $\text{dec}(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \geq (\rho - 1)/2$  are obtained by applying the transference result to properly chosen multivariate decomposition methods (MDMs) on the space  $H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ . Here we sketch the construction of the MDMs, see Gnewuch et al. (2024, Sec. 4.3) for details and further references.

Let  $\mathbf{U}$  denote the set of all finite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ . For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{U}$  we use  $(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{0}_{\mathbf{v}^c})$  to denote the point  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  given by  $y_j := x_j$  if  $j \in \mathbf{v}$  and  $y_j = 0$  otherwise. Due to Lemma 2.5, we always have  $(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{0}_{\mathbf{v}^c}) \in \mathfrak{X}(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ . The construction of MDMs is based on the anchored decomposition

$$(4.17) \quad f = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{U}} f_{\mathbf{u}}$$

of the functions  $f \in H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ , where

$$f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v} \subseteq \mathbf{u}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{u} \setminus \mathbf{v}|} \cdot f(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{0}_{\mathbf{v}^c})$$

for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{X}(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ . The anchored components  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$  of  $f$  only depend on the variables with indices in  $\mathbf{u}$ , so that  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$  may be considered as a multivariate function



with domain  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{u}|}$ . We stress that (4.17) is a non-orthogonal decomposition in the space  $H(K_\beta)$ .

At first, we choose a finite set  $\mathcal{B}$  of non-empty elements of  $\mathcal{U}$ , which specifies the anchored components  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$ , whose integrals with respect to the  $|\mathbf{u}|$ -dimensional standard normal distribution will be approximated. For each  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}$  we employ a Smolyak formula  $B_{\mathbf{u}, n_{\mathbf{u}}}$ , which uses  $n_{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{N}$  function values for the integration of the functions  $f_{\mathbf{u}}$ . The corresponding MDM is given by

$$(4.18) \quad B(f) := f(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}} B_{\mathbf{u}, n_{\mathbf{u}}}(f_{\mathbf{u}}).$$

As building blocks for the Smolyak formulas, we use a sequence  $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of univariate quadrature formulas, where  $B_n$  uses  $n$  function evaluations and  $e(B_n, k_{\beta_1})$  converges to 0 sufficiently fast, see again Gnewuch et al. (2024, Sec. 4.3) for details. For instance, we may use Gauss-Hermite rules  $B_n$ , which yield

$$e(B_n, k_{\beta_1}) \leq C \cdot \beta_1^n$$

with an explicitly known absolute constant  $C$ , see Irrgeher et al. (2015, Prop. 1) in the specific case  $\omega := 1/e$  as well as  $a := \ln(1/\beta_1)$  and  $b := 1$ . For alternatives, see Section 4.2. For the specific choice of  $\mathcal{B}$  and of  $n_{\mathbf{u}}$  for  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{B}$  we refer again to Gnewuch et al. (2024, Sec. 4.3).

## 5. $L^2$ -APPROXIMATION

As before, we consider sequences  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := (\sigma_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta} := (\beta_j)_{j \in J}$  of shape parameters and base parameters, respectively.

**5.1. The Transference Result.** In contrast to integration, we may use the relation (2.10) directly to establish a transference result for  $L^2$ -approximation in a straightforward way.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. Moreover, assume that (2.10) and (2.11) are satisfied for every  $j \in J$ . For every linear sampling method  $A$  with nodes from  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$  we have*

$$e(A, L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = (\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\beta})_*^{1/2} \cdot e(Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1} A Q_{\mathbf{c}}, K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 2.7. Put  $Q := Q_{\mathbf{c}}$ . Since  $Q|_{H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}$  is an isomorphism from  $H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  to  $H(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$  with

$$\|Qf\|_{H(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})}^2 = \|f\|_{H((\mathbf{1}-\boldsymbol{\beta})_* K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}^2 = (\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\beta})_*^{-1} \cdot \|f\|_{H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}^2$$

for every  $f \in H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ , we have

$$e(A, L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = (\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\beta})_*^{1/2} \cdot \sup_{\|f\|_{H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \leq 1} \|Qf - A Q f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\|Qf - A Q f\|_{L^2(\mu)} = \|f - Q^{-1} A Q f\|_{L^2(\mu)},$$

since  $Q$  is an isometric isomorphism on  $L^2(\mu)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.2.** Let the assumptions from Theorem 5.1 be satisfied. For a linear sampling method  $A$  on the Gaussian space  $H(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$  according to (3.1) with nodes

from  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$  the linear sampling method  $Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}AQ_{\mathbf{c}}$  on the Hermite space  $H(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  is easily determined explicitly: For  $f: \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}AQ_{\mathbf{c}}(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n Q_{\mathbf{c}}f(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{y}_i) \cdot b_i$$

with  $\mathbf{y}_i \in \ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)$  and  $b_i \in L^2(\mu)$  given by

$$\mathbf{y}_i := \mathbf{c}\mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and} \quad b_i(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\varphi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{c}^{-1}\mathbf{z})} \cdot a_i(\mathbf{c}^{-1}\mathbf{z}),$$

see Lemma 2.8.

It is easy to see that  $(\mathbf{x}_i, a_i) \mapsto (\mathbf{y}_i, b_i)$  defines a bijection on the set  $\ell^2(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \times L^2(\mu)$  of pairs of nodes and coefficients. Furthermore,

$$\text{cost}(A) = \text{cost}(Q_{\mathbf{c}}^{-1}AQ_{\mathbf{c}}),$$

cf. Remark 4.4.

**Corollary 5.3.** *Assume that (2.6) and (2.10) are satisfied. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have*

$$\frac{e_n(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})}{e_0(L_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})} = \frac{e_n(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{e_0(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} = e_n(K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}),$$

i.e., the normalized  $n$ -th minimal errors for  $L^2$ -approximation on Gaussian spaces and on the corresponding Hermite spaces, related by (2.10), coincide.

*Proof.* Combine Theorem 5.1, Remark 5.2, and Lemma 3.1.  $\square$

**5.2. Functions of Finitely Many Variables.**  $L^2$ -approximation in the case of finitely many variables has been studied previously by Fasshauer et al. (2012) and Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018) for Gaussian spaces and by Irrgeher et al. (2016a) and Irrgeher et al. (2016b) for Hermite spaces. While the latter paper employs linear sampling methods as described in Section 3, Irrgeher et al. (2016a) and Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018) allow a larger class of algorithms, namely linear algorithms  $A$  based on linear information, i.e.,

$$(5.1) \quad A(f) := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(f) \cdot a_i$$

with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , bounded linear functionals  $\lambda_i$  on  $H(M)$  and coefficients  $a_i \in L^2(\mu)$ ; Fasshauer et al. (2012) consider both classes of algorithms. In the case of general linear algorithms, the same tractability concepts have been studied on the one hand in Fasshauer et al. (2012) and Sloan and Woźniakowski (2018) for Gaussian spaces, and on the other hand in Irrgeher et al. (2016a) for Hermite spaces, with rather complete and matching results for both types of function space.

It was already observed in Irrgeher et al. (2016b) that the linear sampling methods studied there achieve the same results as algorithms of the form (5.1) for several tractability concepts. Indeed, as shown in Krieg et al. (2023), the results from Dolbeault et al. (2023) are applicable and lead to rather complete results for tractability based on linear sampling methods, though in a non-constructive way. Therefore, we do not apply our transference result to this case here. Our results for infinitely many variables, however, are new.

**5.3. Functions of Infinitely Many Variables.** As in Section 4.4, we consider  $\rho$  given by (4.14) and assume that the function  $\$$  obeys (4.15).

The next result follows easily from Gnewuch et al. (2024, Cor. 4.10) by means of our transference result.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Assume that (2.6) is satisfied. The polynomial decay rate of  $n$ -th minimal errors of  $L^2$ -approximation on the Gaussian space  $H(L_\sigma)$  is*

$$\text{dec}(L_\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1).$$

*Proof.* We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 4.14: By Corollary 5.3, we only have to consider  $\text{dec}(K_\beta)$ , and  $\text{dec}(K_\beta)$  is known for  $L^2$ -approximation, too. This time, however, the sequence  $\beta = (\beta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined as in (2.10), but again  $\beta_j \asymp \sigma_j^2$  and the weights  $\beta_j^{-\nu} = 2^{r_j \cdot \nu}$  with  $\nu, j \in \mathbb{N}$  are exponentially growing Fourier weights in the sense of Gnewuch et al. (2024, Sec. 2.1), possibly after reordering the kernels. As before,

$$\rho = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(1/\beta_j)}{\ln(j)} = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_j \cdot \ln(2)}{\ln(j)}.$$

Hence we obtain from Gnewuch et al. (2024, Cor. 4.10) that the polynomial decay rate of  $n$ -th minimal errors of  $L^2$ -approximation on the Hermite space  $H(K_\beta)$  is

$$\text{dec}(K_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho - 1). \quad \square$$

#### REFERENCES

- N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 68:337–404, 1950.
- J. Dick, C. Irrgeher, G. Leobacher, and F. Pillichshammer. On the optimal order of integration in Hermite spaces with finite smoothness. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 56:684–707, 2018.
- M. Dolbeault, D. Krieg, and M. Ullrich. A sharp upper bound for sampling numbers in  $L_2$ . *Appl. and Comput. Harm. Ana.*, 63:113–134, 2023.
- G. Fasshauer, F. J. Hickernell, and H. Woźniakowski. On dimension-independent rates of convergence for function approximation with Gaussian kernels. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 50:247–271, 2012.
- M. Gnewuch, M. Hefter, A. Hinrichs, K. Ritter, and G. W. Wasilkowski. Embeddings for infinite-dimensional integration and  $L_2$ -approximation with increasing smoothness. *J. Complexity*, 54:101406, 1–32, 2019.
- M. Gnewuch, M. Hefter, A. Hinrichs, and K. Ritter. Countable tensor products of Hermite spaces and spaces of Gaussian kernels. *J. Complexity*, 71:101654, 2022.
- M. Gnewuch, A. Hinrichs, K. Ritter, and R. Růßmann. Infinite-dimensional integration and  $L^2$ -approximation on Hermite spaces. *J. Approx. Theory*, 300:106027, 2024.
- C. Irrgeher and G. Leobacher. High-dimensional integration on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , weighted Hermite spaces, and orthogonal transforms. *J. Complexity*, 31:174–205, 2015.
- C. Irrgeher, P. Kritzer, G. Leobacher, and F. Pillichshammer. Integration in Hermite spaces of analytic functions. *J. Complexity*, 31:380–404, 2015.
- C. Irrgeher, P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, and H. Woźniakowski. Tractability of multivariate approximation defined over Hilbert spaces with exponential weights. *J. Approx. Theory*, 207:301–338, 2016a.
- C. Irrgeher, P. Kritzer, F. Pillichshammer, and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation in Hermite spaces of smooth functions. *J. Approx. Theory*, 207:98–126, 2016b.
- T. Karvonen and S. Särkkä. Gaussian kernel quadrature at scaled Gauss-Hermite nodes. *BIT Numer. Math.*, 59:877–902, 2019.

- T. Karvonen, C. J. Oates, and M. Girolami. Integration in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of Gaussian kernels. *Math. Comp.*, 90:2209–2223, 2021.
- D. Krieg, P. Siedlecki, M. Ullrich, and H. Woźniakowski. Exponential tractability of  $L_2$ -approximation with function values. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 49(2): 18, 2023.
- F. Y. Kuo and H. Woźniakowski. Gauss-Hermite quadratures for functions from Hilbert spaces with Gaussian reproducing kernels. *BIT Numer. Math.*, 52:425–436, 2012.
- F. Y. Kuo, I. H. Sloan, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. Liberating the dimension. *J. Complexity*, 26:422–454, 2010.
- F. Y. Kuo, I. H. Sloan, and H. Woźniakowski. Multivariate integration for analytic functions with Gaussian kernels. *Math. Comp.*, 86:829–853, 2017.
- G. Leobacher, F. Pillichshammer, and A. Ebert. Tractability of  $L_2$ -approximation and integration in weighted Hermite spaces of finite smoothness. *J. Complexity*, 78, 2023. 101768.
- H. Q. Minh. Some properties of Gaussian reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and their implications for function approximation and learning theory. *Constr. Approx.*, 32:307–338, 2010.
- V. I. Paulsen and M. Raghupathi. *An Introduction to the Theory of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- I. H. Sloan and H. Woźniakowski. Multivariate approximation for analytic functions with Gaussian kernels. *J. Complexity*, 45:1–21, 2018.
- I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support vector machines*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2008.
- I. Steinwart and C. Scovel. Mercer’s theorem on general domains: On the interaction between measures, kernels, and RKHSs. *Constr. Approx.*, 35:363–417, 2012.
- I. Steinwart, D. Hush, and C. Scovel. An explicit description of the reproducing kernel Hilbert space of Gaussian RBF kernels. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52:4635–4663, 2006.
- J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. *Information-Based Complexity*. Academic Press, New York, 1988.

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT OSNABRÜCK, ALBRECHTSTRASSE 28A, 49076 OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

*Email address:* michael.gnewuch@uni-osnabrueck.de

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, RPTU KAISERSLAUTERN, POSTFACH 3049, 67653 KAISERSLAUTERN, GERMANY

*Email address:* klaus.ritter@math.rptu.de

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, RPTU KAISERSLAUTERN, POSTFACH 3049, 67653 KAISERSLAUTERN, GERMANY

*Email address:* robin.ruessmann@math.rptu.de