

Weak convergence rates for spectral regularization via sampling inequalities

Sabrina Guastavino^{1*}, Gabriele Santin², Francesco Marchetti³,
Federico Benvenuto¹

^{1*}Department of Mathematics, University of Genova, Genova, Italy.

²Department of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy.

³Department of Mathematics “Tullio Levi-Civita”, University of Padova, Padova, Italy.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): sabrina.guastavino@unige.it;
Contributing authors: gabriele.santin@unive.it;
francesco.marchetti@unipd.it; federico.benvenuto@unige.it;

Abstract

Convergence rates in spectral regularization methods quantify the approximation error in inverse problems as a function of the noise level or the number of sampling points. Classical strong convergence rate results typically rely on source conditions, which are essential for estimating the truncation error. However, in the framework of kernel approximation, the truncation error in the case of Tikhonov regularization can be characterized entirely through sampling inequalities, without invoking source conditions. In this paper, we first generalize sampling inequalities to spectral regularization, and then, by exploiting the connection between inverse problems and kernel approximation, we derive weak convergence rate bounds for inverse problems, independently of source conditions. These weak convergence rates are established and analyzed when the forward operator is compact and uniformly bounded, or the kernel operator is of trace class.

Keywords: Inverse problems, spectral regularization, approximation theory, kernel methods, sampling inequalities, weak error estimates

MSC Classification: 65J20 , 65J22 , 41A25 , 47A52 , 46N40

1 Introduction

The problem of recovering a function from discrete data arises in various application domains such as inverse problems, interpolation, kernel approximation and learning [1–5]. The quality of the estimation is typically assessed in terms of convergence rates, which quantify the decay of the approximation error as the number of data samples increases. In inverse problems, given a finite and discrete set of noise-corrupted observations, spectral regularization schemes yield one-parameter families of estimators whose squared-norm error satisfies the classical bias–variance trade-off. The key point in the study of convergence rates is the *source condition*, which is crucial for bounding the bias term. Source conditions encode a priori smoothness assumptions on the (possibly generalized) solution f^\dagger of an inverse problem described by the forward equation $Af^\dagger = g$, where $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a compact linear operator. The classical form is

$$f^\dagger = \psi(A^*A)w, \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_1,$$

where ψ is an index function, for example $\psi(t) = t^\mu$ for the classical Holder-type source conditions [2, 6]. In inverse problems, convergence rate bounds have been established in both a deterministic setting, where the noise is infinite dimensional, and a statistical setting, where the data are drawn from a (possibly unknown) distribution. These analyses accommodate general classes of operators, such as Hilbert–Schmidt or trace-class operators [7, 8]. Moreover, a precise correspondence between the convergence rates in these two settings has been established [9]. The main limitation of source conditions is that, while they guarantee the theoretical computability of the bounds, they impose assumptions that are often unrealistic and rarely satisfied in practice.

A different but related line of research arises in kernel approximation and approximation theory, where convergence rate results are derived under a deterministic setting, and sampling is therefore treated as a geometric process yielding a set of points $\mathcal{X}_n = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ contained in the compact subset over which functions are defined. The central tool for bounding the approximation error are the *sampling inequalities* that are defined in terms of the *fill distance*

$$h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_n} \|x - x_i\|.$$

This quantity reflects the density of the distribution of the sampling points, and offer a concrete way to measure how well the domain is covered [10–12]. Since the deterministic approximation error studied in approximation theory mirrors the bias term in statistical inverse problems, it is natural to ask:

Is it possible to establish error estimates for spectral regularization of inverse problems by using sampling inequalities and, therefore, independently of source conditions?

In this study, we provide a positive response to this question under the condition that the error estimates are given in a weak sense. To achieve this result, we analyze the interplay between operator-theoretic regularization and kernel approximation theory

by exploiting that the image of a compact operator is a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS). Our main contributions are the following:

1. we generalize the bounds for the approximation error using sampling inequalities to the setting of *spectral regularization methods*, obtaining deterministic bias bounds depending explicitly on the fill distance h ;
2. we derive upper bounds on the variance term under gaussian noise models, by incorporating additive noise in the sampling process;
3. we use such approximation bounds to give weak error estimates for spectral regularized solutions in inverse problems.

Weak error estimates are obtained by selecting suitable test functions. In this study we consider two classes of test functions, each of which depends on the forward operator, providing two distinct ways to evaluate the convergence of spectral reconstruction error in a weak sense. The main advantage of using sampling inequalities to derive these error bounds is that the resulting estimates do not require any *a priori* assumptions on the smoothness of the source, which is rarely available in practical applications. In contrast, such weak estimates depend on geometric properties of the sampling set, most notably the fill distance. This shift can make the resulting error bounds potentially meaningful in real-world problems, since the fill distance can either be computed directly from the data, as in the case of a training set in supervised learning, or be known in advance, as in image reconstruction where the sampling pattern is controlled (e.g., sensor locations, acquisition grids).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the mathematical setup and highlight the connection between approximation problems in RKHS and inverse problems solutions. In Section 3, we state our main results, which include new bounds for spectral regularized solutions of approximation problems, obtained via sampling inequalities, and their translation into weak error estimates for spectral regularized solutions in inverse problems. Section 4 provides application examples. In Sections 5 and 6 the proofs of the main results are presented, and finally the conclusions are drawn in Section 7.

2 Mathematical setup

2.1 Compact linear operators and RKHSs

In this section, we recall some basic facts about linear compact operators and their connection with RKHSs, with the aim of fixing the notation used throughout the paper. We refer to [2] and [13] for a detailed treatment of these topics.

2.1.1 Compact linear operators

Let us consider a compact linear operator $A : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$, where \mathcal{H}_1 is a Hilbert space and \mathcal{H}_2 is a Hilbert space of functions over a set \mathcal{X} , and denote by $D(A)$, $R(A)$ and $N(A)$ the domain, range, and null space of A , respectively. In this setting there exists a singular system $\{(\sigma_j, u_j, v_j)\}_j$ of A , i.e., a \mathcal{H}_1 -orthonormal system $\{v_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}_1$, a \mathcal{H}_2 -orthonormal system $\{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}_2$, and strictly positive and non increasing

numbers $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that A has the spectral decomposition

$$Av = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sigma_j \langle v_j, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} u_j, \quad v \in \mathcal{H}_1.$$

It follows that the adjoint $A^* : \mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ of A is given by

$$A^*u = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sigma_j \langle u_j, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2} v_j, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}_2,$$

so that

$$R(A^*) = \left\{ \sum_j a_j v_j \in \mathcal{H}_1 : \sum_j v_j^2 / \sigma_j^2 < +\infty \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Moreover, provided that the expansion

$$\phi_x := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sigma_j u_j(x) v_j \quad (2)$$

converges for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, using the fact that $\{v_j\}_j$ is a basis of $N(A)^\perp$ the operator A can be written as

$$(Aw)(x) = \langle w, \phi_x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad w \in \mathcal{H}_1. \quad (3)$$

We remark that $\phi_x \in N(A)^\perp$ and, letting $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ be a feature map defined by $\phi(x) = \phi_x$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{F} := \overline{\text{span}\{\phi(x), x \in \mathcal{X}\}} = N(A)^\perp. \quad (4)$$

We recall that the pseudoinverse is a bounded operator if and only if A has closed range and, since A is compact, this is true if and only if it has a finite dimensional range. The pseudo inverse of A has the representation

$$A^\dagger u = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_j} \langle u_j, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2} v_j, \quad u \in R(A) \otimes R(A)^\perp,$$

and its adjoint, which satisfies $(A^\dagger)^* = (A^*)^\dagger$, is

$$(A^\dagger)^* v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_j} \langle v_j, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} u_j, \quad v \in R(A^\dagger) \otimes R(A^\dagger)^\perp = N(A) \otimes N(A)^\perp. \quad (5)$$

2.1.2 Spectral regularization

Spectral regularization tools play a fundamental role in inverse problems. In general, a spectral regularization is a map $\mathfrak{R} : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{H}_2 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{R}(B, z, \lambda) := s_\lambda(B^*B)B^*z, \quad (6)$$

where $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is a bounded linear operator, $z \in \mathcal{H}_2$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $s_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the *regularization function* and the operator $s_\lambda(B^*B)$ is defined via the spectral calculus. In order to ensure stability and convergence of the spectral regularization, the family $\{s_\lambda\}_{\lambda>0}$ has to satisfy the following:

Assumption 1. *The regularization (or filtering) function $s_\lambda : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $\lambda > 0$ satisfies the following properties:*

1. *there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \|B\|^2]} |ts_\lambda(t)| \leq D \quad \text{uniformly in } \lambda > 0, \quad (7)$$

2. *there exists a constant $E > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\lambda > 0} \sup_{t \in [0, \|B\|^2]} |\lambda s_\lambda(t)| \leq E, \quad (8)$$

3. *there exists $q > 0$ called qualification of the method and constants $C_a > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \|B\|^2]} |t^a(1 - ts_\lambda(t))| \leq C_a \lambda^a \quad \forall \lambda > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq a \leq q. \quad (9)$$

The idea of spectral regularization is to provide approximated solutions of a linear operator equation with noisy data by filtering out high frequencies. Typical examples are the following.

- Tikhonov regularization: in this case the regularization function is given by $s_\lambda(t) = (\lambda + t)^{-1}$ and the qualification is $q = 1$.
- Truncated singular value decomposition (or spectral cut-off): in this case the regularization function is given by

$$s_\lambda(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t}, & \text{if } t \geq \lambda \\ 0, & \text{if } t < \lambda \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

and q is arbitrary.

- Landweber regularization: given γ such that $|1 - \gamma t| < 1$ for $t \in \sigma(B^*B)$, the regularization function is given by

$$s_\lambda(t) = t^{-1} \left(1 - (1 - \gamma t)^{(1/\lambda)} \right) \quad (11)$$

and q is arbitrary.

2.1.3 Linear compact operators and RKHSs

A key ingredient in our results is the connection between linear compact operators and RKHSs. We first recall the definition of RKHS.

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{H}_K := \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$ be an Hilbert space of real valued functions on a non-empty set \mathcal{X} . \mathcal{H}_K is said to be a RKHS if there exists a reproducing kernel $K : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $K(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g(x) = \langle g, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K}$.

Equivalently, \mathcal{H}_K is a RKHS if the evaluation functionals $L_x : g \in \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L_x(g) := g(x)$ are continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and in this case $K(\cdot, x)$ is the Riesz representer of L_x for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The space \mathcal{H}_K is often named the native space of K in the literature on approximation theory [14–16]. The following fact is a well-established result in the theory of linear operators (see Chapter 17.3 [17]). For the sake of clarity, we give a simple proof of this result in our framework.

Theorem 1. Let A be a compact linear operator defined by equation (3). The range $R(A)$ of A is a RKHS \mathcal{H}_K with inner product

$$\langle g, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} := \langle A^\dagger g, A^\dagger h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad g, h \in \mathcal{H}_K, \quad (12)$$

and kernel

$$K(x, x') := \langle \phi_x, \phi_{x'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad x, x' \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (13)$$

where ϕ_x is defined in equation (2).

Proof First, the expression (12) is well defined since $\mathcal{H}_K = R(A) \subset D(A^\dagger)$, and it indeed defines an inner product since it is clearly symmetric, linear, and positive semi-definite. The space $(\mathcal{H}_K, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K})$ is thus a pre-Hilbert space. It is in fact complete, since any Cauchy sequence $\{g_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{H}_K$ defines a Cauchy sequence $\{A^\dagger g_n\}_n \subset \mathcal{H}_1$. Since \mathcal{H}_1 is complete, this sequence has in turn a limit $g \in \mathcal{H}_1$, and it is easy to see that $g_n \rightarrow Ag$ in \mathcal{H}_K .

To see that this space is a RKHS we show that L_x is bounded for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (see Definition 1). Indeed, for all $u \in \mathcal{H}_K$ we have that there is $v \in N(A)^\perp \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ with $Av = u$, and in particular for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x)| &= |Av(x)| = |\langle \phi_x, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}| \leq \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|\phi_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \\ \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} &= \|A^\dagger u\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\|L_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_K'} \leq \|\phi_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} < \infty$.

Finally, the definition (13) and (3) show that for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $K(x, x') = \langle \phi_x, \phi_{x'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = A\phi_{x'}(x)$, and thus $K(\cdot, x) \in \mathcal{H}_K$ since $\mathcal{H}_K = R(A)$. Moreover, for $u = Av \in \mathcal{H}_K$ with $v \in N(A)^\perp$ we can write

$$\langle K(\cdot, x), u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} = \langle A\phi_x, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} = \langle A^\dagger A\phi_x, A^\dagger u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \langle \phi_x, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}$$

$$= Av(x) = u(x),$$

which shows that K is the reproducing kernel of \mathcal{H}_K . \square

Observe that the definition (13) also gives the expression

$$K(x, x') = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sigma_j^2 u_j(x) u_j(x'), \quad (14)$$

and that the theorem shows the existence of an isomorphism between the space \mathcal{F} in (4) and the RKHS. Namely, the first isomorphism theorem applied to the map

$$A : \mathcal{H}_1 \longrightarrow R(A) = \mathcal{H}_K \subseteq \mathcal{H}$$

yields

$$\mathcal{F} = N(A)^\perp \simeq \mathcal{H}_1 / N(A) \simeq R(A) = \mathcal{H}_K.$$

As the kernel is invariant under unitary transformations, the map ϕ_x associated with a given kernel K is determined only up to the action of the unitary group on \mathcal{H}_1 , i.e.

$$K(x, x') = \langle \phi_x, \phi_{x'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \langle U\phi_x, U\phi_{x'} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1},$$

for each unitary operator U acting on \mathcal{H}_1 .

2.2 Semi-discrete inverse problems in RKHSs

Given any set of nodes $\mathcal{X}_n = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and a function $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$, we consider the *semi-discrete operator*

$$(A_n f)_i := \langle f, \phi_{x_i} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = (Af)(x_i), \quad (15)$$

which maps $A_n : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. With the normalized inner product on \mathbb{R}^n , its adjoint is

$$A_n^* w = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \phi_{x_i} \quad \text{and} \quad A_n^* A_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \cdot, \phi_{x_i} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \phi_{x_i}, \quad (16)$$

for $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In this framework, we start by considering the reconstruction of the function

$$g := Af : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

from its sampled values $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ with $y_i = g(x_i)$. In this case, the kernel-based interpolant takes the form

$$\hat{g}^{(n)} = k(\mathcal{X}_n) \cdot c \quad \text{where} \quad k(\mathcal{X}_n) := (K(\cdot, x_1), \dots, K(\cdot, x_n)) \quad (17)$$

and the coefficients $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ solves the linear system

$$Kc = y, \quad \text{where} \quad K = (K_{ij}) = K(x_i, x_j) = (A_n A_n^*)_{ij} \quad (18)$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, is the so-called interpolation, or collocation, or simply kernel, or Gram's matrix. Therefore, the interpolant $\hat{g}^{(n)}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{X}_n} := \text{span}\{K(x, \cdot), x \in \mathcal{X}_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_K$. When K is strictly positive definite, the interpolant (17) is the unique minimizer of the *empirical risk*

$$\hat{g}^{(n)} = \underset{z \in \mathcal{H}_K}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - z(x_i))^2. \quad (19)$$

We refer to [14–16] for more details on this topic, including classical results. The associated inverse problem consists in recovering the minimum-norm solution

$$\hat{f}^{(n)} := \underset{f' \in F}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|f'\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}, \quad (20)$$

where

$$F := \underset{f \in \mathcal{H}_1}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - (A_n f)_i)^2. \quad (21)$$

Thanks to the representer theorem (see e.g. [18, Theorem 1]), the solution admits a finite representation

$$\hat{f}^{(n)} = \phi(\mathcal{X}_n) \cdot c \quad \text{where} \quad \phi(\mathcal{X}_n) := (\phi_{x_1}, \dots, \phi_{x_n}) \quad (22)$$

with the same coefficients c appearing in the interpolation formula (17). Equivalently, the minimizers (19) and (20) are related by

$$\hat{f}^{(n)} = A^\dagger \hat{g}^{(n)}.$$

When the data are perturbed by i.i.d. Gaussian noise,

$$y^\delta = y + \delta, \quad \delta_i \sim G(0, \sigma^2), \quad (23)$$

it is natural to consider a regularized reconstruction. In the direct (kernel) formulation, it is common practice to solve the Tikhonov regularized problem

$$\hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} := \underset{z \in \mathcal{H}_K}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^\delta - z(x_i))^2 + \lambda \|z\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2, \quad (24)$$

with $\lambda > 0$ the regularization parameter, whose solution has the finite representation

$$\hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} = k(\mathcal{X}_n) \cdot c_\lambda^\delta, \quad (K + \lambda I) c_\lambda^\delta = y^\delta. \quad (25)$$

The inverse Tikhonov regularized problem

$$\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}_1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^\delta - (A f)(x_i))^2 + \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}. \quad (26)$$

then satisfies

$$\hat{f}_\lambda^{(\delta,n)} = (A^\dagger \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta,n)}) = \phi(\mathcal{X}_n) \cdot c_\lambda^\delta. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, direct and inverse estimators share the same coefficient vector, with only the basis $\{K(\cdot, x_i)\}$ replaced by $\{\phi_{x_i}\}$ through the relation $f = A^\dagger g$. In particular, the representer theorem makes the correspondence between the two problems completely explicit, independently of whether regularization is applied.

More generally, a spectral regularization map s_λ applied to $A_n^* A_n$ yields the solution

$$\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} = s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* y^\delta. \quad (28)$$

For such spectral regularization methods, error estimates are provided only when some source condition is given. See, for example, [8] and references therein. Moreover, spectral regularization provides a generalization of the classical smoothing strategy for interpolation, since it defines an approximation function as

$$\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} := A_{s_\lambda} y^\delta \quad (29)$$

where $A_{s_\lambda} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow R(A) = \mathcal{H}_K$, defined by

$$A_{s_\lambda} := A s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^*, \quad (30)$$

is the semidiscrete influence operator [19]. Inspired by this direct-inverse connection, in the next section we present some widely used tools from approximation theory that will be employed to compute weak error estimates for inverse problems, independent of source conditions.

2.3 Kernel-based approximation and sampling inequalities

We assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, and we define the *fill distance* of the set of points \mathcal{X}_n as follows

$$h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_n} \|x - x_i\|_2,$$

which measures to what extent the domain is filled by data nodes, and the *separation distance*

$$q_{\mathcal{X}_n} := \frac{1}{2} \min_{i \neq j} \|x_i - x_j\|_2, \quad (31)$$

which measures the minimal distance between two distinct nodes. It is clear that $q_{\mathcal{X}_n} \leq h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}$. The reverse inequality characterizes certain sets that are of large interest in kernel-based methods.

Definition 2. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded. A sequence $\{\mathcal{X}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sets $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$, each of n pairwise distinct points, is called *quasi-uniform* if there is $c_u \in (0, 1]$ such that $c_u h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} \leq q_{\mathcal{X}_n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For quasi-uniform points there is a constant $c > 0$ depending on d and \mathcal{X} such that $h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} \leq cn^{-1/d}$. We remark that it can be proven by a volume argument that

$h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} \geq c'n^{-1/d}$ for any bounded set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. It follows that quasi-uniform sequences of points provided an asymptotically optimal filling of \mathcal{X} .

The approximation power of certain methods that we will discuss in the following will be measured by means of suitable sampling inequalities. These formalize the idea that, for sufficiently regular functions, an approximant that is close to a target function on a sufficiently dense discrete set needs to also be close in the global sense [11, 12].

The results derived from such inequalities, which we recall in the following, differ according to the regularity of the kernel. To quantify this regularity, we will make use of Sobolev spaces $W_p^\tau(\mathcal{X})$ of possibly fractional smoothness $\tau := k + s$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < s < 1$, and with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Denoting as D^α the derivative with multiindex $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, if $s = 0$ these spaces are equipped with the seminorm and norm defined as

$$|g|_{W_p^k(\mathcal{X})} = \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \|D^\alpha g\|_{L_p(\mathcal{X})}^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad \|g\|_{W_p^k(\mathcal{X})} = \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \|D^\alpha g\|_{L_p(\mathcal{X})}^p \right)^{1/p},$$

while in the general case we set

$$\|g\|_{W_p^{k+s}(\mathcal{X})} := \left(\|g\|_{W_p^k(\mathcal{X})}^p + |g|_{W_p^{k+s}(\mathcal{X})}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where we used the seminorm

$$|g|_{W_p^{k+s}(\mathcal{X})} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \frac{|D^\alpha g(x) - D^\alpha g(y)|^p}{\|x - y\|_2^{d+ps}} dx dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

with the usual modification for $p = \infty$. We remark that if $\tau > d/2$ and \mathcal{X} is bounded and with a Lipschitz boundary, the Sobolev inequality gives the continuous embedding $W_2^{k+s}(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow C(\mathcal{X})$, and in particular all point evaluation functionals are continuous in $W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$, which is thus a RKHS according to Definition 1.

We consider two classes of kernels of different smoothness, for both of which there are known sampling inequalities that we recall in the remaining part of this section. First, if $K \in C^{k,s}(\mathcal{X})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in (0, 1)$ with respect to both arguments, then there is a continuous embedding $\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow C^{k,s}(\mathcal{X})$ (see e.g. [14]). Since $C^{k,s}(\mathcal{X}) \subset W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$ if $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded and sufficiently regular, it also holds that $\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$. Examples in this class are the Matérn kernels and the compactly-supported Wendland kernels, see e.g. Chapter 10 [14]. On the other hand, there are kernels of infinite smoothness whose RKHS is embedded in $W_p^k(\mathcal{X})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Examples are the Gaussian and Inverse Multi Quadrics (IMQ) (see [10]).

The first result is Theorem 4.1 in [20], which generalized Theorem 2.6 [21], and it encompasses the case of Sobolev spaces. We report here the version of this result that is needed for our purposes. We remark that we will use the result for $q = 2, \infty$. In the second case the result of [21] would be sufficient in our bounds, while we need this extended version for $q = 2$.

Theorem 2 ([20]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $s > 0$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $\tau := k + s > d/2$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m \leq \lceil m_0 \rceil - 1$ and $m_0 = k + s - d(1/2 - 1/q)_+$, where $(x)_+ := \max(x, 0)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded and satisfies an interior cone condition. Then there are constants $C, h_0 > 0$ such that for all $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} < h_0$, and any $z \in W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$ it holds*

$$|z|_{W_q^m(\mathcal{X})} \leq C \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau-m-d(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})_+} |z|_{W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})} + h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\frac{d}{\gamma}-m} \|z|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_2 \right),$$

where $\gamma := \max(2, q)$, and $x/\infty = 0$.

Remark 1. *A similar result holds if \mathbb{R}^d is replaced by the sphere \mathbb{S}^d (see Theorem 3.3 in [22]), provided the fill distance is computed using the geodesic distance. We omit this result here for simplicity.*

For the second class of kernels, which are embedded in any Sobolev space, we will need instead the following. The result for Gaussians and IMQs was proved in Corollary 5.1 [10], while Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.7 in [23] extended the results to Multiquadrics and shifted surface splines.

Theorem 3 ([10],[23]). *Let $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the union of finitely many compact cubes with equal side lengths. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. Then there are constants $c, c', h_0 > 0$ such that for all $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} < h_0$, and any $z \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$ the following holds:*

- *If K is the Gaussian kernel, then*

$$\|D^\alpha z\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} \leq h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{c \frac{\log(h)}{h}} \|z\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + h^{-2|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \|z|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_\infty.$$

- *If K is the IMQ, Multiquadric, or shifted surface spline, then*

$$\|D^\alpha z\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} \leq h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{-\frac{c}{h}} \|z\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + h^{-2|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \|z|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_\infty.$$

The result is valid for much more general kernels, provided one can estimate the embedding constant of \mathcal{H}_K in W_p^k for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $1 \leq p < \infty$ (see Theorem 4.5 in [10]). We stick here to this formulation for simplicity.

We remark that sampling inequalities have already been used in [24] to provide bounds on inverse problems, even if in a simpler setting when source conditions are considered. Namely, [24] considers only Tikhonov regularization, pointwise bounded noise, and assumes that the problem is *mildly-ill posed*, meaning that strong bounds on the reconstruction of g can directly be transferred to strong bounds on the reconstruction of f (see Assumption 4.6 in [24]).

3 Main results

This section is devoted to the main theoretical results of the paper. In the first part, we show that spectral regularization yields an approximate interpolation operator whose behavior can be controlled through sampling inequalities. In the second part, we

apply these results to inverse problems and establish weak error estimates expressed in terms of projections onto operator-dependent test functions, thereby avoiding the use of source conditions.

3.1 Approximate interpolation via spectral regularization

We can now use the sampling inequalities of Section 2.3 to obtain a bound on the norm of the error $e_\lambda^{(n)} := g - \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$, where $g \in R(A)$ and $\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$ is computed by spectral regularization, as described in Section 2.2 on the noise-free data, i.e.

$$\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} = As_\lambda(A_n^* A_n)A_n^* y. \quad (32)$$

For this we need bounds on the terms $\left|e_\lambda^{(n)}\right|_{W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})}$ and $\left\|(e_\lambda^{(n)})_{|\mathcal{X}_n}\right\|_2$ appearing in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3. We derive these bounds in Lemma 5, where we prove that both quantities can be controlled by terms depending solely on λ and on the properties of the filtering function, and more specifically on the constants $D, C_{1/2}$ and q (see Definition 1). By inserting these bounds in the corresponding sampling inequalities we obtain the following error bounds for spectral regularization. We refer to Section 5.3 for the proofs of these results.

Proposition 1. *Let $q, \tau, d, m, h_0, C, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_n$ be as in Theorem 2, with $h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} \leq h_0$. Assume that $\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$, and let $\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$ be computed by spectral regularization with constants $D, C_{1/2} > 0$ as in Definition 1. Then*

$$\left|g - \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}\right|_{W_q^m(\mathcal{X})} \leq C' h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\frac{d}{2}-m} \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau-\frac{d}{2}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}, \quad (33)$$

with $\gamma := \max(2, q)$, $C' := C \max\{C_e(D+1), C_{1/2}\}$ and $C_e > 0$ as in (66).

In the following, we will use the inequality in 33 in the case $q = 2$ and $q = \infty$.

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_n, c, c', h_0$ be as in Theorem 3, with $h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}} \leq h_0$. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$ and let $\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$ be computed by spectral regularization with constants $D, C_{1/2} > 0$ as in Definition 1. Then, setting $C' := \max\{D+1, C_{1/2}\}$ we have the following:*

- If K is the Gaussian kernel, then

$$\left\|D^\alpha \left(g - \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}\right)\right\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} \leq C' h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \left(e^{-\frac{c'-c \log(h)}{h}} + \lambda^{1/2}\right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})}.$$

- If K is the IMQ, Multiquadric, or shifted surface spline, then

$$\left\|D^\alpha \left(g - \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}\right)\right\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} \leq C' h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \left(e^{-\frac{c'+c}{h}} + \lambda^{1/2}\right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})}.$$

We remark that Lemma 5 generalizes Proposition 3.1 in [21], which holds for Tikhonov regularization only. It follows that in this case Proposition 1 coincides with Proposition 3.6 in [21], while Proposition 2 is related with Theorem 6.1 in [10].

3.2 Weak error estimates for inverse problems

Let A be the compact operator defined in (3) described by the map ϕ . We now state two bounds for the weak error of spectral regularization: a general estimate valid for any bounded operator A , followed by an improved rate under a trace-class assumption on A^*A .

Proposition 3. *Let $\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)}$ be the spectral regularized solution defined in equation (28). When A is uniformly bounded, for each $\psi \in D((A^*)^\dagger)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \leq C_\psi \left(\|\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} - g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} + \sigma_{\max} c \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{E}{\lambda} \right), \quad (34)$$

where $E > 0$ is the constant appearing in the second property of spectral regularization in Definition 1, σ_{\max}^2 is the largest eigenvalue of A^*A , c is the uniform boundedness constant, and $\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$ is the noise-free spectrally regularized solution introduced in (32).

In addition, if the operator A^*A is of trace class, then the following bound holds:

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \leq C_\psi \left(\|\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} - g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} + \sigma_{\max} \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'' \right), \quad (35)$$

where $C'' > 0$ is the constant bounding the trace norm of the operator $A_n^*A_n$.

We now derive analogous bounds for a different family of test functions commonly used in the study of sparse approximation [25], i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F}) := \left\{ \psi = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_i \phi_{x_i}, \ x_i \in \mathcal{X}, \ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |\alpha_i| < +\infty \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}.$$

Since $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$ is a subspace of the feature space \mathcal{F} , it is naturally endowed with a seminorm. We extend this seminorm to $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F}) \oplus N(A)$ by setting $|\psi + v|_{\mathcal{A}_1} := |\psi|_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ for any $v \in N(A)$, with $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$. The statements below mirror the previous estimates, but now for test functions in $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$, and are expressed in terms of the ℓ_1 -norm of the coefficient sequence α associated with a given $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$.

Proposition 4. *Under the same hypothesis of proposition 3, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq \|\alpha^\psi\|_{\ell_1} \left(\|\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} - g\|_\infty + c^2 \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{E}{\lambda} \right), \quad (36)$$

for each $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$ whose coefficient sequence α^ψ is absolutely summable. Moreover, if the operator A^*A is of trace class then the following bound holds:

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq \|\alpha^\psi\|_{\ell_1} \left(\|\hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} - g\|_\infty + c \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'' \right), \quad (37)$$

By plugging the sampling inequalities into the propositions above, we obtain weak error bounds for inverse problems that are independent of any source conditions and controlled via suitable test functions.

Proposition 5. (*Weak error bounds for spectral regularization*). Let $\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)}$ be the spectral regularized solution defined in equation (28) and $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathcal{X})$. For each $\psi \in D((A^*)^\dagger)$, we have the following weak error bound

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq C_\psi \left(C_f h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau - \frac{d}{2}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \sigma_{\max} c \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{E}{\lambda} \right), \quad (38)$$

where $C_f = C' \|f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$. Hence, the error becomes minimal for

$$\lambda \simeq \left(\frac{\nu^2}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{-\frac{d}{3}}. \quad (39)$$

If A^*A is of trace class then

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq C_\psi \left(C_f h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau - \frac{d}{2}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \sigma_{\max} \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'' \right), \quad (40)$$

where $C_f = C' \|f^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}$. Hence, the error becomes minimal for

$$\lambda \simeq \left(\frac{\nu}{n} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{-\frac{d}{3}}. \quad (41)$$

The following corollary quantifies the optimal convergence rate of the weak error.

Corollary 1. For each $\psi \in D((A^*)^\dagger)$, by assuming $h = O(n^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ we have the following optimal weak error bound

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) = O \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\min(\frac{\tau}{d}, \frac{1}{2})} \right), \quad (42)$$

with

$$\lambda = O(1) \quad (43)$$

If A^*A is of trace class then we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\min(\frac{\tau}{d}, \frac{2}{3})}\right), \quad (44)$$

with

$$\lambda = O(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}) \quad (45)$$

As in the previous case, we exploit the sampling inequalities to derive a weak error bound for test functions in $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$.

Proposition 6. (Weak error bounds for spectral regularization). Let $\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)}$ be the spectral regularized solution defined in equation (28). For each $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq \|\alpha\|_{\ell_1} \left(C_f \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau - \frac{d}{2}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + c^2 \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{E}{\lambda} \right), \quad (46)$$

where $C_f = C' \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}$. Hence the error becomes minimal for

$$\lambda \simeq \left(\frac{\nu^2}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (47)$$

If A^*A is of trace class then

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \leq \|\alpha\|_{\ell_1} \left(C_f \left(h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}^{\tau - \frac{d}{2}} + \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + c \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'' \right), \quad (48)$$

Hence the error becomes minimal for

$$\lambda \simeq \left(\frac{\nu}{n} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (49)$$

The following corollary provides the optimal convergence rate in this case.

Corollary 2. . For each $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$, by assuming $h = O(n^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ we have the following optimal weak error bound

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\min(\frac{\tau}{d} - \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6})}\right), \quad (50)$$

with

$$\lambda = O(n^{-\frac{1}{3}}). \quad (51)$$

If A^*A is of trace class then

$$\mathbb{E}(|\langle \psi, \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta, n)} - f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}|) = O\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\min(\frac{\tau}{d} - \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3})}\right), \quad (52)$$

with

$$\lambda = O(n^{-\frac{2}{3}}). \quad (53)$$

Rates are the result of the well-known trade-off between bias and variance. For instance, in Corollary 1, which yields the strongest rates, the error is bias-dominated when $\frac{\tau}{d} < \frac{1}{2}$, so that increasing the kernel regularity τ improves the convergence rate. Once the regularity exceeds the threshold $\frac{\tau}{d} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, however, the rate becomes variance-limited, and further increases in τ no longer improve it, as the error is now controlled by the amplification term. This behavior highlights a fundamental limitation: even with highly regular kernels, the convergence rate cannot exceed $O(n^{-1/2})$, reflecting the minimax optimal rate common to many statistical estimation problems. Consequently, while higher regularity is advantageous in low-dimensional settings, its benefit diminishes in higher dimensions or for fixed sample sizes. This is the case, for instance, of the infinitely smooth Gaussian kernel: although it can, in theory, induce a very fast decay of the bias term, the overall convergence rate is ultimately limited by the variance. In high-dimensional settings or with a fixed sample size, this variance dominates the error, so that the high regularity of the kernel does not necessarily translate into better practical performance.

4 Applications

In this section we present several examples of linear functionals to which the error bounds shown above apply. In particular, we examine two classical cases: the inverse differentiation problem and the deconvolution problem with a translation-invariant kernel.

4.1 Limited regularity

Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_1 := L^2[0, 1]$. Consider the forward operator

$$g(x) = (Af)(x) = \langle f, \phi_x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \int_0^x f(t) dt \quad (54)$$

where $\phi_x(t) = 1_{[0, x]}(t)$. The inverse problem is to find f such that $g = Af$, given $g \in \mathcal{H}_2 := L^2[0, 1]$. The image $R(A)$ is the Beppo Levi space, or homogeneous Sobolev space [26], equipped with the norm

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} := \|A^\dagger g\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = |g|_{W_2^1},$$

where the generalized inverse A^\dagger of the integral operator (54) is exactly the derivative $D = A^\dagger$ over $R(A)$. Indeed, any function $g \in \mathcal{H}_2 \setminus R(A)$ is such that $g(0) \neq 0$ and can

be approximated in the \mathcal{H}_2 norm with a sequence of elements in $R(A)$, which means that $g \in \partial\mathcal{R}(A)$ and $R(A)^\perp = \emptyset$. Moreover, as $g(0) = 0$ for each $g \in R(A)$ no constant functions except zero are allowed in the range $R(A)$ and $A^\dagger = A^{-1}$. Then, $R(A)$ is an Hilbert space with the Brownian reproducing kernel

$$K(x_1, x_2) = \langle \phi_{x_1}, \phi_{x_2} \rangle_{L^2[0,1]} = \int_0^1 1_{[0,x_1]}(t) 1_{[0,x_2]}(t) dt = \min(x_1, x_2) \quad (55)$$

and scalar product

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K} := \langle Dg_1, Dg_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2}.$$

We now present two examples of test functions to which the weak error bounds of Proposition 3 and Proposition 4 apply, respectively. The first test function are the characteristic function $\chi_{xy} := \phi_y - \phi_x = 1_{[x,y]}$ where $y > x$, we have a $|\chi_{xy}|_{\mathcal{A}_1} = 2$. For these functions the bound in Proposition 4 readily applies, and the striking fact is that this bound is independent of the distance between x and y , showing that we can localize the error with asymptotically infinite accuracy.

The second test functions are weakly differentiable functions on $[0, 1]$ and belong to the domain of $(A^*)^\dagger$, since A is the integral transform (54). In the following we report an example of such a test function satisfying the condition of Proposition 3. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $a, b \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$, $a < b$, and define

$$\psi_0 := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (-\chi_{[a-\varepsilon, a]} + \chi_{[b, b+\varepsilon]}),$$

where χ is the indicator function. Since $\psi_0 \in L_2(0, 1)$, the function $\psi := A^*\psi_0$ is in $R(A^*)$ by definition, and it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(t) &= A^*\psi_0(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(-\int_t^1 \chi_{[a-\varepsilon, a]}(x) dx + \int_t^1 \chi_{[b, b+\varepsilon]}(x) dx \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(-\begin{cases} \varepsilon, & t \leq a - \varepsilon, \\ a - t, & a - \varepsilon < t \leq a \\ 0, & t > a \end{cases} + \begin{cases} \varepsilon, & t \leq b, \\ b + \varepsilon - t, & b < t \leq b + \varepsilon \\ 0, & t > b + \varepsilon \end{cases} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & t \leq a - \varepsilon, \\ 1 - (a - t)/\varepsilon, & a - \varepsilon < t \leq a \\ 1, & a < t \leq b \\ 1 + (b - t)/\varepsilon, & b < t \leq b + \varepsilon \\ 0, & t > b + \varepsilon, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which is a C^0 -smoothed indicator function of the interval $[a, b]$. Moreover,

$$\|\psi_0\|_{L_2(0,1)}^2 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\int_{a-\varepsilon}^a dx + \int_b^{b+\varepsilon} dx \right) = \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

According to Lemma 2 and Remark 3, we thus have that

$$\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{L_2(0,1)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}} \|g\|_{L_2(0,1)} \quad \text{for all } g \in L_2(0,1).$$

This implies in particular that one can get arbitrarily close to measuring the error on a compactly supported area, up to accepting a constant growing as $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$.

4.2 Infinitely smooth

Now we see the case of a convolution operator with a infinitely smooth Gaussian kernel. In this case, we show that bounds of Proposition 4 hold true for sufficiently regular approximation of any square integrable test function. Suppose $A : \mathcal{H}_1 = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{L}^2(C)$ where $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ a compact set, represents the space-invariant convolution operator

$$Af(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\phi}(x-t) f(t) dt ,$$

where $\tilde{\phi}$ is a real-valued positive definite, continuous and square integrable function (cfr. equation 2.38 in [27]). From the definition of the adjoint operator $A^*g(t) = \int_C \phi(x+t)g(x)dx$, we have that the reproducing kernel of $R(A)$ is

$$K(x, x') = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\phi}(x-t) \tilde{\phi}(x'-t) dt$$

is the autocorrelation function of $\tilde{\phi}$. If we take

$$\phi_x(t) := \tilde{\phi}(x-t) := \sqrt{2/\pi} \exp(-(x-t)^2)$$

the kernel K is given by

$$K(x, x') = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x-x')^2\right) .$$

In this case \mathcal{A}_1 is dense in $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{R})$ as it contains Gaussian functions with given variance. This result can be found in [28].

Lemma 1. *For any $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $t_0 > 0$ and $N_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for $0 < n \leq N_\epsilon$, such that for $t \neq 0$ and $|t| < t_0$*

$$\left\| \psi - \sum_{n=1}^{N_\epsilon} \alpha_n \exp(-(\cdot - nt)^2) \right\|_2 \leq \epsilon$$

Thus, for each $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set of coefficient α_i with $i = 1, \dots, n$ so that the function

$$\psi_{n_\epsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\epsilon} \alpha_i \phi_{x_i}$$

satisfies $\|\psi_{n_\epsilon} - \psi\| \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, we can approximate any functional ψ with an arbitrary precision ϵ by ψ_{n_ϵ} and for such an approximation ϕ_ϵ , we have the error bound in proposition 4. The coefficients α_n depends also on the t chosen to guaranteed the approximation, while t can be chosen arbitrarily small, so that the approximation is valid even for compact subset \mathcal{C} .

5 Proof of the approximation bound

We start by proving a technical result to bound the value of the evaluation of a linear functional on $A^\dagger g$ in terms of the \mathcal{H}_2 -norm of $g \in D(A^\dagger)$.

5.1 Bounds on the \mathcal{H}_2 norm

We recall that $D(A^\dagger) = R(A) \otimes R(A)^\perp$, $D((A^*)^\dagger) = R(A^*) \otimes R(A^*)^\perp$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$. There exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| \leq C \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \quad \text{for all } g \in D(A^\dagger), \quad (56)$$

if and only if

$$\psi \in D((A^*)^\dagger) = R(A^*) + R(A^*)^\perp, \quad (57)$$

and in this case (56) holds with $C = \|(A^)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.*

Moreover, the condition (57) holds for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$ if and only if the range $R(A)$ is finite dimensional, and in this case in (56) we can take

$$C = \|(A^*)^\dagger\|_{\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2} \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}.$$

Proof First, if $g \in R(A)^\perp$ then $A^\dagger g = 0$ and the bound holds trivially, so we can assume $g \in R(A)$. Moreover, if $\psi \in R(A^*)^\perp$ we have by definition that $(A^*)^\dagger \psi = 0$ and thus $\|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = 0$, and furthermore $R(A^*)^\perp \subset N(A)$, so that $\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = 0$ for all $g \in R(A)$ since $R(A^\dagger) \subset N(A)^\perp$. Thus in this case (56) and (57) are clearly equivalent.

For all other cases, we first write all statements explicitly in terms of the bases. Let $\psi := \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j u_j \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $g := \sum_j b_j v_j \in R(A)$ be generic elements, which means that it holds

$$\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 = \sum_j a_j^2 < \infty, \quad \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = \sum_j b_j^2 \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}^2 = \sum_j b_j^2 / \sigma_j^2 < \infty, \quad (58)$$

which implies also that $A^\dagger g = \sum_j (b_j/\sigma_j) u_j$ is well defined. Moreover, recall from (1) that $\psi \in R(A^*)$ if and only if

$$\sum_j a_j^2/\sigma_j^2 < \infty, \quad (59)$$

and in this case

$$(A^*)^\dagger \psi = (A^\dagger)^* \psi = \sum_j (a_j/\sigma_j) u_j, \quad \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = \sum_j (a_j/\sigma_j)^2. \quad (60)$$

Finally, we have that

$$\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \sum_j \frac{a_j b_j}{\sigma_j}. \quad (61)$$

To prove now that (57) implies (56), we can simply apply the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to (61) and get

$$\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \leq \left(\sum_j (a_j/\sigma_j)^2 \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(\sum_j b_j^2 \right)^{1/2} = \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2},$$

where we used (58) and (60) in the last equality.

For the opposite direction assume instead that (57) does not hold, which, thanks to (59), implies that

$$C_n := \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^2/\sigma_j^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty.$$

We can consider now the function $g \in \mathcal{H}_K = R(A)$ dedined by

$$b_j := \begin{cases} a_j/\sigma_j, & j \leq n \\ 0, & j > n, \end{cases}$$

which is indeed in \mathcal{H}_K for any finite $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see (58)). However, we have from (58) and (61) that

$$\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j/\sigma_j)^2 = C_n, \quad \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (a_j/\sigma_j)^2 \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{C_n},$$

and thus (56) may hold only if $C \geq C_n$. Since n is generic and $C_n \rightarrow \infty$, there can be no finite C that works in (56).

Finally, $R(A^*) + R(A^*)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_1$ if and only if the sum is direct, which holds if and only if $R(A^*)$ is closed. This in turn is equivalent to require that $R(A)$ is closed, and since A is compact this is possible if and only if $R(A)$ is finite. In this case $(A^*)^\dagger$ is a bounded operator, and thus the estimate on C follows. \square

From this lemma it is immediate to obtain a bound on the error in the approximation of the source, given a \mathcal{H}_2 -bound on the error in the approximation of the data.

Proposition 7. *Let $g \in R(A)$ and $\hat{g} \in \{\hat{g}^{(n)}, \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}, \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n,\delta)}\}$ (see (19), (24) and (29)). Define $f := A^\dagger g$ and $\hat{f} := A^\dagger \hat{g}$. Then for each $\psi \in D((A^*)^\dagger)$ it holds*

$$\left| \langle \psi, f - \hat{f} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| \leq C \|g - \hat{g}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \quad \text{for all } g \in D(A^\dagger),$$

with $C := \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.

Proof The result follows by applying Lemma 2 to the function $g - \hat{g} \in R(A) \subset D(A^\dagger)$. \square

We conclude the section with some remarks on this result.

Remark 2 (On the proof of Lemma 2). *The direct implication can be proved also more directly, by observing that the expression $(A^\dagger)^* \psi$ is well defined if and only if $\psi \in D((A^\dagger)^*) = D((A^*)^\dagger)$, and in this case*

$$\langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \langle (A^\dagger)^* \psi, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \|(A^\dagger)^* \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_2},$$

and thus indeed (56) works with $C = \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.

Remark 3 (Computation of C). *When (57) holds, either $\psi \in R(A^*)^\perp$ and then $C = 0$ as shown in the proof, or $\psi \in R(A^*)$. In this case, unless $\psi = 0$, there exists $\psi_0 \in N(A^*)^\perp$ such that $\psi = A^* \psi_0$, and thus $C = \|(A^*)^\dagger \psi\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$.*

5.2 Bounds on the L_∞ norm

We now turn to analogous bounds expressed in the L_∞ norm.

Lemma 3. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and assume that there are indices $I \subset \mathbb{N}$, points $(x_i)_{i \in I} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and coefficients $(c_i)_{i \in I} \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $\sum_{i=1}^\infty |c_i| =: C < \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \psi - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \phi_{x_i} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} = 0. \quad (62)$$

Then

$$\left| \langle \psi, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| \leq C \|g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \quad \text{for all } g \in D(A^\dagger).$$

Proof Set $\psi_n := \sum_{j=1}^n c_j \phi_{x_j}$. We use the fact that $Af(x) = \langle \phi_x, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $f \in \mathcal{H}_1$ (see (3)), and that $AA^\dagger g = g$ for all $g \in \mathcal{H}_2$ to write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \psi_n, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^n c_j \langle \phi_{x_j}, A^\dagger g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^n c_j A(A^\dagger g)(x_j) \right| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^n c_j g(x_j) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n |c_j| |g(x_j)| \leq C \|g\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})}, \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit for $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the left-hand side concludes the proof thanks to (62) and the continuity of the norm. \square

As in the previous paragraph, the lemma implies a result relating a weak error on $A^\dagger g$ with an L_∞ -error on g .

Proposition 8. Let $g \in R(A)$ and $\hat{g} \in \{\hat{g}^{(n)}, \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}, \hat{g}_{s_\lambda}^{(n,\delta)}\}$ (see (19), (24) and (29)). Define $f := A^\dagger g$ and $\hat{f} := A^\dagger \hat{g}$. Then for each $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F}) + N(A)$ it holds

$$\left| \left\langle \psi, f - \hat{f} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| \leq |\psi|_{\mathcal{A}_1} \|g - \hat{g}\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \quad \text{for all } g \in D(A^\dagger).$$

Proof First, observe that $N(A) = \overline{R(A^\dagger)}^\perp \supset R(A^\dagger)^\perp$, thus if $\psi \in N(A)$ it holds $\left\langle \psi, f - \hat{f} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} = 0$. We can then assume $\psi \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{F})$.

The result then follows by applying Lemma 3 to the function $g - \hat{g} \in R(A) \subset D(A^\dagger)$. \square

Remark 4. Observe that in Proposition 7 we do not need to add a term $v \in N(A)$ since $N(A) = \overline{R(A^\dagger)}^\perp = N((A^\dagger)^*) \subset D((A^\dagger)^*) = D((A^*)^\dagger)$, and thus this case is already covered by (56) with $C = 0$.

5.3 Sampling inequalities for spectral regularization

We first recall how to compute interpolants using kernels that are positive definite, but non necessarily strictly positive definite.

Lemma 4. Let $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$, and set $V(\mathcal{X}_n) := \text{span}\{K(\cdot, x) : x \in \mathcal{X}_n\}$. Let $P_{\mathcal{X}_n} : \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{X}_n)$ be the orthogonal projection onto $V(\mathcal{X}_n)$. Then, for $g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$ the function $P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g$ interpolates g at \mathcal{X}_n , and it can be written as

$$P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i K(x, x_i), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (63)$$

with $\alpha := K^\dagger g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$.

Proof The space $V(\mathcal{X}_n)$ is finite dimensional, hence closed. It follows that the orthogonal projection $P_{\mathcal{X}_n}$ is well defined, and by definition it holds that $g - P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g \in V(\mathcal{X}_n)^\perp$, and in particular

$$0 = \langle g - P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g, k(\cdot, x_j) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} = g(x_j) - P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g(x_j) \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (64)$$

This means that $v \in V(\mathcal{X}_n)$ coincides with $P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g$ if and only if it interpolates g at \mathcal{X}_n .

Now, since $P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g \in V(\mathcal{X}_n)$ it can be written in the form (63) for some coefficient vector $\alpha := (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The interpolation conditions (64) mean that $K\alpha = g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, and in particular $g|_{\mathcal{X}_n} \in R(K)$. This in turns implies that the coefficients can be chosen as $\bar{\alpha} := K^\dagger g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$, since KK^\dagger is the identity on $R(K)$ and thus $K\bar{\alpha} = KK^\dagger g|_{\mathcal{X}_n} = g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$. \square

We can now prove a generalization of Proposition 3.1 in [21].

Lemma 5. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$, $\lambda > 0$, s_λ a regularization function. Let $\hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} := \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha_\lambda)_j K(\cdot, x_j)$ with $\alpha_\lambda = s_\lambda(K)g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$. Then, if s_λ has a qualification $q \geq 1/2$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g - \hat{g}_\lambda)|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_2 &\leq C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}, \\ \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} &\leq (D+1) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}, \end{aligned}$$

where $D, C_{1/2}$ are the constants of Definition 1.

Proof We set $b := g|_{\mathcal{X}_n}$ and denote as $K = U\Sigma U^T$ an SVD/eigendecomposition of K , with $\Sigma := \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{(n)}, \dots, \sigma_n^{(n)})$, $\sigma_i^{(n)} \geq \sigma_{i+1}^{(n)} \geq 0$. Furthermore we let $n' \leq n$ be the largest index for which $\sigma_{n'}^{(n)} > 0$. We first observe that the norm of $P_{\mathcal{X}_n}g$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{X}_n}g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} &= \sqrt{\alpha^T K \alpha} = \sqrt{b^T K^\dagger K K^\dagger b} = \|K^{1/2} K^\dagger b\|_2 \\ &= \|U \Sigma^{1/2} U^T U \Sigma^\dagger U^T b\|_2 = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^\dagger U^T b\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^\dagger$ is a diagonal matrix. Moreover, note that multiplying by $\Sigma^{1/2}$ gives

$$(\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^\dagger)_{ii} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\sigma_i^{(n)}} \sqrt{\sigma_i^{(n)}} / \sigma_i^{(n)} = 1, & 1 \leq i \leq n' \\ 0, & n' + 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases} \quad (65)$$

For the discrete term, Lemma 4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g - \hat{g}_\lambda)|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_2 &= \|(P_{\mathcal{X}_n}g - \hat{g}_\lambda)|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_2 \\ &= \|K\alpha - K\alpha_\lambda\|_2 \\ &= \|K(K^\dagger - s_\lambda(K))b\|_2 \\ &= \|U\Sigma U^T U(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))U^T b\|_2 \\ &= \|\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))U^T b\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that (65) implies that

$$\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma)) = \Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^\dagger,$$

so we can continue with

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g - \hat{g}_\lambda)|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_2 &= \|\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^\dagger U^T b\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^\dagger U^T b\|_2 \\ &= \|\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 \|P_{\mathcal{X}_n}g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K}. \end{aligned}$$

The norm of the first term can be computed explicitly since the matrix is diagonal, giving

$$\|\Sigma(\Sigma^\dagger - s_\lambda(\Sigma))\Sigma^{1/2}\|_2 = \max_{t \in \{\sigma_1^{(n)}, \dots, \sigma_{n'}^{(n)}\}} \left| t \left(\frac{1}{t} - s_\lambda(t) \right) t^{1/2} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \max_{t \in \{\sigma_1^{(n)}, \dots, \sigma_{n'}^{(n)}\}} \left| t^{1/2} (1 - ts_\lambda(t)) \right| \\
&\leq C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used property (3) of Definition 1, with $q \geq 1/2$, in the last step. Thus

$$\left\| (g - \hat{g}_\lambda)|_{\mathcal{X}_n} \right\|_2 \leq C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \|P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K},$$

since $P_{\mathcal{X}_n}$ is an orthogonal projection.

For the second term we proceed similarly and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} &= \sqrt{\alpha_\lambda^T K \alpha_\lambda} = \sqrt{b^T s_\lambda(K) K s_\lambda(K) b} = \left\| K^{1/2} s_\lambda(K) b \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} s_\lambda(\Sigma) U^T b \right\|_2 = \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} s_\lambda(\Sigma) \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma^\dagger U^T b \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \Sigma^{1/2} s_\lambda(\Sigma) \Sigma^{1/2} \right\|_2 \|P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

and now as before

$$\left\| \Sigma^{1/2} s_\lambda(\Sigma) \Sigma^{1/2} \right\|_2 = \max_{t \in \{\sigma_1^{(n)}, \dots, \sigma_{n'}^{(n)}\}} |ts_\lambda(t)| \leq D \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0,$$

using (1) in Definition 1. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} &\leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + \left\| \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + D \|P_{\mathcal{X}_n} g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} \\
&\leq (D+1) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K},
\end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. \square

These two bounds allow us to use a sampling inequality to bound the error of the spectrally regularized approximant. For the first case we assume that there is a continuous embedding $\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})$, i.e., there is $C_e > 0$ such that

$$|g|_{W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})} \leq \|g\|_{W_2^\tau(\mathcal{X})} \leq C_e \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X}). \quad (66)$$

We can now prove Proposition 1 and Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 1 We use the sampling inequality of Theorem 2, setting $h := h_{\mathcal{X}_n, \mathcal{X}}$ to simplify the notation. Taking $v := g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}$ and using the norm inequality (66) and Lemma 5 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} \right|_{W_q^m(\mathcal{X})} &\leq C \left(h^{\tau-m-d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+C_e} \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + h^{\frac{d}{\gamma}-m} \left\| (g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)})|_{\mathcal{X}_n} \right\|_2 \right) \\
&\leq C \left(h^{\tau-m-d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+C_e(D+1)} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} + h^{\frac{d}{\gamma}-m} C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \right) \\
&\leq C' \left(h^{\tau-m-d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+} + h^{\frac{d}{\gamma}-m} \lambda^{1/2} \right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \\
&\leq C' h^{\frac{d}{\gamma}-m} \left(h^{\tau-d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+-\frac{d}{\gamma}} + \lambda^{1/2} \right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K},
\end{aligned}$$

with C' as in the statement. Observing that $d\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}\right)+\frac{d}{\gamma} = \frac{d}{2}$ gives the first statement. \square

Proof of Proposition 2 Using Theorem 3, and following the same approach as in the proof of Proposition 1, we get for the first case

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^\alpha (g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)})\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} &\leq h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{c \frac{\log(h)}{h}} \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + h^{-2|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \|(g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)})|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_\infty \\
&\leq h^{-3|\alpha|} \left(e^{c \frac{\log(h)}{h}} (D+1) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} \right) \\
&\leq C' h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \left(e^{-\frac{c' - c \log(h)}{h}} + \lambda^{1/2} \right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

with $C' := \max\{D+1, C_{1/2}\}$. The second case is completely analogous, giving

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^\alpha (g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)})\|_{L_q(\mathcal{X})} &\leq h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{-\frac{c}{h}} \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})} + h^{-2|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \|(g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)})|_{\mathcal{X}_n}\|_\infty \\
&\leq h^{-3|\alpha|} e^{\frac{c'}{h}} \left((D+1) e^{-\frac{c'+c}{h}} + C_{1/2} \lambda^{1/2} \right) \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_K(\mathcal{X})},
\end{aligned}$$

and using the same C' as before. \square

Proof of proposition 3 Given $\hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)}$ in equation (29), we want to estimate the error

$$g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)}$$

as a function of λ , δ and n . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} &= g - A_\lambda y^\delta \\
&= g - A_\lambda y - A_\lambda \delta \\
&= g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)} - A_\lambda \delta
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Proposition 7 to $\hat{g} = \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)}$ we get

$$\left| \left\langle \psi, f - \hat{f}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| \leq C \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} + \|A_\lambda \delta\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}.$$

If $\mathcal{H}_2 = L_2(\mathcal{X})$, we take the expected value, and bound the second term using Proposition 9. \square

Proof of proposition 6 Following the same approach, we apply instead Proposition 8 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left\langle \psi, f - \hat{f}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} \right| &\leq |\psi|_{\mathcal{A}_1} \|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(\delta, n)}\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \\
&\leq |\psi|_{\mathcal{A}_1} \left(\|g - \hat{g}_\lambda^{(n)}\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} + \|A_\lambda \delta\|_{L_\infty(\mathcal{X})} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and bound the second term using Proposition 9. \square

6 Proof of the noise amplification bound

Proposition 9. Let $\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)}$ be the spectral regularized solution defined in equation (28) and $\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)}$ be the noisy-free spectral regularized solution defined as

$$\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)} := s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* A_n f. \quad (67)$$

Then we have the following bounds

$$\mathbb{E}|(A(\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)})(x)| \leq c^2 \frac{E\nu}{\sqrt{n\lambda}} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\|A(\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)})\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \sigma_{\max} \frac{E\nu c}{\sqrt{n\lambda}}, \quad (69)$$

where $E > 0$ is the constant of the second property of the spectral regularization, σ_{\max}^2 is the maximum eigenvalue of $A^* A$ and $c > 0$ is the constant of the uniformly bounded hypothesis.

If $A^* A$ is of trace class then we have the following bounds

$$\mathbb{E}|(A(\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)})(x)| \leq c \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'', \quad (70)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\|A(\hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(\delta,n)} - \hat{f}_{s_\lambda}^{(n)})\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \sigma_{\max} \frac{\nu}{n} \frac{E}{\lambda} C'', \quad (71)$$

where $C'' > 0$ is the constant which bounds the trace norm of $A_n^* A_n$.

Proof Let $\{(\sigma_l^{(n)}, v_l^{(n)}, u_l^{(n)})\}_{l=1}^n$ be the singular value decomposition of $A_n^* A_n$, then

$$(A_n f)_i = \langle f, \phi_{x_i} \rangle = \sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_l^{(n)} \langle f, v_l^{(n)} \rangle (u_l^{(n)})_i \quad (72)$$

and

$$\phi_{x_i} = \sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_l^{(n)} v_l^{(n)} (u_l^{(n)})_i. \quad (73)$$

Let

$$\eta = \mathbf{y} - A_n f, \quad (74)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta &= \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) \langle v_j^{(n)}, A_n^* \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} v_j^{(n)} = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) \langle v_j^{(n)}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \phi_{x_l} \eta_l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} v_j^{(n)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) \langle v_j^{(n)}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \eta_l \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^{(n)} (u_k^{(n)})_l v_k^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} v_j^{(n)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) \sum_{l=1}^n \sigma_j^{(n)} (u_j^{(n)})_l \eta_l v_j^{(n)} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) \sigma_j^{(n)} \hat{\eta}_j v_j^{(n)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\eta}_j = \sum_{l=1}^n (u_j^{(n)})_l \eta_l = \langle \eta, u_j^{(n)} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is a random variable with mean 0 and variance ν^2 . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(A_\lambda \eta)(x)| &= |\langle \phi_x, s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1}| \leq \|\phi_x\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \|s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_1} \\
\mathbb{E}(\|s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\|s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2)} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n s_\lambda^2((\sigma_j^{(n)})^2) (\sigma_j^{(n)})^2 \mathbb{E}(\hat{\eta}_j^2) \|v_j^{(n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2} \\
&\leq \frac{E\nu}{n\lambda} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (\sigma_j^{(n)})^2} \leq \frac{E\nu}{\sqrt{n\lambda}},
\end{aligned}$$

where E is the constant of the second property of the spectral regularization (8) and we use $\sum_{j=1}^n (\sigma_j^{(n)})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \|\phi_{x_j}\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 \leq nc$. In the case that the operator $A^* A$ is of trace class then by assuming $C'' > 0$ the constant which bounds the trace norm of the operator $A_n^* A_n$ the bound becomes $\frac{EC''\nu}{n\lambda}$. Therefore for the uniformly boundness hypothesis we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|A_\lambda \eta(x)| \leq c^2 \frac{E\nu}{\sqrt{n\lambda}}.$$

Further, we have the following bound

$$\mathbb{E}(\|A_\lambda \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}) \leq \|A\| \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\|s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2)} \quad (75)$$

$$\leq \sigma_{\max} \frac{\nu E c}{\sqrt{n\lambda}} \quad (76)$$

where σ_{\max}^2 is the maximum eigenvalue of $A^* A$. In the case of the hypothesis that $A^* A$ is of trace class we obtain the following two bounds

$$\mathbb{E}|A_\lambda \eta(x)| \leq c \frac{EC''\nu}{n\lambda},$$

$$\mathbb{E}(\|A_\lambda \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}) \leq \|A\| \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\|s_\lambda(A_n^* A_n) A_n^* \eta\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2)} \quad (77)$$

$$\leq \sigma_{\max} \frac{\nu EC''}{n\lambda}. \quad (78)$$

□

7 Conclusions

We have presented an approach to error estimation in spectral regularization of inverse problems based on sampling inequalities. By interpreting the reconstruction error in a weak sense, we show that convergence rates can be established independently of a priori smoothness assumptions on the unknown solution. This is achieved by exploiting

the connection between inverse problems and kernel approximation in RKHS, and by extending sampling inequalities to spectral regularization. Our main contributions include: (i) spectral regularized error bounds expressed in terms of the fill distance of sampling points for kernel approximation problems; (ii) point-wise variance bounds beyond traditional L_2 norm, in the framework of kernel approximation with additive Gaussian noise; and (iii) weak convergence estimates for spectral regularized solutions of inverse problems depending on the fill distance for two given classes of test functions according to the forward operator. Our findings show that increasing kernel regularity improves convergence rates only up to a certain degree. For sufficiently smooth kernels or high dimensions, the rate becomes variance-limited and cannot exceed $O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$, yielding the classical minimax optimal rate for many statistical estimation problems. Importantly, the bounds depend on geometric properties of the sampling set and are independent of the regularity of the unknown solution, thus allowing possibly relevant implications for practical applications, such as image reconstruction and kernel-based learning, where sampling patterns are often known.

Acknowledgements. All authors acknowledge the Gruppo Nazionale per il Calcolo Scientifico - Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (GNCS - INdAM). This research was conducted within the framework of the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Genoa (CUP D33C23001110001). G.S. was partially supported by the project “Perturbation problems and asymptotics for elliptic differential equations: variational and potential theoretic methods” funded by the program “NextGenerationEU” and by MUR-PRIN, grant 2022SENJZ3.

References

- [1] Wahba, G.: Practical approximate solutions to linear operator equations when the data are noisy. *SIAM journal on numerical analysis* **14**(4), 651–667 (1977)
- [2] Engl, H.W., Hanke, M., Neubauer, A.: *Regularization of Inverse Problems* vol. 375. Springer, New York (1996)
- [3] Bertero, M., De Mol, C., Pike, E.R.: Linear inverse problems with discrete data. I. General formulation and singular system analysis. *Inverse problems* **1**(4), 301 (1985)
- [4] Vapnik, V.: *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer, New York (2013)
- [5] Cucker, F., Zhou, D.X.: *Learning Theory: An Approximation Theory Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2007)
- [6] Loubes, J.-M., Rivoirard, V.: Review of rates of convergence and regularity conditions for inverse problems. *International Journal of Tomography and Statistics* **11**(S09), 61–82 (2009)

- [7] Wang, C., Zhou, D.-X.: Optimal learning rates for least squares regularized regression with unbounded sampling. *Journal of Complexity* **27**(1), 55–67 (2011)
- [8] Blanchard, G., Mücke, N.: Optimal rates for regularization of statistical inverse learning problems. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 1–43 (2017)
- [9] Guastavino, S., Benvenuto, F.: Convergence rates of spectral regularization methods: A comparison between ill-posed inverse problems and statistical kernel learning. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* **58**(6), 3504–3529 (2020)
- [10] Rieger, C., Zwicknagl, B.: Sampling inequalities for infinitely smooth functions, with applications to interpolation and machine learning. *Adv. Comput. Math.* **32**(1), 103–129 (2010)
- [11] Rieger, C., Wendland, H.: Sampling inequalities for sparse grids. *Numer. Math.* **136**(2), 439–466 (2017)
- [12] Rieger, C., Wendland, H.: Sampling inequalities for anisotropic tensor product grids. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **40**(1), 285–321 (2020)
- [13] Desoer, C.A., Whalen, B.H.: A note on pseudoinverses. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **11**(2), 442–447 (1963) <https://doi.org/10.1137/0111031> <https://doi.org/10.1137/0111031>
- [14] Wendland, H.: *Scattered Data Approximation*. Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, vol. 17. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2005)
- [15] Fasshauer, G.E.: *Meshfree Approximation Methods with MATLAB*. World Scientific, ??? (2007)
- [16] Fasshauer, G.E., McCourt, M.: *Kernel-Based Approximation Methods Using MATLAB*. Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences, vol. 19. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ (2015)
- [17] Kress, R.: *Linear Integral Equations* vol. 82. Springer, New York (1999)
- [18] Schölkopf, B., Herbrich, R., Smola, A.J.: A generalized representer theorem. In: Helmbold, D., Williamson, B. (eds.) *Computational Learning Theory*, pp. 416–426. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2001)
- [19] Vogel, C.R.: *Computational Methods for Inverse Problems*. SIAM, ??? (2002)
- [20] Arcangéli, R., Silanes, M.C., Torrens, J.J.: An extension of a bound for functions in sobolev spaces, with applications to (m, s)-spline interpolation and smoothing. *Numerische Mathematik* **107**(2), 181–211 (2007) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00211-007-0092-z>

- [21] Wendland, H., Rieger, C.: Approximate interpolation with applications to selecting smoothing parameters. *Numerische Mathematik* **101**(4), 729–748 (2005)
- [22] Le Gia, Q.T., Narcowich, F.J., Ward, J.D., Wendland, H.: Continuous and discrete least-squares approximation by radial basis functions on spheres. *Journal of Approximation Theory* **143**(1), 124–133 (2006) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jat.2006.03.007> . Special Issue on Foundations of Computational Mathematics
- [23] Lee, M.B., Yoon, J.: Sampling inequalities for infinitely smooth radial basis functions and its application to error estimates. *Applied Mathematics Letters* **36**, 40–45 (2014) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aml.2014.05.001>
- [24] Krebs, J., Louis, A.K., Wendland, H.: Sobolev error estimates and a priori parameter selection for semi-discrete tikhonov regularization. *Journal of Inverse and Ill-posed Problems* **17**(9), 845–869 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1515/JIIP.2009.050>
- [25] DeVore, R.A., Temlyakov, V.N.: Some remarks on greedy algorithms. *Adv. Comput. Math.* **5**(2-3), 173–187 (1996) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02124742>
- [26] Deny, J., Lions, J.-L.: Les espaces du type de beppo levi. In: *Annales de L’institut Fourier*, vol. 5, pp. 305–370 (1954)
- [27] Bertero, M., Boccacci, P.: *Introduction to inverse problems in imaging* (1998)
- [28] Calcaterra, C.: Linear combinations of gaussians with a single variance are dense in ℓ_2 . In: *Proceedings of the World Congress on Engineering*, vol. 2 (2008)