

A Theory on Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space for Machine Learning

<https://github.com/Shena4746/RKHS-for-ML>

2020/05/14

What's this?

This document collects basic results on Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space that are useful in the context of machine learning, aimed at readers with a basic knowledge of functional analysis. The content relies heavily on the existing literature listed in the bibliography, in particular [1] [2]. [3] [4] [5]

Overview

Contents

1	Basic Property of RKHS	2
1.1	Properties of Reproducing Kernel	2
1.2	RKHS of a kernel	4
1.3	Basic Properties of Kernel	12
2	Reconstruction of RKHS	12
2.1	Reconstruction via Restriction	12
2.2	Reconstruction via Operator	12
2.3	Reconstruction via Sum and Product	12
3	Inheritance from Kernel to RKHS	12
3.1	Measurability of RKHS	12
3.2	Separability of RKHS	12
3.3	Continuity of RKHS	12
4	Mercer Representation	12

1 Basic Property of RKHS

1.1 Properties of Reproducing Kernel

Definition 1.1 (Reproducing kernel). *Let E be a nonempty set. A function K defined by*

$$K : E \times E \ni (x, y) \mapsto K(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}$$

is called a reproducing kernel of a Hilbert space H of functions on E if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $K(\cdot, x) \in H$ for every $x \in E$
- (b) $\langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_H = f(x)$ for every $x \in E$ and every $f \in H$.

Such a Hilbert space, associated with its reproducing kernel, is called a reproducing kernel hilbert space, and is denoted by (H, K) .

Remark 1.2. (b) is called the textitreproducing property, and the identity is called the textitreproducing identity. \triangleleft

Theorem 1.3 (Characterization of RKHS). *A Hilbert space H of functions on a nonempty set E admits a reproducing kernel K if and only if all evaluation functionals $\{\text{ev}_x\}_{x \in E}$ are continuous on H .*

Proof. Suppose (H, K) is a RKHS. For $x \in E$ and for $f \in H$ we have

$$|\text{ev}_x(f)| = |f(x)| = |\langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle| \leq \|f\| \|K(\cdot, x)\| \leq \|f\| K(x, x)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\|f\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, ev_x is continuous linear functional (with norm $K(x, x)^{1/2}$).

Conversely, if $\text{ev}_x : H \ni f \mapsto f(x) \in \mathbb{F}$ is continuous, then, by Riesz's representation theorem, there exists $r_x \in H$ such that

$$\langle f, r_x \rangle = f(x)$$

for every $f \in H$. If this happens for every $x \in E$, then $K(x, y) := r_x(y)$ is a reproducing kernel of H . \square

Corollary 1.4. *Every convergent sequence in RKHS converges pointwise to the same limit.*

Proof. $|f_n(x) - f(x)| = |\text{ev}_x(f_n - f)| \rightarrow 0$ when $f_n \rightarrow f$ in norm by continuity of evaluation functional. \square

Proposition 1.5. *(Uniqueness of H and K)*

- (a) Let (H, K) be a RKHS. The subspace H_0 spanned by $\{K(\cdot, x)\}_{x \in E}$ is dense in H .
- (b) A Hilbert space admits at most one reproducing kernel.
- (c) A function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a reproducing kernel for at most one Hilbert space. In particular, there is at most one RKHS that has H_0 as a dense subspace.

Proof. For density of H_0 , observe $f \in H$ fulfills $f \perp H_0$ if and only if

$$\langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_H = f(x) = 0$$

for every $x \in E$, which is the case precisely when $f \equiv 0$. (b) is an immediate consequence of (a) and Corollary 1.4. To check (b), suppose K_1 and K_2 qualify as a reproducing kernel of H . By definition,

$$f(x) = \langle f, K_1(\cdot, x) \rangle_H = \langle f, K_2(\cdot, x) \rangle_H$$

for every $x \in E$, and hence

$$\langle f, K_1(\cdot, x) - K_2(\cdot, x) \rangle_H = 0$$

for every $f \in H$ and $x \in E$. From this we conclude $K_1 = K_2$. Finally suppose that (H_1, K) and (H_2, K) are two RKHSs. Pick $f \in H_1$. By (a), there is $\{f_n\} \subset H_0 \subset H_1 \cap H_2$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in H_1 -norm. Since $\{f_n\}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in H_2 , it admits a limit $g \in H_2$. But Corollary 1.4 implies $f = g$, and hence $f \in H_2$. We then have

$$\|f\|_{H_1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{H_1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{H_0} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{H_2} = \|f\|_{H_2}.$$

Therefore, H_1 is isometrically included in H_2 . Symmetry thus shows that both Hilbert spaces coincide. Exactly the same argument also works for the last claim. \square

Proposition 1.6. (*Representation of RK in terms of evaluation functional*) In arbitrary RKHS (H, K) , the reproducing kernel $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ always fulfills the identity

$$K(x, y) = \langle \text{ev}_y, \text{ev}_x \rangle_{H^*}$$

for all $x, y \in E$, where H^* is the dual space of H .

Proof. It suffices to show that a function K defined by the above equation is also a reproducing kernel. Let a mapping $I : H^* \rightarrow H$ be the isometric anti-linear surjection, guaranteed by Riesz's Representation Theorem, that assigns to every functional in H^* the corresponding representor in H , i.e., $g^*(f) = \langle f, Ig^* \rangle_H$ for all $f \in H$ and $g \in H^*$, where g^* is the adjoint of g . Then we have

$$K(x, y) = \langle \text{ev}_y, \text{ev}_x \rangle_{H^*} = \langle I\text{ev}_y, I\text{ev}_x \rangle_H = \text{ev}_x(\text{ev}_y) = (I\text{ev}_y)(x),$$

for all $x, y \in E$, and hence $K(\cdot, y) = I\text{ev}_y \in H$. From this it follows that

$$f(y) = \text{ev}_y(f) = \langle f, I\text{ev}_y \rangle_H = \langle f, K(\cdot, y) \rangle$$

for all $y \in E$. Thus, K is a reproducing kernel. \square

Definition 1.7. (*Kernel, Feature Space, Feature Map*) A function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is called a kernel if there is a \mathbb{F} -Hilbert space H and a mapping $\varphi : E \rightarrow H$ such that

$$K(x, y) = \langle \varphi(y), \varphi(x) \rangle_H$$

for all $x, y \in E$. Such a φ is called a feature map, and H a feature space.

Remark 1.8. Proposition 1.6 tells us that every RK is indeed a kernel, and that the map $E \ni x \mapsto \text{ev}_x \in H^*$ is a feature map with a feature space H^* . Every RKHS (H, K) also admits a more simple feature map φ_K , called a canonical feature map, given by

$$\varphi_K : E \ni x \mapsto K(\cdot, x) \in H.$$

This clearly shows that, given a kernel, neither feature space nor feature map are uniquely determined. \triangleleft

1.2 RKHS of a kernel

Definition 1.9. (*Positive definite function*) Let E be a nonempty set. A function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called positive definite if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $a \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $x \in E^n$ there holds

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \bar{a}_j K(x_i, x_j) \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where \bar{c} is the complex conjugate of c .

Proposition 1.10. (*Characterization of real positive definite function*) A real function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is positive definite if and only if it has the following properties:

- (a) K is symmetric.
- (b) The defining inequality (1) holds for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ instead of \mathbb{C}^n .

Proposition 1.11. Every positive definite function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies

- (a) $K(x, x) \geq 0$ for every $x \in E$
- (b) $K(x, y) = \overline{K(y, x)}$ for every $x, y \in E$
- (c) \overline{K} is also positive definite, and conversely
- (d) $|K(x, y)| \leq K(x, x)K(y, y)$ for every $x, y \in E$.

Proof. (a) and (c) clearly hold. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x, y \in E$, we have

$$g(\alpha, \beta) := |\alpha|^2 K(x, x) + \alpha \overline{\beta} K(x, y) + \overline{\alpha} \beta K(y, x) + |\beta|^2 K(y, y) \geq 0.$$

Choose $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $\alpha = i, \beta = 1$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} K(x, y) + K(y, x) &= g(1, 1) - K(x, x) - K(y, y) =: A \in \mathbb{R} \\ iK(x, y) - iK(y, x) &= g(i, 1) - K(x, x) - K(y, y) =: B \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2K(y, x) &= A + iB \\ 2K(x, y) &= A - iB, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (b). Finally, for $x, y \in E$ with $K(x, y) \neq 0$ and for $r \in \mathbb{R}$, (b) gives

$$0 \geq g(r, K(x, y)) = r^2 K(x, x) + 2r |K(x, y)|^2 + |K(x, y)|^2 K(y, y).$$

As RHS is quadratic in r , it must satisfy

$$|K(x, x)|^4 - |K(x, y)|^2 K(x, x) K(y, y) \leq 0,$$

from which (d) follows. □

Corollary 1.12. (*Kernel is positive definite*) A kernel is positive definite.

Proof. For the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \overline{a_j} \overline{K(x_i, x_j)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \overline{a_j} \langle \varphi(x_i), \varphi(x_j) \rangle = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \varphi(x_i) \right\|^2 \geq 0,$$

and hence \overline{K} as well as K are positive definite. \square

Theorem 1.13. (*RKHS generated by inner product space*) Let H_0 be the subspace of \mathbb{F}^E , equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0}$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_0}$. Then there exists unique RKHS (H, K) that extends H_0 in the sense that

- (a) $H_0 \subset H \subset \mathbb{F}^E$ and the subspace topology of H_0 in H coincides with the topology of $(H_0, \|\cdot\|_{H_0})$

if and only if H_0 satisfies the following conditions:

- (b) every evaluation functional ev_x is continuous in $(H_0, \|\cdot\|_{H_0})$
(c) any Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\} \subset H_0$ converging pointwise to 0 converges to 0 also in H_0 -norm.

Consequently, H is isomorphic to the completion of H_0 .

Proof. Suppose such an extension H exists. H satisfies (b) by Theorem 1.3. Since H is complete, a Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\} \subset H_0$ tends to some f , for which we have

$$f(x) = \text{ev}_x(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ev}_x(f_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = 0$$

for every $x \in E$. Therefore, f is identically 0.

Conversely, suppose (b)(c) hold. Let H be the set of all functions $f \in \mathbb{F}^E$ for which there exists a Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\} \subset H_0$ converging pointwise to f . Clearly, $H_0 \subset H \subset \mathbb{F}^E$. The rest of proof consists of the following Lemmas. \square

Lemma 1.14. Let $f, g \in H$ and let $\{f_n\}$ and $\{g_n\}$ be two Cauchy sequences in H_0 that converge pointwise to f and g respectively.

- (A) The sequence $\langle f_n, g_n \rangle_{H_0}$ is convergent.
(B) The limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g_n \rangle_{H_0}$ depends solely on f and g , independent of the choice of f_n and g_n .
(C) $\langle f, g \rangle_H := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g_n \rangle_{H_0}$ is an inner product on H .

Proof. It follows from the definition of f_n and g_n that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f_n, g_n \rangle_{H_0} - \langle f_m, g_m \rangle_{H_0}| &= |\langle f_n - f_m, g_n \rangle - \langle f_m, g_n - g_m \rangle| \\ &\geq \|g_n\| \|f_n - f_m\| + \|f_m\| \|g_n - g_m\| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (A). In order to verify (B), suppose $\{f'_n\}$ and $\{g'_n\}$ are also such approximating sequences. We then similarly deduce that

$$|\langle f_n, g_n \rangle - \langle f'_n, g'_n \rangle| \leq \|g_n\| \|f_n - f'_n\| + \|f'_n\| \|g_n - g'_n\|.$$

$\{f_n - f'_n\}$ and $\{g_n - g'_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences tending pointwise to 0. Thus, assumption (c) gives $\|f_n - f'_n\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|g_n - g'_n\| \rightarrow 0$. So, (A) and (B) show that $\langle f, g \rangle_H$ is well-defined. Note that if $\langle f, f \rangle_H = 0$, then for every $x \in E$

$$f(x) = \text{ev}_x(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ev}_x(f_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = 0,$$

and hence $f \equiv 0$. As the symmetry, positivity, linearity are quite obvious, we conclude that (C) is true. \square

Lemma 1.15. (A) Let $f \in H$ and let $\{f_n\} \subset H_0$ be a Cauchy sequence converging pointwise to f . Then $f_n \rightarrow f$ also in H -norm.

(B) H_0 is dense in H .

Proof. (A): Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_{H_0} < \epsilon$$

for all $n, m > N$. For fixed n , $\{f_n - f_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence converging pointwise to $f_n - f$. Therefore, by definition of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$,

$$\|f - f_n\|_H = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f_m\|_{H_0} \leq \epsilon.$$

(B) is obvious from (A). \square

Lemma 1.16. Every evaluation functional ev_x is continuous on H .

Proof. Fix $x \in E$. As a linear functional ev_x is assumed to be continuous on H_0 , it admits unique continuous extension T_x onto the closure of H_0 in H , that is, onto whole H , where we use the assumption (a) and Lemma2(B). T_x is also the evaluation functional on H . Indeed, for f and f_n as in Lemma1.15, we have

$$T_x(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ev}_x(f_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x).$$

\square

Lemma 1.17. *H is a RKHS satisfying (a) in Theorem 1.13. Consequently, H is isomorphic to the completion of H_0 and thus unique RKHS that meets the requirement.*

Proof. We first prove that H is actually a RKHS. In light of Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 1.16, it suffices to show that H is complete. Let $\{f_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in H . Let $x \in E$. $\{f_n(x)\}$ is also a Cauchy in \mathbb{F} , and hence converges to some $f(x)$. By Lemma 1.15, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $g_n \in H_0$ such that $\|f_n - g_n\|_H < n^{-1}$. In view of the inequality

$$\|f - f_n\|_H \leq \|f - g_n\|_H + \|g_n - f_n\|_H,$$

it suffices to prove that $\|f - g_n\|_H \rightarrow 0$. To this end, we show that $\{g_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence converging pointwise to f (and then apply Lemma 1.15).

For fixed $x \in E$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g_n(x) - f(x)| &\leq |g_n(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x) - f(x)| \\ &= |\text{ev}_x(g_n - f_n)| + |f_n(x) - f(x)| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since ev_x is continuous and $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ pointwise. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_n - g_m\|_{H_0} &= \|g_n - g_m\|_H \\ &\leq \|g_n - f_n\| + \|f_n - f_m\| + \|g_m - f_m\| \\ &= n^{-1} + \|f_n - f_m\| + m^{-1} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

when $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, as required. H is isomorphic to the completion of H_0 since H_0 is dense in H . Uniqueness of (H, K) comes from Proposition 1.5. \square

Theorem 1.18. (Moore-Aronszajn) *For arbitrary positive definite function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, there exists unique RKHS H that has K as its reproducing kernel. Moreover, the subspace H_0 spanned by $\{K(\cdot, x)\}_{x \in E}$ is dense in H .*

Proof. Define an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0}$ on H_0 by setting

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{H_0} := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \beta_j K(y_i, x_j),$$

where $f = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i K(\cdot, x_i)$ and $g = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j K(\cdot, y_j)$. Let us observe

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \beta_j K(y_i, x_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \overline{g(x_i)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \overline{\beta_j} f(y_j),$$

and therefore that the value $\langle f, g \rangle_{H_0}$ is determined by solely by f and g , independent of the choice of representing linear combination. Choosing $g = K(\cdot, x)$ yields

$$\langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_{H_0} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \overline{h(x_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i K(x, x_i) = f(x).$$

So, K fulfills the reproducing identity under $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0}$. In particular,

$$\|K(\cdot, z)\|_{H_0} = \langle K(\cdot, z), K(\cdot, z) \rangle_{H_0} = K(z, z) \geq 0.$$

From this definiteness of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0}$ follows; indeed, if $\langle f, f \rangle_{H_0} = 0$, then we have

$$|f(x)| = |\langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle| \leq \langle f, f \rangle_{H_0}^{1/2} K(x, x)^{1/2} = 0,$$

for every $x \in E$, implying $f \equiv 0$. We then conclude that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_0}$ is in fact an inner product on H_0 as the other requirements are easy to check.

We now show that H_0 fulfills the conditions of Theorem1.13. First, each ev_x is continuous on H_0 ; in fact, for $f, g \in H_0$,

$$|\text{ev}_x(f) - \text{ev}_x(g)| = |\langle f - g, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_{H_0}| \leq \|f - g\|_{H_0} K(x, x)^{1/2}$$

for every $x \in E$. To verify the other condition, let $\{f_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in H_0 converging pointwise to 0. Let $B > 0$ be an upper bound for $\|f_n\|_{H_0}$. For $\epsilon > 0$ and large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\|f_n - f_N\| < \frac{\epsilon}{B}$$

for all $n \geq N$. We may write

$$f_N = \sum_{i=1}^k K(\cdot, x_i)$$

for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}$ and $x_i \in E$, and for some fixed k . It then follows that

$$\|f_n\|_{H_0}^2 = \langle f_n - f_N, f_n \rangle_{H_0} + \langle f_N, f_n \rangle_{H_0} \leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^k f(x_i)$$

for $n \geq N$, and hence $\|f_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, there is a RKHS H that has H_0 as a dense subspace. Furthermore, for each $f \in H$ there is $\{f_n\} \subset H_0$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise as well as in H -norm, for which we have

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_{H_0} = \langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_H,$$

for every $x \in E$. Thus, K is a reproducing kernel of H . Uniqueness follows from Proposition1.5. \square

Theorem 1.19. (*Characterization of positive definite function*) A function $K : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is positive definite (and thus a reproducing kernel of some RKHS) if and only if K is a kernel, that is, if and only if there exists some mapping φ of E into some \mathbb{F} -Hilbert space H such that

$$K(x, y) = \langle \varphi(y), \varphi(x) \rangle_H$$

for all $x, y \in E$.

Proof. If (H, K) is the RKHS generated by positive definite function K , then the canonical feature map $\varphi_K : E \ni x \mapsto K(\cdot, x) \in H$ obviously qualifies. The converse follows from Corollary 1.12. \square

Remark 1.20. Theorem 1.19 implies that RKHS (H, K) is a natural feature space. \triangleleft

Theorem 1.19 is a powerful tool to construct a positive definite function as well as to prove a given function is a kernel *if we can find an appropriate feature space*, as the following example illustrates.

Example 1.21. Let us show that $K(x, y) = \min(x, y)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is positive definite. Let $H := L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, \mu)$ be the space of all square integrable functions on \mathbb{R}_+ with respect to a σ -finite measure μ . It is well-known that H is a Hilbert space with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_H := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f \bar{g} d\mu$. Then we have

$$K(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} 1_{[0, y]}(t) 1_{[0, x]}(t) d\mu(t) = \langle \varphi(y), \varphi(x) \rangle_H,$$

where $\varphi : E \ni x \mapsto 1_{[0, x]}(\cdot) \in H$ is the feature map, and $1_A(\cdot)$ is the indicator function of A . Therefore, K is positive definite. \triangleleft

The next Theorem relates a feature map (therefore a kernel) and the RKHS the corresponding positive definite function generates.

Theorem 1.22. (*RKHS generated by feature map*) Let $E \neq \emptyset$. Suppose K is a positive definite kernel with a feature space H_0 and a feature map $\varphi_0 : E \rightarrow H_0$. Then the Hilbert space

$$H := \{f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \mid \exists w \in H_0 : f(x) = \langle w, \varphi_0(x) \rangle_{H_0} \forall x \in E\}$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_H := \inf\{\|w\|_{H_0} : w \in H_0, f = \langle w, \varphi_0(\cdot) \rangle_{H_0}\}$$

is the RKHS generated by K , and H and $\|\cdot\|_H$ are determined independent of the choice of feature space H_0 and feature map φ_0 . Moreover, the function

$$V : H_0 \ni w \mapsto \langle w, \varphi_0(\cdot) \rangle_{H_0} \in H$$

is an isometric isomorphism on $(\ker V)^\perp$.

Proof. In light of Theorem 1.18, it suffices to prove that H is RKHS with reproducing kernel K . The property of V are automatically obtained in the process. It is easy to verify that $\|\cdot\|_H$ is actually a norm on H . As $\ker V$ is closed subspace of H_0 , we get the orthogonal decomposition $H_0 = \ker V \oplus (\ker V)^\perp$. Let $H_1 := (\ker V)^\perp$ and the restriction of V onto H_1 be denoted by V_1 . Since every $f \in H$ can be written as $f = V(w_0 + w_1) = V_1 w_1$, with $w_0 \in \ker V$, $w_1 \in H_1$, we see that $V_1 : H_1 \rightarrow H$ is an isomorphism. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_H &= \inf\{\|w_0 + w_1\|_{H_0}^2 : w_0 \in \ker V, w_1 \in H_1, w_0 + w_1 \in V^{-1}(\{f\})\} \\ &= \inf\{\|w_0\|^2 + \|w_1\|^2 : w_0 \in \ker V, w_1 \in H_1, w_0 + w_1 \in V^{-1}(\{f\})\} \\ &= \|V_1^{-1}(f)\|_{H_1} \left(:= \|V_1^{-1}(f)\|_{H_0} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this equation, we conclude that $V_1 : H_1 \rightarrow H$ is an isometric isomorphism, as required, and that H is a Hilbert space.

It remains to show that K qualifies as the reproducing kernel. Observe

$$K(\cdot, x) = \langle \varphi_0(x), \varphi_0(\cdot) \rangle_{H_0} = V\varphi_0(x) \in H.$$

Moreover, the fact $\langle w, \varphi_0(x) \rangle_{H_0} = 0$ for all $w \in \ker V$ implies

$$f(x) = \langle V_1^{-1}f, \varphi_0(x) \rangle_{H_0} = \langle f, V\varphi_0(x) \rangle_H = \langle f, K(\cdot, x) \rangle_H$$

for all $f \in H$ and $x \in E$. □

1.3 Basic Properties of Kernel

2 Reconstruction of RKHS

2.1 Reconstruction via Restriction

2.2 Reconstruction via Operator

2.3 Reconstruction via Sum and Product

3 Inheritance from Kernel to RKHS

3.1 Measurability of RKHS

3.2 Separability of RKHS

3.3 Continuity of RKHS

4 Mercer Representation

References

- [1] Alain Berlinet and Christine Thomas-Agnan. *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Springer, 1st edition, 2004.
- [2] Andreas Christmann and Ingo Steinwart. *Support vector machines*. Springer, 1st edition, 2008.
- [3] Felipe Cucker and Ding Xuan Zhou. *Learning theory: An approximation theory viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 1st edition, 2007.
- [4] Vern I. Paulsen and Mrinal Raghupathi. *An Introduction to the Theory of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge University Press, 1st edition, 2016.
- [5] Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. The MIT Press, 1st edition, 2001.