

Boosting Causal Additive Models

Maximilian Kertel^{1,2} and Nadja Klein^{2,3}

¹ Technology Development Battery Cell, BMW Group, Munich, Germany

² Department of Statistics, TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany

³ Chair of Uncertainty Quantification and Statistical Learning,
Research Center Trustworthy Data Science and Security (UA Ruhr)

January 15, 2024

Abstract

We present a boosting-based method to learn additive Structural Equation Models (SEMs) from observational data, with a focus on the theoretical aspects of determining the causal order among variables. We introduce a family of score functions based on arbitrary regression techniques, for which we establish necessary conditions to consistently favor the true causal ordering. Our analysis reveals that boosting with early stopping meets these criteria and thus offers a consistent score function for causal orderings. To address the challenges posed by high-dimensional data sets, we adapt our approach through a component-wise gradient descent in the space of additive SEMs. Our simulation study underlines our theoretical results for lower dimensions and demonstrates that our high-dimensional adaptation is competitive with state-of-the-art methods. In addition, it exhibits robustness with respect to the choice of the hyperparameters making the procedure easy to tune.

Keywords: causal discovery; directed acyclic graph; boosting; high-dimensional data; reproducing kernel Hilbert space

1 Introduction

Causal discovery is the process of deriving causal relationships between variables in a system. These help in improving decisions, predictions and interventions [Kyono et al., 2020]. With the rapid growth of large-scale data sets in fields as healthcare, genetics [Aibar et al., 2017], or manufacturing [Kertel et al., 2023], causal discovery has become increasingly important. Traditionally, the researcher designs an experiment and intervenes on certain variables, that is, assigns for example a drug or placebo, which allows to estimate the causal effect of the manipulated variables. Often however, it is less time, and effort consuming or more practical or ethical to collect data of a steady state of the system, where no variables are manipulated. For instance, in complex manufacturing domains, the number of input variables might be too large to conduct a design of experiments, and additionally those experiments would lead to a production downtime generating high costs.

Thus, although observational data is often complex, noisy, or has confounding variables [Bhattacharya et al., 2021], it is desirable to derive causal relationships from observational data rather than having to rely on impractical experimental studies.

In this work, we follow the assumption that the causal relationships between variables can be modeled as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). This assumption implies that the impact between two variables flows in at most one direction, and there are no cyclic or self-reinforcing pathways. It is the goal of the present work to identify the DAG from observational data. Existing algorithms for this task can be broadly classified into two categories. First, constraint-based methods rely on statistical tests for conditional independence, but these approaches become computationally expensive and difficult apart from multivariate normal or multinomial distributions [Zhang et al., 2011, Shah and Peters, 2018]. Additionally, they assume faithfulness [Peters et al., 2017], and the identified graph is typically not unique [Spirtes et al., 1993, Kalisch and Bühlman, 2007].

Instead, we focus on the second category for identifying DAGs from observational data, namely on Structural Equation Models (SEMs). SEMs rely on the assumption that each variable is a function of other variables in the system and a perturbing noise term. Peters et al. [2014] show that if one restricts the functional relationships and the noise, called the Additive Noise Model (ANM), then the implied distribution is unique. Specifically, this is the case when the functional relationships are non-linear, and the noise term is Gaussian, as we assume throughout this work. This allows to identify the SEM from data.

Causal discovery using ANMs is an active field of research [Vowels et al., 2022]. Many recent works leverage continuous acyclicity characterisations [Lachapelle et al., 2019, Yu et al., 2019, Zheng et al., 2020, Kalainathan et al., 2022, Ng et al., 2022a,b] and find the DAG using gradient-descent. However, opposed to earlier works [as for example, Shimizu et al., 2011, Bühlmann et al., 2014] for most machine learning methods the statistical behaviour is unknown [Kaiser and Sipos, 2022]. In this context, a popular contribution is that of Aibar et al. [2017], which successfully derives the cyclic graphical representation of a gene regulatory network using boosting. Our work is an extension of this approach towards acyclic graphs.

In this paper, we leverage the success of gradient-based methods towards statistical boosting for causal discovery in ANMs and investigate the underlying statistical behaviour. In particular, we show consistency and robustness of our proposed method.

Our main contributions are the following.

- We propose a generic method for causal discovery based on unspecified regression techniques. We then state assumptions on the regression technique that lead to consistent causal discovery, see Proposition 1.
- We show in Theorem 5 that L^2 -boosting with early stopping fulfills the conditions of Proposition 1, that is, L^2 -boosting can be employed for consistent causal discovery.
- We show in Theorem 6 that L^2 -boosting with early stopping avoids overfitting even under misspecification. Further, if the model is correctly specified, then L^2 -boosting with early stopping is consistent, as we show in Theorem 7.
- We propose a variant of the boosting procedure for high-dimensional settings, when the number of variables p is large.
- We conduct a simulation study demonstrating that our approach is competitive with state-of-the-art methods. We furthermore show that it is robust with respect to the choice of the hyperparameters and thus easy to tune.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we discuss SEMs and required assumptions. Section 3 reviews boosting and Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces (RKHSs). Section 4 proposes the novel causal discovery method and shows its consistency. Section 5 explores the results of Section 4 empirically and benchmarks different state-of-the-art algorithms with our approach, while Section 6 concludes. Technical details and proofs can be found in the Appendix.

2 Causal Discovery

Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^\top$ be a p -dimensional random vector. For any $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_T\} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ and a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we define $\mathbf{x}_S := (x_{s_1}, \dots, x_{s_T})^\top$. Analogously, for the random vector \mathbf{X} we set $\mathbf{X}_S := (X_{s_1}, \dots, X_{s_T})^\top$. We order the elements in S to make the representations unique, such that $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_T$. For a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) G on X_1, \dots, X_p we define the parents of $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ denoted by $\mathbf{pa}_G(k)$ as those $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ for which the edge $X_j \rightarrow X_k$ exists in G . We assume that there exists a DAG G so that \mathbf{X} follows a SEM with additive noise, that is

$$X_k = f_k(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{pa}_G(k)}) + \varepsilon_k. \quad (1)$$

Here, ε_k are i.i.d. noise terms for $k = 1, \dots, p$.

Every DAG has at least one topological ordering π (that is, a permutation) on $\{1, \dots, p\}$. We denote the nonempty set of topological orderings for G by $\Pi(G)$. With $\pi \in \Pi(G)$ there can only be a directed path in G from X_j to X_k if $\pi(j) < \pi(k)$ but not vice versa; see Figure 1 for an illustrating example.

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= f_1(X_2) + \varepsilon_1 \\ X_2 &= \varepsilon_2 \\ X_3 &= f_3(X_2) + \varepsilon_3 \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \circlearrowleft X_1 \leftarrow X_2 \rightarrow X_3 \circlearrowright \text{---} \end{array}$$

Figure 1: An example of a SEM on the left-hand side and its corresponding graph G on the right-hand-side for $p = 3$. The set of possible topological orderings is $\{(2, 1, 3), (2, 3, 1)\}$. For $\pi^0 = (2, 3, 1)$ it holds $X_1 = f_1(X_2) + \varepsilon_1 = f_{12}(X_2) + f_{13}(X_3) + \varepsilon_1$ with $f_{12} = f_1$ and $f_{13} = 0$.

2.1 Identifiability

The goal of our analysis is to identify the graph G from the distribution of \mathbf{X} . In general there is no one-to-one correspondence between the distribution $P(\mathbf{X})$ and the underlying SEM or G . However, if we impose appropriate restrictions on the noise terms $\{\varepsilon_k : k = 1, \dots, p\}$ and the functions $\{f_k : k = 1, \dots, p\}$, then the desired one-to-one correspondence between a distribution and a SEM exists [see Peters et al., 2014, Corollary 31]. In this case, we call the SEM identifiable. We consider SEMs with the following assumptions, which guarantee identifiability.

Assumption 1. For the SEM of Equation (1) assume that f_k has the additive decomposition

$$f_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{pa}_G(k)}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{pa}_G(k)} f_{kj}(x_j), \quad k = 1, \dots, p,$$

where the f_{kj} are three times differentiable, non-linear and non-constant for any $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $j \in \mathbf{pa}_G(k)$. Further, let $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_p)$ be a random vector of independent components, which are normally distributed with mean zero and standard deviations $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p > 0$. We call SEMs of this form Causal Additive Models [CAMs; Bühlmann et al., 2014].

Define $\varpi_\pi(k) = \{j : \pi(j) < \pi(k)\}$ as the predecessors of k with respect to a permutation π . Thus for $p = 3$ and $\pi = (2, 1, 3)$ it holds $\varpi_\pi(1) = \{2\}$, $\varpi_\pi(2) = \emptyset$, $\varpi_\pi(3) = \{1, 2\}$.

Consider a CAM, which is characterized by functions f_1, \dots, f_p , standard deviations $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$, and a graph G with topological ordering π . The implied density is

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^p p(x_k | \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{pa}_G(k)}) = \prod_{k=1}^p p(x_k | \mathbf{x}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}). \quad (2)$$

Here, $p(x_k | \mathbf{x}_S)$ is the density of the conditional distribution of X_k given $\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S$, which we assume to exist throughout this work. For $S = \emptyset$, we set $p(x_k | \mathbf{x}_S) = p(x_k)$. The second equality in Equation (2) holds since X_k is independent from its predecessors in π given its parents [see Peters et al., 2017, Proposition 6.31], that is

$$X_k \perp X_{\varpi_\pi(k) \setminus \mathbf{pa}_G(k)} | \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{pa}_G(k)}. \quad (3)$$

For any combination of f_1, \dots, f_p , G and any topological ordering π of G , it trivially holds

$$f_k = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{pa}_G(k)} f_{kj}(X_j) = \sum_{j \in \varpi_\pi(k)} \widetilde{f}_{kj}(X_j),$$

where $\widetilde{f}_{kj} = f_{kj}$ if $j \in \mathbf{pa}_G(k)$ and $\widetilde{f}_{kj} = 0$ if $j \notin \mathbf{pa}_G(k)$. Consequently any CAM characterized by f_1, \dots, f_p , G , $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$ can be re-parameterized by f_1, \dots, f_p , π , $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$, where π is a topological ordering of G . Note that the latter parametrization is not unique, since π can be chosen arbitrarily from the set of topological orderings of G . However, once the topological ordering π is known, G can be found by identifying the parents of X_k (those j for which $f_{kj} \neq 0$) within $\varpi_\pi(k)$ for any $k = 1, \dots, p$. This is straightforward using pruning or feature selection methods [Teyssier and Koller, 2005, Shojaie and Michailidis, 2010, Bühlmann et al., 2014]. Thus, we simplify our objective and instead of searching for G , we aim to identify its topological ordering π .

Consider a CAM characterized by f_1, \dots, f_p , G , $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$. It can be re-parameterized by the parameter tuple $\theta = (f_1, \dots, f_p, \pi, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p)$. Using Equation (3) it follows that the implied conditional distribution of $X_k | \mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)} = \mathbf{x}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}$ is Gaussian with mean $f_k(\mathbf{x}_{\varpi_\pi(k)})$ and standard deviation σ_k . The implied density p_θ is given by

$$\log(p_\theta(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_k} \phi \left(\frac{x_k - f_k(\mathbf{x}_{\varpi_\pi(k)})}{\sigma_k} \right) \right),$$

where ϕ is the density function of a univariate standard normal distribution. From now on let \mathbf{X} follow a CAM characterized by $\theta^0 = (f_1^0, \dots, f_p^0, \pi^0, \sigma_1^0, \dots, \sigma_p^0)$. To identify θ^0 we define the population score function

$$\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} [-\log(p_\theta(x))].$$

It holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} [-\log(p_{\theta^0}(x))] \leq \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} [-\log(p_{\theta}(x))],$$

and equality holds if and only if $p_{\theta^0} = p_{\theta}$ by the properties of the Kullback-Leibler divergence. For these minimal θ , their ordering π must be in $\Pi(G^0)$ by the identifiability.

Let us consider the problem of minimizing the score function with respect to θ . Fixing π and f_1, \dots, f_p in θ and minimizing with respect to $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p$ leads to the minimizers

$$\sigma_{k,p_{\theta^0},f_k,\pi}^2 := \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[(X_k - f_k(\mathbf{x}_{\varpi_{\pi}(k)}))^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[\left(X_k - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} f_{kj}(X_j) \right)^2 \right]$$

for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Hence, when minimizing the score function we only need to consider the subset of the parameter space $(f_1, \dots, f_p, \pi, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p)$, where $\sigma_k = \sigma_{k,p_{\theta^0},f_k,\pi}$, $k = 1, \dots, p$, that is, the relevant parameter space reduces to (f_1, \dots, f_p, π) . Thus, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} [-\log(p_{\theta}(x))] &= \arg \min_{\theta=(f_1, \dots, f_p, \pi, \sigma_1=\sigma_{1,p_{\theta^0},f_1,\pi}, \dots, \sigma_p=\sigma_{p,p_{\theta^0},f_p,\pi})} \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} [-\log(p_{\theta}(x))] \\ &= \arg \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p, \pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k,p_{\theta^0},f_k,\pi}^2) + C \\ &= \arg \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p, \pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k,p_{\theta^0},f_k,\pi}^2), \end{aligned}$$

with C only depending on p . Denote the functions aligning with π by

$$\vartheta(\pi) = \left\{ (f_1, \dots, f_p) : f_k = \sum_{\pi(j) < \pi(k)} f_{kj}, f_{kj} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f_{kj} \text{ is } \begin{array}{l} \text{three times differentiable,} \\ \text{non-linear, and} \\ \text{non-constant.} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We fix π and optimize with respect to f_1, \dots, f_p to define a population score on the orderings

$$S(\pi) = \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k,p_{\theta^0},f_k,\pi}^2). \quad (4)$$

By identifiability, $S(\pi)$ is minimal if and only if $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$, that is

$$\sum_{k=1}^p \log((\sigma_k^0)^2) = S(\pi^0) < S(\pi) \forall \pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0), \pi \notin \Pi(G^0). \quad (5)$$

Intuitively, the score $S(\pi)$ measures how much variance remains when any X_k is regressed on using its predecessors $\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_{\pi}(k)}$. An example for $p = 2$ is depicted in Figure 2.

2.2 Estimation of the Ordering

In practice we are unaware of the true parameter tuple θ^0 but observe N realizations $\mathbf{x}^N := (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ of \mathbf{X} with density p_{θ^0} , where $\mathbf{x}_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\ell} = (x_{\ell 1}, \dots, x_{\ell p})^{\top}$. It is natural to propose the empirical version of the population score function (4)

$$\widehat{S}(\pi) = \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\widehat{\sigma}_{k,\widehat{f}_k,\pi}^2), \quad (6)$$




Figure 2: The blue dots represent 500 realizations of a distribution following a SEM with $p = 2$ and $X_1 = \varepsilon_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $X_2 = -3 \cos(X_1) + \varepsilon_2$ with $\varepsilon_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. On the left-hand-side we plot X_2 on the y -axis and X_1 on the x -axis, while on the right-hand-side it is vice versa. The red lines give the conditional mean functions. We see that $\arg \min_{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{D}((1, 2))} \sum_{k=1}^2 \log(\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, (1, 2)}^2) = (0, -3 \cos(x_1))$ and $\arg \min_{(f_1, f_2) \in \mathcal{D}((2, 1))} \sum_{k=1}^2 \log(\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, (2, 1)}^2) = (0, 0)$. The distribution $X_1 - \mathbf{E}[X_1 | X_2 = x_2]$ becomes bi-modal for larger values of x_2 . The unexplained noise (distance of blue dots to red line) is smaller on the left, which is the correct ordering, thus $S((1, 2)) < S((2, 1))$.

where

$$\hat{\sigma}_{k, \hat{f}_k, \pi}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(x_{\ell k} - \hat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell \varpi_{\pi}(k)}) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(x_{\ell k} - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \hat{f}_{kj, \pi}(x_{\ell j}) \right)^2.$$

Here $\hat{f}_{k, \pi} = \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \hat{f}_{kj, \pi}$ is a regression function estimate using data $(\mathbf{x}_{\ell \varpi_{\pi}(k)}, x_{\ell k}), \ell = 1, \dots, N$ with the convention $\mathbf{x}_{\ell S} := \mathbf{x}_{\ell S} = (\mathbf{x}_{\ell s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\ell s_T})$ for $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_T\}$ introduced before. Although the regression estimates depend on the data and thus N , we omit the additional index for better readability.

Remark 1. *In contrast to the population version (4), it is unclear whether (6) is also minimized at $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ even for $N \rightarrow \infty$. This is due to the fact, that the regression functions $\hat{f}_{k, \pi}$ and the prediction errors $\hat{\sigma}_{k, \hat{f}_k, \pi}^2$ are estimated from a finite sample.*

Since any regression function estimator leads to a score function \hat{S} , the following remark gives some intuition on necessary properties through two “extreme” examples.

Remark 2. *1. Let the regression estimator interpolate the data, that is, $\hat{f}_{k, \pi}(x_{\ell, \varpi_{\pi}(k)}) = x_{\ell k}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N, k = 1, \dots, p$ and all π . Then the regression estimator is overfitting. In that case any permutation π has a score diverging to $-\infty$.*

2. Let $\hat{f}_{k, \pi}(x_{\ell, \varpi_{\pi}(k)}) = 0$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, N, k = 1, \dots, p$ and all π . Then the regression estimator is underfitting. Again, any ordering π has the same score, which is $\sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N x_{\ell k}^2 \right)$.

In both cases, \hat{S} cannot identify an optimal ordering $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ even with infinite data. Intuitively, we need a regression estimator, that

1. is not overfitting and preserves the non-explainable noise, and
2. provides estimates that are close to the true regression functions f_1^0, \dots, f_p^0 .

In this work, we apply L^2 -boosting regression in conjunction with early stopping [Bühlmann and Yu, 2003, Raskutti et al., 2014] and show that the resulting score of Equation (6) prefers consistently a $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$. Proposition 1 below formalizes the intuition of Remark 2 and states necessary conditions on the regression function estimator. In the following Definition 1, Y takes the role of X_k , while $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ takes the role of $\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}$.

Definition 1 (Non-overfitting). *Let \hat{f} be a regression estimate based on N i.i.d. samples $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, y_1), \dots, (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_N, y_N)$ from $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y)$. We say the estimator is not overfitting w.r.t. $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y)$, if*

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (y_\ell - \hat{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell))^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y} \left[(Y - \hat{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}))^2 \right] \right|$$

converges to 0 in probability for $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 1. *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, if the regression estimator is such that*

1. $\hat{f}_{k,S}$ is not overfitting with respect to (\mathbf{X}_S, X_k) for any combination of $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{k\}$ according to Definition 1 and
2. $\hat{\sigma}_{k, \hat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_{k, \pi^0}^0}^2 = (\sigma_k^0)^2$ for all $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ and $k = 1, \dots, p$, that is

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(x_{\ell k} - \hat{f}_{k, \varpi_{\pi^0}(k)}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell \varpi_{\pi^0}(k)}) \right)^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} (\sigma_k^0)^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_k - \sum_{j \in \text{pa}_{G^0}(k)} f_{kj}^0(X_j) \right)^2 \right].$$

Then it holds for the derived score function \hat{S} that

$$\hat{S}(\pi^0) < \hat{S}(\pi)$$

for any $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ and $\pi \notin \Pi(G^0)$ with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Sketch of the proof of Proposition 1 Our goal is to show that for any $\pi \notin \Pi(G^0)$ and $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ it holds asymptotically

$$\sum_{k=1}^p \log(\hat{\sigma}_{k, \hat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2) = \hat{S}(\pi^0) < \hat{S}(\pi) = \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\hat{\sigma}_{k, \hat{f}_{k, \pi}}^2).$$

By inequality (5) this is fulfilled if for $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\pi \notin \Pi(G^0)$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \hat{S}(\pi) \geq S(\pi) \tag{7}$$

and if at the same time for $\pi^0 \in \Pi(G^0)$ it holds that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \hat{S}(\pi^0) = S(\pi^0). \tag{8}$$

Applying the continuous mapping theorem, Relation (8) is ensured by Condition 2.

Contrariwise for relation (7) when $\pi \notin \Pi(G^0)$, the non-overfitting Condition 1. of Proposition 1 ensures that for any $k = 1, \dots, p$ and for $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(x_{\ell k} - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \widehat{f}_{kj, \pi}(x_{\ell j}) \right)^2 \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[\left(X_k - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \widehat{f}_{kj, \pi}(X_j) \right)^2 \right].$$

It thus follows that for $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{S}(\pi) &= \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}}^2 \right) = \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(x_{\ell k} - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \widehat{f}_{kj, \pi}(x_{\ell j}) \right)^2 \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[\left(X_k - \sum_{j \in \varpi_{\pi}(k)} \widehat{f}_{kj, \pi}(X_j) \right)^2 \right] \right) \\ &\geq \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2) = S(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

A detailed proof can be found in the Appendix A.

3 Background and Preliminaries

As our main result in Theorem 5 relies on boosting Kernel Hilbert space regressions, we briefly introduce necessary concepts and results on boosting (Section 3.1) and Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces (RKHSs) (Section 3.2) next. Further details on the two concepts can be found in Bühlmann and Yu [2003], Schapire and Freund [2012], as well as Wahba [1990], Schölkopf and Smola [2001], Wainwright [2019], respectively.

3.1 Boosting

L^2 -boosting addresses the problem of finding a function f in some function space H that minimizes the expected L^2 -loss

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, Y} \left[(Y - f(\mathbf{X}))^2 \right]. \quad (9)$$

In practice, (9) is replaced by the empirical minimizer of

$$\frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (y_{\ell} - f(\mathbf{x}_{\ell}))^2 \quad (10)$$

based on N i.i.d. samples $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N, y_N)$. L^2 -boosting employs a functional gradient descent approach using a base learner S that maps $y^N := (y_1, \dots, y_N)^{\top}$ to the estimates \widehat{f} and $\widehat{y}^N = \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}^N)$, where $\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}^N) := (\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_N))^{\top}$. More precisely, after initializing \widehat{f}_0 , in each boosting step $m = 1, \dots, m_{\text{stop}}$ the residuals at the current $\widehat{f}^{(m)}$

$$u_{\ell} = \frac{\partial}{\partial f} \frac{1}{2N} (y_{\ell} - f(x_{\ell}))^2 \Big|_{f=\widehat{f}^{(m)}} = \frac{1}{N} (y_{\ell} - \widehat{f}^{(m)}(x_{\ell}))$$

are computed and $\hat{f} = S(u) = S(u_1, \dots, u_N)$ is determined. The solution is then used to update the estimate of the regression function

$$\hat{f}^{(m+1)} = \hat{f}^{(m)} + v\hat{f},$$

where $0 < v \leq 1$ is the step size that is commonly fixed at a small value [Bühlmann and Yu, 2003]. For many base learners S this leads for fixed N to an overfitting if $m_{\text{stop}} \rightarrow \infty$. Stopping earlier is thus desired and *early stopping* often applied [Schapire and Freund, 2012]. Following Bühlmann and Yu [2003], Raskutti et al. [2014], we consider linear and symmetric base learners S , that is, $S : y^N \mapsto \hat{y}^N$ is a linear and symmetric mapping. Spline regression and linear regression, even in the generalized ridge regression sense, fall under this definition. So does the (additive) kernel ridge regression [Raskutti et al., 2014, Kandasamy and Yu, 2016], which we will consider in the following. In contrast, the popular choice of decision trees are not linear. Proposition 1 of Bühlmann and Yu [2003] shows that the estimate $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ after m boosting steps for \mathbf{y} is given by

$$\hat{f}^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}^N) = \hat{\mathbf{y}}^N = B^{(m)}\mathbf{y} = (I - (I - S)^m)\mathbf{y}.$$

As we assume S to be symmetric, there exists an orthogonal $U \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ containing the eigenvectors of S , such that for the diagonal matrix D with the eigenvalues of S on the diagonal, it holds that $S = UDU^T$. It follows that $B^{(m)} = U(I - (I - D)^m)U^T$.

3.2 Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

We choose the function estimates \hat{f} from a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) H , while S is a kernel regression estimator. We start by introducing kernel functions.

Definition 2. We call a symmetric function $K : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a positive definite (p.d.) kernel on \mathbb{R}^p if

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^N \alpha_k \alpha_\ell K(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_\ell) \geq 0$$

for any $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and any $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$.

For any p.d. kernel K , there exists a unique Hilbert space H with $K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) \in H \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and where further it holds for any $f \in H$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle f, K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) \rangle_H. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) is called the reproducing property. Consequently H is called a RKHS. By the reproducing property it holds for $f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_k)$ and $g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_k)$, that

$$\langle f, g \rangle_H = \alpha^T G \beta, \quad (12)$$

where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is symmetric with $G_{jk} = \frac{K(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k)}{N}$. We call G the Gram matrix. By the representation theorem [Wainwright, 2019, Proposition 12.33] the minimizer of

$$\hat{f} = \arg \min_{f \in H} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (y_\ell - f(\mathbf{x}_\ell))^2 + \gamma \|f\|_H^2 \quad (13)$$

can be expressed by

$$\widehat{f} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \beta_{\ell} K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_{\ell}),$$

where $\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(G + \gamma NI)^{-1}y^N$. By Equation (12), $\|\widehat{f}\|_H^2 = \beta^T G \beta$ holds. Clearly, the mapping $S : y^N \mapsto G(G + \lambda I)^{-1}y^N = \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}^N)$ is linear and symmetric. It can be derived that S has the eigenvalues $d_{\ell} = \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{\ell}}{\widehat{\mu}_{\ell} + \gamma N}$, where $\widehat{\mu}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mu}_N$ are the eigenvalues of G . The regularization parameter $\lambda = \gamma N$ shall be constant in N in this work.

The boosting estimate $\widehat{f}^{(m)}$ is sequentially built by adding small amounts of the current estimates. These current estimates are of the form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \widehat{\alpha}_{\ell} K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_{\ell})$. Thus, if S is the base learner used for boosting, it holds by the construction of the boosting estimator, that there exists a $\widehat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with

$$\widehat{f}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \widehat{\beta}_{\ell} K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_{\ell}). \quad (14)$$

Here, $\widehat{f}^{(m)}$ is the boosting regression estimate after m boosting steps. In this context we define

$$\mathcal{F}_N := \left\{ f \in H : f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \beta_{\ell} K(\cdot, \mathbf{x}_{\ell}), \|f\|_H = 1, \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^p \right\}$$

and $\widehat{f}^{(m)} \in h\mathcal{F}_N$ for some $h > 0$. For a continuous kernel $K \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$, we can define an integral operator $\mathcal{K} : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$f(\cdot) \mapsto (\mathcal{K}(f))(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} K(x, y) f(x) d\mathbb{P}(x).$$

Under assumptions on \mathbb{P} and K , Sun [2005] shows that the operator \mathcal{K} has eigenvalues $\mu_k \geq 0$ and eigenvectors $\phi_k \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, so that $\mathcal{K}(\phi_k) = \mu_k \phi_k$. If the eigenvalues are ordered non-increasingly, then μ_k goes to 0. The decay rate of the eigenvalues will be important in our analysis. We close this subsection with two examples.

Example 1 (Kernel functions).

1. **Gaussian kernels on \mathbb{R}** : $K : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is defined for some $\varsigma > 0$ by

$$K(x, x') = \exp\left(-\frac{|x - x'|^2}{2\varsigma}\right).$$

Its eigenvalues exist under mild assumptions on $P(\mathbf{X})$ [Sun, 2005, Section 4] and follow an exponential decay of the form

$$\mu_k \leq \exp(-Ck)$$

for some $C > 0$. For further details, see Section C of Bach and Jordan [2002] and Example 3 of Cucker and Smale [2002].

2. **Additive Kernel:** Let H_1, \dots, H_p be RKHSs with kernels K_k on X_k , $k = 1, \dots, p$. The space $H_1 \oplus \dots \oplus H_p := \{f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \sum_{k=1}^p f_k(x_k), f_k \in H_k\}$ is a RKHS with kernel $K = \sum_{k=1}^p K_k$. Its norm is defined by $\|f\|_H^2 = \sum_{k=1}^p \|f_k\|_{H_k}^2$ [see Wainwright, 2019, Proposition 12.27]. For Gaussian kernels K_1, \dots, K_p , we assume that the eigenvalues of K can be upper bounded by

$$\mu_k \leq p \exp(-Ck) \quad (15)$$

for some $C > 0$. Note that for p fixed, this is of type

$$\mu_k \leq \exp(-C'k)$$

for some $C' > 0$. The solution of (13) can then be written by $\hat{f}(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \sum_{k=1}^p \hat{f}_k(x_k)$, where

$$\hat{f}_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \hat{\beta}_\ell K_k(\cdot, x_{\ell k})$$

and $\hat{\beta}$ is shared among the different components, that is, does not depend on k [see Kandasamy and Yu, 2016, for further details].

The idea behind inequality (15) is the following. Each K_k is a self-adjoint and compact operator for any $k = 1, \dots, p$. Let A, B be linear and self-adjoint operators with non-increasing eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$ and μ_1, μ_2, \dots , respectively. It holds by Zwahlen [1965/66] for the non-increasing eigenvalues $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots$ of the self-adjoint and linear operator $A + B$ that for any $1 \leq r, s \leq p$

$$\gamma_{r+s} \leq \gamma_{r+s-1} \leq \lambda_r + \mu_s.$$

Now consider the non-increasing eigenvalues μ_ℓ^k of the operator $A_1 + \dots + A_k$. Let $\lambda_\ell^j, \ell = 1, 2, \dots$ be the eigenvalues of A_j . Then it holds that

$$\mu_{\ell p}^p \leq \mu_{(p-1)\ell}^{p-1} + \lambda_\ell^p \leq \dots \leq \lambda_\ell^1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell^p.$$

Inequality (15) follows under the assumption that $\lambda_\ell^j \leq \exp(-C\ell)$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ for some $C > 0$.

The Gaussian (and its additive counterpart) kernel is bounded, which allows to uniformly upper-bound the supremums norm of the unit ball on H .

Remark 3. If H is a RKHS with kernel K such that $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \leq B$ for some $B > 0$, then it holds

$$\sup_{\|f\|_H \leq 1} \|f\|_\infty \leq B < \infty.$$

4 Boosting DAGs

In this section we prove Theorem 5 which is our main result. It states that if we choose the regression procedure in Section 2 as L^2 -boosting with early stopping, then the estimator for the topological ordering is consistent. This holds for an uniform and asymptotic number of boosting iterations. We provide the assumptions in Section 4.1 and prove the statement in Section 4.2. In Section 4.3 we propose an adaption of the procedure which is effective in high dimensions.

4.1 Assumptions

Proposition 1 has shown that in order to consistently estimate the causal ordering, we have to avoid overfitting whenever we regress X_k onto \mathbf{X}_S for any $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{k\}$. This poses the main challenge in applying Proposition 1. We assume that $X_k - \mathbb{E}[X_k | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S]$ is sub-Gaussian, which later allows to control the regression estimates.

Definition 3. We call a random variable ε sub-Gaussian if its Orlicz norm defined by

$$s(\varepsilon) = \inf \left\{ r \in (0, \infty) : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}$$

is finite.

Assumption 2. For any k and $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{k\}$ consider the decomposition

$$X_k = \mu_{k,S}(\mathbf{X}_S) + \varepsilon_{k,S},$$

where

$$\mu_{k,S}(\mathbf{X}_S) = \mathbf{E}[X_k | \mathbf{X}_S] \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_{k,S} = X_k - \mathbf{E}[X_k | \mathbf{X}_S].$$

We assume that

1. $\varepsilon_{k,S} | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S$ is sub-Gaussian with Orlicz norm $s_{k,S}(\mathbf{x}_S)$, $0 < s_{k,S}(\mathbf{x}_S) \leq s_{max}$ for all $\mathbf{x}_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$, and
2. $\|\mu_{k,S}\|_\infty \leq \mu_{max} < \infty$.

The constants shall hold uniformly for any $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{k\}$.

We will prove that the regression estimate will lie in the function class $h\mathcal{F}_N$ for some radius $h > 0$. We denote the ball of radius h in H by B_h . In Theorem 5 we use the radius $h > 0$ and the function complexity measures Rademacher complexity and covering numbers to derive Condition 1. of Proposition 1. Both measures quantify the richness of a function class. While the Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F}_N can be upper-bounded by Theorem 13 given in the Appendix, we also need to upper bound the covering numbers of \mathcal{F}_N . The complexity measures for $h\mathcal{F}_N$ can then be upper-bounded using scaling arguments. We thus make the following assumption:

Assumption 3. For any $k = 1, \dots, p$, let H_k be a RKHS on X_k and $B_1^k := \{f \in H : \|f\|_{H_k} \leq 1\}$. Then it shall hold for any $z > 0$ and $k = 1, \dots, p$

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{uz}{2}, B_1^k \right) \right)} du < \infty.$$

Here, $\mathcal{N}(\cdot, B_1^k)$ is the covering number with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, which is defined in Section B.2.

Remark 4. Let $H_S = H_{s_1} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{s_k}$ and denote the unit ball of H_{s_k} by $B_1^{s_k}$ and the unit ball of H_S by B_1^S . Assume that for any $j = 1, \dots, k$ it holds that

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{uz}{2}, B_1^j \right) \right)} du \leq C(z) < \infty$$

for some $0 < C(z) < \infty$. Further, one can derive that

$$\mathcal{N}(u, B_1^S) \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{u}{k}, B_1^{s_j}\right).$$

Thus, using Jensen's inequality and that $\mathcal{N}(\cdot, B_1^j)$ is non-increasing, it holds that

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log\left(\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{uz}{2}, B_1^S\right)\right)} du \leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^k \log\left(\mathcal{N}\left(\frac{uz}{2k}, B_1^{s_j}\right)\right)} du \leq \sqrt{p} C\left(\frac{z}{2p}\right) < \infty.$$

We assume that the eigenvalues of the random Gram matrix G vanish with the same rate as the eigenvalues of the operator \mathcal{K} . For details on the connection between the eigenvalues of G and \mathcal{K} , consult Section C of Bach and Jordan [2002].

Assumption 4. For $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ let $H = H_{s_1} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{s_k}$ be the RKHS on \mathbf{X}_S generated by the additive kernel $K_{s_1} + \dots + K_{s_k}$. There shall exist events \mathcal{B}_N with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_N) = 1$ so that on \mathcal{B}_N and for $K_0 = \lfloor \frac{1}{2C_d+1} \ln(N) \rfloor$ it holds for the empirical eigenvalues of the Gram matrix G

$$\sum_{k=K_0}^N \widehat{\mu}_k \leq \sum_{k=K_0}^N \exp(-C_u k),$$

and additionally

$$\widehat{\mu}_{K_0} \geq \exp(-C_d K_0)$$

for some $C_d > C_u > 0$. The constants hold uniformly for any $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$.

To give some intuition, recall that for the kernel regression estimator $S : y^N \mapsto \widehat{y}^N$ it holds that $S = UDU^\top$, where U contains the eigenvectors of G and D is a diagonal matrix with entries $d_\ell = \frac{\widehat{\mu}_\ell}{\lambda + \widehat{\mu}_\ell}$. Clearly, d_ℓ has a similar decay rate as $\widehat{\mu}_\ell$. For simplicity, consider $w^N = U^\top y^N$. Assumption 4 then ensures that only few entries of w^N largely influence $\widehat{y}^N = UDw^N$, while most entries of w^N contribute little. Thus, \widehat{y}^N is mostly influenced by a small subspace of \mathbb{R}^N .

4.2 Main Theorem

We state now the main theorem.

Theorem 5. Let $H_{k'}$ be a RKHS on $X_{k'}$ with Gaussian kernel $K_{k'}$ for any $k' = 1, \dots, p$. Assume that $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ follows a CAM as in Assumption 1 for functions $f_1^0 \in H_1, \dots, f_p^0 \in H_p$, where $H_k = H_{k_1} \oplus \dots \oplus H_{k_q}$, $\{k_1, \dots, k_q\} = \mathbf{pa}(k)$. Given Assumptions 2, 3, and 4 and assuming we estimate $\widehat{f}_{k,\pi}^{(m_{stop})} = \widehat{f}_{k,\pi} = \sum_{j \in \varpi_\pi(k)} \widehat{f}_{kj,\pi}$ using L^2 -boosting with X_k as response, $\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}$ as predictors and with number of boosting steps chosen as $m_{stop} = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$, then it holds that

$$\widehat{S}(\pi^0) < \widehat{S}(\pi)$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$ with probability going to 1 for any $\pi^0 \in \Pi^0$ and $\pi \notin \Pi^0$.

Remark 5. *Theorem 2 of Minh [2010] ensures that f_1^0, \dots, f_p^0 are smooth, non-constant, and non-linear and thus meet Assumption 1.*

Proof. We apply Proposition 1 and show the following two conditions.

1. *Boosting under Misspecification:* $\hat{f}_{k,S}^{(m_{stop})}$ is not overfitting with respect to (\mathbf{X}_S, X_k) for any $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{k\}$, and
2. *Consistency of Variance Estimation:* For any $k = 1, \dots, p$ and $\pi^0 \in \Pi^0$ it holds

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(\mathbf{x}_{\ell k} - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell \varpi_{\pi^0}(k)}) \right)^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_k - f_k^0(\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)}) \right)^2 \right] \right| \rightarrow 0$$

in probability.

We will see that 1. follows from Theorem 6 in Section 4.2.1 and 2. is shown in Theorem 7 in Section 4.2.2. \square

4.2.1 Boosting under Misspecification

We now show Condition 1. of Theorem 5. We fix $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_d\}$ and k and define $(\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_d) = \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X}_S$ and $Y = X_k$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N$ be the random element containing N i.i.d. observations of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ and denote the realizations of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N$ by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_N)$. Analogously we define Y^N and y^N . Our goal is to prove, that

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell}) - y_{\ell} \right)^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y} \left[\left(\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) - Y \right)^2 \right] \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad (16)$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$ for the boosting estimate $\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$. The left term is an expectation with respect to the empirical distribution P_N (and thus depends on the realizations), whereas the right term is under the population distribution induced by $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y)$ denoted by P . Thus, the l.h.s. of Equation (16) becomes

$$(P_N - P) \left[\left(\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) - Y \right)^2 \right]. \quad (17)$$

Assumptions 2', 3', and 4' are reformulated versions of Assumptions 2, 3, and 4 using the notation introduced above.

Assumption 2'. *Let $Y = \mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon$, for which we define the random variables*

$$\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y | \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon = Y - \mathbb{E} \left[Y | \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \right].$$

We assume that $\varepsilon | \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ is sub-Gaussian with Orlicz norm $s(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$ and $0 < s(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq s_{max}$ for all $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|\mu\|_{\infty} \leq \mu_{max} < \infty$. Let $\sigma_{max}^2 := \max_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \right]$.

Assumption 3'. *Let $B_1 := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_H \leq 1\}$, where H is the additive RKHS on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_d)$. Then for any $z > 0$ it holds*

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \left(\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{uz}{2}, B_1 \right) \right)} du < \infty.$$

Assumption 4'. There exist events \mathcal{B}_N on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N$ with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_N) = 1$ so that on \mathcal{B}_N and for $K_0 = \lfloor \frac{1}{2C_d+1} \ln(N) \rfloor$ it holds for the empirical eigenvalues of the Gram matrix G for $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$

$$\sum_{k=K_0}^N \widehat{\mu}_k \leq \mu_k \leq \sum_{k=K_0}^N \exp(-C_u k),$$

and additionally

$$\widehat{\mu}_{K_0} \geq \exp(-C_d K_0)$$

for some $C_d > C_u > 0$.

Note that all constants in the Assumptions 2', 3', 4' are independent of the choice of k, S . It is the purpose of this subsection to prove the following theorem (and thus Condition 1).

Theorem 6. Under the Assumptions 2', 3' and 4' it holds for $m_{stop}(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$

$$\left| (P - P_N) \left(Y - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right)^2 \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (18)$$

As $\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$ depends on the realizations $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$ and y^N , the convergence above is not trivial. For simplicity we drop the dependency of $f, \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$ on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ in the proof below.

Proof. We decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & |(P_N - P) \left(Y - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2| \\ & \leq \underbrace{|(P_N - P)Y^2|}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{2|(P_N - P)\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}Y|}_{\text{II}} + \underbrace{|(P_N - P) \left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2|}_{\text{III}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (18) we show the convergence in probability for I – III. Term I goes to 0 in probability since Y has a finite fourth moment. For term II it holds for any $\xi > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(|(P_N - P)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}| \geq \xi \right) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} |(P_N - P)Yf| \geq \xi \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$. For $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$, the first line on the r.h.s. goes to 0 by Corollary 1 and the second line vanishes by Lemma 5. The third line converges to 0 due to Assumption 4'. This shows the convergence in probability of term II.

Similarly, for term III it holds for any $\xi > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(|(P_N - P) \left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2| \geq \xi \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P) \left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P) \left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \{\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N\} \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(|(P_N - P) \left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2| \geq \xi \right) \cap \left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \{\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N\} \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} |(P_N - P)f^2| \geq \xi \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \right) \cap \{\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N\} \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\{\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$, the first line on the r.h.s. converges to 0 due to Corollary 2 and the other terms behave as described for term II. This shows the convergence in probability for term III. Overall, this proves Condition 1. \square

4.2.2 Consistency of Variance Estimation

In this paragraph we prove Condition 2. in the proof of Theorem 5. We fix again k and assume that $\varpi_{\pi^0}(k)$ has size d , that is, $\pi^0(k) = d + 1$. We set $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\widetilde{X}_1, \dots, \widetilde{X}_d) = \mathbf{X}_{\varpi_{\pi^0}(k)}$ and $Y = X_k$.

Theorem 7. *Let*

$$Y = f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2),$$

where f^0 lies in a RKHS H for which Assumption 4' holds with $\|f^0\|_H = R$. Then, it holds with the number of boosting steps chosen as $m_{stop} = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (y_\ell - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell))^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y - f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right)^2 \right] \right| = |\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \rightarrow 0$$

in probability.

Proof. We define the semi-norm

$$\|g\|_{2,N}^2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N g(y_\ell, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell)^2.$$

By the triangle inequality it holds that

$$\|Y - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N} \leq \|Y - f^0\|_{2,N} + \|f^0 - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N}. \quad (19)$$

Next, we show how to asymptotically lower and upper bound $\|Y - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N}$ by σ .

Lower bound: By Remark 3 and as $\|f^0\|_H = R$, $\|f^0\|_\infty$ is bounded. Further, $f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}]$ and the noise $Y - f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \varepsilon$ is Gaussian and thus sub-Gaussian with an Orlicz norm that is uniformly bounded. Hence, by Theorem 6 and the continuous mapping theorem the l.h.s. of (19) converges and it holds

$$\|Y - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N} = \sqrt{\|Y - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N}^2} \rightarrow \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|Y - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_2^2]} \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|Y - f^0\|_2^2]} = \sigma$$

in probability.

Upper bound: The term $\|Y - f^0\|_{2,N} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \varepsilon_\ell^2}$ converges to σ in probability. Thus, it remains to show that $\|f^0 - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$, which follows from Lemma 1 below. \square

Lemma 1. *For $Y = f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, $f^0 \in H$, and if \hat{f} is the boosting estimate with $m_{stop} = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$ boosting steps, then $\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$ converges to f^0 in a fixed design, that is,*

$$\|f^0 - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_{2,N} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell) - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Proof. The proof is in the Appendix C. \square

Remark 6. *Lemma 1 also holds for heteroscedastic noise and is stated similarly in Bühlmann and Yu [2003], Raskutti et al. [2014].*

Remark 7. *The combination of Theorem 6 and 7 is insightful. If we are unsure whether $f^0 \in H$ and the noise is independent, then limiting appropriately the number of boosting iterations leads to*

1. *a consistent estimator for f^0 if the assumptions hold, and*
2. *an estimator, so that the prediction error on the samples $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(y_\ell - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell) \right)^2$ is asymptotically close to the L^2 -error $\mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right)^2 \right]$ for yet unobserved realizations of $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y)$. Here, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(y_\ell - \hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell) \right)^2$ depends only on the observations used for learning $\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$ and thus no hold-out set is necessary.*

We emphasize, that although the results are stated for the Gaussian kernel they can be adapted to kernels with other eigenvalue decay rates.

4.3 Boosting DAGs for Large Dimensions

Theorem 5 shows that we can asymptotically identify the true causal ordering using boosting regressions. However, there are $p!$ possible permutations on $\{1, \dots, p\}$ that constitute the search space. Thus, beyond a very small p or without extensive prior knowledge on the topological order the computational costs are prohibitive. We address this issue through component-wise boosting in an additive noise model.

Additive Noise Model The true graph G^0 and the true structural equations f_1^0, \dots, f_p^0 can be represented by a function $F^0 : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, where

$$F^0(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1^0(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_p^0(\mathbf{x}))^\top = (f_1^0(\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(1)}), \dots, f_p^0(\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(p)}))^\top.$$

Thus, the graph G^0 has an edge from X_j to X_k if and only if the function f_k^0 is not constant in its j -th component. Note that the set of functions $F : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ corresponding to a DAG is non-convex [Zheng et al., 2020]. We assume that the structural equations $f_k^0(\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(k)})$ decompose additively, that is $f_k^0(\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(k)}) = \sum_{j \in \text{pa}(k)} f_{kj}^0(x_j)$.

Component-wise Boosting Instead of applying L^2 -boosting to estimate f_k^0 , $k = 1, \dots, p$ one-by-one as in Theorem 5, we employ component-wise boosting to estimate F^0 . This means, we define the loss function on the functions $F : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ as the log-likelihood function given \mathbf{x}^N

$$L(F, \mathbf{x}^N) = L((f_1, \dots, f_p), \mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_{\ell k} - f_k(\mathbf{x}_\ell))^2 \right)$$

and proceed as follows. Choose a step size $0 < \mu \leq 1$ and let $F^{(1)} = 0$ be the starting value. Then, for $m = 1, 2, \dots$ we set $f_k^{(m+1)}(\mathbf{x}) = f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) + \mu \widehat{f}_{kj}(x_j)$, where $(j, k) \in \{1, \dots, p\} \times \{1, \dots, p\}$ is the solution of

$$\arg \min_{(j,k) \notin N^m} S(j, k; F^{(m)}),$$

and $S(j, k; F^{(m)})$ is the score on the edges defined by

$$S(j, k; F^{(m)}) := \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(\widehat{f}_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell j}) - (\mathbf{x}_{\ell k} - f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_\ell)) \right)^2 \right). \quad (20)$$

Here, the candidate functions \widehat{f}_{kj} are determined by solving the kernel ridge regression

$$\widehat{f}_{kj} = \arg \min_{g_{kj} \in H_j} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(g_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell j}) - (\mathbf{x}_{\ell k} - f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_\ell)) \right)^2 + \lambda \|g_{kj}\|_{H_j}^2. \quad (21)$$

In the set N^m we track the edges (j, k) that would cause a cycle when added to $F^{(m)}$. Hence, $F^{(m)}$ corresponds to a DAG for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$

Note that if the edge (j, k) is chosen, then we only need to update $S(j, k; F^{(m+1)})$ for $(j, k) \notin N^{m+1}$, while this number remains unchanged for $k' \neq k$, that is, $S(j, k'; F^{(m+1)}) = S(j, k'; F^{(m)})$. This reduces the computational burden. We stop the procedure after m_{stop} steps, which is the crucial tuning parameter of (component-wise) boosting.

Choosing m_{stop} Inspired by results from boosting for regression [Tutz and Binder, 2006, Bühlmann and Hothorn, 2007] we use the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) to select m_{stop} . For any $f_k^{(m)}$ we calculate the trace of the mapping $B_k^{(m)} : (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{Nk}) \mapsto (f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_N))$. Then we define the AIC score

$$AIC(F^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{k=1}^p AIC_k(f_k^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}^N) = \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_{\ell k} - f_k^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_\ell))^2 + \text{tr}(B_k^{(m)}) \right). \quad (22)$$

We stop the procedure and set $m_{stop} = m$ if $AIC(F^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}^N)$ increases with m . We emphasize that this is merely a local minimum w.r.t to the AIC score and the global optimum is hard to find due to the non-convexity of the search space. The algorithm using the AIC is outlined in Algorithm 1 in Appendix D. It can be understood as a component-wise functional gradient descent in the space of those additive functions $\mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ which imply a DAG.

Pruning We prune the estimated graph \hat{G} by running an additive model regression of every node on its parents. Finally, we keep only those nodes as parents whose p -value is below 0.001. For more details on pruning, see Bühlmann et al. [2014].

5 Simulation Study

In this section we empirically investigate the proposed algorithms. In Section 5.1 we describe the data-generating processes. In Section 5.2 we verify Theorem 5 for data sets of small dimensions. In Section 5.3 we benchmark the algorithm of Section 4.3 on high-dimensional data sets against state-of-the-art methods. Further, we run a sensitivity analysis on the effect of the hyperparameters.

Every presented result is based on 100 randomly generated data sets unless stated otherwise. Aside from the sensitivity analysis, we set the step size $\mu = 0.3$ and the penalty parameter $\lambda = 0.01$. While it is known that boosting is commonly robust with respect to the step size (as long as it is small enough), we find in Section 5.3.2, that our method is robust also against the specific choice of λ . We therefore refrain from further tuning here.

5.1 Sampling SEMs and Data Generation

The generation of the synthetic data sets follows closely Bühlmann et al. [2014], Lachapelle et al. [2019], Zheng et al. [2020], Ng et al. [2022b], that is, they are generated as follows.

1. Generate **underlying graph** G^0 with one of the following two methods.
 - (a) Generate a DAG according to the Erdős-Rényi (ER) model [Erdős and Rényi, 1959]. That means, we first generate a random DAG with the maximal number of edges and keep every edge with a constant probability. Every node has the same distribution for the number of its neighbors.
 - (b) Generate a scale-free (SF) graph using the model of Barabási and Albert [1999]. There exist hubs of nodes with large degree, while other nodes have a smaller degree. This graph structure is observed in various applications [Jeong et al., 2000, Wille et al., 2004, Kertel et al., 2023].
2. Generate **structural equations** (SEs) in one of the two ways.
 - (a) **Additive:** For any edge (j, k) in the graph, sample f_{kj}^0 from a Gaussian process with mean 0 and covariance function $cov(f^0(x_{\ell j}), f^0(x_{\ell' j})) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x_{\ell j} - x_{\ell' j})^2}{2}\right)$ and set $f_k^0(\mathbf{x}_{\ell \text{pa}_{G^0}(k)}) = \sum_{j \in \text{pa}_{G^0}(k)} f_{kj}^0(x_{\ell j})$ for $\ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, N$.

- (b) **Non-additive:** For every node k consider its parents $\mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)$ and sample f_k^0 from a Gaussian Process with mean 0 and covariance function

$$\text{cov}(f^0(x_{\ell \mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)}), f^0(x_{\ell' \mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)})) = \exp\left(-\frac{\|x_{\ell \mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)} - x_{\ell' \mathbf{pa}_{G^0}(k)}\|_2^2}{2}\right),$$

for $\ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, N$.

3. Sample the **standard deviation** σ_k^0 for all $k = 1, \dots, p$ from a uniform distribution on $[\sqrt{2}/5, \sqrt{2}]$.

Finally, we sample the variables with no incoming edges from a centered Gaussian distribution with standard deviation as chosen in step 3. Following the topological order of G^0 , we generate the data set recursively according to the SEM. We emphasize, that non-additive SEs conflict with Assumption 1.

5.2 Low-Dimensional Data

In this low-dimensional simulation study we generate data by setting $p = 5$ and sample from an ER graph with on average five edges.

Then, we calculate the score for any of the $p!$ permutations π as described in Section 2. For every regression we choose m_{stop} to be the minimal m , for which $AIC_k(f_k^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}^N)$ increases with m . Recall that $f_k^{(m)}$ is a function on $\mathbf{x}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}$ and we use regular (not component-wise) boosting. We generate data sets with $N = 10, 20, 50, 100, 200$ observations with either additive or non-additive SEs. To evaluate the quality of the estimated permutations, we use the transposition distance

$$d_{trans}(\pi_1, \pi_2) := \min |\{\text{transpositions } \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_J : \sigma_1 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_J \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2\}|.$$

For an estimated permutation $\hat{\pi}$ we then set

$$d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0) := \min_{\pi^0 \in \Pi^0} d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \pi^0).$$

Thus, we calculate the minimal number of adjacent swaps so that the estimated permutation aligns with the underlying topological order. The results are depicted in Table 1 and as

N	Additive SEs		Non-additive SEs	
	$\overline{(d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0))}$	SD($d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0)$)	$\overline{(d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0))}$	SD($d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0)$)
10	3.29	1.90	3.26	1.95
20	1.76	1.93	2.03	2.00
50	0.49	1.12	0.85	1.55
100	0.35	0.92	0.56	1.04
200	0.03	0.22	0.23	0.61

Table 1: Mean ($\overline{(d_{trans}(\hat{\pi}, \Pi^0))}$) and standard deviation (SD) of the transposition distances (d_{trans}) between the estimated permutation $\hat{\pi}$ and the set of true permutations Π^0 for SEMs with additive and non-additive SEs. The underlying graphs are of ER type with on average five edges.

expected, increasing the sample size decreases the transposition distances. This supports Theorem 5. Further, the convergence seems also to hold under non-additive SEs. This indicates a robustness of the algorithm with respect to non-additive SEs.

5.3 High- Dimensional Data

5.3.1 Comparison with Existing Methods

In the following we compare the method proposed in Section 4.3 (denoted by DAGBoost) with Bühlmann et al. [2014] (denoted by CAM) and Zheng et al. [2020] (denoted by DAGSNOTEARS). For CAM we employ the default configuration and for DAGSNOTEARS we set $\lambda = 0.03$ and cutoff to 0.3. For a comparison with other methods see Bühlmann et al. [2014].

As performance measure we calculate the Structural Hamming Distance (SHD) between the true and the estimated graph for data sets containing $N = 200$ observations of $p = 100$ variables. The mean and standard deviation (SD) of the SHDs are given in Table 2.

Additive	Graph	CAM		DAGBoost		DAGSNOTEARS	
		$\overline{\text{SHD}}$	SD(SHD)	$\overline{\text{SHD}}$	SD(SHD)	$\overline{\text{SHD}}$	SD(SHD)
True	SF	30.18	9.47	30.08	9.57	176.96	23.06
True	ER	12.07	4.24	14.90	7.12	127.64	15.84
False	SF	77.63	7.57	67.47	5.73	135.32	18.20
False	ER	36.40	7.96	37.57	9.15	111.78	13.16

Table 2: Mean ($\overline{\text{SHD}}$) and standard deviation (SD) of SHDs between the true graph and the graphs estimated by the three presented algorithms.

From this table we make the following observations. DAGSNOTEARS does not provide satisfying results, while CAM and DAGBoost perform noticeably better in all simulation scenarios. Compared to DAGBoost, CAM achieves slightly better results for the easiest setting of ER graphs and additive SEs (improvement by 0.5 standard deviations). Generally, all methods suffer from an uneven edge distribution (SF graphs). However, for DAGBoost the mean of the SHDs increases less than CAM when the graph is of type SF instead of ER. Thus, in the most complex scenario of non-additive SEs and a non-even distribution of the edges among the nodes (SF graphs), DAGBoost is more than one standard deviation better than CAM. This is an important insight for real-world applications, which often follow SF graphs.

Additive	Graph	CAM		DAGBoost		DAGSNOTEARS	
		Precision	Recall	Precision	Recall	Precision	Recall
True	SF	0.868	0.817	0.967	0.712	0.165	0.198
True	ER	0.907	0.979	0.933	0.920	0.174	0.154
False	SF	0.676	0.383	0.930	0.345	0.037	0.024
False	ER	0.823	0.788	0.918	0.693	0.127	0.083

Table 3: Mean of precision and recall for the three presented algorithms. Precision is the ratio between the correctly identified edges and all identified edges. Recall is the share of the correctly identified edges among all true edges.

Table 3 furthermore summarizes the mean of the precision and the recall for the three algorithms. The precision, that is, the ratio of the correctly identified edges to all identified edges, is larger for DAGBoost. On the other hand, the recall, which is the share of the

identified edges among all true edges, is larger for CAM. Hence, the edges of DAGBoost are more reliable, while CAM misses a lower number of the underlying relationships.

Overall, DAGBoost is a strong competitor to CAM, both of which outperform DAGSNOTEARS. In particular, DAGBoost tends to estimate more reliable edges and is superior compared to CAM in complex non-additive and SF settings. Last, we make note the advantage of less tuning required for DAGBoost compared to CAM. While CAM has additional tuning parameters for the preliminary neighborhood selection [see Bühlmann et al., 2014], the tuning parameters of DAGBoost are merely the step size μ and the penalty parameter λ which we found to be rather robust (see the sensitivity analysis below), thus relatively easy to tune. Pruning the resulting graph has a positive effect on the SHD between the estimated and the true graph for DAGBoost. However, this effect is much larger for CAM as the graph before pruning contains many more edges. Thus, DAGBoost is less reliant on the hyperparameters of the pruning step compared to CAM.

5.3.2 Sensitivity Analysis

We investigate the performance of DAGBoost with respect to a variation of the step size μ and the regularization parameter λ .

When varying λ we set $\mu = 0.3$. On the other hand when varying μ we fix $\lambda = 0.01$. We conduct our analysis with ER graphs with $p = 100$ nodes and additive SEs. The mean and standard deviation of the SHD between the estimated and true graph are reported in Tables 4 and 5.

μ	mean(SHD)	SD(SHD)	mean(runtime in s)	SD(runtime in s)
0.3	14.90	7.12	58.47	14.82
0.5	14.21	7.17	43.72	10.97
0.7	13.65	7.13	37.45	7.46
0.9	13.17	7.05	20.17	2.84

Table 4: Mean and SD of SHDs between estimated and true graph for a varying step size μ . The penalty parameter is fixed at $\lambda = 0.01$. The graphs are of ER type and the SEs are additive. The runtime statistics are based on 10 experiments.

λ	mean(SHD)	SD(SHD)	mean(runtime in s)	SD(runtime in s)
0.001	15.58	7.56	43.54	10.23
0.01	12.12	6.92	64.10	19.28
0.1	14.90	7.12	204.87	63.54

Table 5: Mean and SD of SHDs between estimated and true graph for a varying penalty parameter λ . The step size is fixed at $\mu = 0.3$. The graphs are of ER type and the SEs are additive. The runtime statistics are based on 10 experiments.

One can see that the influence of the hyperparameters on the SHDs is minor. The AIC score controls the number of boosting steps m_{stop} very efficiently. It thus accounts well for the different base learners, which depend on the step size μ and the penalty parameter λ . An increase in the step size or a reduction in the penalty parameter leads to a smaller number of boosting iterations which in turn leads to a reduced runtime. At the same time

the quality of the estimated graph is not strongly effected. We thus recommend to use DAGBoost with a large step size or a low penalty parameter if the computational resources or the time are limited.

Although the impact of the hyperparameters is shown for one specific setting, based on our observations, they similarly hold in a wide range of data-generating processes.

6 Conclusion

In this work we investigated boosting for causal discovery and for the estimation of the causal order. We proposed a generic score function on the orderings that depends on a regression estimator. We presented two sufficient conditions on the regression estimator, so that the score function can consistently distinguish between aligning and incompatible orderings.

1. The regression estimator must consistently find the true regression function in a correctly specified scenario with homoscedastic noise, and
2. the mean squared prediction error on the samples must converge to the expected L^2 -prediction error for yet unseen observations even in general misspecified scenarios.

Together, the conditions imply a safety net for the regression estimator, which is interesting on its own. In a misspecified setting, the fit of the regression function to the observed samples gives a good estimate for the expected squared prediction error for yet unobserved realizations. In a correctly specified setting on the other side, the regression estimator still identifies the underlying functional relationship.

We showed that boosting with appropriate early stopping provides this safety net. Thus, our analysis gives insights on the generalization ability of boosting procedures for real-world data, which most likely does not meet all model assumptions.

In order to use a score function on the orderings for the identification of the topological order, one needs to score every possible permutation. This is infeasible for large p and insufficient prior knowledge on the causal structure. Thus we proposed a greedy boosting in the space of functions of $\mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ which correspond to a DAG. The algorithm can be understood as a functional gradient descent in the space of additive SEMs, aka component-wise boosting.

A simulation study underlined that the score function on the permutations consistently prefers a correct causal order and the convergence manifests already for small N . These findings were even robust to non-additive SEs. For small p or in case of extensive prior knowledge that drastically reduces the search space of permutations, the combination of the score and a feature selection procedure can be used for deriving the causal graph.

The second part of our simulations study showed that the gradient descent is highly competitive with state-of-the-art algorithms. Particularly for complex data-generating processes, the algorithm provides a noticeable benefit. Besides, the exact choice of the hyperparameters are efficiently and automatically balanced by the number of boosting iterations and the AIC score. Thus, the procedure is easy to tune and ready to be applied to a variety of data sets.

Many parts of our analysis were generic and the RKHS regression can easily be replaced by other regression estimators as spline regression or neural networks. Thus one can further

investigate which regression estimators lead to consistent estimators for the causal order and the empirical performance and theoretical properties are to be explored. A combination of gradient-based methods as in Zheng et al. [2018] and boosting could also lead to insights.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Recall that $\varpi_\pi(k) := \{j : \pi(j) < \pi(k)\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{S}(\pi) &= \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}}^2) \\
&\geq \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left((P_N - P) \left(X_k - \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}) \right)^2 + \sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2 \right) \\
&\geq \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2) \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\max \left\{ 0, \frac{-(P_N - P) \left(X_k - \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}) \right)^2}{\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2 + (P_N - P) \left(X_k - \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}) \right)^2} \right\}}_{=:\Delta_{N,k}} \\
&= \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sum_{k=1}^p \log(\sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2) + \sum_{k=1}^p \Delta_{N,k} \\
&= S(\pi) + \sum_{k=1}^p \Delta_{N,k} \\
&= S(\pi^0) + \sum_{k=1}^p \Delta_{N,k} + \underbrace{S(\pi) - S(\pi^0)}_{\xi_{\pi, \pi^0} > 0} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left((\sigma_k^0)^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2 \right) + \Delta_{N,k} + \xi_{\pi, \pi^0} \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^p \log \left(\widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2 \right) + \underbrace{\max \left\{ 0, -\frac{(\sigma_k^0)^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_{k, \widehat{f}_{k, \pi^0}}^2}{(\sigma_k^0)^2} \right\}}_{=:\gamma_{N,k}} + \Delta_{N,k} + \xi_{\pi, \pi^0} \\
&= \widehat{S}(\pi^0) + \sum_{k=1}^p (\gamma_{N,k} + \Delta_{N,k}) + \xi_{\pi, \pi^0}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we used that for any $k = 1, \dots, p$

$$\begin{aligned}
P \left((X_k - \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}))^2 \right) &= \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[(X_k - \widehat{f}_{k, \pi}(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}))^2 \right] \\
&\geq \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta^0}} \left[(X_k - f_k(\mathbf{X}_{\varpi_\pi(k)}))^2 \right] \\
&= \min_{(f_1, \dots, f_p) \in \vartheta(\pi)} \sigma_{k, p_{\theta^0}, f_k, \pi}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second and last inequality Lemma 2 below was used. Further, $\xi_{\pi, \pi^0} > 0$, which does not depend on N , by the identifiability of the model. By the assumptions and the

continuous mapping theorem it holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Delta_{N,k}| \geq \frac{\xi_{\pi,\pi^0}}{2p}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}\left(|\gamma_{N,k}| \geq \frac{\xi_{\pi,\pi^0}}{2p}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, p \text{ and } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

from which we derive that

$$\xi_N = \left| \sum_{k=1}^p \Delta_{N,k} + \gamma_{N,k} \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^p |\Delta_{N,k}| + \sum_{k=1}^p |\gamma_{N,k}| < \xi_{\pi,\pi^0}$$

with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 2. For $x > 0$ and $x + \delta > 0$ it holds that

$$\log(x + \delta) \geq \log(x) + \max\left\{0, -\frac{\delta}{x + \delta}\right\}$$

Proof. The statement is true for $\delta \geq 0$. For $\delta < 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \log(x) &= \log(x - |\delta| + |\delta|) \leq \log(x - |\delta|) + \frac{|\delta|}{x - |\delta|} = \log(x + \delta) - \frac{\delta}{x + \delta} \\ &= \log(x + \delta) - \max\left\{0, -\frac{\delta}{x + \delta}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. \square

B Proof of Theorem 6

The proof of Theorem 6 decomposes $(P_N - P)\left(Y - \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\right)^2$ into $(P_N - P)\left(Y \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\right)$ and $(P_N - P)\left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\right)^2$. We show both convergences using the theory of empirical processes.

For this purpose, we show in Section B.1 that $\|\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H$ can be upper-bounded. Section B.2 then derives the convergence of $(P_N - P)\left(Y \widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\right)$ using *Covering Numbers*. The convergence of $(P_N - P)\left(\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\right)^2$ is then shown using *Rademacher Complexities*.

B.1 Upper-Bound of the RKHS Norm of Regression Function Estimate

The main result of this section is Lemma 5, which upper-bounds the Hilbert space norm of the boosting estimate $\|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H$ with a probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$ for a suitably chosen number of boosting iterations m . The analysis is based on the fact that $\|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2$ can be expressed as a quadratic form.

Lemma 3. Let S be the kernel regression learner with penalty parameter λ . Assume that the Gram matrix G is invertible. Then it holds for the boosting estimate after m boosting steps that

$$\|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 = \frac{1}{N} (y^N)^T U (I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^T y^N,$$

where $U, D, \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and D, Λ are diagonal matrices. Λ has the eigenvalues $\widehat{\mu}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mu}_N$ of G and D has $\frac{\widehat{\mu}_1}{\widehat{\mu}_1 + \lambda}, \dots, \frac{\widehat{\mu}_N}{\widehat{\mu}_N + \lambda}$ on the diagonal. U contains the corresponding eigenvectors of G .

Proof. It holds for the linear base learner S mapping y^N to $\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}^N)$, that

$$S = G(G + \lambda I)^{-1}.$$

The matrix S is symmetric and has the eigenvalues $d_1 = \frac{\widehat{\mu}_1}{\widehat{\mu}_1 + \lambda}, \dots, d_N = \frac{\widehat{\mu}_N}{\widehat{\mu}_N + \lambda}$. Thus, for the orthogonal matrix U containing the eigenvectors of S and the diagonal matrix D containing the eigenvalues d_1, \dots, d_N of S it holds that

$$S = UDU^T.$$

By Equation (14), the estimate $\widehat{f}^{(m)} = B^{(m)}y^N = (I - (I - S)^m)y^N$ can be expressed by

$$\widehat{f}^{(m)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \widehat{\beta}_k K(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_k)$$

for some $\widehat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Using the results of Section 3.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 &= \widehat{\beta}^\top G \widehat{\beta} \\ &= \widehat{f}^{(m)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)^\top \frac{G^{-1}}{\sqrt{N}} G \frac{G^{-1}}{\sqrt{N}} \widehat{f}^{(m)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (y^N)^\top B^{(m)} G^{-1} B^{(m)} y^N. \end{aligned}$$

Note that G , S and $B^{(m)}$ have the same eigenvectors. Besides, Λ and $I - (I - D)^m$ are diagonal matrices, so they commute. Hence, $B^{(m)} G^{-1} B^{(m)} = U(I - (I - D)^m) U^\top U \Lambda^{-1} U^\top U (I - D)^m U^\top = U(I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^\top$. Thus,

$$\|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 = \frac{1}{N} (y^N)^\top B^{(m)} G^{-1} B^{(m)} y^N = \frac{1}{N} (y^N)^\top U (I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^\top y^N.$$

□

The following Hanson-Wright-inequality gives probabilistic upper bounds for quadratic forms as derived in Lemma 3.

Theorem 8 (Hanson-Wright-Inequality). *[Rudelson and Vershynin, 2013, Theorem 1.1] Consider a random vector $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with independent components, for which $\mathbb{E}(Z_\ell) = 0, \ell = 1, \dots, N$ and for which the Orlicz norm of Z_1, \dots, Z_N is uniformly bounded by s_{max} . For any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ it holds for every $t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \|M\mathbf{Z}\|^2 - \mathbb{E} [\|M\mathbf{Z}\|^2] \right| > t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-c \min \left\{ \frac{t^2}{s_{max}^4 \|M\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{s_{max} \|M\|} \right\} \right).$$

Lemma 3 shows that the RKHS norm can be expressed as a quadratic form. In the next steps, we upper bound the quadratic form, that is, the RKHS norm of $\widehat{f}^{(m)}$ using Theorem 8. We see, that we can choose M in Theorem 8 as the matrix square root of $U(I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^\top$ so that $\|MY\|^2 = \|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2$. Thus, these bounds depend on the number of boosting steps m and D and Λ (which are functions of G), where the latter are probabilistically depending on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N$. Controlling D , this allows us to vary m with N such that the growth of the upper bound for $\|\widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2$ can be controlled with a high probability. Observe that Theorem 8 requires centered random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_N .

Lemma 4. Decompose $Y = \mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, where $\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$ and $\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$. Assume that $\|\mu\|_\infty < \mu_{max}$ and the Orlicz norm and variance of the conditional distribution of $\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ given some realization $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ is uniformly bounded by s_{max} and σ_{max}^2 , respectively. Let $\hat{f}^{(m)}$ be the boosting estimate after m boosting steps and $\Lambda, D, U \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as in Lemma 3. We can upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 > 1 + 2N(\mu_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2) \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)\|_F^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left(-C \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4s_{max}^4 \|M_m\|_F^2}, \frac{1}{2s_{max}^2 \|M_m\|} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) := M_m := \frac{1}{N} U (I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^T.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3 it holds

$$\|\hat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 = \frac{1}{N} (y^N)^T U (I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1} U^T y^N = (y^N)^\top M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) y^N.$$

We emphasize that G and thus D, U and S are functions of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N$. We calculate for $\mu^N = (\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1), \dots, \mu(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_N)) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varepsilon^N = (\varepsilon_1(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1), \dots, \varepsilon_N(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_N)) \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{f}^{(m)}\|_H^2 - 2N(\mu_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2) \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 > 1 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left(\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) Y^N\|^2 - 2N(\mu_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2) \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 > 1 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(2 \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \mu^N\|^2 + 2 \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \varepsilon^N\|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2N(\mu_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2) \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 > 1 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right) \end{aligned}$$

In the third line we used the decomposition $y^N = \mu^N + \varepsilon^N$ and the inequality $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$. In the following we upper-bound the terms $\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \mu^N\|^2$ and $-N \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 \sigma_{max}^2$. For the first term observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \mu^N\|^2 & = \text{tr} \left(((\mu^N)^\top M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \mu^N) \right) \\ & = \text{tr} \left(M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \mu^N (\mu^N)^\top \right) \\ & \leq \text{tr} \left(M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \right) \text{tr} \left(\mu^N (\mu^N)^\top \right) \\ & \leq N \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 \mu_{max}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the latter term using that $\mathbf{E} \left[\varepsilon_k^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \right] \leq \sigma_{max}^2, k = 1, \dots, N$ it holds analogously

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \varepsilon^N\|^2 | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \right] & = \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \left((\varepsilon^N)^\top M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \varepsilon^N \right) | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \left(M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \right) \text{tr} \left(\varepsilon^N (\varepsilon^N)^\top \right) | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \right] \\ & \leq \text{tr} \left(M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[(\varepsilon^N)^\top \varepsilon^N | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \right] \\ & \leq N \|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 \sigma_{max}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence $-N\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2\sigma_{max}^2 \leq -\mathbb{E}\left[\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\varepsilon^N\|^2|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N\right]$. Using these results and plugging in the condition $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$ we can upper-bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(2\|M_m^{1/2}\mu^N\|^2 + 2\|M_m^{1/2}\varepsilon^N\|^2 - 2N(\mu_{max}^2 + \sigma_{max}^2)\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\|_F^2 > 1|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|M_m^{1/2}\varepsilon^N\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\left(\|M_m^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N)\varepsilon^N\|^2|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N\right) > \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N\right) \\ & = \mathbb{P}\left(\|M_m^{1/2}\varepsilon^N\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\left(\|M_m^{1/2}\varepsilon^N\|^2\right) > \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N\right) \\ & \leq 2\exp\left(-C\min\left\{\frac{1}{4s_{max}^4\|M_m\|_F^2}, \frac{1}{2s_{max}^2\|M_m\|}\right\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 8 (Hanson-Wright-inequality) and the fact that $\varepsilon^N|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$ is a centered, sub-Gaussian random vector with independent components with Orlicz norm bounded by s_{max} . \square

We now show that if we choose $m = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4}\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{C_d+1}}$ then the growth of $\|\hat{f}^{(m)}\|_H$ with N is of lower order as $N^{1/4}$ with a probability going to 1 if $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$.

Lemma 5 (Upper bound $\|\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H$). *Under Assumption 4' and for $m_{stop} = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4}\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{C_d+1}}$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ and a $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4-\delta})$ so that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \notin h(N)\mathcal{F}_N \cap \{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N\}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (23)$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. As outlined in relation (14), by the representation theorem it holds that $\hat{f}^{(m)} \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N$ for some $h(N) \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus we need to show that $\|\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H \leq h(N)$. We prove the statement by showing the convergence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})}\|_H^2 > h(N)^2|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N\right) \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly for any $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ and some $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4-\delta})$. The statement then follows by integrating out with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$. Applying Lemma 4, we need to prove the following two statements.

1. $N\|M_m^{1/2}\|_F^2 \in o(N^{1/2-2\delta})$. This implies, $\|M_m\|_F^2 \leq \|M_m^{1/2}\|_F^4 \in o(1)$.
2. $\|M_m\| \in o(1)$.

It is emphasized that M_m is a function of the random sample $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$.

The statement is proven in Lemma 6. \square

Lemma 6. *Under Assumption 4' it holds for*

$$M_m(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) := M_m := \frac{1}{N}U(I - (I - D)^m)^2\Lambda^{-1}U^T$$

that there exists a $\delta > 0$ so that the following statements hold for $m = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4}\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{C_d+1}}$ uniformly in $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$, where \mathcal{B}_N is defined in Assumption 4'.

1. $N^{1/2+2\delta} \|M_m^{1/2}\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \text{tr}((I - (I - D)^m)^2 \Lambda^{-1}) \rightarrow 0$,
2. $\|M_m\|_F^2 \rightarrow 0$, and
3. $\|M_m\| \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. 1.: Uniformly in $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned}
N^{1/2+2\delta} \|M_m^{1/2}\|_F^2 &= N^{1/2+2\delta} \text{tr}(M_m) \\
&= \frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^N (1 - (1 - d_k)^m)^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\widehat{\mu}_k}{\widehat{\mu}_k + \lambda}\right)^m\right)^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^N \min \left\{1, m^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{\mu}_k}{\widehat{\mu}_k + \lambda}\right)^2\right\} \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^N \min \left\{\lambda^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1}, m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k\right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 N^{1/2-2\delta}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor K_0 \rfloor} \min \left\{\lambda^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1}, m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k\right\} + \sum_{k=\lceil K_0 \rceil}^N \min \left\{\lambda^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1}, m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k\right\} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 N^{1/2-2\delta}} \left(K_0 \widehat{\mu}_{K_0}^{-1} \lambda^2 + \sum_{k=\lceil K_0 \rceil}^N m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which holds for any $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. The inequality (i) is shown in Lemma 8. The last inequality is due to the fact that $\widehat{\mu}_k^{-1}$ is monotonically increasing. We choose $K_0 = K_0(N) = \lfloor \frac{1}{2C_d+1} \ln(N) \rfloor$. Uniformly in $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ it holds by Assumption 4' for a small $\delta > 0$

$$\frac{K_0 \widehat{\mu}_{K_0}^{-1}}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \leq \frac{K_0 \exp(C_d K_0)}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \rightarrow 0.$$

For the latter part observe that it holds for any $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ and by Assumption 4'

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=[K_0]}^N m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k &\leq \frac{m^2}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=[K_0]}^N \exp(-C_u k) \\
&\leq \frac{m^2}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \int_{K_0}^{\infty} \exp(-C_u(z-1)) dz \\
&= \frac{m^2 \exp(C_u)}{N^{1/2-2\delta} C_u} \exp(-C_u K_0) \\
&= \frac{m^2 \exp(C_u)}{N^{1/2-2\delta} C_u} \exp(-C_u (\underbrace{K_0+1}_{\geq \frac{1}{2C_d+1} \ln(N)} - 1)) \\
&\leq \frac{m^2 \exp(2C_u)}{N^{1/2-2\delta} C_u} N^{-\frac{C_u}{2C_d+1}} \\
&= \frac{m^2 \exp(2C_u)}{C_u} N^{-\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+1}} N^{2\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that for $m = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{C_d+1}}$ where the constants are chosen independently of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$, it holds

$$m^2 N^{-\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+1}} = N^{\frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+2} - \frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+1}} = N^{-\xi},$$

where $\xi := \frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+1} - \frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{2C_d+2} > 0$. For $\delta < \frac{\xi}{2}$ it holds that $\frac{1}{N^{1/2-2\delta}} \sum_{k=[K_0]}^N m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k \rightarrow 0$.

2. follows by $\|M_m\|_F^2 \leq \|M_m^{1/2}\|_F^4 \rightarrow 0$.
3. follows by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|M_m\| &= \frac{1}{N} \max_{k=1, \dots, N} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\widehat{\mu}_k}{\widehat{\mu}_k + \lambda} \right)^m \right)^2 \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{N} \max_{k=1, \dots, N} \min \left\{ 1, m^2 \left(\frac{\widehat{\mu}_k}{\widehat{\mu}_k + \lambda} \right)^2 \right\} \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2 N} \max_{k=1, \dots, N} \min \left\{ \widehat{\mu}_k^{-1}, m^2 \widehat{\mu}_k \right\} \leq \frac{m^2 \widehat{\mu}_1}{\lambda^2 N} \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (i) follows again from Lemma 8 as $\widehat{\mu}_1 \leq 1$. □

The following Lemma immediately follows from the proof of Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. *Under Assumption 4' it holds for $m = m(N) = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u+C_d+1/2}{C_d+1}}$ on \mathcal{B}_N , that*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\widehat{\mu}_\ell}{\widehat{\mu}_\ell + \lambda} \right)^m \right)^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 8. *It holds for $0 \leq \widehat{\mu}_k \leq 1$, that*

$$1 - (1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^m \leq 1 - \max\{0, 1 - m\widehat{\mu}_k\} = \min\{1, m\widehat{\mu}_k\}$$

Proof. It is equivalent to show that

$$(1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^m \geq \max\{0, 1 - m\widehat{\mu}_k\}.$$

The l.h.s. and the r.h.s. are equal for $\widehat{\mu}_k = 0$. On the interval $[0, \frac{1}{m})$ it holds that

$$\frac{\partial(1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^m}{\partial\widehat{\mu}_k} = -m(1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^{m-1} \geq -m = \frac{\partial(\max\{0, 1 - m\widehat{\mu}_k\})}{\partial\widehat{\mu}_k}.$$

Hence,

$$(1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^m \geq \max\{0, 1 - m\widehat{\mu}_k\} \text{ for } \widehat{\mu}_k \in [0, \frac{1}{m}).$$

Clearly, for $\mu_k \in [\frac{1}{m}, 1]$

$$(1 - \widehat{\mu}_k)^m \geq \max\{0, 1 - m\widehat{\mu}_k\}.$$

□

B.2 Results on Covering Numbers

Lemma 5 has shown that for $m_{stop} = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$, it holds $\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N$ for some $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$ with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$. In this section we use the covering numbers from empirical process theory to show the convergence of the inner product

$$|(P - P_N)Y\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}|. \quad (24)$$

The covering numbers measure the complexity of a function class.

Definition 4. For a function class \mathcal{F} and a semi-metric d on \mathcal{F} the covering number $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, d)$ is the minimal size of a subset $S \subset \mathcal{F}$, such that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$ there is an $s \in S$ so that $d(f, s) < \varepsilon$. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, d) = \min_{\{S \subset \mathcal{F} | \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \exists s \in S: d(f, s) < \varepsilon\}} |S|.$$

In this work, we choose $d(f, g) = \|f - g\|_\infty$ and thus write $\mathcal{N}(u, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) = \mathcal{N}(u, \mathcal{F})$. For a suitable C_0 [chosen as in Dudley's Theorem, see Theorem 8.4 of van de Geer, 2014] not depending on \mathcal{F} we define the covering number entropy integral by

$$\mathcal{J}(z, \mathcal{F}) := C_0 z \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{uz}{2}, \mathcal{F}\right)} du.$$

For a constant $C > 0$, let $\mathcal{H} = \{Ch | h \in \mathcal{G}\}$ be a scaled version of some function class \mathcal{G} . The following remark shows that the entropy integral $\mathcal{J}(z, \mathcal{H})$ of \mathcal{H} can be upper bounded by an expression depending on C and the entropy integral $\mathcal{J}(z, \mathcal{G})$ of \mathcal{G} .

Remark 8. For $C > 0$ the identity

$$\mathcal{N}(Cz, C\mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|) \leq \mathcal{N}(z, \mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|)$$

holds and thus $\mathcal{J}(Cz, C\mathcal{G}) \leq C\mathcal{J}(z, \mathcal{G})$, where $C\mathcal{G} = \{Cg | g \in \mathcal{G}\}$. This upper bound is not optimal [see Cucker and Smale, 2002] but sufficient for our purposes.

Eventually, we will show in Corollary 1 that if $\widehat{f}^{(m_{stop})}$ is in the ball of radius $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$, then this growth rate $h(N)$ is slow enough to ensure the convergence of (24). We rely on the following theorem.

Theorem 9 (van de Geer [2014, Theorem 3.2]). *Let $K = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty$ and assume that Y is sub-Gaussian with Orlicz norm smaller than s . Then for t, N such that ¹*

$$\sqrt{\frac{2t}{N}} + \frac{t}{N} \leq 1 \text{ it holds with probability } 1 - 8 \exp(-t)$$

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(P_N - P)Yf|/C \leq \frac{2\mathcal{J}(Ks, \mathcal{F}) + Ks\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (25)$$

Corollary 1. *Let f_1, f_2, \dots be a sequence in H such that*

$$f_N \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N,$$

where $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$. If $\mathcal{J}(z, \mathcal{F}_N) \leq \mathcal{J}(z, B_1) = C_0 z \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log(\mathcal{N}(\frac{uz}{2}, B_1))} < \infty$ for all $z > 0$ as in Assumption \mathcal{J} , then

$$|(P_N - P)Yf_N| \leq \xi.$$

converges to 0 in probability.

Proof. For $h(N)\mathcal{F}_N$ it holds that

$$K := \sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} \|f\|_\infty \leq \sup_{f \in h(N)B_1} \|f\|_\infty \leq Bh(N).$$

Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{J}(u, \mathcal{F})$ and applying Remark 8, we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(Ku, h(N)\mathcal{F}_N) \leq \mathcal{J}(Bh(N)u, h(N)B_1) \leq h(N)\mathcal{J}(Bu, B_1) \forall u \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

As the Orlicz norm fulfills the triangle inequality and as the Orlicz norm of the bounded random variable $\mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ is finite, the Orlicz norm of $Y = \mu(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + \varepsilon$, denoted by s , is bounded and Y is thus sub-Gaussian. We now apply Theorem 9 and set $t = N^{1/2}$ (the condition $\sqrt{\frac{2t}{N}} + \frac{t}{N} \leq 1$ is then fulfilled for $N > \frac{1}{2}(7 + 3\sqrt{5})$).

It holds with probability $1 - 8 \exp(-N^{1/2})$

$$\begin{aligned} |(P_N - P)Yf_N| &\leq \sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} |(P_N - P)Yf| \\ &\leq \frac{\mathcal{J}(Bh(N)s, h(N)\mathcal{F}_N) + Bh(N)s_{max}N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &\leq \frac{h(N)\mathcal{J}(Bs, \mathcal{F}_N) + Bh(N)s_{max}N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &\leq \frac{h(N)\mathcal{J}(Bs, B_1) + Bh(N)s_{max}N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

¹There is a typo in van de Geer [2014], where it says $J_0(K\sigma, \mathcal{F})$ instead of $J_\infty(K\sigma, \mathcal{F})$.

$\mathcal{J}(B_s, B_1)$ is finite and constant in N by Assumption 3'. Let $\xi > 0$ be arbitrary. As $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$, there exists N^0 so that

$$\frac{h(N)\mathcal{J}(B_s, B_1)}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \frac{\xi}{2} \forall N > N^0.$$

For the second term observe that as $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$

$$\frac{Bh(N)s_{max}N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{N}} = \frac{Bh(N)s_{max}}{N^{1/4}} \leq \frac{\xi}{2}$$

for all $N > N^1$ for some $N^1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus for $N > \max\{N^0, N^1\}$

$$|(P_N - P)Yf_N| \leq \xi$$

with probability $1 - 8 \exp(-8N^{1/2}) \rightarrow 1$. This proves the convergence in probability. \square

B.3 Results on Rademacher Complexities

In this section we use concept of the Rademacher complexity to show the convergence of

$$\left| (P - P_N) \left(\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \right)^2 \right|.$$

It is again based on Lemma 5, which ensures that for $m_{stop} = N^{\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_u + C_d + 1/2}{C_d + 1}}$, it holds $\hat{f}^{(m_{stop})} \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N$ for some $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4 - \delta})$ for some $\delta > 0$ with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 5 (Rademacher complexity). *Let \mathcal{F} be a function class on \mathbf{X} . Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N$ be i.i.d. realizations of Rademacher random variables, which are independent of \mathbf{X} . Further let $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ be i.i.d realizations of \mathbf{X} . We define the Rademacher complexity $R_N(\mathcal{F})$ by*

$$R_N(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}, \sigma} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^N \sigma_\ell f(\mathbf{x}_\ell) \right| \right].$$

Note that $R_N(\mathcal{F})$ is deterministic. Given fixed observations $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$, the empirical Rademacher complexity is given by

$$\hat{R}_N(\mathcal{F} | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) = \hat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^N \sigma_\ell f(\mathbf{x}_\ell) \right| \right].$$

The Rademacher complexity is a tool to upper bound $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(P_N - P)f|$.

Theorem 10. [Wainwright, 2019, Theorem 4.10] *Let \mathcal{F} be uniformly bounded with constant B . Then it holds for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and with probability $1 - \exp(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 N}{2B^2})$, that*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |(P_N - P)f| \leq 2R_N(\mathcal{F}) + \varepsilon.$$

The Rademacher complexity is linked to its empirical counterpart with high probability.

Theorem 11 (Bartlett and Mendelson [2002, Theorem 11]). *Let \mathcal{F} be uniformly bounded by B . Then it holds with probability $1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 N}{B^2}\right)$*

$$\left| \widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) - R_N(\mathcal{F}) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

We collect some helpful relationships for the Rademacher complexity.

Theorem 12 (Bartlett and Mendelson [2002, Theorem 12]). *Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_p$ be function classes and let \mathcal{F} be uniformly bounded by B . Then*

1. for $c \in \mathbb{R}$: $R_N(c\mathcal{F}) = |c|R_N(\mathcal{F})$,
2. $R_N\left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{F}_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^p R_N(\mathcal{F}_j)$,
3. for $\mathcal{F}^2 := \{|f|^2 : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$, it follows $R_N(\mathcal{F}^2) \leq 4BR_N(\mathcal{F})$.

The Rademacher complexity can be upper bounded for kernel functions.

Theorem 13 (Bartlett and Mendelson [2002, Lemma 22]). *The empirical Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F}_N is upper bounded by*

$$\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) \leq \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \widehat{\mu}_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

while the population Rademacher complexity can be upper bounded by

$$R_N(\mathcal{F}_N) \leq \left(\frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mu_k \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that if the sequence μ_1, μ_2, \dots is summable, then $R_N(\mathcal{F}_N) \in O(N^{-1/2})$. For this case we connect the results above in a corollary.

Corollary 2. *For any sequence f_1, f_2, \dots in H for which*

$$f_N \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N,$$

where $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4-\delta})$ for some $\delta > 0$ and $\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) \in O(N^{-1/2})$, it holds

$$|(P_N - P)f_N^2| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \text{ for } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $\xi > 0$ be arbitrary and fixed. By Theorem 12 it holds that

$$R_N(h(N)\mathcal{F}_N) = h(N)R_N(\mathcal{F}_N),$$

and as \mathcal{F}_N is uniformly bounded by $Bh(N)$ it holds by Theorem 12

$$R_N\left((h(N)\mathcal{F}_N)^2\right) = 4Bh(N)R_N(\mathcal{F}_N).$$

From Theorem 10 we obtain that for any $\xi > 0$

$$|(P_N - P)f_N^2| \leq \sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} |(P_N - P)f^2| \leq 2R_N((h(N)\mathcal{F}_N)^2) + \frac{\xi}{2} = 8Bh(N)^2R_N(\mathcal{F}_N) + \frac{\xi}{3}$$

with probability $1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\xi^2 N}{4(Bh(N))^2}\right)$, which converges to 1 as $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, as \mathcal{F}_N is uniformly bounded by B and by setting $\varepsilon = N^{-1/2+2\delta}$ in Theorem 11, we observe that

$$|\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) - R_N(\mathcal{F}_N)| \leq N^{-1/2+2\delta}$$

with probability going to 1 for any $\delta > 0$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |(P_N - P)f_N^2| &\leq \sup_{f \in h(N)\mathcal{F}_N} |(P_N - P)f^2| \\ &\leq 8Bh(N)^2R_N(\mathcal{F}_N) + \frac{\xi}{3} \\ &\leq 8Bh(N)^2|R_N(\mathcal{F}_N) - \widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N)| + 8Bh(N)^2\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) + \frac{\xi}{3} \\ &\leq 8Bh(N)^2N^{-1/2+2\delta} + 8Bh(N)^2\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) + \frac{\xi}{3} \end{aligned}$$

with probability going to 1 for $N \rightarrow \infty$. As $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4})$, it holds $h(N)^2\widehat{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_N) < \frac{\xi}{3}$ by Assumption 4' and Theorem 13 for N chosen large enough. Similarly, $h(N)^2N^{-1/2+2\delta} < \frac{\xi}{3}$ for N chosen large enough, as $h(N) \in o(N^{1/4-\delta})$. This proves the statement. \square

C Proof of Theorem 7

Proof of Lemma 1. Using

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^0 - \widehat{f}^{(m)}\|_{2,N}^2 &= \frac{1}{N} \|f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) - B^{(m)}y^N\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \|f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) - U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top y^N\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \|f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) - U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top (f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) + \varepsilon^N)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{N} \|f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) - U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N} \|U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top \varepsilon^N\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{2}{N} \|U(I - D)^m U^\top f^0(\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)\|_2^2}_I + \underbrace{\frac{2}{N} \|U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top \varepsilon^N\|_2^2}_{II}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds due to $\|a + b\|^2 \leq 2\|a\|^2 + 2\|b\|^2$, we show the convergence of I and II to 0 in probability for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that $S = UDU^\top$ with U containing the orthonormal eigenvalues of S and D being a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $D_{\ell\ell} = d_\ell = \frac{\widehat{\mu}_\ell}{\widehat{\mu}_\ell + \lambda}$, where $\widehat{\mu}_\ell, \ell = 1, \dots, N$ are the eigenvalues of G .

Convergence of I:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{N} \|U(I-D)^m U^\top f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)\|_2^2 &= \frac{2}{N} f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)^\top U(I-D)^m U^\top U(I-D)^m U^\top f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) \\ &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (1-d_\ell)^{2m} \left(U^\top f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) \right)_\ell^2 \end{aligned}$$

As G has full rank, there exists a $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) = \sqrt{N}G\beta$. Define $\tilde{f} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \beta_\ell K(\cdot, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\ell)$ for which holds $\tilde{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) = f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N)$. By the representation theorem it further holds $\beta^\top G\beta = \|\tilde{f}\|_H^2 \leq \|f^0\|_H^2 = R^2$. Let $D_{\hat{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_N$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (1-d_\ell)^{2m} \left(U^\top f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N) \right)_\ell^2 &\leq \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \frac{(U^\top f^0(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N))_\ell^2}{2em d_\ell} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \frac{(U^\top \sqrt{N}G\beta)_\ell^2}{em d_\ell} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^N \frac{(U^\top G\beta)_\ell^2}{em d_\ell} \\ &\leq (1+\lambda) \sum_{\ell=1}^N \frac{(U^\top G\beta)_\ell^2}{em \hat{\mu}_\ell} \\ &= \frac{1+\lambda}{em} \text{tr} \left(D_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1} U^\top G\beta\beta^\top GU \right) \\ &= \frac{1+\lambda}{em} \text{tr} \left(\underbrace{UD_{\hat{\mu}}^{-1}U^\top}_{G^{-1}} G\beta\beta^\top G \right) \\ &= \frac{1+\lambda}{em} \beta^\top G\beta = \frac{1+\lambda}{em} \|\tilde{f}\|_H^2 \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{em} R^2, \end{aligned}$$

which goes to 0 as $m(N) \rightarrow \infty$ for $N \rightarrow \infty$. In the first inequality we have used the fact that $(1-x)^{2m} \leq \exp(-x)^{2m} = \exp(-2mx) \leq \frac{1}{2emx}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where e is Euler's number. In the second inequality we have used $\frac{1}{d_\ell} = \frac{\hat{\mu}_\ell + \lambda}{\hat{\mu}_\ell} \leq \frac{1+\lambda}{\hat{\mu}_\ell}$, as $0 < \hat{\mu}_\ell \leq 1$ for all $l = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Convergence of II:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \|U(I - (I-D)^m) U^\top \varepsilon^N\|_2^2 > \xi \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \|U(I - (I-D)^m) U^\top \varepsilon^N\|_2^2 > \xi \right) \cap \{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N \} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\{ \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N \} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The latter term goes again to 0 by Assumption 4'. For any $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ we show that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \|U(I - (I-D)^m) U^\top \varepsilon^N\|_2^2 > \xi \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right) \rightarrow 0$$

for any $\xi > 0$ and uniformly in $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$. Recall that $\varepsilon^N \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$ is a sub-Gaussian vector with mean 0 and independent components. Thus, we can apply the Hanson-Wright inequality

of Theorem 8. Remember that D is a function of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$. We need to show for any $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$, $A_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top$ that $\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| A_m \varepsilon^N \right\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right] \rightarrow 0$, $\|A_m^2\|_F^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|A_m^2\| \rightarrow 0$. It holds by Lemma 8 uniformly for $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| A_m \varepsilon^N \right\|_2^2 \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{Y^N \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}U(I - (I - D)^m)U^\top \varepsilon^N \right\|_2^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y^N \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \left((\varepsilon^N)^\top U(I - (I - D)^m)^2 U^\top \varepsilon^N \right) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{Y^N \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^N = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \left(\varepsilon^N (\varepsilon^N)^\top \right) \text{tr} \left(U(I - (I - D)^m)^2 U^\top \right) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \text{tr} \left((I - (I - D)^m)^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (1 - (1 - d_\ell)^m)^2 \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\mu}_\ell}{\lambda + \hat{\mu}_\ell} \right)^m \right)^2 \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $N \rightarrow \infty$. Further,

$$\|A_m^2\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \text{tr} \left((I - (I - D)^m)^4 \right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \left((I - (I - D)^m)^2 \right) \right)^2,$$

which goes to 0 with the same calculation as above. Finally,

$$\|A_m^2\| \leq \frac{1}{N} \rightarrow 0.$$

The statement follows by integrating out \mathcal{B}_N with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^N$. □

D Algorithm

Data: $\mathbf{x}^N = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$
Input: Kernels K_1, \dots, K_p implying RKHSs H_1, \dots, H_p , penalty λ , step size μ
Output: \widehat{G}, \widehat{F}
 $F^{(1)} \leftarrow 0$
 $\widehat{G} \leftarrow \emptyset$
 $N \leftarrow \emptyset$
 $\widehat{f}_{kj} = \arg \min_{g_{kj} \in H_j} \sum_{\ell=1}^N (g_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell j}) - \mathbf{x}_{\ell k})^2 + \lambda \|g_{kj}\|_{H_j}^2, j, k = 1, \dots, p, j \neq k$
 $S(j, k) \leftarrow \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^N \left(\widehat{f}_{kj}(\mathbf{x}_{\ell j}) - \mathbf{x}_{\ell k} \right)^2 \right)$
for $m \leftarrow 2$ **to** m_{stop} **do**
 // Find the next edge and update graph
 $(j^0, k^0) \leftarrow \arg \min_{(j,k) \notin N} S(j, k, F^{(m-1)}); \widehat{G} \leftarrow \widehat{G} + (j^0, k^0)$
 $f_{k^0}^{(m)} \leftarrow f_{k^0}^{(m-1)} + \mu \widehat{f}_{k^0 j^0}$
 $f_k^{(m)} \leftarrow f_k^{(m-1)}, k = 1, \dots, k^0 - 1, k^0 + 1, \dots, p$
 $F^{(m)} \leftarrow (f_1^{(m)}, \dots, f_p^{(m)})$
 // Check if AIC score has increased
 if $AIC(F^{(m)}, \mathbf{x}^N) > AIC(F^{(m-1)}, \mathbf{x}^N)$ **then** break
 // Update edges that cause cycle and ensure they are not chosen anymore
 $N \leftarrow getForbiddenEdges(\widehat{G})$
 // Update S
 $\widehat{f}_{k^0 j} \leftarrow \text{Equation (21)}, j = 1, \dots, p$
 $S(j, k^0, F^{(m)}) \leftarrow \text{Equation 20}, j = 1, \dots, p$
end
return $\widehat{G}, F^{(m)}$

References

- Trent Kyono, Yao Zhang, and Mihaela van der Schaar. CASTLE: Regularization via auxiliary causal graph discovery. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1501–1512. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- Sara Aibar, Carmen Bravo González-Blas, Thomas Moerman, Vân Anh Huynh-Thu, Hana Imrichova, Gert Hulselmans, Florian Rambow, Jean-Christophe Marine, Pierre Geurts, Jan Aerts, et al. Scenic: single-cell regulatory network inference and clustering. *Nature methods*, 14(11):1083–1086, 2017.
- Maximilian Kertel, Stefan Harmeling, Markus Pauly, and Nadja Klein. Learning causal graphs in manufacturing domains using structural equation models. *International Journal of Semantic Computing*, 17(04):511–528, 2023.
- Rohit Bhattacharya, Tushar Nagarajan, Daniel Malinsky, and Ilya Shpitser. Differentiable causal discovery under unmeasured confounding. In Arindam Banerjee and Kenji Fuku-

- mizu, editors, *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 130, pages 2314–2322. The Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 13–15 Apr 2021.
- Kun Zhang, Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Kernel-based conditional independence test and application in causal discovery. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 804–813, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 2011. AUAI Press. ISBN 9780974903972.
- Rajen Shah and Jonas Peters. The hardness of conditional independence testing and the generalised covariance measure. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1514–1538, 2018.
- Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2017.
- Peter Spirtes, Clark Glymour, and Richard Scheines. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*, volume 81. MIT Press, 01 1993. ISBN 978-1-4612-7650-0. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1754.001.0001>.
- Markus Kalisch and Peter Bühlman. Estimating high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with the PC-algorithm. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(3):613–636, 2007.
- Jonas Peters, Joris M. Mooij, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Causal discovery with continuous additive noise models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2009–2053, 01 2014. ISSN 1532–4435.
- Matthew J. Vowels, Necati Cihan Camgoz, and Richard Bowden. D’ya like DAGs? a survey on structure learning and causal discovery. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(4), 11 2022.
- Sébastien Lachapelle, Philippe Brouillard, Tristan Deleu, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Gradient-based neural DAG learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Yue Yu, Jie Chen, Tian Gao, and Mo Yu. DAG-GNN: DAG structure learning with graph neural networks. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *The Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7154–7163. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019.
- Xun Zheng, Chen Dan, Bryon Aragam, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Eric Xing. Learning sparse nonparametric dags. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3414–3425. The Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2020.
- Diviyani Kalainathan, Olivier Goudet, Isabelle Guyon, David Lopez-Paz, and Michale Sebag. Structural agnostic modeling: Adversarial learning of causal graphs. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(219):1–62, 2022.
- Ignavier Ng, Sébastien Lachapelle, Nan Rosemary Ke, Simon Lacoste-Julien, and Kun Zhang. On the convergence of continuous constrained optimization for structure learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 8176–8198. The Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2022a.

- Ignavier Ng, Shengyu Zhu, Zhuangyan Fang, Haoyang Li, Zhitang Chen, and Jun Wang. Masked gradient-based causal structure learning. In *International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*, pages 424–432. SIAM, 2022b.
- Shohei Shimizu, Takanori Inazumi, Yasuhiro Sogawa, Aapo Hyvärinen, Yoshinobu Kawahara, Takashi Washio, Patrik O Hoyer, and Kenneth Bollen. DirectLiNGAM: A direct method for learning a linear non-Gaussian structural equation model. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:1225–1248, 2011.
- Peter Bühlmann, Jonas Peters, and Jan Ernest. CAM: Causal additive models, high-dimensional order search and penalized regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(6):2526–2556, 2014. doi: 10.1214/14-AOS1260.
- Marcus Kaiser and Maksim Sipos. Unsuitability of NOTEARS for causal graph discovery when dealing with dimensional quantities. *Neural Processing Letters*, 54(3):1587–1595, 2022.
- Marc Teyssier and Daphne Koller. Ordering-based search: A simple and effective algorithm for learning bayesian networks. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 584–590, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 2005. AUAI Press. ISBN 0974903914.
- Ali Shojaie and George Michailidis. Penalized likelihood methods for estimation of sparse high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs. *Biometrika*, 97(3):519–538, 07 2010.
- Peter Bühlmann and Bin Yu. Boosting with the l2 loss. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462):324–339, 2003. doi: 10.1198/016214503000125. URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214503000125>.
- Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J. Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Early stopping and non-parametric regression: an optimal data-dependent stopping rule. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):335–366, 2014.
- Robert E. Schapire and Yoav Freund. *Boosting: Foundations and Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 2012. ISBN 0262017180.
- Grace Wahba. *Spline Models for Observational Data*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1990. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611970128.
- Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2001. ISBN 0262194759.
- Martin J. Wainwright. *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge, 2019.
- Kirthevasan Kandasamy and Yaoliang Yu. Additive approximations in high dimensional nonparametric regression via the salsa. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 69–78. The Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2016.
- Hongwei Sun. Mercer theorem for RKHS on noncompact sets. *Journal of Complexity*, 21(3):337–349, 2005. ISSN 0885-064X.

- Francis R. Bach and Michael I. Jordan. Kernel independent component analysis. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Jul):1–48, 2002.
- Felipe Cucker and Steve Smale. On the mathematical foundations of learning. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 39(1):1–49, 2002.
- Bruno Peter Zwahlen. Über die Eigenwerte der Summe zweier selbstadjungierter Operatoren. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 40:81–116, 1965/66.
- Ha Quang Minh. Some properties of Gaussian reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and their implications for function approximation and learning theory. *Constructive Approximation*, 32:307–338, 2010.
- Gerhard Tutz and Harald Binder. Generalized additive modeling with implicit variable selection by likelihood-based boosting. *Biometrics*, 62(4):961–971, 2006.
- Peter Bühlmann and Torsten Hothorn. Boosting algorithms: Regularization, prediction and model fitting. *Statistical Science*, 22(4):477–505, 2007. doi: 10.1214/07-STS242.
- Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. On random graphs i. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 6:290, 1959.
- Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999. doi: 10.1126/science.286.5439.509.
- Hawoong Jeong, Bálint Tombor, Réka Albert, Zoltan N Oltvai, and A-L Barabási. The large-scale organization of metabolic networks. *Nature*, 407(6804):651–654, 2000.
- Anja Wille, Philip Zimmermann, Eva Vranová, Andreas Fürholz, Oliver Laule, Stefan Bleuler, Lars Hennig, Amela Prelić, Peter von Rohr, Lothar Thiele, et al. Sparse graphical gaussian modeling of the isoprenoid gene network in arabidopsis thaliana. *Genome biology*, 5(11):1–13, 2004.
- Xun Zheng, Bryon Aragam, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Eric P Xing. DAGs with NO TEARS: Continuous optimization for structure learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2018.
- Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-Gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18:1–9, 2013. doi: 10.1214/ECP.v18-2865.
- Sara van de Geer. On the uniform convergence of empirical norms and inner products, with application to causal inference. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):543–574, 2014.
- Peter L. Bartlett and Shahar Mendelson. Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.