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Abstract

Sparse shrunk additive models and sparse random feature models have been developed separately as methods to learn low-order functions, where there are few interactions between variables, but neither offers computational efficiency. On the other hand, \( \ell_2 \)-based shrunk additive models are efficient but do not offer feature selection as the resulting coefficient vectors are dense. Inspired by the success of the iterative magnitude pruning technique in finding lottery tickets of neural networks, we propose a new method—Sparser Random Feature Models via IMP (ShRIMP)—to efficiently fit high-dimensional data with inherent low-dimensional structure in the form of sparse variable dependencies. Our method can be viewed as a combined process to construct and find sparse lottery tickets for two-layer dense networks. We explain the observed benefit of SHRIMP through a refined analysis of the generalization error for thresholded Basis Pursuit and resulting bounds on eigenvalues.

From function approximation experiments on both synthetic data and real-world benchmark datasets, we show that SHRIMP obtains better than or competitive test accuracy compared to state-of-the-art sparse feature and additive methods such as SRFE-S, SSAM, and SALSA. Meanwhile, SHRIMP performs feature selection with low computational complexity and is robust to the pruning rate, indicating a robustness in the structure of the obtained subnetworks. We gain insight into the lottery ticket hypothesis through SHRIMP by noting a correspondence between our model and weight/neuron subnetworks.
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1. Introduction

Kernel regression is an established choice for learning a target function from data with solid theoretical foundation (Hearst et al., 1998; Zhang, 2005). Kernel methods are general-purpose methods for estimating a function by fitting measurements to a representative function in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (Campbell, 2002). The power of the method is derived from the Representer Theorem which connects finite measurements and continuous function space; however, kernel ridge regression does not take into account additional structure in the underlying target function, which can be
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limiting when additional structure is known to be present. In many physical settings (Harris, 2019), functions may arise naturally as sums of functions, each with a limited variable interaction. Such low-order structure (Kuo et al., 2010) may also be used to reduce the complexity of the system being modeled (Potts and Schmischke, 2021a,b). The Multiple Kernel Learning line of literature (Gönen and Alpaydın, 2011; Bach, 2008; Xu et al., 2010) and more recent methods such as shrunk additive models (Kandasamy and Yu, 2016; Liu et al., 2020) have been developed to exploit such low-order structure. However, these methods are computationally inefficient due to the cost of kernel ridge regression and minimal $\ell_1$-norm optimization (Liu et al., 2020), as well as repeated computation of the kernel at test and prediction periods.

In an independent line of work, the well-studied random features model as introduced in Rahimi and Recht (2008c) allows for an approximation to the kernel function of interest without the computational cost of constructing a full kernel matrix, with bounds given in Rahimi and Recht (2008b,a); Avron et al. (2017); Cortes et al. (2010). However, neither the generic random features model nor the shrunk additive model offers the possibility of simple model compression or feature selection. Kernel methods have been investigated in the context of feature selection (Kumar et al., 2009) and in sparse additive models (Huang et al., 2010; Yin et al., 2012; Ravikumar et al., 2009), and recent work by Hashemi et al. (2021) introduces the sparse random features model with coefficient vector recovered using basis pursuit. However, it is a priori unclear what coefficient sparsity means, especially in the $\ell_1$ sense, for random feature models.

Inspired by the success of the iterative magnitude pruning (IMP) technique for finding sparse subnetworks of neural networks with comparable performance (Frankle and Carbin, 2019; Zhou et al., 2019), we propose a new $\ell_2$-based method—Sparser Random Feature Models via Iterative Magnitude Pruning (SHRIMP)—to efficiently fit high-dimensional data with inherent low-order structure. This method can be viewed as a combined process to construct and find lottery tickets of two-layer dense networks: it randomly initializes a fixed first layer with only low-order interactions by using sparse random weights instead of dense weights (Stage I) and applies neuron pruning to find a sparser subnetwork by IMP (Stage II). From experiments on both synthetic data and real-world benchmark datasets, we show that SHRIMP is better or competitive against both random sparse feature models and shrunk additive models. We offer a refined analysis of the thresholded $\ell_1$-based sparse random feature model based on Hashemi et al. (2021), and through our experiments and further discussion offer insight into the success of our method.

We connect our work to the larger active literature on random features learning and the theory of neural networks. Neural networks in certain regimes have been found to be kernel machines (Jacot et al., 2018; Chizat et al., 2019), and thus linear regression has been revisited as a model for neural network behavior (Liang and Rakhlin, 2020; Hastie et al., 2019). In particular, there has been a concentrated interest in the generalization and double descent behaviors of random features regression (Montanari et al., 2019; Jacot et al., 2020; d’Ascoli et al., 2020); these works study ReLU features, while the closest model to our setting is that of Liao et al. (2020). As random features regression has become essential for studying neural networks in the kernel regime, we hope that random features pruning can be used to study neural network pruning; much of the current theory on neural network pruning has been existential in nature (Orseau et al., 2020; Malach et al., 2020; Pensia et al., 2020). Moreover, the lottery ticket hypothesis has one of the greatest implications for model compression, helping alleviate problems related to massive neural networks, such as unequal access to computing resources among researchers, and the environmental impact of deep learning.

Our main contributions are as follows:
1. We propose a two-stage algorithm, SHRIMP, to learn sparse random feature models with low-order interactions efficiently via an iterative magnitude pruning technique. It is surprising that \( \ell_2 \)-based SHRIMP finds sparser models than basis pursuit, which is a staple among algorithms used for sparse recovery and feature selection.

2. Experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets verify that with proper choice of the order \( q \) in the low-order function model, SHRIMP obtains better or matching test performance compared to existing sparse feature or shrunk additive models while at the same time being scalable to high-dimensional settings. Beyond the effectiveness and efficiency, we show that SHRIMP is robust to parameters such as pruning rate and exhibits surprising support recovery ability with odd/even separation.

3. We offer a refined analysis of the main theorem from Hashemi et al. (2021) that allows us to connect our experimental findings with initial theoretical results from the compressed sensing literature; one perspective of our method is that it situates itself between \( \ell_2 \)-based and \( \ell_0 \)-based methods. Our analysis on the evolution of the spectrum of the Gram matrix during the SHRIMP algorithm iterations offers additional insight into the benefit of SHRIMP over random pruning.

4. By connecting our SHRIMP model to the process of finding winning lottery tickets for a two-layer fully connected neural network initialized with a random sparse subnetwork and with neurons pruned by IMP, we shed light on the successful performance of IMP as a mechanism for finding lottery tickets.

![Figure 1: Illustration of the relationship between SHRIMP and different types of pruning.](image)

1.1. Related Work

**Sparse Random Feature Models and Shrunk Additive Models.** In high-dimensional settings arising from modeling physical systems, the underlying governing function is well-approximated as being a sum of low-order functions; that is, the function can be written as a sum of component functions, such that only \( q \) variables out of a total of \( d \) variables are active in each component,
with \( q \ll d \) (DeVore et al., 2011; Kuo et al., 2010). Recent methods such as SALSA (Kandasamy and Yu, 2016) and SSAM (Liu et al., 2020) are kernel-based methods that directly exploit such low-order structure. Separately, the random Fourier features model of Rahimi and Recht (2008c) is a popular choice in approximating a kernel function when there are many data samples and the construction of the kernel matrix is computationally expensive. Additive kernels were considered in Vedaldi and Zisserman (2012), while coefficient sparsity was investigated in Yen et al. (2014); Özcelikkale (2020). The first work (to our knowledge) to combine these approaches—exploiting low-order structure and random features together—was the work of Hashemi et al. (2021), which uses an \( \ell_1 \)-based approach with sparse random features in order to learn a low-order function. A detailed comparison of SHRIMP with sparse random feature models (Hashemi et al., 2021; Elesedy et al., 2020) and shrunk additive models (Kandasamy and Yu, 2016; Liu et al., 2020) is listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of sparse random feature models: SRFE-S (Hashemi et al., 2021), shrunk additive models such as SALSA (Kandasamy and Yu, 2016), SSAM (Liu et al., 2020), and IMP in Linear Regression (Elesedy et al., 2020). Here, \( d \) denotes the data dimension, \( q \) denotes the interaction order of features, and \( T_p \) indexes the pruning iteration. The feature number with \( N_s \) corresponds to the number of non-zero components in the feature vector by \( \ell_1 \)-regularization; \( N_{best} \) denotes the number of features remaining after IMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>SHRIMP</th>
<th>SALSA</th>
<th>SSAM</th>
<th>SRFE-S</th>
<th>IMP in LR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample sparsity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-order Interaction</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature sparsity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Efficiency</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularization</td>
<td>implicit ( \ell_2 )</td>
<td>( \ell_2 )-norm</td>
<td>( \ell_1 )-norm</td>
<td>( \ell_1 )-norm</td>
<td>implicit ( \ell_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature model</td>
<td>random feature</td>
<td>kernel</td>
<td>kernel</td>
<td>random feature</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Features*</td>
<td>( \binom{d}{q} \cdot n \rightarrow N_{best} )</td>
<td>( \binom{d}{q} \rightarrow N_s )</td>
<td>( \binom{d}{q} \cdot n \rightarrow N_s )</td>
<td>( d \rightarrow d - T_p )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lottery Ticket Hypothesis and Iterative Magnitude Pruning. Frankle and Carbin (2019) proposed the lottery ticket hypothesis and a corresponding iterative magnitude pruning (IMP) procedure for compressing overparameterized neural networks, which is a primary inspiration for our algorithm. The IMP procedure prunes weights based on their magnitude and then retrains the pruned subnetwork from the same initial weights as the original network at each pruning iteration. IMP is demonstrated empirically to find a sparse subnetwork (i.e., winning ticket) with comparable test accuracy to the original dense network. Follow-up work (Zhou et al., 2019; Ramanujan et al., 2020; Malach et al., 2020) theoretically proves that for an overparameterized neural network with randomly-initialized weights under some conditions, there exists a subnetwork of it that can obtain competitive performance. Furthermore, Elesedy et al. (2020) initiated a theoretical analysis of a simplified form of IMP, where the algorithm prunes a single weight per iteration, and the solution is obtained by gradient flow (i.e., min \( \ell_2 \)-norm estimator) in linear models. However, this is not a practical sparse estimation method in linear models due to the inefficiency of one-weight-per-iteration pruning and computation of gradient descent with \( t \rightarrow \infty \). Instead, our work applies proportional IMP to neuron pruning and utilizes the implicit regularization of the pseudo-inverse to reduce com-
putational cost significantly. The work Zhang et al. (2021a) analyzes the geometric structure of the model throughout the pruning process; we corroborate these ideas by providing results on the eigenvalues of the Gram matrix throughout the pruning. However, our work does not focus solely on the lottery ticket hypothesis but should serve as a stand-alone method for low-order function approximation.

1.2. Notations
Throughout the paper, $A^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse of a matrix $A$, and hence $c = A^\dagger y$ is the minimal $\ell_2$-norm estimator in the overparameterized regime, and the least-square estimator in the underparameterized regime. We denote the number of data points by $m$, the dimension of data by $d$, and the number of features by $N$. Measurement noise $e_k$ is defined as $y_k = f(x_k) + e_k$ with either $|e_k| \leq E = 2\nu$ or $e_k$ i.i.d. drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, \nu^2)$, $\forall k \in [m]$.

2. Preliminaries
Low order functions arise naturally in the physical world and are used as a form of the reduced-complexity model for such systems (Potts and Schmischke, 2021a,b). Let us first recall the definition for an order-$q$ function, as well as definitions for bounded $\rho$-norm functions and $q$-sparse feature weights from Hashemi et al. (2021).

**Definition 1 (Order-$q$ Function, (Hashemi et al., 2021))** For any $d, q, K \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $q \leq d$, a function $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an order-$q$ function of at most $K$ terms if there exist functions $g_1, \ldots, g_K : \mathbb{C}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} g_j(x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_q}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} g_j(x|_{S_j}),$$

where $S_j \subseteq [d]$ is an index subset of $[d]$ and $x|_{S_j}$ is the restriction of $x$ onto the indices.

In general, such a decomposition is not unique. However, the set of order-$q$ functions forms a vector space, as the sum of two order-$q$ functions is itself an order-$q$ function, and the space is closed under scalar multiplication. Additionally, if we let $\| \cdot \|$ be a function norm, then we can define

$$\|f\| = \inf \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} (\|g_1\|^2 + \cdots + \|g_K\|^2)},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible order-$q$ decompositions of $f$. If each $g_j$ lies in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS), then $f$ lies in the direct sum of the component Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces with RKHS norm defined as above (Aronszajn, 1950).

**Definition 2 (Bounded $\rho$-norm Function, (Hashemi et al., 2021))** Fix a probability density function $\rho : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ has finite $\rho$-norm with respect to $\phi(x; w)$ if it belongs to the class

$$\mathcal{F}(\phi, \rho) := \left\{ f(x) = \int_{w \in \mathbb{R}^d} \phi(w; x) dw : \|f\|_\rho := \sup_w \left| \frac{\alpha(w)}{\rho(w)} \right| < \infty \right\}.$$
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Definition 3 (q-sparse Feature Weights, (Hashemi et al., 2021)) Let $d, q, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $q \leq d$, and let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a probability distribution. A collection of $N = n^\binom{d}{q}$ weight vectors $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_N$ is called a set of q-sparse feature weights if it is generated as follows: for each index subset $S_j \subseteq \{d\}$, $|S_j| = q$ draw $n$ i.i.d. random vectors $z_1, \ldots, z_n \sim \rho$, and construct q-sparse features $\{\omega_{jk}\}_{k=1}^n$ by setting $\text{supp}(\omega_{jk}) = S_j$ and $\omega_{jk} |_{S_j} = z_k, k \in [n]$.

Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be a data matrix consisting of $m$ $d$-dimensional samples, and let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ be the matrix of $N$ $d$-dimensional feature weights constructed according to Def. 3. Construct the random feature matrix $A = \phi(XW^*)$ so that $AA^*$ approximates a kernel matrix of interest. For example, let $\phi(\cdot) := [\cos(\cdot) \sin(\cdot)]^2$ (with $A = [\sin(XW^*) \cos(XW^*)]$), $q = d$, and $\rho$ be the normal distribution, $E_W[AA^*]$ is the kernel matrix of the Gaussian kernel (Rahimi and Recht, 2008c). In the more general case of $q \leq d$, with $\rho$ as a normal distribution, $E_W[AA^*]$ is the kernel matrix corresponding to a direct sum of Gaussian kernels, each defined over $\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^q$. See the appendix for more precise approximation bounds.

3. Sparsier Random Feature Models via Iterative Magnitude Pruning

**Algorithm 1** SHRIMP: Sparsier Random Feature Models via Iterative Magnitude Pruning

**Input:** Training dataset $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times d} \times \mathbb{C}^m$, parametric basis function $\phi(\cdot; w)$, feature sparsity level $q$, pruning rate $p \in (0, 1)$, iterations of pruning $T \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

**Stage I. Constructing:** Draw $N = n^\binom{d}{q}$ q-sparse features $\{w_j\}_{j=1}^N$ according to Def. 3, form the matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, and construct a random feature matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times N}$ by $A = \phi(XW^*)$.

**Stage II. Pruning:** Compute the min $\ell_2$-norm solution $c_0 = A^T y$ and set $P_0 = \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

for $t = 1, \ldots, T$ do

Get the feature index set $P_t$ by pruning $p \times |P_{t-1}|$ features from $c_{t-1}$ with $c_t^s$ denoting the ascending sorted (by absolute value) array of $c_t$ by

$$P_t = \{i \in P_{t-1} : |c_{t-1,i}| \geq c_{t-1,i}^s_{p \times |P_{t-1}|}\}.$$ 

Update the min $\ell_2$-norm solution: $c_t = A_{P_t}^T y$, where $A_{P_t}$ is the column submatrix of $A$ with index set $P_t$.

end

**Output:** the pruned minimal $\ell_2$ norm estimator and feature index pair set $\{(c_t, P_t)\}_{t=1}^T$.

---

In this section, we first present the SHRIMP algorithm and then illustrate its connection to the lottery ticket hypothesis and network pruning. To address the challenge of targeting low-order additive structure efficiently with feature selection, we propose a two-step SHRIMP method (Algorithm 1) to find a sparse low-order random feature subnetwork of a fully connected neural network: first, we initialize a sparse random feature model by constructing low-order random feature weights as a subnetwork of the dense network, according to Def. 3; second, SHRIMP finds a sparse winning lottery ticket $c_t^*$ by forming a set of sparse min $\ell_2$-norm estimators $\{c_t\}_{t=1}^T$ via IMP and selecting the best model via a validation dataset. At test time, with the best model $\{c_t^*, P_t^*\}$ chosen, we...
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where $K = \binom{d}{q}$. Using the notation of Algorithm 1, if $s$ is the sparsity level of $c^*$, then we can compress the number of nonzero entries of $W_{P^*}$, $c^*$, to $(q + 1)s$. This is in contrast to the standard random feature model with dense $W$, $c$, where there are $(d + 1)N$ non-zeros. Note that SHRIMP performs best when the target function is a sum of low-order components, so that the selected model is actually a pruned sparse model. Experiments shown in Table 2 corroborate this finding, with “Avg size” (#features) much smaller than $N$. Explicitly capturing the low-order structure is an advantage of SHRIMP.

4. Experiments

In this section, show generalization error results on synthetic and real-world datasets. We then illustrate several benefits of SHRIMP compared to other approaches including computational efficiency, robustness to pruning rate, and sparse support recovery, as well as other benefits of iterative magnitude pruning.

4.1. Function Approximation

To demonstrate the performance of SHRIMP on low-order functions, we first test different models on synthetic functions with $x = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d]^T$. See the appendix for additional experiments.

- Simple additive functions: $f_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} x_i + \exp(-x_d)$ and $f_2(x) = \cos(x_1) + \sin(x_2)$;
- Functions with pairwise behavior (from Liu et al. (2020)): $f_3(x) = (2x_1 - 1)(2x_2 - 1)$ and $f_4(x) = (2x_1 - 1)(2x_2 - 1) + (2x_1 - 1)(2x_3 - 1) + (2x_2 - 1)(2x_3 - 1)$;
- Low-order non-smooth functions Hashemi et al. (2021): $f_5(x) = \operatorname{sinc}(x_1)\operatorname{sinc}(x_3)^3 + \operatorname{sinc}(x_2)$;
- Ishigami example used for uncertainty and sensitivity analysis Ishigami and Homma (1990); Hashemi et al. (2021): $f_6(x) = \sin(x_1) + 7\sin^2(x_2) + 0.1x_4^4\sin(x_1)$;
- An order-2 function with many order-1 components: $f_7(x) = \cos(x_1)x_3 + x_2^2x_4 + \sum_{i=3}^{d} x_i$.

Experimental Results. Table 2 reports the test mean-squared error (MSE) for the function approximations $\{f_i(x)\}_{i=1}^{7}$, and corresponding optimal $q^3$. As shown in Table 2, SHRIMP consistently outperforms other function approximations, often by an order of magnitude. This is consistent across low- ($s_i^{q*}$) and high-dimensional ($s_i^{q*}$) settings. In particular, SHRIMP performs notably better than SALSA Kandasamy and Yu (2016), which explicitly constructs the additive kernel matrix and performs kernel regression. One notable example is $f_6$, the Ishigami function; SHRIMP is the only method that attains a test MSE less than 1 in the low-dimensional setting. In addition, SHRIMP succeeds in finding sparse models. The best-performing SHRIMP model often has orders of magnitude fewer features, performing significant model compression (from initial 20000 features to “Avg size” in Table 2), and often moving from the overparameterized to the underparameterized setting via this compression. When more variables are involved, e.g., $f_1$, which is order-1 but involves all the variables, #features retained also increases. On the other hand, for $f_2$, which is a simple sum involving two trigonometric terms, SHRIMP retains only 19 features yet attains the best test error by a significant margin.

3. See the appendix for more results on $q = d$. 
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Table 2: Comparison of the test errors of SHRIMP, Min \( \ell_2 \), SALSA, and SRFE-S with \( q = q^* \).

Avg size denotes the average pruned model size of SHRIMP taken over three runs. \( l \) denotes the setting with different \((m, d, q)\) pairs: \( s^q_l = (140, 10, q^*_l) \), \( s^q_h = (1400, 100, q^*_h) \), where \( l \) denotes low dimension and \( h \) denotes high dimension, and all methods use \( q^* \) (the ground-truth order). The best MSE for each \( f_i(x) \) over all models is in purple. From the comparison between \( s^q_l \) and \( s^q_h \), SHRIMP is the best overall, and is significantly more scalable to the high-dimensional setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( f_1(x) )</th>
<th>( f_2(x) )</th>
<th>( f_3(x) )</th>
<th>( f_4(x) )</th>
<th>( f_5(x) )</th>
<th>( f_6(x) )</th>
<th>( f_7(x) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s^q_l )</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>7.85e-04</td>
<td>1.98e-05</td>
<td>1.15e-01</td>
<td>1.27e-01</td>
<td>7.52e-03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>7.49e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min ( \ell_2 )</td>
<td>4.37e-20</td>
<td>5.45e-24</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>5.94e-02</td>
<td>7.36e-03</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.98e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>1.59e-12</td>
<td>1.26e-15</td>
<td>8.80e-02</td>
<td>6.14e-02</td>
<td>7.32e-03</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>2.72e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>1.37e-22</td>
<td>7.90e-32</td>
<td>4.98e-12</td>
<td>2.54e-12</td>
<td>6.39e-04</td>
<td>2.58e-02</td>
<td>2.83e-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg size*</td>
<td>3100.33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>171.67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s^q_h )</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>1.52e-03</td>
<td>8.71e-06</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.16e-01</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.40e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min ( \ell_2 )</td>
<td>1.68e-20</td>
<td>3.51e-24</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.16e-01</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.49e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>1.99e-11</td>
<td>2.54e-13</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>8.49e-02</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.34e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>1.61e-22</td>
<td>1.11e-30</td>
<td>5.11e-01</td>
<td>5.11e-01</td>
<td>1.50e-02</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>5.82e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg size*</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order \( q^* \) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

4.2. Real-world Datasets

We test SHRIMP on eight real-world datasets from the UCI repository (http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml) and follow the experimental setup (https://github.com/kirthevasank/salsa) in Kandasamy and Yu (2016). We compare the test errors with shrunk additive models, SALSA (Kandasamy and Yu, 2016) and SSAM Liu et al. (2020), and the sparse model by Lasso. For the experiments with SHRIMP, we use 90% of the original training dataset as training data and 10% as validation data to select the best model from models trained with \( q^* \). From Table 3, SHRIMP attains the best test errors on the Propulsion and Galaxy datasets and has comparable results on all other datasets while still being significantly more efficient to implement.

4.3. Application to State Estimation for Robotics

We apply SHRIMP to a real-world application—state estimation for robotics— and compare the performance and execution time with SALSA Kandasamy and Yu (2016). According to the data source (Wei et al., 2022), the truck data is obtained by tele-operating a scale 1/5, four-wheel drive, Ackermann steering vehicle. We apply SHRIMP and SALSA to infer next-timestamp positions, 4.

---

4. This problem has a low-order nature since it is a dynamic system, for example, next time step positions \( \text{pos}_{x,t+1} = \text{pos}_{x,t} + \text{vel}_{x,t} \cdot \delta t \), where \( \text{vel}_{x,t} \) depends on other features except \( \text{pos}_x \) and \( \text{pos}_y \), so the order is less than the number of total features.
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Table 3: Test MSE on eight real-world benchmark datasets. The results of SALSA, SSAM, and Lasso are taken from Liu et al. (2020) and Kandasamy and Yu (2016). The best MSE for each dataset is in purple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset (m, d)</th>
<th>SHRIMP (q, n₀)</th>
<th>SALSA (q)</th>
<th>SSAM</th>
<th>Lasso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion (200, 15)</td>
<td>1.02 × 10⁻⁶ (2, 84)</td>
<td>8.81 × 10⁻⁵ (8)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.48 × 10⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxy (2000, 20)</td>
<td>5.41 × 10⁻⁶ (3, 575)</td>
<td>1.35 × 10⁻⁴ (4)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.39 × 10⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfoil (750, 41)</td>
<td>2.65 × 10⁻¹ (2, 30)</td>
<td>5.18 × 10⁻¹ (5)</td>
<td>4.87 × 10⁻¹</td>
<td>5.20 × 10⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPP (2000, 59)</td>
<td>6.55 × 10⁻² (2, 49)</td>
<td>6.78 × 10⁻² (2)</td>
<td>6.94 × 10⁻²</td>
<td>7.40 × 10⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin (256, 50)</td>
<td>1.24 × 10⁰ (1, 60)</td>
<td>1.02 × 10⁰ (3)</td>
<td>1.01 × 10⁰</td>
<td>1.11 × 10⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Télémonit (1000, 19)</td>
<td>6.00 × 10⁻² (4, 86)</td>
<td>3.47 × 10⁻² (9)</td>
<td>6.89 × 10⁻²</td>
<td>8.63 × 10⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (256, 12)</td>
<td>3.94 × 10⁻¹ (7, 15)</td>
<td>2.62 × 10⁻¹ (1)</td>
<td>3.79 × 10⁻¹</td>
<td>4.40 × 10⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillcraft (1700, 18)</td>
<td>5.81 × 10⁻¹ (8, 21)</td>
<td>5.47 × 10⁻¹ (1)</td>
<td>5.43 × 10⁻¹</td>
<td>6.65 × 10⁻¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Test MSE and training/inference time comparison: SHRIMP vs. SALSA.

4.4. Properties of SHRIMP

Computational Efficiency. To compare the time efficiency of SHRIMP to SRFE-S (Hashemi et al. (2021) with ℓ1-minimization), we approximate the function \( f_3(x) = 3 \cos(x_3) + 4 \sin(x_4) + 2 \sin(x_2) \) using varying values for the parameters \( m, d, \) and \( N \). Figure 2 Left shows that at equal parameter choices, \( m, d, N \), SHRIMP is significantly faster than SRFE-S. In particular, as \( m \) increases, the cost of SHRIMP over varying \( N \) increases linearly, while the cost of basis pursuit increases exponentially. In addition to offering better generalization error, SHRIMP is significantly less computationally intensive.

To compare training and inference time efficiency of SHRIMP to SALSA Kandasamy and Yu (2016), we implement SHRIMP in MATLAB and compare it with the official code of SALSA with
function and test them on the same function \( f(x) \) with only \( q = 1, \ldots, 5 \) for both methods without any early stopping. Figure 2 Right shows that as the number of data increases\(^5\), the training and inference time of SALSA increase fast since both stages need to compute kernels. In contrast, SHRIMP (with a proper choice of \( N \))\(^6\) is more computationally efficient and scalable with large datasets, especially for inference time; even with ten times more initial features (\( N = 2000 \)), the inference time grows slowly since the resulting model is sparse (\( N_{\text{best}} \ll N \)). This shows the benefits of random sparse features over kernel methods in the applications of online model severing and mobile device inference, which requires less model size.

**Robustness to Pruning Rate.** We study the robustness of SHRIMP to the pruning rate on real-world datasets by using a range of pruning rates \( p(\%) \in \{15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50\} \) and comparing the best \( q \) chosen by validation dataset and corresponding test MSE. Figure 3 shows that the best \( q \) is almost invariant over all pruning rates, and the corresponding test MSEs remain within a small range. Hence, SHRIMP exhibits robustness to the pruning rate, indicating a corresponding robustness in the structure of good subnetworks.

**Sparse Support Recovery.** We illustrate the power of SHRIMP as a method for sparse support recovery on a simple order-1 additive function \( f_s(x) = 3 \cos(x_3) + 4 \sin(x_4) + 2 \sin(x_2) \) with separate component functions on each coordinate. We sample \( m = 1000 \) points uniformly from \([-1, 1]^5\) and apply SHRIMP with \( N = 10000 \) (\( N_0 = 20000 \) features), \( q = q_\ast = 1 \), and pruning rate \( p = 20\% \). Figure 4 shows that both the sparse support set and the even/odd property are recovered by SHRIMP. At first, when \( N_t = 20000 \), the min \( \ell_2 \)-norm solution has many small weights distributed across false coordinates \( \{x_3, x_5\} \). At the first key point \( N_t = 8192 \), most unnecessary weights on sin have been pruned; after \( N_t = 879 \), remaining weights are only on \( \{x_2, x_3, x_4\} \) with correct even/odd partition. The best test MSE is at \( N_t = 38 \), where the resulting vector is extremely sparse.

---

5. Note that since the training and inference time of SALSA and SSAM do not depend on the number of features \( N \) and SSAM is generally slower than SALSA due to the computation of \( \ell_1 \) minimization, we provide two \( N_s \)s for SHRIMP to compare their computational costs with SALSA.

6. Note that if we start SHRIMP with an extremely large \( N \) and the number of data is small (\( m \ll N \)), the elapsed time for first few iterations will be long and the training time will be longer than SALSA.
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Figure 3: Robustness of pruning rate of SHRIMP shown by test MSE and the corresponding best $q$ over four datasets. Note the lines of best $q$ of Airfoil and CCPP are at 2 and shifted on purpose for illustration. Test MSE of propulsion is also shifted 0.01 up for illustration.

Figure 4: Illustration of support recovery of SHRIMP with $f(s) = 3 \cos(x_3) + 4 \sin(x_4) + 2 \sin(x_2)$. Top and bottom left: Support recovery plots with $N_t = 20000$ ($t = 0$), $8192$ ($t = 4$), $879$ ($t = 14$), $38$ ($t = 28$) with y-axis corresponding to the weight magnitude; Bottom right: Test MSE tracking of the pruning from $N_t = 20000$ to $N_t = 12$ with pruning iteration $t \in [0, 33]$.

and matches the support set exactly. Along the pruning process, the subnetworks found by SHRIMP maintain a comparative or better test error with only a small fraction of weights. In other words, winning tickets found by SHRIMP exhibit the ability to recover sparse low-order interactions in random feature models.

Benefits of Iterative Magnitude Pruning Compared to Random Pruning. We explore the role of IMP in sparse random feature models by showing the test MSE curves for approximating functions \{$f_2(x), f_5(x), f_7(x)$\} as defined above, using a different number of features $N_t$ (see Figure 5). We train and evaluate models with SHRIMP, minimal $\ell_2$- and $\ell_1$-norm (SRFE-S Hashemi et al.
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(2021)) estimators with the same \(\{N_i\}\) set. Figure 5 illustrates the role and benefit of IMP in finding sparse winning subnetworks. SHRIMP (in blue) has a similar computational cost compared to plain \(\min \ell_2\) (in orange), the only difference being in sorting and comparing the absolute weights; at the same time, SHRIMP achieves better test error with a sparser resulting model (i.e., lower \(N_i\)). The resulting sparse subnetwork behaves better than even the overparameterized solution of plain \(\min \ell_2\) in the middle plot of \(f_5(x)\), which also shows the double descent curve. SRFE-S is inefficient due to the computation of \(\ell_1\) minimization and is comparably flatter than the other two models, which indicates that it does not benefit from a smaller \(N_i\) solution. Hence, the pruning by IMP is efficient and obtains sparser and better subnetworks than the models obtained by \(\ell_1\) and \(\ell_2\) regularization.

![Figure 5: Test MSE of sparse random feature models obtained by SHRIMP, \(\min \ell_2\)-norm estimation, \(\min \ell_1\)-norm estimation (SRFE-S). From left to right: \(f_2(x)\), \(f_5(x)\), \(f_7(x)\).](image)

**Spectrum of SHRIMP pruning compared to Random Pruning.** Figure 6 shows the maximal and minimal eigenvalues of \(A_S A_S^T/N_i\) throughout pruning for the function \(f_7(x) = \cos(x_1)x_3 + x_2^2x_4 + \sum_{j=3}^{d} x_j\) (Note that we observe similar spectrum patterns for other kinds of functions as well). We notice that for all methods excluding SHRIMP use variance 1/q—which results in the best generalization error over all cases—these values are essentially constant (up to numerical instability for small \(N_i\)). The case for small variance is predicted by the random features approximation of Rahimi and Recht (2008c), as the kernel approximation is good, while the case for high variance is predicted by Hashemi et al. (2021), where mutual coherence is low. However, SHRIMP with low variance has a decreasing maximum eigenvalue throughout the pruning process, providing some explanation for the good performance of SHRIMP (with Theorem 5); it is important to both perform magnitude pruning and choose a proper variance, as SHRIMP is a two-stage procedure.

5. Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we first provide Theorem 5, improving the analysis of the generalization error for thresholded Basis Pursuit from Hashemi et al. (2021). Thresholded Basis Pursuit performs basis pursuit followed by a pruning step, keeping only the top \(s\) entries of the resulting coefficient vector. Our analysis refines the result of Hashemi et al. (2021) by exposing the role of the maximum singular value of \(A\) in the resulting generalization bound. Moreover, we remove the explicit dependence on the number of features \(N\), demonstrating that a smaller maximum singular value indicates better generalization. For the proofs of all statements in this section, we refer the reader to the appendix.

For sake of comparing with SRFE-S in Hashemi et al. (2021), we restate SRFE-S according to our two-stage paradigm in Definition 4.
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Theorem 5 (Generalization Bounds for Thresholded Basis Pursuit) For a bounded $\rho$-norm function $f$ as defined in Def. 2, construct the dictionary matrix $A$ from Stage I in Algorithm 1 with $m$ samples $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k=1}^m$, where $x_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma^2 I)$, $y_k = f(x_k) + \epsilon_k$ with $|\epsilon_k| \leq 2\nu$ or $e_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \nu^2)$, and $\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$, and $\phi(x; \omega) = \exp(i\langle x, \omega \rangle)$. Assume the conditions the following conditions: (1) $\sigma^2 \lambda_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\sqrt{\mu(N_2-1)}}{2} \right)^2 \lambda - 1$; (2) number of features satisfies $N = \frac{4}{c^2} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\sigma d \frac{\log m}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \right)^2$; (3) number of measurements $m \geq 4(2\sigma^2 + 1)^d \log \frac{N^2}{\delta}$. Suppose $\gamma^2$ is estimated by BP (i.e., $\hat{\gamma}$), with $\eta = \min\{\eta', \tilde{\eta}\}$, where $\eta' = \sqrt{2(\sigma^2 \lambda_2^2 + 4\nu^2) + \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^T A)/m} \kappa_{s,2}(c^*)}$ and $\tilde{\eta} = 2\sqrt{(\sigma^2 \lambda_2^2 + 4\nu^2) + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*)}$ with approximation error $\epsilon$ and $\kappa_{s,p}(c) := \min\{\|c - z\|_p: z \text{ is s-sparse}\}$. Apply an additional pruned step with sparsity $s$, then with probability at least $1 - 5\delta$, the generalization error is bounded by

$$\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| f_{S^c}^*(x) - f^*(x) \right|^2 \, d\mu} \leq \left( \frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( 2s^\frac{1}{2} \left| c^* - c^*_S \right|^2 + (\kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \left| c^* - c^*_S \right|^2 + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*),$$

where

$$\|c^* - c^*_S\|_2 \leq C \min \left\{ 2\sqrt{(\epsilon^2 \left| f \right|^2 + 2\nu^2)} + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*), \sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \left| f \right|^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(A^T A)}{m}} \epsilon \right\}.$$
and $\kappa_{s,1}(e^*)$ is bounded by $\frac{N^{-s}}{N^s} \|f\|_p$.

Theorem 5 connects the numerical results on the decaying maximum singular value of $A$, the empirical success of SHRIMP, and refined theory from a similar setting (finding a sparse coefficient vector in a low-order random features model that has good generalization error). Moreover, in our new analysis, the role of the norm of the smallest entries of the coefficient vector is explicitly revealed: the smaller the norm of the vector of small entries, the better the implied generalization. This result is directly connected to Belkin et al. (2020). Thus, we connect the $\ell_1$-based methods of previous work with $\ell_2$-based methods through this new analysis.

**Corollary 6 (Generalization Bounds for Order-$$q$$ Functions)** Fix $\epsilon > 0$. For an order-$$q$$ function as in Def. 1 with at most $K$ terms, and fix the sparsity $s = nK$ with $N = n(\frac{d}{q})$ and $K \ll (\frac{d}{q})$. Assume the following conditions: $\gamma^2 \sigma^2 \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left( \left( \frac{\sqrt{\Pi(2s-1)}}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{q}} - 1 \right)$, number of features $N = \frac{4}{\epsilon^2} \left( 1 + 4 \gamma \sigma d \sqrt{1 + \frac{12}{d} \log \frac{m}{\delta} + \frac{2}{d} \log \frac{4}{\delta}} \right)^2$, and number of measurements $m \geq 4(2 \gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1)^{\max(2q-d,0)} (\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1)^{\min(2q,2d-2q)} \log \frac{N^2}{\delta}$. Then the generalization error corresponding to the thresholded $\ell_1$ estimator with the $s$ largest elements (in magnitude) is bounded by $O(\left( 1 + C' s^{-\frac{1}{2}} m^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^\frac{1}{4}(\frac{4}{\delta}) \right) \sqrt{\epsilon^2 (\frac{d}{q}) \|f\|^2 + E^2})$ with probability at least $1 - 5\delta$, where $\|f\| := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} |g_j|_p$.

Note that Corollary 6 improves the generalization bound of SRFE-S (Def. 4) in Hashemi et al. (2021) from depending on the number of features $N$ to the sparsity level $s$ in the $1 + C' s^{-\frac{1}{2}} m^{-\frac{1}{4}} \log^\frac{1}{4}(\frac{4}{\delta})$ term.

Then we shed light on the maximal and minimal eigenvalues of the Gram matrices of SHRIMP observed in Figures 6. The bounds in Proposition 7 below are obtained using techniques inspired by Chen and Schaeffer (2021).

**Proposition 7 (Bounds on Eigenvalues of Gram Matrix)** Consider data $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ i.i.d. drawn from $N(0, \gamma^2 I_d)$, weights $\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_N\}$ i.i.d. drawn from $N(0, \sigma^2 I_q)$, and the Fourier feature matrix $a_{j,k} = \phi(x_j, \omega_k)$, where $\phi(x, \omega) = \exp(i<x, \omega>)$. Fix the feature sparsity $q \leq d$ as in Def. 1 and consider the regime $m \leq N$. Let $\lambda_k(\frac{1}{N} AA^*)$ be the $k$th eigenvalue of the scaled Gram matrix. Then the expectation of the maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ and the minimum eigenvalue $\lambda_m$ of the matrix $\frac{1}{N} AA^*$ satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}\lambda_1 \geq 2 - \frac{(N - 1)m}{N^2} + \frac{(N - 1)(m^2 - m)}{N^2} (4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1)^{-\frac{2}{q}},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\lambda_m \leq \frac{c - 1}{c} + \frac{1}{m} + \left( \frac{c - 1}{c} m + 1 \right) (4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1)^{-\frac{2}{q}},$$

where $c = N/m$.

**Remark 8** Using Markov’s inequality, for $c \to 1^+$, i.e. $N = m$, we have

$$\lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} AA^* \right) \leq N^p (4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1)^{-\frac{2}{q}} + N^{p-1}$$
with probability $1 - N^{-p}$ for $0 < p < 1$. If $\gamma^2\sigma^2 = O(1)$, then we observe the benefit of small $q$ (i.e., low-order interactions); if $q \to d$ (in the high dimensional setting), then the minimum eigenvalue becomes arbitrarily small while the maximum remains above 2, and thus the system is ill-conditioned. In particular, the conditioning is directly related to the size of $(4\gamma^2\sigma^2 + 1)^{-\frac{4}{3}}$.

Further Discussion. We connect our results to $\ell_0$-based methods. First we note the explicit connection to SINDy (Zhang and Schaeffer, 2019), which algorithmically is similar to SHRIMP, except instead of pruning the smallest magnitude coefficients, it prunes the all entries smaller than some threshold. However, their results are about coefficient recovery, and generalization bounds for $\ell_0$-based methods are sparse in the literature. From Remark 2 in Nikolova (2013), the iterates of SHRIMP are each local minimizers of an $\ell_0$-regularized problem, which gives insight to the behavior of SHRIMP; However, SHRIMP arrives in an adaptive and greedy nature, depending on the solution of the previous one. Further discussion on these topics is given in the appendix.

6. Discussion

We propose a new method, Sparser Random Feature Models with IMP, to exploit low-order additive structure in a learning problem, which often occurs in many domains of interest. In this method, we explicitly construct a sufficiently overparameterized sparse feature matrix in order to approximate a given underlying low-order function, and then prune coefficients by adaptively solving a min $\ell_2$-norm problem and applying iterative magnitude pruning. This can be seen as an instance of feature selection or neuron pruning in the neural network pruning literature. We test our method on both synthetic and real datasets: SHRIMP vastly exceeds other methods on synthetic data; it is often better or at least competitive on real datasets. We illustrate the relationship between low-order structure and pruning, corresponding to weight and neuron pruning, respectively, and show the IMP has the greatest effect when combined with sparse feature models. Our analysis provides generalization bounds for thresholded BP and bounds on eigenvalues of Gram Matrix, which explains the benefits of our method. We hope to shed some light on the lottery ticket hypothesis in a simple model, similar to how regression is once again being studied in the context of deep learning theory; our method corresponds to certain pruning methods in two-layer neural networks.

More robust generalization bounds can be given to our SHRIMP model—for example, in the context of random features regression, studying the eigenspectrum of a pruned sub-Gram matrix throughout our algorithm is a possible extension of our work. Another possible future direction is to adaptively discover the low-order structure as we go, instead of fixing the parameter $q$ in advance. This results in a setting more closely tied to practical pruning and allows for greater flexibility (e.g., if the underlying function is a sum of functions of various orders), and may shed light on what a pruned network is learning.
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Appendix

The appendix is organized as follows:

- Appendix A: Experimental Details of Function Approximation
- Appendix B: Additional Experiments
- Appendix C: Proofs of Theorems in Section 5
- Appendix D: Further Discussion

Appendix A. Experimental Details of Function Approximation

Data Generation. We generate the data \( X \times y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^m \) in the following way: (1) sample \( m \) \( d \)-dimensional points \( x_1, \ldots, x_m \) with \( x_j \sim \text{Unif}[-1, 1]^d \), except for the Ishigami function from \( \text{Unif}[-\pi, \pi]^d \); (2) For each, function \( f_i, y_j = f_i(x_j) \). Note that we include no additive noise in our experiments, although the observed behavior is robust to the presence of noise.

Experimental Set-up. In the function approximation experiments, models are evaluated in both low-dimensional \((s_l^{q_s} \text{ and } s_l^d\) with \( m = 140, d = 10\) and high-dimensional \((s_h^{q_s} \text{ and } s_h^d\) with \( m = 1400, d = 100\)) settings. The results for \( q = q_s \) are in Table 2, and the full results with both sparse \((q = q_s \) and dense features \((q = d)\) are in Table 5 in the appendix. For SRFE-S, Min \( \ell_2 \), and SHRIMP in \( s_l^{q_s} \) and \( s_h^{q_s} \), we sample \( w \) according to Def. 3 and \( \rho = N(0, q^{-1}I_d) \) with \( q = q_s \) as the actual order of those low-order functions. We set \( n = N/\binom{d}{2} \) with \( N = 10000 \) in our experiments and form the random feature matrix \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \). The dictionary \( A = [\cos(XW^\top), \sin(XW^\top)] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 2N} \). For SHRIMP, we set 0.2 as the pruning rate and validate on 10\% of the training set to choose the best pruned model. For SALSA, we form the kernel matrix \( K \) by \( K_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{\binom{d}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{\|s_i - s_j\|_2^{2}}{2q} \right) \); note that \( \mathbb{E}_W[AA^\top] = K \).

Each model is evaluated by the average of test mean squared errors over three runs. For the sake of completeness, we also experiment with the same functions with \( q = d \) for all functions \( s_l^d \) and \( s_h^d \) in Table 2—which corresponds to standard kernel regression and random feature regression with standard Gaussian kernel. Here, random weights are drawn \( W \sim N(0, d^{-1}I_d) \) and fully dense.

Appendix B. Additional Experiments

B.1. Comparing Function Approximations with Sparse and Dense Features

Table 5 shows the full results of function approximation with sparse \((q = q_s)\) and dense features \((q = d)\). As shown in Table 5, for both the low-dimensional \((s_l^{q_s}, s_l^d)\) and high-dimensional \((s_h^{q_s}, s_h^d)\) settings, models with \( q = q_s \) (i.e., \( s_l^{q_s} \) and \( s_h^{q_s} \)), where the low order \( q \) matches the actual order of functions, have significantly better performance for all methods over corresponding models with \( q = d \) (i.e., \( s_l^d \) and \( s_h^d \)). This shows the benefit of our use of low-order structure compared to previous random features work with dense features. However, with dense features \( q = d \), the advantage of

---

7. It is the traditional sampling way for Ishigami function.
8. In the low-order case, since the actual orders are known and are small enough such that \( \binom{d}{2} < N \), we can use the actual order \( q_s \).
pruning over other methods fades: pruning over all functions performs comparably to standard $\ell_1$ and $\ell_2$ based methods in both low and high dimensions since all features add to the representative capacity, and when SHRIMP does perform worse, it is very slight. This is also exhibited as the average size of the model is much larger when using dense features as opposed to sparse features.

Table 5: Full comparison of the test errors of SHRIMP, Min $\ell_2$, SALSA, and SRFE-S with $q = q_\ast$ and $q = d$. *Avg size denotes the average pruned model size of SHRIMP over three runs. $^s$ denotes the setting with different $(m, d, q)$ pairs: $s_{l_q}^q = (140, 10, q_\ast), s_{l_h}^d = (140, 10, d), s_{d_q}^q = (1400, 100, q_\ast), s_{d_h}^d = (1400, 100, d)$, where $l$ denotes low dimension and $h$ denotes high dimension. The best MSE for each $f_i(x)$ over all models is in purple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting$^s$</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$f_1(x)$</th>
<th>$f_2(x)$</th>
<th>$f_3(x)$</th>
<th>$f_4(x)$</th>
<th>$f_5(x)$</th>
<th>$f_6(x)$</th>
<th>$f_7(x)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s_{l_q}^q$</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>7.85e-04</td>
<td>1.98e-05</td>
<td>1.15e-01</td>
<td>1.27e-01</td>
<td>7.52e-03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>7.49e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min $\ell_2$</td>
<td>4.37e-20</td>
<td>5.45e-24</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>5.94e-02</td>
<td>7.36e-03</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.98e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>1.59e-12</td>
<td>1.26e-15</td>
<td>8.80e-02</td>
<td>6.14e-02</td>
<td>7.32e-03</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>2.72e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>1.37e-22</td>
<td>7.90e-32</td>
<td>4.98e-12</td>
<td>2.54e-12</td>
<td>6.39e-04</td>
<td>2.58e-02</td>
<td>2.83e-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg size*</td>
<td>3100.33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>171.67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{d_q}^q$</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>5.35e-02</td>
<td>1.47e-03</td>
<td>5.56e-02</td>
<td>1.64e-01</td>
<td>4.11e-03</td>
<td>1.27e+01</td>
<td>9.17e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min $\ell_2$</td>
<td>1.71e-02</td>
<td>1.93e-03</td>
<td>3.50e-02</td>
<td>1.01e-01</td>
<td>4.62e-03</td>
<td>1.45e+01</td>
<td>6.15e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>1.68e-02</td>
<td>1.91e-03</td>
<td>3.38e-02</td>
<td>9.67e-02</td>
<td>4.62e-03</td>
<td>1.44e+01</td>
<td>6.05e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>1.70e-02</td>
<td>1.63e-03</td>
<td>3.51e-02</td>
<td>9.81e-02</td>
<td>6.57e-03</td>
<td>1.60e+01</td>
<td>5.91e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>6726</td>
<td>77.67</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>12020</td>
<td>450.33</td>
<td>5342.33</td>
<td>39.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{d_h}^d$</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>1.52e-03</td>
<td>8.71e-06</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.16e-01</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.40e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min $\ell_2$</td>
<td>1.68e-20</td>
<td>3.51e-24</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.16e-01</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.49e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>1.99e-11</td>
<td>2.54e-13</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>8.49e-02</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.34e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>1.61e-22</td>
<td>1.11e-30</td>
<td>1.26e-02</td>
<td>5.11e-01</td>
<td>1.50e-02</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>5.82e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{d_h}^d$</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>1.43e-01</td>
<td>2.35e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.05e+00</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>1.69e+01</td>
<td>2.06e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min $\ell_2$</td>
<td>6.01e-02</td>
<td>2.32e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.05e+00</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>1.40e+01</td>
<td>8.33e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>2.62e+04</td>
<td>1.23e+03</td>
<td>4.63e+03</td>
<td>3.34e+04</td>
<td>3.20e+02</td>
<td>2.44e+04</td>
<td>4.66e+04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>6.07e-02</td>
<td>2.35e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.07e+00</td>
<td>9.33e-02</td>
<td>1.41e+01</td>
<td>8.32e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>6663</td>
<td>14933.33</td>
<td>8199</td>
<td>6908.67</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>14730.67</td>
<td>8328.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order $q_\ast$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting$^s$</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$f_1(x)$</th>
<th>$f_2(x)$</th>
<th>$f_3(x)$</th>
<th>$f_4(x)$</th>
<th>$f_5(x)$</th>
<th>$f_6(x)$</th>
<th>$f_7(x)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s_{d_h}^d$</td>
<td>SRFE-S</td>
<td>1.43e-01</td>
<td>2.35e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.05e+00</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>1.69e+01</td>
<td>2.06e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min $\ell_2$</td>
<td>6.01e-02</td>
<td>2.32e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.05e+00</td>
<td>8.20e-02</td>
<td>1.40e+01</td>
<td>8.33e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALSA</td>
<td>2.62e+04</td>
<td>1.23e+03</td>
<td>4.63e+03</td>
<td>3.34e+04</td>
<td>3.20e+02</td>
<td>2.44e+04</td>
<td>4.66e+04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHRIMP</td>
<td>6.07e-02</td>
<td>2.35e-02</td>
<td>1.55e+00</td>
<td>3.07e+00</td>
<td>9.33e-02</td>
<td>1.41e+01</td>
<td>8.32e-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg size</td>
<td>6663</td>
<td>14933.33</td>
<td>8199</td>
<td>6908.67</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>14730.67</td>
<td>8328.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.2. Additional Iterative Magnitude Pruning Curves

We show comprehensive curves in Figure 7 and 8 to illustrate the role of IMP in sparse random feature models using the functions defined in Section 4 with different number of features $N_t$. For sake of completeness, Figure 7 shows more types of test MSE curves with approximating functions $f_1(x), f_3(x), f_4(x), f_6(x)$, which are not included in Section 4 due to page limit. Except for $f_1(x)$,
where the pruned curve has a little better test performance over the best solution of SRFE-S but with more number of features since the coefficient vector of function \( f_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} x_i + \exp(-x_d) \) is comparably dense with random sparse features, SHRIMP find sparser estimators with better performance than SRFE-S and plain \( \ell_2 \)-norm estimator on other functions.

Furthermore, we include additional curves comparing the aforementioned methods to the naive pruning method (where the weights are kept fixed without retraining after each pruning step) in Figure 8. As shown in those figures, naive pruning usually has worse performance than the original minimal \( \ell_2 \)-norm solution, let alone SHRIMP, which verifies the benefit of retraining from the same initialization of iterative magnitude pruning as Frankle and Carbin (2019) suggests.

**B.3. Results on High-Order Functions**

In addition to low-order functions, we present test MSE curves of high-order functions with different methods in Figure 9 for completeness. All experiments are with \( m = 140, d = 10, q = d \) since the ground-truth order \( q^* = d \), and the same experimental settings as the synthetic experiments in Section 4. For \( f_{h1}(x) \) and \( f_{h2}(x) \), SHRIMP results in better performance with sparser models. However, for \( f_{h3}(x) \), which has underlying dense weights, SHRIMP can only have comparable performance to SRFE-S but with a sparser coefficient vector.
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B. ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS

Figure 8: Test MSE of sparse random feature models obtained by SHRIMP, native pruning method, min $\ell_2$-norm estimation, min $\ell_1$-norm estimation (SRFE-S). From top to bottom and left to right: $f_2(x), f_5(x), f_7(x), f_3(x), f_4(x), f_6(x)$ as defined in Section 4, respectively.

Figure 9: Test MSE of high-order functions approximated by sparse random feature models obtained by SHRIMP, min $\ell_2$-norm estimation, min $\ell_1$-norm estimation (SRFE-S). Left: $f_{h1}(x) = \sin(\sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i)$; Middle: $f_{h2}(x) = \cos(\prod_{i=1}^{d} x_i)$; Right: $f_{h3}(x) = (1 + \|x\|_2^{-1/2})$. Blue: SHRIMP; Orange: Plain min $\ell_2$; Green: SRFE-S.

B.4. Experiments on Different Variances of Random Features

We show the performance of random feature models with different variances of $w$ on functions with varying smoothness. We compare SHRIMP and min $\ell_2$ solutions on the following functions:

- **Sum of low-frequency functions only (i.e., smooth function):** $f_{a1}(x) = \cos(x_1) x_3 + x_2^2 x_4 + \sum_{j=3}^{d} x_j$
- **Low-freq + High-freq:** $f_{a2}(x) = \cos(x_1 + x_2) + 5 \cos(2x_3 + 10x_4)$
• High-freq + High-freq: \( f_{a3}(x) = \sin(9x_1) + 10\cos(10x_2) \)

For all functions, we set \( d = 10, q = q_*, m = 200, N = 1500 \), and average over 10 trials. We give the test errors of SHRIMP vs the minimum \( \ell_2 \)-norm solution at three different variances: \( 1/q, 1, 100 \) in Table 6. For the smooth function \( f_{a1} \) with only low-frequency component functions, SHRIMP outperforms the min \( \ell_2 \) norm at all corresponding variances, and as \( \sigma^2 \) increases, performance degrades. This implies that sampling at lower frequencies may have an implicit bias toward smooth functions. When there are higher-frequency component functions, such as \( f_{a2} \) and \( f_{a3} \), performance improves as \( \sigma^2 \) increases; in this case, we need to sample at higher frequencies. Moreover, for \( f_{a3} \), increasing \( \sigma^2 \) allows for more gains: for this function a \( \sigma^2 \approx 170 \) seems to do the best from a course sweep over \( \sigma^2 \) ranging up to 200.

We can visualize the behavior of different types of functions with high variance \( w \) through the spectrum in Figure 10. We plot the maximum eigenvalue of the Gram matrix throughout SHRIMP and random pruning for \( f_{a1} \) and \( f_{a3} \), where the weights are drawn from \( \mathcal{N}(0, 100I) \), a relatively high variance. We notice that for \( f_{a1} \), the maximum eigenvalue of SHRIMP qualitatively matches that of random pruning throughout the pruning process. However, for \( f_{a3} \), the behavior of the maximum eigenvalue of SHRIMP seems to more closely match that of SHRIMP with low variance on smooth functions (such as those given in the main paper), where the maximum eigenvalue of SHRIMP is smaller than that of random pruning for essentially the entire pruning process. We discuss some explanations for this behavior in Section D, as well as some limitations of our current theory in explaining this phenomenon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \sigma^2 )</th>
<th>( 1/q )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>( 1/q )</th>
<th>2.99e-04</th>
<th>0.137</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( f_{a1} )</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>1.19e-05</td>
<td>2.99e-04</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{a2} )</td>
<td>55.205</td>
<td>40.023</td>
<td>9.734</td>
<td>14.411</td>
<td>12.778</td>
<td>4.935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{a2} )</td>
<td>186.283</td>
<td>184.581</td>
<td>47.864</td>
<td>73.381</td>
<td>50.650</td>
<td>10.334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Test MSE of \( \{f_{a1}\}_{i=1}^{3} \) with random feature models with different variances.

**B.5. Experiments on Kernel Approximation**

We show an example of kernel approximation with \( f(x) = x_1^2 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_4 \) and \( d = 5 \) in this section to illustrate the benefit of sparse random features beyond kernel approximation capacity. As Figure 11 shows, the minimal \( \ell_2 \) regression on a random features model is equivalent to the minimum RKHS kernel regression on the kernel matrix corresponding to the random feature matrix. In Figure 11, the blue lines represent the test MSE of the minimal \( \ell_2 \) estimator for sparse random feature models (i.e., \( \hat{c} = A^T y \)) with increasing number of features \( N \), while the orange lines represent the test MSE of estimators from kernel regression with the kernel \( K \) defined in Section 4. Notice that the top-middle plot, \( q = 2 \) equals the actual order \( q_* \) of the function, and exhibits very interesting behavior as \( N \) grows. Instead of asymptotically approaching the orange line as the plots with \( q = 3, 4, 5 \) do, the test error curve of the sparse random feature model with min \( \ell_2 \)-norm estimator is significantly better than what can be obtained with kernel regression, which is
Figure 10: Maximum eigenvalue of $A_S A_S^\top / N_t$ with weight vectors drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 100 \mathbf{I})$. Left: $f_{a_1}$; Right: $f_{a_3}$.

Figure 11: Illustration of benefit of sparse random feature models beyond a RKHS understanding by comparing with kernel approximation method on $f(x) = x_2^2 + x_2 x_3 + x_1 x_2 + x_4$. From top to down and from left to right: $q = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$.

This implies a benefit of sparse random feature models beyond a RKHS understanding, which would necessitate a more robust statistical study beyond approximation capacities.

Appendix C. Proofs of Theorems in Section 5

C.1. Proof of Theorem 5

Proof [Proof of Theorem 5] Denote $c^2$ as the minimal $\ell_1$ norm solution obtained by basis pursuit, $c^2|_{S^c}$ as the pruned solution with zeros on $i \notin S^c$, where $S^c$ is the support set of the $s$ largest coefficients of $c^2$, and $c^*_s$ as $c^*$ supported on $S^s$, which is the support set of the $s$ largest coefficients
of $c^*$. Since both $c^2|_{S^2}$ and $c^*_s$ are $s$-sparse, we have for any $z$,

$$
\left| f_{S^2}(z) - f^*(z) \right|^2 = \left| [\phi(z; \omega_1), \ldots, \phi(z; \omega_N)] (c^* - c^2|_{S^2}) \right|^2
$$

$$
= \left| [\phi(z; \omega_1), \ldots, \phi(z; \omega_N)] (c^2|_{S^2} - c^*_s) + (c^*_s - c^*) \right|^2
$$

$$
\leq 2 \left| [\phi(z; \omega_1), \ldots, \phi(z; \omega_N)] (c^2|_{S^2} - c^*_s) \right|^2
$$

$$
+ 2 \left| [\phi(z; \omega_1), \ldots, \phi(z; \omega_N)] (c^*_s - c^*) \right|^2
$$

$$
\leq 4s \left| c^*_s - c^2|_{S^2} \right|^2 + 2 \left| \sum_{j \notin S^*} \phi(z, \omega_j) c^2_j \right|^2
$$

$$
\leq 4s \left| c^*_s - c^2|_{S^2} \right|^2 + 2 \left| \sum_{j \notin S^*} \phi(z, \omega_j) \left| c^2_j \right|^2 \right|
$$

$$
\leq 4s \left| c^*_s - c^2|_{S^2} \right|^2 + 2 (2s \kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2
$$

We provide two ways to bound $\| c^*_s - c^2|_{S^2} \|_2$ by using an alternative $\eta'$ or $\bar{\eta}$ instead of $\eta$.

1. **With the max singular value of $A$ (or $\lambda_{\text{max}}(A^*A)$).** From (86) in Hashemi et al. (2021), we have $\| y - Ac^* \|^2 \leq 2m(\epsilon^2 \| f \|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)$, then

$$
\| y - Ac^*_s \|_2 \leq \| y - Ac^* \|_2 + \| A(c^* - c^*_s) \|_2
$$

$$
\leq \sqrt{2m(\epsilon^2 \| f \|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\lambda_{\text{max}}(A^*A)\kappa_{s,2}(c^*)}
$$

$$
= \eta' \sqrt{m}
$$

Then $\eta' = \sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \| f \|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\lambda_{\text{max}}(A^*A)\kappa_{s,2}(c^*)}$.

2. **With $\kappa_{s,1}$.** Follow the proof idea of (86), we have

$$
\| y - Ac^*_s \|^2 \leq 2 \left( \sum_{k=1}^m (f(x_k) - f^*(x_k))^2 + 4\nu^2 m \right)
$$

$$
\leq 2 \left( \sum_{k=1}^m 2(f(x_k) - f^*(x_k))^2 + 2(f^*(x_k) - f^*_s(x_k))^2 + 4\nu^2 m \right)
$$

$$
\leq 4m(\epsilon^2 \| f \|_\rho^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*) + 2\nu^2) := \tilde{\eta}^2 m
$$

where $(f(x_k) - f^*_s(x_k))^2$ is bounded from Lemma 2 in Hashemi et al. (2021). Then $\tilde{\eta} = 2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 \| f \|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*)}$.

From Stability of BP-based Sparse Reconstruction (Foucart and Rauhut, 2013) (which is also Lemma 6 in Hashemi et al. (2021)), we have

$$
\| c^2 - c^*_s \|_2 \leq C' \frac{\kappa_{s,1}(c^*_s)}{\sqrt{s}} + C \min\{\eta', \bar{\eta}\} = C \min\{\eta', \bar{\eta}\}
$$
where $\kappa_{s,1}(c^*_s) = 0$ since $c^*_s$ is $s$-sparse. Then, if the coherence of $A$ satisfies $\mu_A \leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{11(2s-1)}}$, we have

$$\|c^\perp|_{S^c} - c^*_s\|_2 \leq 3\|c^\perp - c^*_s\|_2 \leq 3C \min\{\eta', \tilde{\eta}\} : = C \min\{\eta', \tilde{\eta}\}$$

(16)

by redefining $C$.

Then for McDiarmid’s inequality, we have

$$\left| \nu(z_k) - \nu(z_k) \right| \leq \frac{2 \left( 4s \|c^*_s - c^\perp|_{S^c}\|_2^2 + 2(\kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2 \right)}{m} : = \Delta_v$$

(17)

$$\Rightarrow t = \Delta_v \sqrt{\frac{m}{2} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} = 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} (2s \|c^*_s - c^\perp|_{S^c}\|_2^2 + (\kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2)$$

Putting everything together, we have

$$\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| f^\perp_{S^c}(x) - f^\star(x) \right|^2 d\mu} \leq m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| f^\perp_{S^c}(z_k) - f^\star(z_k) \right|^2}$$

(18)

$$+ \left( \frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} (2s \|c^*_s - c^\perp|_{S^c}\|_2^2 + (\kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

For the first term, following (96) in Hashemi et al. (2021), we bound as follows:

$$m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| f^\perp_{S^c}(z_k) - f^\star(z_k) \right|^2} \leq 2 \|c^\perp|_{S^c} - c^*_s\|_2 + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*)$$

(19)

where $A$ satisfies 2s-RIP condition and $c^\perp|_{S^c} - c^*_s$ is 2s-sparse.

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have the refined bound as follows:

$$\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| f^\perp_{S^c}(x) - f^\star(x) \right|^2 d\mu} \leq \left( \frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} (2s \|c^*_s - c^\perp|_{S^c}\|_2^2 + (\kappa_{s,1}(c^*))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \|c^\perp|_{S^c} - c^*_s\|_2 + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*)$$

(20)

where

$$\|c^*_s-c^\perp|_{S^c}\|_2 \leq C \min \left\{ \sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}{m} \kappa_{s,2}(c^*)}, 2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 2\nu^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*)} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if we plug in $\kappa_{s,2}(c^*) \leq \epsilon \|f\|_p$ from (89) in Hashemi et al. (2021), we have

$$\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| f^\perp_{S^c}(x) - f^\star(x) \right|^2 d\mu} \leq \left( \frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

$$\left( 2s \left( C \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}{m} \epsilon \|f\|_p^2 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 2\nu^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*)}}}{2} \right\}^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*) \right)$$

$$+ 2C \min \left\{ \sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 4\nu^2)} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(A^*A)}{m} \epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon^2 \|f\|_p^2 + 2\nu^2 + \kappa_{s,1}^2(c^*)}} + \kappa_{s,1}(c^*) \right\}$$

(21)
C. PROOFS OF THEOREMS IN SECTION 5

C.2. Proof of Corollary 6

Proof [Proof of Corollary 6] For the Corollary, since \( c^* \) is \( s \)-sparse, \( \kappa_{s,p} = 0, \forall p \) and \( c^*_s - c^* = 0 \).

We can bound \( \left| f^2_{S^*}(z) - f^*(z) \right|^2 \) using almost the same way as equation 12, but with a tighter constant. Since both \( c^*_i |_{S^*} \) and \( c^* \) are \( s \)-sparse, \( |S^* \cup S^*| = 2s \) and \( |c^*_i |_{S^*} - c^*|_i = 0, \forall i \notin S^* \cup S^* \). Then,

\[
\left| f^2_{S^*}(z) - f^*(z) \right|^2 = \left| \phi(z; \omega_1), \ldots, \phi(z; \omega_N) \right| (c^* - c^*_i)_S^* \right|^2
= \left| \phi(z; \omega_1) \right|_{i \in S^* \cup S^*} \left( [c^*]_{i \in S^* \cup S^*} - [c^*_i]_{i \in S^* \cup S^*} \right)_S^*
\leq 2s\|c^* - c^*_i \|_S^2 \]

Hence, the bound in Lemma 7 (with \( \eta = \sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho + E^2)} \)) changes to

\[
\|c^*_i \|_S^2 - c^* \|_S^2 \leq 3C\eta = 3C\sqrt{2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)} := C\sqrt{\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2} \tag{23}
\]

after redefining \( C \).

Furthermore, we can bound the difference in \( \nu \) from (91) in Hashemi et al. (2021) by

\[
|\nu(z_k) - \nu(\tilde{z}_k)| \leq \frac{1}{m} \left| f^2_{S^*}(z_k) - f^*(z_k) \right|^2 - \left| f^2_{S^*}(\tilde{z}_k) - f^*(\tilde{z}_k) \right|^2 \leq \frac{4s}{m}\|c^* - c^*_i \|_S^2 = \frac{4sC^2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)}{m} \tag{24}
\]

where \( \tilde{z}_k \) results from perturbing \( z_k \) at the \( k \)-th coordinate, and

\[
t = \frac{4sC^2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)}{m} \sqrt{\frac{m}{2} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} = sC^2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2) \sqrt{\frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \tag{25}
\]

Therefore, with probability exceeding \( 1 - \delta \),

\[
\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| f^2_{S^*}(x) - f^*(x) \right|^2 \mu} \leq \frac{4sC^2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)}{m} \sqrt{\frac{m}{2} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} \leq 2\|c^*_i \|_S^2 - c^* \|_S^2 + \left( \frac{8}{m} \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right)^\frac{1}{2} s^2 C \sqrt{\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2} \leq \frac{4s}{m}\|c^* - c^*_i \|_S^2 = \frac{4sC^2(\epsilon^2 \|f\|_\rho^2 + 4\nu^2)}{m} \tag{26}
\]

With order-\( q \) features, we have \( \eta = \sqrt{2\epsilon^2(\frac{d}{q}) \|f\|^2 + 2E^2} \), where \( \|f\| = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \|g_j\|_\rho \).

Hence, the bound reduces to
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C.3. Proof of Proposition 7

Proof [Proof of Proposition 7] Let $X_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^m$ be the $\ell$th row of $A^*$ for $\ell \in [N]$, i.e.,

$$X_\ell = [\phi(x_1, \omega_\ell), \ldots, \phi(x_m, \omega_\ell)] = [\phi(x_1, \omega_\ell), \ldots, \phi(x_m, \omega_\ell)].$$

We can decompose $\frac{1}{N} AA^*$ into the following sum of rank-1 matrices:

$$\frac{1}{N} AA^* = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N X_\ell^* X_\ell = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N [\phi(x_1, \omega_\ell), \ldots, \phi(x_m, \omega_\ell)]^T [\phi(x_1, \omega_\ell), \ldots, \phi(x_m, \omega_\ell)]. \quad (28)$$

For a fixed $\ell$, each component of $X_\ell^* X_\ell$ takes the form $\exp(i \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle)$.

Here, we quantify the effect of the conditioning of the linear system $AA^*$ (overparameterized setting) as $N \to m^+$. Since $\min(m, N) = m$, we will bound $\lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} AA^* \right)$ and $\lambda_1 \left( \frac{1}{N} AA^* \right)$.

The Rayleigh quotient can be bounded by

$$\lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} AA^* \right) \leq \frac{1}{N} \langle A^* v, A^* v \rangle. \quad (29)$$

for all unit vectors $v \in \mathbb{C}^m$. The set $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1}\}$ forms a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^m$ of dimension at most $m - 1$, thus there exists a unit vector $z \in \mathbb{C}^m$ orthogonal to $\text{span}(\mathcal{X})$. And

$$\lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} AA^* \right) \leq \frac{1}{N} \langle z, AA^* z \rangle$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=m}^N z^* X_\ell^* X_\ell z$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=m}^N \sum_{j,k=1}^m \overline{z}_j z_k \exp(i \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle)$$

$$\leq \frac{N - m + 1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=m}^N \sum_{j \neq k} \overline{z}_j z_k \exp(i \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle). \quad (30)$$
The vector $z$ is independent of $\omega_\ell$ for $\ell \geq m$, therefore, applying expectations lead to:

$$
\mathbb{E} \lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} A A^* \right) \leq \frac{N - m + 1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell = m}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k}^{N} \mathbb{E} \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle \exp(i \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle) \\
= \frac{N - m + 1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell = m}^{N} \sum_{j \neq k}^{N} \mathbb{E} \langle x_j - x_k, \omega_\ell \rangle \exp(-\sigma^2 \|x_k - x_j\|^2/2) \\
= \frac{N - m + 1}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell = m}^{N} \mathbb{E} \exp(-\sigma^2 \|x_k - x_j\|^2/2) \\
\leq \frac{N - m + 1}{N} + \frac{(N - m + 1) \sqrt{m^2 - m}}{N} \left( 4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{-\frac{q}{4}}
$$

(31)

using Holder’s and Jensen’s inequalities (noting $\|z\|_2^2 = 1$). Repeating for the maximum eigenvalue:

$$
\lambda_1 \left( \frac{1}{N} A A^* \right) \geq \frac{1}{N} \langle z, A A^* z \rangle 
$$

and setting the unit vector to $z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} X_1$ yields

$$
\lambda_1 \left( \frac{1}{N} A A^* \right) \geq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\ell = 1}^{N} X_\ell^* X_\ell \cdot X_1 \\
= \frac{1}{N^2} \left( N^2 + \sum_{\ell = 2}^{N} X_\ell^* X_\ell \cdot X_1 \right) \\
= 1 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\ell = 2}^{N} \sum_{j,k=1}^{m} \exp(i \langle x_k - x_j, \omega_1 - \omega_\ell \rangle) \\
= 1 + \frac{(N - 1)m}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\ell = 2}^{N} \sum_{j,k=1}^{m} \exp(i \langle x_k - x_j, \omega_1 - \omega_\ell \rangle),
$$

(32)

and thus

$$
\mathbb{E} \lambda_1 \left( \frac{1}{N} A A^* \right) \geq 2 - \frac{(N - 1)m}{N^2} + \frac{(N - 1)(m^2 - m)}{N^2} \left( 4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{-\frac{q}{4}}.
$$

(33)

Consider a linear scaling $N = cm$ for $c > 1$, then

$$
\mathbb{E} \lambda_m \left( \frac{1}{N} A A^* \right) \leq \frac{(c - 1)m + 1}{cm} + \frac{(c - 1)m + 1}{cm} \sqrt{m^2 - m} \left( 4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{-\frac{q}{4}} \\
\leq \frac{c - 1}{c} + \frac{1}{m} + \frac{c - 1}{c} m \left( 4\gamma^2 \sigma^2 + 1 \right)^{-\frac{q}{4}}.
$$

(34)
Appendix D. Further Discussion

In this section, we provide further discussion and future research directions on how SHRIMP connects to previous work on $\ell_0$-regularized problems and random features approximations.

D.1. Connection to $\ell_0$-regularized Problems

We first note the similarities of SHRIMP with the SINDy (Zhang and Schaeffer, 2019) algorithm. SINDy prunes all features whose magnitude lies below a fixed $\lambda$. Thus, SHRIMP can be considered as an adaptive form of SINDy, where the $\lambda$ is chosen adaptively at each step depending on the data. Zhang and Schaeffer (2019) prove under certain conditions that SINDy converges to a fixed point, which is a local minimizer of the non-convex $\ell_0$-regularized regression problem with regularization parameter $\lambda$. However, the proof requires the matrix $A$ to be full column-rank, which in our case, is not guaranteed; in fact, one of the advantages of SHRIMP is that it can often move from the overparameterized to the underparameterized setting.

A more general perspective on the minimizers of the $\ell_0$-regularized regression problem is given in Nikolova (2013). Remark 2 in Nikolova (2013) indicates that SHRIMP solves an $\ell_0$-regularized minimization problem at each step. Additionally, Theorem 3.2 indicates that when $A$ has full rank with probability one and when SHRIMP prunes in the underparameterized setting, each iterate is a strict local minimum of the regularized regression problem. Thus, SHRIMP can be seen as solving for local minimizers in a data-dependent sequence of $\ell_0$-regularized regression problems.

However, there are still a few gaps in this direction. First, we focus on generalization performance of pruned models, while most work on $\ell_0$-regularization focus on sparse recovery. Moreover, the results in Nikolova (2013) indicate that solutions of problems that SHRIMP is solving are local minimizers of the regularized regression problem for any regularization parameter greater than zero, but it is hard to compare which local minimizer is the best regarding test performance.

D.2. The variance of the random feature weights

In our experiments in Section 4, we set the variance of the $w$ to be $1/q$, or the inverse of the order of the function assuming oracle access. This is motivated by two reasons: first, in deep learning initialization (He et al., 2015; Kumar, 2017) and corresponding theory (Ba et al., 2019), the variance of the weights in a layer is the inverse of the input dimension or the number of weights in the layer. Second, consider the bound for kernel approximation given in Rahimi and Recht (2008c), which is

$$\Pr\left[\sup_{x,y \sim \mathcal{M}} |z(x)'z(y) - k(x,y)| \geq \epsilon\right] \leq 2^8 \left(\frac{\sigma \text{diam}(\mathcal{M})}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{N\epsilon^2}{4(d+2)}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a compact set.

If the data comes from a Gaussian distribution, with high probability they lie in a compact set ($\mathcal{M}$). When the dimension ($d$) increases, the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{M})$ grows as $O(\sqrt{d})$. If we use low-order features to approximate, the effective dimension is $q$, so the diameter grows as $O(\sqrt{q})$. Thus, setting $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{q}$ mitigates this increase by allowing the numerator to be $O(1)$.

However, the theory with respect to basis pursuit requires a variance that increases with $q$. Our experiments in Section B.4 corroborate this theoretical gap. While smaller variance may suffice to learn smooth or low-frequency functions, setting the variance to be small may not allow enough
high-frequency weights to be sampled to learn higher frequency functions. One possible explanation is that these higher frequency functions are better represented by functions in the RKHS corresponding to kernel parameter matching that of the larger variances in the random features. However, as shown in equation 35, the kernel approximation is much worse when $\sigma$ is large. Thus, understanding this behavior is an interesting future direction.