



**HAL**  
open science

# Laplace Transform Based Low-Complexity Learning of Continuous Markov Semigroups

Vladimir Kostic, Karim Lounici, H el ene Halconruy, Timoth ee Devergne,  
Pietro Novelli, Massimiliano Pontil

► **To cite this version:**

Vladimir Kostic, Karim Lounici, H el ene Halconruy, Timoth ee Devergne, Pietro Novelli, et al.. Laplace Transform Based Low-Complexity Learning of Continuous Markov Semigroups. 2025. hal-04904846

**HAL Id: hal-04904846**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04904846v1>**

Preprint submitted on 21 Jan 2025

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.

# Laplace Transform Based Low-Complexity Learning of Continuous Markov Semigroups

Vladimir R. Kostic  
 Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia  
 University of Novi Sad  
 vladimir.kostic@iit.it

Karim Lounici  
 CMAP, École Polytechnique  
 karim.lounici@polytechnique.edu

Hélène Halconrui  
 SAMOVAR, Télécom SudParis  
 Modal'X, Université Paris Nanterre  
 helene.halconrui@telecom-sudparis.eu

Timothée Devergne  
 Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia  
 timothee.devergne@iit.it

Pietro Novelli  
 Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia  
 pietro.novelli@iit.it

Massimiliano Pontil  
 Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia  
 University College London  
 massimiliano.pontil@iit.it

## Abstract

Markov processes serve as a universal model for many real-world random processes. This paper presents a data-driven approach for learning these models through the spectral decomposition of the infinitesimal generator (IG) of the Markov semigroup. The unbounded nature of IGs complicates traditional methods such as vector-valued regression and Hilbert-Schmidt operator analysis. Existing techniques, including physics-informed kernel regression, are computationally expensive and limited in scope, with no recovery guarantees for transfer operator methods when the time-lag is small. We propose a novel method that leverages the IG's resolvent, characterized by the Laplace transform of transfer operators. This approach is robust to time-lag variations, ensuring accurate eigenvalue learning even for small time-lags. Our statistical analysis applies to a broader class of Markov processes than current methods while reducing computational complexity from quadratic to linear in the state dimension. Finally, we illustrate the behaviour of our method in two experiments.

## 1 Introduction

Markov semigroups play a critical role in modeling dynamics of complex systems across various fields, including option pricing in finance (Karatzas and Shreve, 1991), molecular dynamics (Schütte and Huisinga, 2003) and climate modeling (Majda et al., 2009), where understanding long-term behavior is essential for accurate forecasting and interpretation. The key mathematical object of interest to describe Markov semigroups is the Infinitesimal Generator (IG), which

governs the evolution of the probability distribution over the state space. Analyzing the spectral properties of the IG can reveal important features such as metastable states, statistics of transition and the committor functions, all of which are critical to understanding the system’s dynamic properties. However, the problem of estimation of the IG presents significant mathematical and computational challenges. The IG is often an unbounded operator, making its analysis and computation particularly difficult.

**Related work.** A substantial body of research has focused on learning dynamical systems from data (see the monographs Brunton et al., 2022; Kutz et al., 2016, and references therein). This has led to the development of two primary approaches: deep learning methods (Bevanda et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2021; Lusch et al., 2018), which excel in capturing complex data representations but often lack rigorous statistical foundations, and kernel methods (Alexander and Giannakis, 2020; Bouvrie and Hamzi, 2017; Das and Giannakis, 2020; Inzerilli et al., 2023; Kawahara, 2016; Klus et al., 2019; Kostic et al., 2022, 2023a; Williams et al., 2015), which offer strong statistical guarantees for Transfer Operator (TO) estimation but require kernel function selection. A closely related challenge, learning invariant subspaces of the TO, has led to several methodologies (Kawahara, 2016; Li et al., 2017; Mardt et al., 2018; Tian and Wu, 2021; Yeung et al., 2019; Wu and Noé, 2019), some leveraging deep canonical correlation analysis (Andrew et al., 2013; Kostic et al., 2023c). Note that TOs share the same eigenfunctions as the IG, which motivates the development of TO methods aimed at learning the spectral properties of the IG. However, TOs are highly sensitive to the choice of time-lag, with their spectral gap deteriorating significantly as the time-lag decreases, making existing spectral recovery guarantees ineffective for small lags—an issue observed in practice (see, e.g., Bonati et al. (2021)). This bottleneck is especially problematic in complex tasks like enhanced sampling (Laio and Parrinello, 2002; Shmilovich and Ferguson, 2023). To address this, research has focused on learning the IG and its eigenstructure directly. As recently shown (Devergne et al., 2024), IG learning can be combined with enhanced sampling methods to efficiently debias data and reveal true dynamics. However, compared to TOs, research on directly learning the IG has been more limited and often case-specific. For instance, (Zhang et al., 2022) developed a deep learning method for Langevin diffusion, while (Klus et al., 2020) extended dynamic mode decomposition to learn the generator, connecting it to Galerkin’s approximation. However, neither of these works provides any formal learning guarantees. To the best of our knowledge, most existing works with theoretical guarantees (Cabannes and Bach, 2024; Pillaud-Vivien and Bach, 2023; Hou et al., 2023) either have limited scope or offer only partial or suboptimal analysis, as summarized in Table 1. Crucially, none adequately addresses the challenge posed by the unboundedness of the IG, leading to incomplete frameworks and suboptimal convergence rates, which in some cases depend explicitly on the state space dimension. Moreover, the estimators in these works are susceptible to spurious eigenvalues and do not offer guarantees for accurate estimation of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. The current state-of-the-art (Kostic et al., 2024) introduces a physics-informed kernel regression method only for Markov processes admitting a Dirichlet form. This approach leverages the Dirichlet form to define an energy-based metric for learning the model and provides a comprehensive statistical analysis with learning guarantees for the spectral decomposition of the IG while avoiding spurious eigenvalues. However, their analysis is limited to self-adjoint IGs and assumes iid data. Moreover, their method requires computing the gradient of the feature map, scaling quadratically with the dimension  $d$  of the state space and hindering the broader applicability.

**Contributions.** We introduce a novel approach for accurate estimation of the spectral decomposition of the IG for a large class of Markov semigroups encompassing all the models studied in the aforementioned prior works. Our method leverages the well-known connection between the resolvent of the IG and the semi-group of TOs through the Laplace transform. Unlike TO methods, our approach estimates the IG directly, hence avoiding small time-lag issues and maintaining a larger spectral gap for accurate eigenvalue and eigenfunction learning. We derive sharp

statistical guarantees for our method, valid for data sampled from a trajectory in the stationary regime, fully accounting for the effects of slow mixing times. Our results are the first to apply to a broad class of Markov semigroups models with sectorial IGs. Computationally, our approach performs a weighted combination of multiple TOs at different time-lags. It involves only a matrix product of a Toeplitz matrix with the kernel embedding, thereby reducing complexity to  $O(n^2d)$ , making it practical for high-dimensional systems. The computational complexity can be further reduced while preserving accuracy by utilizing standard scaling techniques, such as random Fourier features. Experiments in molecular dynamics show superior performance, where other methods struggle due to computational demands.

## 2 Background

Various physical, biological, and financial systems evolve through stochastic processes  $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ , where  $X_t \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  represents the system's state at time  $t$ . We focus on continuous-time *Markov processes* with continuous paths, which are essential for modeling these systems. This class includes Itô diffusion processes (see Ex. 1 and 2), reflected or time-changed Brownian motions, and processes with local time. Markov processes model phenomena where the future depends only on the present, not the past, and are described by their laws—measures on the path space. This foundational approach to *Markov theory* defines the process through the *infinitesimal generator*, a key linear (often unbounded) operator on a space of observables (functions defined on the state space).

**Markov theory.** The dynamics of a continuous-time Markov process  $X$  is described by a family of probability densities  $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t \in E | X_0 = x) = \int_E p_t(x, y) dy, \quad (1)$$

and *transfer operators*  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$  such that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$A_t f = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y) p_t(\cdot, y) dy = \mathbb{E}[f(X_t) | X_0 = \cdot]. \quad (2)$$

The transfer operator is essential for understanding the dynamics of  $X$ . We examine its action on  $\mathcal{L}^2_{\pi}(\mathcal{X})$ , noting the presence of an *invariant measure*  $\pi$ , which satisfies  $A_t^* \pi = \pi$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . We assume that the Markov process  $X$  meets two key properties regarding  $\pi$ : **[1]**  $\pi$  ensures *long-term stability*, meaning  $X$  converges to  $\pi$  from any initial state  $x$ . **[2]** The process is *geometrically ergodic*, implying exponential convergence to the invariant measure. Finally, the process is characterized by the *infinitesimal generator*  $L$ , defined for  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2_{\pi}(\mathcal{X})$  by the limit  $Lf = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (A_t f - f)/t$ , with  $L$  being closed on its domain.

The class of **sectorial generators** consists of the operators generating strongly continuous semigroups, analytic in a sector of the complex plane defined by growth conditions in an angular region, i.e.,  $L$  is a (stable) sectorial operator with angle  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$ ,

$$\mathbb{F}(L) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\theta}^- := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Re(z) \leq 0 \wedge |\Im(z)| \leq -\Re(z) \tan(\theta)\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbb{F}(L)$  denotes the *numerical range* of  $L$ . This class covers all time-reversal processes (self-adjoint IG), but also important non-time-reversal processes, such as Advection-Diffusion and underdamped Langevin (Kloeden et al., 1992).

**Spectral decomposition.** When continuous for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ , the operator  $R_{\mu} = (\mu I - L)^{-1}$  is the *resolvent* of  $L$ , with its domain called *resolvent set*  $\rho(L) = \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mu I - L \text{ is bijective, } R_{\mu} \text{ is continuous}\}$ . For a sectorial operator, the resolvent is uniformly bounded outside a sector containing the spectrum. Its spectral decomposition writes

$$L = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_i g_i \otimes f_i \quad (4)$$

with eigenvalues  $(\lambda_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$  and corresponding left and right eigenfunctions  $f_i, g_i \in L^2$ , respectively.

**Link with SDEs.** *Itô diffusion processes* are a key example of Markov processes, governed by stochastic differential equations (SDEs) of the form:

$$dX_t = a(X_t)dt + b(X_t)dW_t, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (5)$$

where  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $W = (W_t^1, \dots, W_t^p)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$  is a standard  $p$ -dimensional Brownian motion, the drift  $a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and diffusion  $b : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$  are globally Lipschitz and sub-linear. This ensures a unique solution  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$ . SDEs like (5) include Langevin dynamics and Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. The IG  $L$  associated with (5) is a second-order differential operator, defined for  $f \in \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , as:

$$Lf(x) = \nabla f(x)^\top a(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[b(x)^\top (\nabla^2 f(x)) b(x)], \quad (6)$$

where  $\nabla^2 f = (\partial_{ij}^2 f)_{i,j \in [d]}$  is the Hessian of  $f$ . Its domain is the Sobolev space  $\mathcal{W}_\pi^{1,2}(\mathcal{X}) = \{f \in \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}) \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2} + \|\nabla f\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2} < \infty\}$ . Its spectral decomposition allows one to solve SDE (5), that is

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_t) \mid X_0 = x] = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} e^{\lambda_i t} \langle g_i, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2} f_i(x). \quad (7)$$

**Example 1** (Overdamped Langevin). *Let  $\sigma$ ,  $k_b$ , and  $T \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . The overdamped Langevin dynamics of a particle in a potential  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies (5) with  $a = -\gamma^{-1} \nabla V$  and  $b \equiv \sqrt{2(k_b T / \gamma)}$ , where  $\gamma$ ,  $k_b$ , and  $T$  are the friction coefficient, Boltzmann constant, and system temperature, respectively. The invariant measure is the Boltzmann distribution  $\pi(dx) \propto e^{-V(x)/(k_b T)} dx$ . In dissipative systems, the IG  $L$  is sectorial, with its spectrum usually in the left half-plane.*

**Example 2** (Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) processes). *The OU process with drift is governed by the SDE (5) with  $a(x) = Ax$  and  $b \equiv B$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the drift matrix and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the diffusion matrix. This models systems like the Vasicek interest rate and neural dynamics, where fluctuations return to equilibrium. If the real parts of  $A$ 's eigenvalues are negative, the OU process has an invariant Gaussian distribution with covariance  $\Sigma_\infty$  satisfying Lyapunov's equation:  $A\Sigma_\infty + \Sigma_\infty A^\top = -BB^\top$ .*

### 3 Problem formulation

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an RKHS with kernel  $k : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be a *feature map* (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008) such that  $k(x, x') = \langle \phi(x), \phi(x') \rangle$  for all  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ . We assume that  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  (Steinwart and Christmann, 2008, Chapter 4.3), enabling us to approximate  $L : \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  with an operator  $G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ . Although  $\mathcal{H}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ , they have different metric structures, so for  $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ . To resolve this, we introduce the *injection operator*  $S_\pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ , which maps each  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  to its pointwise equivalent in  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  with the appropriate  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2$  norm.

Let  $R_\mu := (\mu I - L)^{-1}$  be the resolvent of the IG  $L$  for shift parameter  $\mu \in \rho(L)$ . Recalling that  $A_t = e^{tL}$  is the TO for the time-lag  $t$ , we can characterize the resolvent via the Laplace transform (see for instance (Bakry et al., 2014), equation (A.1.3)) as

$$R_\mu = \int_0^\infty A_t e^{-\mu t} dt. \quad (8)$$

Thus, to approximate the action of this operator on the RKHS, an obvious risk metric would be the mean square error (MSE) w.r.t. stationary distribution  $\pi$ :

$$\min_{G: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}(G) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0 \sim \pi} \|\psi(X_0) - G^* \phi(X_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (9)$$

Aspect	(Cabannes and Bach, 2024)	(Hou et al., 2023)	(Kostic et al., 2024)	Our work
Many Markov Processes	$\times$ (only Laplacian)	$\times$ (only Itô)	$\times$ (only Dirichlet form)	$\checkmark$
Risk metric	$\mathcal{L}_\pi^2$ norm	$\mathcal{L}_\pi^2$ norm	Weighted Sobolev norm	$\mathcal{L}_\pi^2$ norm
Required prior knowledge	$\times$	$\checkmark$ (full info. needed)	$\checkmark$ (partial info. needed)	$\times$
Data	iid	trajectory	iid	trajectory
IG error bound	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{d}{2(d+1)}})$	Var = $\mathcal{O}(\frac{d^2}{\gamma^2 \sqrt{n}})$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+\beta)}})$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+\beta)}})$
Spectral rates	$\times$ (spuriousness)	$\times$ (spuriousness)	$\checkmark$ (self-adjoint)	$\checkmark$ (sectorial)
Computational complexity	$\mathcal{O}(n^2+n^{3/2}d)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^3d^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(rn^2d^2)$	$\mathcal{O}((r \vee d)n^2)$ $\mathcal{O}(rn(\sqrt{n} \vee N) \vee dnN)$

Table 1: Comparison to previous kernel-based works on generator learning. State-space dimension is  $d$ ,  $N$  is the number of features (possibly  $N=\infty$ ),  $n$  is a sample size and  $r \ll n \wedge N$  is estimator’s rank. Our learning bounds are derived in Thm. 1 where parameters  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  quantify the intrinsic difficulty of the problem and the impact of kernel choice on IG learning.

where, recalling the Laplace transform, we define the target feature via Bochner integral

$$\psi(X_0) = \int_0^\infty \phi(X_t) e^{-\mu t} dt. \quad (10)$$

An universal approximation result holds true for the problem in (9), c.f. App. A.2). Specifically, if  $\mathcal{H}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  and the injection operator is Hilbert-Schmidt, then one can find arbitrarily good finite-rank approximations of the IG’s resolvent. However, learning the IG alone is insufficient for forecasting the process, and estimating the spectral decomposition of  $L$  is of greater interest. But, as noted in (Kostic et al., 2023a), as the estimator’s rank increases, metric distortion between  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  hinders learning.

The bottleneck in the risk functional (9) is the integral computation in (10), which hinders standard operator regression methods. In the next section, we present a novel general approach to address this difficulty.

## 4 Approach and main results

Here, we propose a different approach based on learning a linear combination of transfer operators:

$$\tilde{R}_m := \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} m_j A_{t_j}, \quad (11)$$

where  $m = (m_j)_{j=0}^{\ell}$  are real weights and  $(t_j)_{j=0}^{\ell}$  are time-lags, with  $\ell \geq 0$ .

Remark, that when  $\ell = 0$ , taking  $t_0 = \Delta t > 0$  and  $m_0 = 1$  we have that  $\tilde{R}_m = A_{\Delta t}$ , implying that the estimators we develop in the following generalize the existing single time-lag transfer operator estimators, see e.g. (Colbrook, 2023; Kostic et al., 2023a). Indeed, our statistical analysis can be applied to this choice of parameters to generalize previous results to non-normal transfer operators and non-iid data.

Since learning (11) can easily be formulated as a vector-valued regression problem

$$\min_{G: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(G) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0 \sim \pi} \|\psi_m(X_0) - G^* \phi(X_0)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\psi_m(X_0) = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} m_j \phi(X_{t_j}), \quad (13)$$

learning algorithms that solve it can also solve (9), whenever the linear combination approximates the integral transform (8). Prime example we consider in this paper is the famous trapezoid rule with  $\ell \geq 1$  points, time-discretization  $\Delta t > 0$  for which

$$t_j = j\Delta t \text{ and } m_j = \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta t}{2} e^{-\mu t_j} & \text{if } j \in \{0, \ell\}, \\ \Delta t e^{-\mu t_j} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq \ell-1, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

and *Reduced Rank Regression* (RRR) estimator proposed in (Kostic et al., 2022). Namely, to learn (8), we constrain (12) to rank- $r$ -RKHS operators  $G \in \mathbb{B}_r(\mathcal{H}) := \{G: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \mid \text{rank}(G) \leq r\}$ , and obtain solution

$$\tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2} \llbracket C_\gamma^{-1/2} \tilde{H}_m \rrbracket_r, \quad (15)$$

where  $\tilde{H}_m = S_\pi^* \tilde{R}_m S_\pi = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} m_j T_{t_j}$ , is the aggregated cross-covariance obtained by combining  $T_{t_j} = S_\pi^* e^{t_j L} S_\pi = \mathbb{E}_{X_0 \sim \pi} [\phi(X_0) \otimes \phi(X_{t_j})]$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq \ell$ , being the cross-covariance operators in RKHS  $\mathcal{H}$  w.r.t. invariant measure  $\pi$ , and  $C_\gamma = T_0 + \gamma I$  is the regularized covariance, since  $C = T_0 = S_\pi^* S_\pi = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} [\phi(X) \otimes \phi(X)]$ .

While the computational details for deriving the empirical version of (15), denoted by  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r$ , are presented in Sec. 5, the main challenge in the statistical analysis of the risk/error bounds, compared to the standard TO case, lies in addressing both the bias from approximating the integral and the variance from non-iid data collected along a single trajectory sampled at frequency  $1/\Delta t$ . While the general case is discussed in Sec. 6, we focus here on well-specified learning problems using the Gaussian kernel, specifically for eigenvalue estimation of self-adjoint operators.

Due to the unbounded nature of the generator, (11) with the choice of (14) may not always provide a good approximation of the integral transform (8). However, as shown in App. C.2.4, for a large class of problems with sectorial IG, such as Ex. 1 and 2, the difference between risks and errors can be bounded in terms of the time-lag, since  $\|R_\mu - \tilde{R}_m\| \leq c \Delta t$ , where  $c$  is a constant when  $\ell \mu \Delta t$  is sufficiently large. Concerning variance, the main challenge is accounting for the unavoidable data dependence by aggregating concentration inequalities at multiples of the initial time-lag, leveraging the mixing time from geometric ergodicity. Our approach reveals the impact of key parameters (shift  $\mu > 0$ , regularization  $\gamma > 0$ ,  $L$  eigenvalues, and time-lag  $\Delta t$ ) on the variance.

Putting both analyses together, we bound the excess risk in the operator norm. Namely, since  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}}(\hat{G}) = \mathcal{R}(\hat{G}) - \min_G \mathcal{R}(G) = \left\| R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi \hat{G} \right\|_{\text{HS}}^2$ , the operator norm error is given by  $\mathcal{E}(\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) = \left\| R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi \hat{G} \right\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ , for which we obtained that

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \lesssim \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda_{r+1}} + \Delta t + \frac{\ln^{3/2}(n/\delta)}{\mu \sqrt{n \Delta t} |\lambda_2|} \quad (16)$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw of samples at frequency  $1/\Delta t$ , for large enough  $n = 2\ell$  and regularization parameter chosen as  $\gamma \asymp 1/(n \Delta t)$ .

Analyzing (16), when the sampling frequency is  $1/\Delta t \asymp n^{1/2}$  and the hyperparameters are chosen such that  $|\lambda_{r+1}| \geq n^{1/2}$ ,  $\gamma \asymp n^{-1/4}$  and  $\mu \asymp \sqrt{1/\Delta t}$ , the learning rate for the operator norm error is  $n^{-1/2} \ln^{3/2}(n)$ . This matches the learning rates in (Kostic et al., 2023a, 2024) for TO and  $R_\mu$ , respectively.

Further, the error/risk analysis led to spectral learning rates, specifically for estimating the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of  $L$ . The key difference in the analysis is that the hypothetical domain  $\mathcal{H}$  typically has a different geometry (norm) than the true domain  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2$  (Kostic et al., 2022, 2023a). To control the potential deterioration of spectral learning rates relative to the risk/error, one must analyze the *metric distortion* of the estimator's eigenfunctions, defined as  $\eta(h) = \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}} / \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ , for  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . When the metric distortion is uniformly bounded (as can occur in well-specified settings), the eigenvalue bound becomes

$$\frac{|\lambda_i - \hat{\lambda}_i|}{|\mu - \lambda_i| |\mu - \hat{\lambda}_i|} - \frac{\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi)}{\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi)} \lesssim \Delta t + \frac{\ln^{3/2}(n^2/\delta)}{\mu \sqrt{n \Delta t}}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\hat{\lambda}_i = \mu - 1/\hat{\nu}_i$  are estimates of the generator's eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$  for  $i \in [r]$ , with  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \sum_{i \in [r]} \hat{\eta}_i \hat{h}_i \otimes \hat{g}_i$  being the spectral decomposition. Note that (17) can be transformed into eigenfunction bounds using standard arguments, see App. C.5 for technical details.

Investigating the spectral learning rate in (17), we find that tuning  $\mu$  in an unbounded manner is prohibitive; if  $\mu$  is too large, the resolvent's eigenvalues collapse to zero. Thus, for spectral estimation, we must fix a small  $\mu > 0$ , which influences the rate and the optimal relationship between  $n$  and  $\Delta t$ . Specifically, the spectral learning rate becomes  $n^{-1/3} \ln^{1/2}(n^2/\delta)$ , corresponding to a sampling frequency of  $1/\Delta t \asymp n^{1/3}$ . As expected, the estimation bias depends on the singular value gap of the resolvent operator restricted to the RKHS, given by  $R_{\mu|_{\mathcal{H}}} = R_{\mu} S_{\pi}$ . Finally, note that metric distortion of eigenfunctions can be estimated from data, allowing for spectral bounds with empirical biases for each eigenpair (see Sec. 6).

In conclusion, while TO methods can learn the IG's eigenfunctions by learning  $A_{\Delta t} = e^{\Delta t L}$ , there are currently no theoretical guarantees for small  $\Delta t$ . This motivated methods that learn the IG directly. Table 1 contrasts these methods with our contribution, which is applicable to more general settings and guarantees learning the leading eigenvalues with lower computational complexity under mild conditions. Compared to Kostic et al. (2024), which relies on the Dirichlet form, our estimator is more general (e.g., applicable to underdamped Langevin diffusion) and offers linear complexity in terms of state dimension, albeit with lower bias and higher variance. For details, see Sec. 6.

## 5 Learning algorithms

In this section we assume the access to the dataset  $\mathcal{D}_n = (x_{i-1})_{i \in [n]}$  obtained by sampling the process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  at some sampling frequency  $1/\Delta t$  for  $\Delta t > 0$  being typically small in order to observe all the relevant time-scales of the process. To simplify analysis, we will assume stationarity, i.e.  $X_0 \sim \pi$ , and, hence,  $X_{j\Delta t} \sim \pi$ . Clearly, to derive empirical risk we need to replace the expectation in (9) with the empirical mean, which leads to estimating cross-covariance operators by their empirical counterparts

$$\widehat{H}_m = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} \frac{m_j}{n-j} \sum_{i=0}^{n-j-1} \phi(x_i) \otimes \phi(x_{i+j}), \quad (18)$$

noting that for the time-lag  $j\Delta t$  we can only observe  $n-j$  pairs from the joint distribution  $\rho_{j\Delta t}$ , that is  $\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} = \frac{1}{n-j} \sum_{i=0}^{n-j-1} \phi(x_i) \otimes \phi(x_{i+j})$ ,  $j=0, \dots, \ell$ .

Therefore, we can construct the empirical RRR estimator of  $\widetilde{R}_m$  as  $\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \widehat{C}_{\gamma}^{-1/2} \llbracket \widehat{C}_{\gamma}^{-1/2} \widehat{H}_m \rrbracket_r$ . We note that when  $r=n$ , empirical RRR coincides with the Ridge Regression solution of the regularized risk, that is without the rank constraint.

In the remainder of this section we show how to compute the estimator and its eigenvalue decomposition in both settings, when the finite dictionary of  $N$  features spans  $\mathcal{H}$  (Algorithm 1) and when  $\mathcal{H}$  is infinite dimensional RKHS (Algorithm 2). To derive them we follow general construction of vector-valued RRR estimator developed in (Turri et al., 2023), detailed in App. B. To that end, recall the definition of the sampling operator  $\widehat{S}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and its adjoint  $\widehat{S}^*: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$

$$\widehat{S}h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (h(x_{i-1}))_{i \in [n]} \text{ and } \widehat{S}^*v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i \phi(x_{i-1}),$$

implying that  $\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} = \frac{n}{n-j} \widehat{S}^* (\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{1}_i \mathbb{1}_{i+j}^{\top}) \widehat{S}$ , where  $(\mathbb{1}_i)_{i \in [n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is the standard basis. Then, using (18), we obtain that  $\widehat{H}_m = \widehat{S}^* M \widehat{S}$ , where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a Toeplitz matrix (i.e. has constant diagonals) given by

$$M_{i,i+j} := \begin{cases} (nm_j)/(n-j) & , i \in [n], 0 \leq j \leq \ell, \\ 0 & , \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

When the process is time-reversal invariant, meaning that  $T_t$ , and consequently  $\widetilde{R}_m$ , are self-adjoint, we can enforce symmetry in the empirical objects by estimating  $T_{j\Delta t} \approx \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} + \widehat{T}_{j\Delta t}^*)$ , which can be done at no cost by replacing  $M$  with  $\frac{1}{2}(M + M^{\top})$ . Consequently, both formulations of the algorithm solve a symmetric eigenvalue problems, resulting in real eigenvalues and avoiding



additional numerical errors.

In finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{H}$ , we have that  $\phi(x)=z(x)^\top z(\cdot)$ , where  $z=[z_1, \dots, z_N]^\top$  is a vector of features that span  $\mathcal{H}$ , that is  $\mathcal{H}=\{h = v^\top z \mid v \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$ . Thus, operator (18) becomes isometrically isomorphic to a matrix computed by replacing  $\phi$  by  $z$ . Thus, estimator  $\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r$  can be expressed as a  $N \times N$  matrix in basis  $(z_i)_{i \in [N]}$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Primal LaRRR

---

**Require:** dictionary of functions  $(z_i)_{i \in [N]}$ ; hyperparameters  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\gamma > 0$  and  $r \in [n]$ .

- 1: Compute  $Z = [z(x_0) \mid \dots \mid z(x_{n-1})] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$
- 2: **if** self-adjoint **then** {using Toeplitz matrix (19)}
- 3:   Symmetrize  $M \leftarrow (M+M^\top)/2$
- 4: **end if**
- 5: Solve eigenvalue problem  $HH^\top v_i = \widehat{\sigma}_i^2 C_\gamma v_i$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , where  $Z_f = ZM$ ,  $H = \frac{1}{n} Z_f Z^\top$  and  $C_\gamma = \frac{1}{n} Z Z^\top + \gamma I$
- 6: Normalize  $v_i \leftarrow v_i / (v_i^\top C_\gamma v_i)^{1/2}$ ,  $i \in [r]$
- 7: Form  $V_r = [v_1 \mid \dots \mid v_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$
- 8: Compute eigentriples  $(\nu_i, w_i^l, w_i^r)$  of  $V_r^\top H V_r$
- 9: Construct  $\widehat{g}_i = z^\top H V_r w_i^l$  and  $\widehat{h}_i = z^\top V_r w_i^r$
- 10: Compute eigenvalues  $\widehat{\lambda}_i = \mu - 1/\nu_i$

**Ensure:** Estimated eigentriples  $(\widehat{\lambda}_i, \widehat{g}_i, \widehat{h}_i)_{i \in [r]}$  of  $L$

---

Alternatively, to derive dual Algorithm 2, applicable to infinite-dimensional  $\mathcal{H}$ , we perform computations in "sample" space, relying on the reproducing property  $h(x) = \langle h, \phi(x) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  and kernel Gram matrices  $K = n^{-1} [k(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j \in [n]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $K_\gamma = K + \gamma I$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Dual LaRRR

---

**Require:** kernel  $k$ ; hyperparameters  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\gamma > 0$  and  $r \in [n]$ .

- 1: Compute  $K = n^{-1} [k(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j \in [n]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$
- 2: **if** self-adjoint **then** {using Toeplitz matrix (19)}
- 3:   Symmetrize  $M \leftarrow (M+M^\top)/2$
- 4: **end if**
- 5: Solve eigenvalue problem  $K_f K u_i = \widehat{\sigma}_i^2 K_\gamma u_i$ ,  $i \in [r]$ , where  $K_f = M K M^\top$
- 6: Normalize  $u_i \leftarrow u_i / (u_i^\top K K_\gamma u_i)^{1/2}$ ,  $i \in [r]$
- 7: Form  $U_r = [u_1 \mid \dots \mid u_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$  and  $V_r = K U_r$
- 8: Compute eigentriples  $(\widehat{\nu}_i, w_i^l, w_i^r)$  of  $V_r^\top M V_r$
- 9: Construct  $\widehat{g}_i = \widehat{S}^* M^\top V_r w_i^l / \widehat{\nu}_i$  and  $\widehat{h}_i = \widehat{S}^* U_r w_i^r$
- 10: Compute eigenvalues  $\widehat{\lambda}_i = \mu - 1/\nu_i$

**Ensure:** Estimated eigentriples  $(\widehat{\lambda}_i, \widehat{g}_i, \widehat{h}_i)_{i \in [r]}$  of  $L$

---

In both algorithms, the most expensive computation is in line 5. Naive computations result in cubic complexity w.r.t feature dimension  $N$  (primal) or sample size  $n$  (dual). However, using classical iterative solvers, like Lanczos or the generalized Davidson method to compute the leading eigenvalues of the generalized eigenvalue problem, when  $r \ll n$  this cost can significantly be reduced, c.f. (Hogben, 2006). Namely, assuming that complexity of computing a kernel is linear in  $d$ , we obtain the complexity of primal LaRRR to be  $\mathcal{O}((r \vee d) n N \vee r(n \ell \vee N^2))$ , while the complexity of dual one is  $\mathcal{O}((r \vee d) n^2)$ .

In light of (7), even when the SDE in (5) is known, Algorithms 1 and 2 allow constructing solutions as

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_t) \mid X_0 = x] \approx \sum_{i \in [r]} e^{\widehat{\lambda}_i t} \langle g_i, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \widehat{h}_i(x), \quad (20)$$

by estimating the dominant spectrum of  $L$  from a single (long) trajectory of the system obtained

through simulations. This approach is particularly interesting for high-dimensional state spaces, where classical numerical methods become unfeasible due to the curse of dimensionality, making data-driven methods a key tool in fields like molecular dynamics, Schütte et al. (2023). We prove in Sec. 6 that the precision of our method does not depend on the state dimension, but on intrinsic effective dimension of the process, which, together with its linear complexity w.r.t.  $d$ , makes it an attractive approach in such problems.

## 6 Statistical learning guarantees

We derive now statistical bounds for estimating IG's resolvent using the Laplace transform-based Reduced Rank Regression algorithm (LaRRR). We then derive learning rates for IG's eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, assuming the RKHS is generated by an universal kernel  $k$ , hence using Alg. 2 to compute  $\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r$ .

We start with the following auxiliary result, essentially proven in (Kostic et al., 2022). It shows that estimated eigenvalues in the operator regression are guaranteed to lie in the  $\epsilon$ -pseudospectrum  $\text{Sp}_\epsilon$  of the true operator (union of all spectra of  $\epsilon$  perturbed operators), where  $\epsilon$  depends on the operator norm error  $\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}) = \|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi \widehat{G}\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$  and the metric distortion  $\eta(h) := \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}} / \|h\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , of estimated eigenfunctions. To obtain the result, the latter is either uniformly bounded or empirically estimated.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\widehat{G} = \sum_{i \in [r]} \widehat{\nu}_i \widehat{h}_i \otimes \widehat{g}_i$  be the spectral decomposition of  $\widehat{G}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , and denote the empirical metric distortions as  $\widehat{\eta}_i = \|\widehat{h}_i\| / \|\widehat{S}\widehat{h}_i\|$ ,  $i \in [r]$ . Then for every  $\mu > 0$ ,  $\Delta t > 0$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $i \in [r]$ ,*

$$\|(\widehat{\nu}_i I - R_\mu)^{-1}\|^{-1} \leq \epsilon_i = \mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}) \widehat{\eta}_i(\widehat{h}_i) \wedge \frac{\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}) \|\widehat{G}\|}{\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \mathcal{E}(\widehat{G})},$$

implying that  $\widehat{\nu}_i$  belongs to  $\epsilon_i$ -pseudospectrum of  $R_\mu$ .

To bound the operator norm version of the excess risk,  $\mathcal{E}(G) = \|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ , we make the following assumptions that quantify the complexity of learning problem and suitability of the chosen RKHS:

- (BK) Boundedness.** There exists  $c_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  such that  $\text{ess sup } \|\phi(x)\|^2 \leq c_{\mathcal{H}}$ , i.e.  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_\pi^\infty(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{H})$ ;
- (RC) Regularity.** For some  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$  there exists  $c_\alpha \gtrsim 0$  such that  $H_\mu H_\mu^* \preceq (c_\alpha / \mu)^2 C^{1+\alpha}$ , with  $H_\mu = S_\pi^* R_\mu S_\pi = \int_0^\infty T_t e^{-\mu t} dt$ .
- (SD) Spectral Decay.** There exists  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and  $c_\beta > 0$  s.t.  $\lambda_j(C) \leq c_\beta j^{-1/\beta}$ , for all  $j \in J$ .

These assumptions, which originate from the state-of-the-art statistical learning theory for regression in RKHS (Fischer and Steinwart, 2020), have been extended to TO regression (Li et al., 2022) and to learning self-adjoint IG of diffusions (Kostic et al., 2024).

Condition **(BK)** ensures that  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\pi^2$ , while **(SD)** quantifies the regularity of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Similar to the regularity condition in (Kostic et al., 2023a), **(RC)** quantifies the relationship between the hypothesis class (bounded operators in  $\mathcal{H}$ ) and the object of interest,  $R_\mu$ . Specifically, **(RC)** holds if  $L$  has eigenfunctions in the  $\alpha$ -interpolation space between  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . If  $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\alpha \geq 1$  (see App. C.1). Since the worst-case bound on metric distortion in Prop. 1 depends on the estimator's norm,  $\alpha$  must be restricted to  $[1, 2]$  to avoid vacuous bounds, though this restriction isn't needed for empirical metric distortions. We present  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$  here and analyze  $\alpha < 1$  in App. C.6.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $L$  be sectorial operator such that  $w_\star = -\lambda_2(L + L^*)/2 > 0$ . Let **(BK)**, **(RC)** and **(SD)** hold for some  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , respectively, and  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi)) = \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . Given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $r \in [n]$ , let*

$$\gamma \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{n \Delta t w_\star} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}}, \quad \varepsilon_n^*(\delta) = \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{\mu^{\frac{2(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha}} n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\beta+3\alpha}} \quad (21)$$

$\Delta t = \varepsilon_n^*$  and  $1/\ell = o(\varepsilon_n^*)$ , then there exists a constant  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $\mathcal{H}$  and gap  $\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) > 0$  such that for large enough  $n \geq r$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \lesssim (\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1} \wedge \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi)) + c\varepsilon_n^*(\delta). \quad (22)$$

*Proof sketch.* Let  $G_{\mu,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2} \llbracket C_\gamma^{-1/2} H_\mu \rrbracket_r$ , and set for brevity  $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) &\leq \underbrace{\|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}^r\|}_{\text{(I) regularization bias}} + \underbrace{\|S_\pi(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \widetilde{G}_{\mu,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(II) rank reduction bias}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\|S_\pi(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(III) integration bias}} + \underbrace{\|S_\pi(\widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - \widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(IV) estimator variance}}. \end{aligned}$$

Regularity assumption **(RC)** guarantees that **(I)**  $\leq \frac{c_\alpha}{\mu} \gamma^{\alpha/2}$ . From definition of RRR, we immediately get **(II)**  $\lesssim \sigma_{r+1}(\widetilde{R}_m S_\pi)$ . Applying proposition in App. C.2.4 yields **(III)**  $\lesssim \Delta t$ . Results of App. C.3 gives the control on **(IV)**. Hence we get w.p.a.l.  $1 - \delta$

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \lesssim \frac{\gamma^{\alpha/2}}{\mu} + \Delta t + \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) + \frac{\ln^{3/2}(\frac{n\ell}{\delta})}{\mu \sqrt{(n-\ell)} \Delta t w_* \gamma^\beta},$$

noting that the same result holds when  $\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi)$  is replaced by  $\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1}$  computed in line 5 of Algorithms 1-2. By balancing with respect to  $\gamma$  first and then with respect to  $\Delta t$ , we derive the final bound.  $\square$

Since Prop. 1 transforms the estimation error via metric distortion into the pseudospectral perturbation level, it is a starting point to derive estimation of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $R_\mu$ , and consequently of  $L$ . The quality of such bounds depends on the properties of  $L$ , in particular on the conditioning of eigenvalues, that is on the angles between its eigenfunctions, or more generally its spectral projectors. The nicest case is for normal generators, where we derive the following.

**Theorem 2.** *Under the assumptions of Thm. 1, let  $(\widehat{\lambda}_i, \widehat{g}_i, \widehat{h}_i)_{i \in [r]}$  be the output of Algorithm 2. If  $L^*L = LL^*$ , then for large enough  $n \geq r$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw of  $\mathcal{D}_n$*

$$\frac{|\lambda_i - \widehat{\lambda}_i|}{|\mu - \lambda_i| |\mu - \widehat{\lambda}_i|} \leq \epsilon_{n,i}^\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \widehat{f}_i - f_i \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}^2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon_{n,i}^\delta}{[\text{gap}_i - \epsilon_{n,i}^\delta]_+},$$

where  $\epsilon_{n,i}^\delta = (\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1} \widehat{\eta}_i \wedge \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) / \sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi)) + \varepsilon_n^*(\delta)$ ,  $\widehat{f}_i = S_\pi \widehat{h}_i / \|S_\pi \widehat{h}_i\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$  and  $\text{gap}_i$  is the difference between  $i$ -th and  $(i+1)$ -th eigenvalue of  $R_\mu$ ,  $i \in [r]$ .

Without further details on the rich theory of spectral perturbations, note that in non-normal setting, the conditioning of eigenvalues typically comes as multiplicative factor, e.g. Bauer-Fike theorem (App. A.3).

**Comparison to other approaches.** Assume for simplicity that the RKHS aligns perfectly with  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  and that  $L = L^*$ , meaning that  $\sigma_j(A_{\Delta t} S_\pi) = \sigma_j(A_{\Delta t})$  and  $\sigma_j(R_\mu S_\pi) = \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu)$  for all  $j \leq r+1$ . TO Methods (TOM) learn  $A_{\Delta t} = e^{\Delta t L}$ , which shares the same eigenfunctions as the generator  $L$ . Worst-case analysis from (Kostic et al., 2023a, Thm. 3 and Eq. 8) for TOM ensures that  $\|\widehat{f}_i - f_i\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}^2 \leq 2|e^{\widehat{\lambda}_i \Delta t} - e^{\lambda_i \Delta t}| / [\text{gap}_i(A_{\Delta t}) - |e^{\widehat{\lambda}_i \Delta t} - e^{\lambda_i \Delta t}|]_+$ . Unfortunately this bound becomes vacuous as  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  since  $\text{gap}_i(A_{\Delta t}) \rightarrow 0$  and  $|e^{\widehat{\lambda}_i \Delta t} - e^{\lambda_i \Delta t}| \not\rightarrow 0$ . In contrast, our generator-based approach is not sensitive to time-lag, as  $\text{gap}_j(R_\mu)$  is independent of  $\Delta t$ , guaranteeing recovery of eigenfunctions even as  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ , which is crucial for capturing fast dynamics.

We now compare our method to the physics-informed approach of (Kostic et al., 2024), using the same simplifying assumptions as above for clarity. In their equation (24), they obtained:

$$\frac{|\lambda_i - \hat{\lambda}_i|}{|\mu - \lambda_i| |\mu - \hat{\lambda}_i|} - \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu)}{\sigma_r(R_\mu)}} \lesssim n^{-\frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha+\beta)}} \ln(\delta^{-1}).$$

Note that their bias term ( $\sqrt{\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu)/\sigma_r(R_\mu)}$ ) is larger than ours ( $\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu)/\sigma_r(R_\mu)$ ), while their variance term ( $\propto n^{-\alpha/2(\alpha+\beta)}$ ) is smaller than ours ( $\propto n^{-\alpha/(3\alpha+2\beta)}$ ). This is expected, as their method is restricted to self-adjoint IGs exploiting the knowledge of their structure, while our results are structure agnostic and apply to the broader class of sectorial IGs.

## 7 Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate performance of Alg. 2 with universal approximation properties. LaRRR successfully recovers the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the process’s IG. In the 1D experiment, we measure error against the ground truth, and in the molecular dynamics experiment, we obtain results consistent with independent study (Mardt et al., 2018).




Figure 1: Relative error distributions for the leading eigenvalues  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ , and  $\lambda_3$  of the generator and transfer operator, estimated from 100 independent trajectories of a 1D Langevin process on a triple-well potential. The relative errors are computed as  $(\hat{\lambda}_i - \lambda_i)/\lambda_i$  for each eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ . The violin plots show the error distribution for both IG (blue) and TO (orange), with the thick bars the mean of the distribution.

**Overdamped Langevin dynamics in 1D.** We evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithm, LaRRR, on a one-dimensional Langevin process with a triple-well potential (Schwantes and Pande, 2015). Specifically, we simulate the dynamics with inverse temperature  $\beta=1$  and potential  $U(x)=4(x^8+0.8e^{-80x^2}+0.2e^{-80(x-0.5)^2}+0.5e^{-40(x+0.5)^2})$  that consists of three Gaussian-like wells located at  $x \in \{-0.5, 0, 0.5\}$ , with a bounding term proportional to  $x^8$  to confine the equilibrium distribution primarily within the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . We generate 100 independent trajectories from this process and apply LaRRR to each trajectory in order to estimate the leading eigenvalues of the generator. By fitting 100 separate models, in Fig. 1 we assess the distribution of the relative errors in the eigenvalue estimates, defined as  $(\hat{\lambda}_i - \lambda_i)/\lambda_i$  for each eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ .

**Alanine Dipeptide.** Alanine dipeptide in water serves as a benchmark for studying dynamics due to its simplicity and metastability, where the system predominantly occupies several states. These metastable states can be identified using the dihedral angles  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . Under reasonable assumptions, the long-term dynamics can be treated as Markovian by integrating out the water degrees of freedom. In this study, we apply our method to alanine dipeptide, using interatomic




Figure 2: Two firsts non trivial eigenfunctions of the alanine dipeptide in water trained on a 250 ns simulation with  $\Delta t = 25$  ps and displayed on an independant 250ns test simulation. The color of the points corresponds to the values of the eigenfunctions.

distances between heavy atoms as input. Notably, the state space dimension is  $d = 45$ , which is intractable for the kernel based generator learning method of (Kostic et al., 2024). The recovery of metastable states corresponding to the leading two (non-trivial) eigenfunctions of IG is shown in Fig. 2.

## 8 Conclusion

We presented a first-of-its-kind method to learn continuous Markov semigroups, offering both theoretical guarantees at any time-lag and linear computational complexity in the state dimension, enabling efficient exploration of high-dimensional complex systems. Furthermore, our method applies to a broad range of Markov processes previously unaddressed. The main limitation of the current results lies in the assumption of uniform sampling. While the theory can be seamlessly adapted to multiple observations sharing the same non-uniform sampling, an important challenge is to extend it to (non-uniformly sampled) single trajectory data.

## Bibliography

- R. Alexander and D. Giannakis. Operator-theoretic framework for forecasting nonlinear time series with kernel analog techniques. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 409:132520, 2020.
- G. Andrew, R. Arora, J. Bilmes, and K. Livescu. Deep canonical correlation analysis. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1247–1255. PMLR, 2013.
- D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*. Springer, 2014.
- P. Bevanda, M. Beier, S. Kerz, A. Lederer, S. Sosnowski, and S. Hirche. KoopmanizingFlows: Diffeomorphically Learning Stable Koopman Operators. *arXiv preprint arXiv.2112.04085*, 2021. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2112.04085. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04085>.
- L. Bonati, G. Piccini, and M. Parrinello. Deep learning the slow modes for rare events sampling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(44):e2113533118, 2021. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2113533118.
- J. Bouvrie and B. Hamzi. Kernel Methods for the Approximation of Nonlinear Systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(4):2460–2492, 2017. doi: 10.1137/14096815x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/14096815x>.
- R. Bradley. *Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions*. Number vol. 1,2,3 in Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions. Kendrick Press, 2007. URL <https://books.google.fr/books?id=aEFhxAEACAAJ>.

- S. L. Brunton, M. Budišić, E. Kaiser, and J. N. Kutz. Modern Koopman Theory for Dynamical Systems. *SIAM Review*, 64(2):229–340, 2022.
- V. Cabannes and F. Bach. The Galerkin method beats graph-based approaches for spectral algorithms. In *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 238 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 451–459. PMLR, 2024.
- M. J. Colbrook. The multiverse of dynamic mode decomposition algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00137*, 2023.
- M. Crouzeix and C. Palencia. The numerical range is a  $(1+2)$ -spectral set. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 38(2):649–655, 2017.
- S. Das and D. Giannakis. Koopman spectra in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 49(2):573–607, 2020.
- C. Davis and W. M. Kahan. The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1):1–46, 1970.
- T. Devergne, V. Kostic, M. Parrinello, and M. Pontil. From biased to unbiased dynamics: An infinitesimal generator approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09028*, 2024.
- F. Fan, B. Yi, D. Rye, G. Shi, and I. R. Manchester. Learning Stable Koopman Embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06509*, 2021. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2110.06509. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.06509>.
- S. Fischer and I. Steinwart. Sobolev norm learning rates for regularized least-squares algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(205):1–38, 2020.
- L. Hogben, editor. *Handbook of Linear Algebra*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2006.
- B. Hou, S. Sanjari, N. Dahlin, S. Bose, and U. Vaidya. Sparse learning of dynamical systems in RKHS: An operator-theoretic approach. In A. Krause, E. Brunskill, K. Cho, B. Engelhardt, S. Sabato, and J. Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 13325–13352. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- P. Inzerilli, V. Kostic, K. Lounici, P. Novelli, and M. Pontil. Consistent long-term forecasting of ergodic dynamical systems, 2023.
- I. Karatzas and S. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics (113) (Book 113). Springer New York, 1991. ISBN 9780387976556.
- T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN 9783642662829.
- Y. Kawahara. Dynamic Mode Decomposition with Reproducing Kernels for Koopman Spectral Analysis. In D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- P. E. Kloeden, E. Platen, P. E. Kloeden, and E. Platen. *Stochastic differential equations*. Springer, 1992.
- S. Klus, I. Schuster, and K. Muandet. Eigendecompositions of transfer operators in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 30(1):283–315, 2019.

- S. Klus, F. Nüske, S. Peitz, J.-H. Niemann, C. Clementi, and C. Schütte. Data-driven approximation of the koopman generator: Model reduction, system identification, and control. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 406:132416, 2020. ISSN 0167-2789. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physd.2020.132416>.
- V. Kostic, P. Novelli, A. Maurer, C. Ciliberto, L. Rosasco, and M. Pontil. Learning dynamical systems via Koopman operator regression in reproducing kernel hilbert spaces. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- V. R. Kostic, K. Lounici, P. Novelli, and massimiliano pontil. Sharp spectral rates for koopman operator learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Lt3jqxsbV0>.
- V. R. Kostic, P. Novelli, R. Grazzi, K. Lounici, and M. Pontil. Deep projection networks for learning time-homogeneous dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09912*, 2023b.
- V. R. Kostic, P. Novelli, R. Grazzi, K. Lounici, et al. Learning invariant representations of time-homogeneous stochastic dynamical systems. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023c.
- V. R. Kostic, K. Lounici, H. Halconruy, T. Devergne, and M. Pontil. Learning the infinitesimal generator of stochastic diffusion processes, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.12940>.
- J. N. Kutz, S. L. Brunton, B. W. Brunton, and J. L. Proctor. *Dynamic Mode Decomposition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016.
- A. Laio and M. Parrinello. Escaping free-energy minima. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(20):12562–12566, 2002. doi: 10.1073/pnas.202427399.
- Q. Li, F. Dietrich, E. M. Bollt, and I. G. Kevrekidis. Extended dynamic mode decomposition with dictionary learning: A data-driven adaptive spectral decomposition of the koopman operator. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 27(10), 2017.
- Z. Li, D. Meunier, M. Mollenhauer, and A. Gretton. Optimal rates for regularized conditional mean embedding learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- B. Lusch, J. N. Kutz, and S. L. Brunton. Deep learning for universal linear embeddings of nonlinear dynamics. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2018.
- A. J. Majda, C. Franzke, and D. Crommelin. Normal forms for reduced stochastic climate models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(10):3649–3653, 2009.
- A. Mardt, L. Pasquali, H. Wu, and F. Noé. VAMPnets for deep learning of molecular kinetics. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2018.
- L. Pillaud-Vivien and F. Bach. Kernelized diffusion maps. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5236–5259. PMLR, 2023.
- A. Quarteroni, R. Sacco, and F. Saleri. *Numerical mathematics*, volume 37. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- M. Reed and B. Simon. *I: Functional Analysis*. Academic Press, 12 1980. ISBN 9780125850506.
- C. Schütte and W. Huisinga. Biomolecular conformations can be identified as metastable sets of molecular dynamics. In *Special Volume, Computational Chemistry*, volume 10 of *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, pages 699–744. Elsevier, 2003. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-8659\(03\)10013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1570-8659(03)10013-0).

- C. Schütte, S. Klus, and C. Hartmann. Overcoming the timescale barrier in molecular dynamics: Transfer operators, variational principles and machine learning. *Acta Numerica*, 32:517–673, 2023.
- C. R. Schwantes and V. S. Pande. Modeling Molecular Kinetics with tICA and the Kernel Trick. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 11(2):600–608, 2015.
- K. Shmilovich and A. L. Ferguson. Girsanov reweighting enhanced sampling technique (grest): On-the-fly data-driven discovery of and enhanced sampling in slow collective variables. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 127(15):3497–3517, 2023.
- I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer New York, 2008.
- W. Tian and H. Wu. Kernel embedding based variational approach for low-dimensional approximation of dynamical systems. *Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics*, 21(3):635–659, 2021.
- L. N. Trefethen and M. Embree. *Spectra and Pseudospectra: The Behavior of Nonnormal Matrices and Operators*. Princeton University Press, 2020. ISBN 9780691213101. doi: doi:10.1515/9780691213101. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691213101>.
- G. Turri, V. Kostic, P. Novelli, and M. Pontil. A randomized algorithm to solve reduced rank operator regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17348*, 2023.
- M. O. Williams, , C. W. Rowley, and I. G. Kevrekidis. A kernel-based method for data-driven Koopman spectral analysis. *Journal of Computational Dynamics*, 2(2):247–265, 2015.
- H. Wu and F. Noé. Variational Approach for Learning Markov Processes from Time Series Data. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 30(1):23–66, 2019.
- E. Yeung, S. Kundu, and N. Hodas. Learning deep neural network representations for koopman operators of nonlinear dynamical systems. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4832–4839. IEEE, 2019.
- K. Yosida. *Functional analysis*, volume 123. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- B. Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- J. Zabczyk. *Mathematical Control Theory: An Introduction*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Springer International Publishing, 2020. ISBN 9783030447762. URL <https://books.google.it/books?id=45tfzQEACAAJ>.
- W. Zhang, T. Li, and C. Schütte. Solving eigenvalue pdes of metastable diffusion processes using artificial neural networks. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 465:111377, 2022. ISSN 0021-9991. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111377>.
- L. Zwald and G. Blanchard. On the Convergence of Eigenspaces in Kernel Principal Component Analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2005.



# Appendix

The supplementary material of this paper is structured into several key sections, each providing detailed insights and/or formal proofs of all our results.

- Section A summarizes key results on Markov semigroups, operator regression in RKHS spaces and spectral perturbation theory, which are intended to ease the understanding of our main contributions.
- In Section B we briefly refer to prior works upon which reduced rank regression algorithms are build, and, importantly, develop extensions of LaRRR to the setting of non-uniformly sampled data from multiple independent trajectories.
- Finally, Section C guides the reader through the proof of our main results in Theorems 1 and 2, also providing the theoretical guarantees for the LaRRR for non-uniformly sampled data.

## A Background

### A.1 Markov semigroups

Markov processes, where the future depends only on the present, are key to modeling physical, biological, and financial systems. This class includes Itô diffusions, time-dependent or singular drift processes with continuous paths, and jump processes like Poisson, Lévy, and Hawkes. Here, we focus on continuous-path Markov processes, primarily Itô diffusions. All Markov processes can be defined both as time-dependent random functions and by their laws, via measures on path space. A key tool is the infinitesimal generator, a linear operator on observables.

We provide here some basics on operator theory for Markov processes. Let  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ) and  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  be a  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued time-homogeneous Markov process defined on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})$  where  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(X_s, s \leq t)$  is the natural filtration of  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ . The dynamics of a continuous-time Markov process  $X$  is described by a family of probability densities  $(p_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t \in E | X_0 = x) = \int_E p_t(x, y) dy, \quad (23)$$

and *transfer operators*  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  such that for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and measurable function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$A_t f = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y) p_t(\cdot, y) dy = \mathbb{E}[f(X_t) | X_0 = \cdot]. \quad (24)$$

The transfer operator is essential for understanding the dynamics of  $X$ . We examine its action on  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ , noting the presence of an *invariant measure*  $\pi$ , which satisfies  $A_t^* \pi = \pi$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . In theory of Markov processes, the family  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  is referred to as the *Markov semigroup* associated to the process  $X$ . The process  $X$  is then characterized by the *infinitesimal generator* (IG)  $L : \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  of the family  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  defined by

$$L = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{A_t - I}{t}. \quad (25)$$

In other words,  $L$  characterizes the linear differential equation  $\partial_t A_t f = L A_t f$  satisfied by the transfer operator. The spectrum of the IG can be difficult to capture due to the potential unboundedness of  $L$ . To circumvent this problem, one can focus on an auxiliary operator, the resolvent, which shares the same eigenfunctions as  $L$  and becomes compact under certain conditions. The following result can be found in Yosida's book (Yosida (2012), Chap. IX) : For

every  $\mu > 0$ , the operator  $(\mu I - L)$  admits an inverse  $L_\mu = (\mu I - L)^{-1}$  that is a continuous operator on  $\mathcal{X}$  and

$$(\mu I - L)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} A_t dt.$$

The operator  $L_\mu$  is the *resolvent* of  $L$  and the corresponding *resolvent set* of  $L$  is defined by

$$\rho(L) = \{\mu \in \mathbb{C} \mid (\mu I - L) \text{ is bijective and } L_\mu \text{ is continuous}\}.$$

In fact,  $\rho(L)$  contains all real positive numbers and  $(\mu I - L)^{-1}$  is bounded. In particular, the resolvent of a *sectorial operator* (see definition (39)) is uniformly bounded outside a sector containing the spectrum. Its spectral decomposition writes

$$L = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_i g_i \otimes f_i \tag{26}$$

with eigenvalues  $(\lambda_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$  and corresponding left and right eigenfunctions  $f_i, g_i \in L^2$ , respectively.

We detail the two examples of processes with sectorial IG discussed in the paper: the overdamped Langevin process and the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

**Example 1 (Overdamped Langevin - detailed)** Let  $\sigma$ ,  $k_b$ , and  $T \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ . The *overdamped Langevin* dynamics of a particle in a potential  $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by the SDE:  $dX_t = -\gamma^{-1} \nabla V(X_t) dt + \sqrt{2(k_b T / \gamma)} dW_t$  and  $X_0 = x$ , where  $\gamma$ ,  $k_b$ , and  $T$  are the friction coefficient, Boltzmann constant, and system temperature, respectively. The invariant measure is the *Boltzmann distribution*  $\pi(dx) = Z^{-1} e^{-V(x)/(k_b T)} dx$ , where  $Z$  is a normalizing constant. Its infinitesimal generator is  $Lf = -\gamma^{-1} \nabla V^\top \nabla f + (k_b T / \gamma) \Delta f$ , for  $f \in \mathcal{W}_\pi^{1,2}(\mathcal{X})$ . Since  $\int (-Lf)g d\pi = -\int \left[ \nabla \left( (k_b T / \gamma) \nabla f(x) \frac{e^{-(k_b T / \gamma)^{-1} V(x)}}{Z} \right) \right] g(x) dx = (k_b T / \gamma) \int \nabla f^\top \nabla g d\pi = \int f(-Lg) d\pi$ , the generator  $L$  is self-adjoint. In dissipative systems, the IG  $L$  is sectorial, with its spectrum usually in the left half-plane. For confining potentials, the spectrum is discrete, featuring 0 as the largest eigenvalue, which corresponds to the distribution  $\pi$ .

**Example 2 (Ornstein-Uhlenbeck - detailed)** The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process with drift is governed by the SDE  $dX_t = AX_t + BdW_t$ , with  $X_0 = x$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the drift matrix and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the diffusion matrix. This models systems like the Vasicek interest rate, damped harmonic oscillators, and neural dynamics, where fluctuations return to equilibrium. If the real parts of  $A$ 's eigenvalues are negative, the OU process has an invariant Gaussian distribution with covariance  $\Sigma_\infty$  satisfying Lyapunov's equation:  $A\Sigma_\infty + \Sigma_\infty A^\top = -BB^\top$ . Its infinitesimal generator is defined, for  $f \in L^2$ , by  $Lf(x) = \nabla f(x)^\top Ax + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[B^\top (\nabla^2 f(x)) B]$ . The IG has a discrete spectrum with eigenvalues related to the drift matrix  $A$ , where 0 corresponds to the distribution  $\pi$ , and the rest are negative, reflecting relaxation rates.

## A.2 Operator Regression in RKHS spaces

Recalling the operator regression problem for learning the resolvent of the generator, for the reader's convenience we state that the learning problem is well posed, the proof of which is essentially the same as in Kostic et al. (2022).

**Proposition 2.** *Given  $\mu > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  be the RKHS associated to kernel  $k: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $S_\pi \in \text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{L}_\pi^2)$ , and let  $P_{\mathcal{H}}$  be the orthogonal projector onto the closure of  $\text{Im}(S_\pi) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a finite rank operator  $G: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that*

$$\mathcal{R}(G) \leq \underbrace{\|S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \|R_\mu S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}}^2}_{\mathcal{R}_0} + \underbrace{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{H}})R_\mu S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{L}_\pi^2)}^2}_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}}(G)} + \varepsilon.$$

Consequently, when  $k$  is universal, the excess risk can be made arbitrarily small.  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}}(G) \leq \varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* First, note that we can decompose

$$\mathcal{R}(G) \leq \underbrace{\|S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}}^2 - \|R_\mu S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}}^2}_{\mathcal{R}_0} + \underbrace{\|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G\|_{\text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{L}_\pi^2)}^2}_{\mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}}(G)},$$

as in (Kostic et al., 2022, Proposition 4) but now applied with additional integration. Next, since  $S_\pi \in \text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{W}_\pi^\mu(\mathcal{X}))$ , according to the spectral theorem for positive self-adjoint operators,  $S_\pi$  admits an SVD  $S_\pi = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_j \ell_j \otimes h_j$ . Recalling that  $[\cdot]_r$  denotes the  $r$ -truncated SVD, i.e.  $[S_\pi]_r = \sum_{j \in [r]} \sigma_j \ell_j \otimes h_j$ , since  $\|S_\pi - [S_\pi]_r\|_{\text{HS}}^2 = \sum_{j > r} \sigma_j^2$ , for every  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|S_\pi - [S_\pi]_r\|_{\text{HS}} < \mu\delta/3$ . Consequently since all the eigenvalues of  $L$  have non-positive real part,  $\|R_\mu(S_\pi - [S_\pi]_r)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \|S_\pi - [S_\pi]_r\|_{\text{HS}}/\mu \leq \delta/3$ . Next since  $\text{Im}(P_{\mathcal{H}}R_\mu S_\pi) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi))$ , for any  $j \in [r]$ , there exists  $g_j \in \mathcal{H}$  s.t.  $\|P_{\mathcal{H}}R_\mu \ell_j - Z_\mu g_j\| \leq \frac{\delta}{3r}$ , and, denoting  $B_r := \sum_{j \in [r]} \sigma_j g_j \otimes h_j$  we conclude  $\|P_{\mathcal{H}}R_\mu [S_\pi]_r - S_\pi B_r\|_{\text{HS}} \leq \delta/3$ . Finally we recall that the set of non-defective matrices is dense in the space of matrices Trefethen and Embree (2020), implying that the set of non-defective rank- $r$  linear operators is dense in the space of rank- $r$  linear operators on a Hilbert space. Therefore, there exists a non-defective  $G \in \text{B}_r(\mathcal{H})$  such that  $\|G - B_r\|_{\text{HS}} < \delta/(3\sigma_1(S_\pi))$ . So, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G\|_{\text{HS}} &\leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{H}})R_\mu S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}} + \|R_\mu S_\pi - [R_\mu S_\pi]_r\|_{\text{HS}} + \|[R_\mu S_\pi]_r - S_\pi B_r\|_{\text{HS}} + \|S_\pi(G - B_r)\|_{\text{HS}} \\ &\leq \|(I - P_{\mathcal{H}})R_\mu S_\pi\|_{\text{HS}} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

□

### A.3 Spectral perturbation theory

Recalling that for a bounded linear operator  $A$  on some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  the *resolvent set* of the operator  $A$  is defined as  $\text{Res}(A) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : A - \lambda I \text{ is bijective}\}$ , and its *spectrum*  $\text{Sp}(A) := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\text{Res}(A)\}$ , let  $\lambda \subseteq \text{Sp}(A)$  be isolated part of spectra, i.e. both  $\lambda$  and  $\mu := \text{Sp}(A) \setminus \lambda$  are closed in  $\text{Sp}(A)$ . Then, the *Riesz spectral projector*  $P_\lambda : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is defined by

$$P_\lambda := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Gamma (zI - A)^{-1} dz, \quad (27)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is any contour in the resolvent set  $\text{Res}(A)$  with  $\lambda$  in its interior and separating  $\lambda$  from  $\mu$ . Indeed, we have that  $P_\lambda^2 = P_\lambda$  and  $\mathcal{H} = \text{Im}(P_\lambda) \oplus \text{Ker}(P_\lambda)$  where  $\text{Im}(P_\lambda)$  and  $\text{Ker}(P_\lambda)$  are both invariant under  $A$  and  $\text{Sp}(A|_{\text{Im}(P_\lambda)}) = \lambda$ ,  $\text{Sp}(A|_{\text{Ker}(P_\lambda)}) = \mu$ . Moreover,  $P_\lambda + P_\mu = I$  and  $P_\lambda P_\mu = P_\mu P_\lambda = 0$ .

Finally if  $A$  is *compact* operator, then the Riesz-Schauder theorem, see e.g. Reed and Simon (1980), assures that  $\text{Sp}(T)$  is a discrete set having no limit points except possibly  $\lambda = 0$ . Moreover, for any nonzero  $\lambda \in \text{Sp}(T)$ , then  $\lambda$  is an *eigenvalue* (i.e. it belongs to the point spectrum) of finite multiplicity, and, hence, we can deduce the spectral decomposition in the form

$$A = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Sp}(A)} \lambda P_\lambda, \quad (28)$$

where geometric multiplicity of  $\lambda$ ,  $r_\lambda := \text{rank}(P_\lambda)$ , is bounded by the algebraic multiplicity of  $\lambda$ . If additionally  $A$  is normal operator, i.e.  $AA^* = A^*A$ , then  $P_\lambda = P_\lambda^*$  is orthogonal projector for each  $\lambda \in \text{Sp}(A)$  and  $P_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{r_\lambda} \psi_i \otimes \psi_i$ , where  $\psi_i$  are normalized eigenfunctions of  $A$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  and  $r_\lambda$  is both algebraic and geometric multiplicity of  $\lambda$ .

Next we review well-known perturbation bounds for eigenfunctions and spectral projectors of normal compact operators, that is when  $AA^* = A^*A$ .

**Proposition 3** (Davis and Kahan (1970)). *Let  $A$  be compact self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Given a pair  $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{f}) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\|\hat{f}\| = 1$ , let  $\lambda$  be the eigenvalue of  $A$  that*

is closest to  $\widehat{\lambda}$  and let  $f$  be its normalized eigenfunction. If  $\widehat{g} := \min\{|\widehat{\lambda} - \lambda| \mid \lambda \in \text{Sp}(A) \setminus \{\widehat{\lambda}\}\} > 0$ , then  $\sin(\angle(\widehat{f}, f)) \leq \|A\widehat{f} - \widehat{\lambda}\widehat{f}\| / \widehat{g}$ .

**Proposition 4** (Sinclair's theorem, see Zwald and Blanchard (2005)). *Let  $A$  and  $\widehat{A}$  be two compact operators on a separable Hilbert space. For nonempty index set  $J \subset \mathbb{N}$  let*

$$\text{gap}_J(A) := \min\{|\lambda_i(A) - \lambda_j(A)| \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus J, j \in J\}$$

denote the spectral gap w.r.t  $J$  and let  $P_J$  and  $\widehat{P}_J$  be the corresponding spectral projectors of  $A$  and  $\widehat{A}$ , respectively. If  $A$  is normal and for some  $\|A - \widehat{A}\| < \text{gap}_J(A)$ , then

$$\|P_J - \widehat{P}_J\| \leq \frac{\|A - \widehat{A}\|}{\text{gap}_J(A)}.$$

For non-normal operators, spectral perturbation becomes much more involved. Two core objects in it are the pseudospectrum and the numerical range, which we review next.

**Definition 1** (Pseudospectrum). *Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , the  $\epsilon$ -pseudospectrum of a bounded operator  $A$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  (w.r.t. the spectral norm) is a set in the complex plane that consists of all eigenvalues of all  $\epsilon$ -perturbations of  $A$  (w.r.t. spectral norm). Formally, it is defined as*

$$\text{Sp}_\epsilon(A) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid z \in \text{Sp}(A + E), \text{ for some operator } E \text{ s.t. } \|E\| \leq \epsilon\}.$$

Since, it provides insights on the sensitivity of eigenvalues, pseudospectrum is the tool of choice in the study of non-normal operators. Equivalently, it can be expressed via resolvent

$$\text{Sp}_\epsilon(A) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \|(zI - A)^{-1}\|^{-1} \leq \epsilon \right\},$$

implying that the lower bounds on the resolvent's norm lead to bounds on the eigenvalue sensitivity to the perturbations. Whenever the operator is normal, that is it commutes with its adjoint, indeed we have that  $\text{dist}(z, \text{Sp}(A)) = \min_{\lambda \in \text{Sp}(A)} |z - \lambda| = \epsilon$  for all  $z \in \partial \text{Sp}_\epsilon(A)$ . On the other hand, when operators are not normal, distance of the eigenvalues of the perturbed operator to the spectrum is typically amplified. A general result showing this is the following.

**Proposition 5** (Bauer-Fike theorem, see Trefethen and Embree (2020)). *Let  $A$  be diagonalizable bounded operator on a separable Hilbert space, that is there exists a bounded operator  $X$  with bounded inverse  $X^{-1}$  such that  $X^{-1}AX$  is diagonal operator. If  $B_\epsilon := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq \epsilon\}$  denotes the  $\epsilon$ -ball in  $\mathbb{C}$ , then*

$$\text{Sp}(A) + B_\epsilon \subseteq \text{Sp}_\epsilon(A) \subseteq \text{Sp}(A) + B_{\epsilon\kappa(X)},$$

where  $\kappa(X) = \|X\| \|X^{-1}\|$  is the condition number of  $X$ . Consequently,  $\text{dist}(z, \text{Sp}(A)) \leq \epsilon\kappa(X)$  for all  $z \in \partial \text{Sp}_\epsilon(A)$ .

We recommend a book by Trefethen and Embree (2020) for an in depth study of nonnormality, pseudospectra and related quantities.

**Definition 2** (Numerical Range). *The field of values, known also as numerical range, of a bounded operator  $A$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  is a set in the complex plane that is closely related to the spectrum of  $A$ . Formally, it is defined as*

$$\text{F}(A) = \left\{ \frac{\langle Av, v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} : v \in \mathbb{H}, v \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Due to Hausdorff's theorem, numerical range is a convex subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  and that its closure contains the spectrum of  $A$ . It is one of the key objects in the study of operator semigroups, since it is known that

$$e^{t \max\{\Re(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \text{Sp}(A)\}} \leq \|e^{tA}\| \leq e^{t \max\{\Re(z) \mid z \in \text{F}(A)\}}.$$

Finally, we conclude this review with the important result on how to bound analytic functions of an operator via its numerical range.

**Theorem 3** (Crouzeix’s Theorem, see Crouzeix and Palencia (2017)). *Let  $A$  be a bounded linear operator on a Hilbert space  $\mathbb{H}$ , and let  $f$  be any analytic function. Then*

$$\|f(A)\| \leq (1 + \sqrt{2}) \max_{z \in \text{cl } F(A)} |f(z)|,$$

where  $\text{cl } F(A)$  denotes the closure of numerical range of  $A$ .

## B Methods and their extension to non-uniform sampling

In this section we discuss the Algorithms 1 and 2, together with their simple extensions to the case of learning from multiple independent copies of the process over a finite time-horizon.

For computationally efficient primal and dual form of the solution of general vector-valued reduced rank regression problem we refer to (Turri et al., 2023, Proposition 2.2). Coupling this result with classical result on solving low rank eigenvalue problems, see e.g. (Kostic et al., 2022, Theorem 2) for application in the context of TO, we obtain the final form of two algorithms.

Now, let us discuss the setting where dataset  $\mathcal{D}_n = (x_{i,t_{j-1}})_{i \in [n], j \in [\ell+1]}$  consisting of  $n$  trajectories sampled at the same (possibly non-uniform) times  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_\ell$ . This is typical when we observe particle systems where  $n$  copies of the same process are tracked.

In this setting, learning transfer operators becomes difficult task since, due to diverse time-lags one ends up with the non-convex optimization problems. Instead, learning IG of the process by LaRRR is direct. Namely, we simply have that  $\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2} \llbracket \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2} \widehat{H}_m \rrbracket_r$  where in this setting

$$\widehat{C}_\gamma = \frac{1}{n(\ell+1)} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [\ell+1]} \phi(x_{i,t_{j-1}}) \otimes \phi(x_{i,t_{j-1}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{H}_m = \sum_{j \in [\ell+1]} m_{j-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \phi(x_{i,t_0}) \otimes \phi(x_{i,t_{j-1}}) \right)$$

where now  $m_0 = \frac{t_1-t_0}{2} e^{-\mu t_0}$ ,  $m_\ell = \frac{t_\ell-t_{\ell-1}}{2} e^{-\mu t_\ell}$  and  $m_j = \frac{t_{j+1}-t_{j-1}}{2} e^{-\mu t_j}$  otherwise for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell-1$ .

In this case, the sampling operator becomes

$$\widehat{S}h = (h(x_{i,t_{j-1}}))_{j \in [\ell+1], i \in [n]} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(\ell+1)}} \left[ h(x_{1,t_0}), \dots, h(x_{n,t_0}), h(x_{1,t_1}), \dots, h(x_{n,t_\ell}) \right]^\top,$$

implying that the matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n(\ell+1) \times n(\ell+1)}$  is defined as

$$M_{i,jn+i} := \begin{cases} (\ell+1) m_j & , i \in [n], 0 \leq j \leq \ell, \\ 0 & , \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Therefore, we can readily implement Algorithms 1 and 2 also in this setting of non-uniformly sampled data. Moreover, analyzing such an estimator, as we discuss in Appendix C.7, from the statistical perspective, becomes an easier task than a single trajectory analysis. This is due to the fact that we observe  $n$  iid copies allows the use of classical concentration inequalities without the need to assess the impact of mixing.

## C Statistical learning theory

In this section we present the proof of main results from Section 6, along with additional discussions for the reader’s convenience. We start presenting the main assumptions, followed by the results on controlling the approximation error and estimator’s variance, in order to conclude with proofs of the main results on the operator norm error and spectral learning bounds.

To that end, we first decompose the operator norm error  $\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) = \|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi \widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$  of the Laplace transform-based Reduced Rank Regression algorithm (LaRRR)  $\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \leq & \underbrace{\|(I - P_{\mathcal{H}})R_\mu S_\pi\|}_{\text{(0) representation bias}} + \underbrace{\|P_{\mathcal{H}}R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}\|}_{\text{(I) regularization bias}} + \underbrace{\|S_\pi(G_{\mu,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(II) rank reduction bias}} + \underbrace{\|S_\pi(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(III) integration bias}} + \\ & \underbrace{\|S_\pi(\widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - \widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r)\|}_{\text{(IV) estimator variance}}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where  $P_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the orthogonal projection in  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  onto the  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi))$ ,  $G_{\mu,\gamma} = C_\gamma^{-1}H_\mu$  and  $G_{\mu,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2}[[C_\gamma^{-1/2}H_\mu]]_r$  are the population KRR and RRR models for the risk (9), respectively, while  $\widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma} = C_\gamma^{-1}\widetilde{H}_m$  and  $\widetilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2}[[C_\gamma^{-1/2}\widetilde{H}_m]]_r$  are the population KRR and RRR models for the approximated risk (12), and, for simplicity, we abbreviate  $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2}$ .

## C.1 Assumptions

In this section we discuss the assumptions that are necessary to study the learning problem. They concern the interplay between the resolvent of IG and the chosen RKHS space, which is encoded in the injection operator  $S_\pi$  and the restriction of the resolvent to the RKHS  $Z_\mu = R_\mu S_\pi$ .

We start by observing that  $S_\pi \in \text{HS}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}))$ , according to the spectral theorem for positive self-adjoint operators, has an SVD, i.e. there exists at most countable positive sequence  $(\sigma_j)_{j \in J}$ , where  $J := \{1, 2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , and ortho-normal systems  $(\ell_j)_{j \in J}$  and  $(h_j)_{j \in J}$  of  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi))$  and  $\text{Ker}(S_\pi)^\perp$ , respectively, such that  $S_\pi h_j = \sigma_j \ell_j$  and  $S_\pi^* \ell_j = \sigma_j h_j$ ,  $j \in J$ . Now, given  $\alpha \geq 0$ , let us define scaled injection operator  $S_{\pi,\alpha} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  as

$$S_{\pi,\alpha} := \sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^\alpha \ell_j \otimes h_j. \quad (31)$$

Clearly, we have that  $S_\pi = S_{\pi,1}$ , while  $\text{Im} S_{\pi,0} = \text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi))$ . Next, we equip  $\text{Im}(S_{\pi,\alpha})$  with a norm  $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$  to build an interpolation space.

$$[\mathcal{H}]_\alpha := \left\{ f \in \text{Im}(S_{\pi,\alpha}) \mid \|f\|_\alpha^2 := \sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^{-2\alpha} \langle f, \ell_j \rangle^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

We remark that for  $\alpha = 1$  the space  $[\mathcal{H}]_\alpha$  is just an RKHS  $\mathcal{H}$  seen as a subspace of  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . Moreover, we have the following injections

$$[\mathcal{H}]_{\alpha_1} \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{H}]_1 \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{H}]_{\alpha_2} \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{H}]_0 = \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}),$$

where  $\alpha_1 \geq 1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq 0$ .

In addition, from **(BK)** we also have that RKHS  $\mathcal{H}$  can be embedded into  $L_\pi^\infty(\mathcal{X})$ , i.e. for some  $\tau \in (0, 1]$

$$[\mathcal{H}]_1 \hookrightarrow [\mathcal{H}]_\tau \hookrightarrow L_\pi^\infty(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}),$$

Now, according to Fischer and Steinwart (2020), if  $S_{\pi,\tau,\infty} : [\mathcal{H}]_\tau \hookrightarrow L_\pi^\infty(\mathcal{X})$  denotes the injection operator, its boundedness implies the polynomial decay of the singular values of  $S_\pi$ , i.e.  $\sigma_j^2(S_\pi) \lesssim j^{-1/\tau}$ ,  $j \in J$ , and the following condition is assured

**(KE) Kernel embedding property:** there exists  $\tau \in [\beta, 1]$  such that

$$c_\tau := \|S_{\pi,\tau,\infty}\|^2 = \text{ess sup}_{x \sim \pi} \sum_{j \in J} \sigma_j^{2\tau} |\ell_j(x)|^2 < +\infty. \quad (32)$$

Assumption **(SD)** allows one to quantify the effective dimension of  $\mathcal{H}$  in ambient space  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ , while the kernel embedding property **(KE)** allows one to estimate the norms of whitened feature maps

$$\xi(x) := C_\gamma^{-1/2} \phi(x) \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (33)$$

as the following result states.

**Lemma 1** (Fischer and Steinwart (2020)). *Let **(KE)** hold for some  $\tau \in [\beta, 1]$  and  $c_\tau \in (0, \infty)$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi} \|\xi(x)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{c_\beta^\beta}{1-\beta} \gamma^{-\beta} & , \beta < 1, \\ c_\tau \gamma^{-1} & , \beta = 1. \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi\|_\infty^2 = \text{ess sup}_{x \sim \pi} \|\xi(x)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq c_\tau \gamma^{-\tau}. \quad (34)$$

Next, we discuss assumption **(RC)** that quantifies the regularity of the problem w.r.t. the chosen RKHS. Typical form in which well-specifiedness of the operator regression problem is expressed, see e.g. Li et al. (2022), is to ask that  $\mathcal{H}$  is invariant under the action of the operator. In our setting, this reads as  $\text{Im}(Z_\mu) \subseteq \text{Im}(S_\pi)$ . This can be relaxed (or straightened) by using interpolation spaces  $[\mathcal{H}]_\alpha = \text{Im}(S_{\pi,\alpha})$ , which leads to **(RC)**. Indeed, according to (Zabczyk, 2020, Theorem 2.2), the condition **(RC)** is equivalent to  $\text{Im}(Z_\mu) = \mu \text{Im}(R_\mu S_\pi) \subseteq \text{Im}(S_{\pi,\alpha})$ , i.e.  $G_{\mathcal{H}}^\alpha := \mu S_{\pi,\alpha}^\dagger S_\pi^* R_\mu S_\pi = \mu S_{\pi,\alpha}^\dagger H_\mu$  is bounded operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mu R_\mu S_\pi = S_{\pi,\alpha} G_{\mathcal{H}}^\alpha$ . In this case we have that  $\mu H_\mu = S_\pi^* (\mu R_\mu) S_\pi = S_\pi^* S_{\pi,\alpha} G_{\mathcal{H}}^\alpha$ , and, thus,  $H_\mu H_\mu^* \preceq (\|G_{\mathcal{H}}^\alpha\|/\mu)^2 C^{1+\alpha}$ . We note that re-scaling with  $\mu$  is motivated by the fact that  $\|\mu R_\mu\| \leq 1$ .

We conclude this section discussing the assumptions for the case when RKHS is build as a span of some finite dictionary of functions  $(z_j)_{j \in [N]}$ ,  $z_j : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $j \in [N]$ ,

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ h_u = \sum_{j \in [N]} u_j z_j \mid u = (u_1, \dots, u_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \right\}. \quad (35)$$

The choice of the dictionary, instrumental in designing successful learning algorithms, may be based on prior knowledge on the process or learned from data (Kostic et al., 2023b; Mardt et al., 2018). The space  $\mathcal{H}$  is naturally equipped with the geometry induced by the norm  $\|h_u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 := \sum_{j=1}^N u_j^2$ . Moreover, every operator  $A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  can be identified with matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  by  $Ah_u = z(\cdot)^\top A u$ . In the following, we will refer to  $A$  and  $A$  as the same object, explicitly stating the difference when necessary.

In this setting all spaces  $[\mathcal{H}]_\alpha$  are finite dimensional, and, hence,  $\text{Im}(Z_\mu) \subset \text{Im}(S_\pi)$  implies also  $\text{Im}(Z_\mu) \subset \text{Im}(S_{\pi,\alpha})$  for every  $\alpha > 0$ . This choice makes **(RC)** for different  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$  all equivalent to asking for  $\mathcal{H}$  to contain *all* eigenfunctions of the generator. Moreover, in this setting we can set  $\beta = \tau = 0$  and observe that in the limit  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$  we have

$$\text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1} C) \rightarrow N \quad \text{and} \quad \|\xi\|_\infty^2 \rightarrow \text{ess sup}_{x \sim \pi} \langle \phi(x), C^\dagger \phi(x) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty.$$

## C.2 Approximation error analysis

In this section we study the approximation errors, i.e. bias terms in (30).

### C.2.1 Representation bias

The first term is the representation error that one incurs only when the hypothesis space  $\mathcal{H}$  is not dense in the true domain  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . That is, if one uses universal kernels, such as RBF Gaussian kernel  $k(x, y) = e^{-\|x-y\|^2/l^2}$  with some length-scale  $l > 0$ , then  $\|(I - P_{\mathcal{H}})R_\mu S_\pi\| = 0$ . On the other hand, when one uses the finite-dimensional RKHS (35), this term quantifies the loss of information due to the restriction of the model to  $\mathcal{H}$ . In recent work by Kostic et al. (2023b) it has been shown how to learn dictionary of functions with neural networks so that the minimal representation error is incurred from perspective of TOs. While, one can use the same method for learning an appropriate kernel for the estimation of the resolvent, an interesting future directing would be to develop representation learning based on the Laplace transform.

### C.2.2 Regularization bias

We control this term using the regularity assumption. The result is stated in the following proposition whose proof we omit since it follows exactly the same lines as (Kostic et al., 2023a, Proposition 5) with the only difference that **(RC)** assumption holds for  $R_\mu$  instead of TO with fixed lag-time.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $G_{\mu,\gamma} = C_\gamma^{-1}H_\mu$  for  $\gamma > 0$ , and  $P_{\mathcal{H}}: \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  be the orthogonal projector onto  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi))$ . If the assumptions **(BK)**, **(SD)** and **(RC)** hold, then*

$$\|G_{\mu,\gamma}\| \leq \begin{cases} (c_\alpha/\mu)c_{\mathcal{H}}^{(\alpha-1)/2} & , \alpha \in [1, 2], \\ (c_\alpha/\mu)\gamma^{(\alpha-1)/2} & , \alpha \in (0, 1], \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_{\mathcal{H}}R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}\| \leq (c_\alpha/\mu)\gamma^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (36)$$

While the previous result gives us the means to study the learning bounds when  $\mathcal{H}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ , whenever the RKHS is finite-dimensional and not learned, the regularization bias is usually coupled with the representation bias and one studies the decay of  $\|R_\mu S_\pi - S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}\|$  as a function of  $\gamma > 0$  w.r.t.  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for the choice of dictionary that forms basis of  $\mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$  in the limit.

### C.2.3 Rank reduction bias

To control of this term, observe that

$$\|S_\pi(G_{\mu,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r)\| = \left\| C_\gamma^{1/2} C_\gamma^{-1} H_\mu (I - P_r) \right\| \leq \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2} H_\mu (I - P_r) \right\| \leq \sigma_{r+1}(B), \quad (37)$$

where  $P_r$  is the orthogonal projector onto the leading right singular space of operator  $B = C_\gamma^{-1/2} H_\mu$ .

This bound on the bias can be further analyzed using the **(RC)** assumption, as indicated by the following proposition essentially proven in (Kostic et al., 2023a, Propositions 6 and 7).

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $B := C_\gamma^{-1/2} H_\mu$ , let **(RC)** hold for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ . Then for every  $j \in J$*

$$\sigma_j^2(Z_\mu) - (c_\alpha/\mu)^2 c_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha/2} \gamma^{\alpha/2} \leq \sigma_j^2(B) \leq \sigma_j^2(Z_\mu). \quad (38)$$

### C.2.4 Integration bias

Diversely to the previous terms analyzed up to now, the control of the integration bias term is truly novel technical contribution in the study of TO and IG data-driven methods. This necessary step allows one to connect empirical objects to the population ones by approximating the integral with the finite sum.

We start with the key result showing that, for the class of sectorial IGs, we can control the difference between the resolvent and its finite-sum approximation via TOs of different times-lags using Crouzeix's theorem 3.

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $L$  be a (stable) sectorial operator with angle  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$ , that is*

$$\mathbb{F}(L) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_\theta^- := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Re(z) \leq 0 \wedge |\Im(z)| \leq -\Re(z) \tan(\theta)\}, \quad (39)$$

where  $\mathbb{F}(L) = \left\{ \langle Lf, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2} / \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2}^2 : f \in \text{dom}(L) \setminus \{0\} \right\}$  denotes the numerical range of  $L$ , and we let  $(m_j)_{j=0}^\ell$  be given by the trapezoid rule

$$m_j = \begin{cases} \frac{t_1 - t_0}{2} e^{-\mu t_0} & , j = 0, \\ \frac{t_{j+1} - t_{j-1}}{2} e^{-\mu t_j} & , 1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1, \\ \frac{t_\ell - t_{\ell-1}}{2} e^{-\mu t_\ell} & , j = \ell, \end{cases} \quad (40)$$



where  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_\ell$  is (possibly non-uniform) discretization in time. Then, for every  $\mu > 0$ ,

$$\|R_\mu - \tilde{R}_m\| \leq 2t_1 + \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})\pi^2 \kappa^2}{18e^2 \cos^2(\theta)} \Delta t + \frac{e^{-\mu t_\ell}}{\mu}, \quad (41)$$

where  $\Delta t = \max_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1})$  is the maximal time-step,  $t_\ell$  is time-horizon and  $\kappa = \max_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1}) / \min_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1}) \in [1, +\infty)$  is the conditioning of discretization that measures the amount of non-uniformity. Consequently, for uniform discretization  $t_j = j\Delta t$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, \ell$ , it holds

$$\|R_\mu - \tilde{R}_m\| \leq \left(2 + \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})\pi^2}{18e^2 \cos^2(\theta)} + \frac{e^{-\ell\mu\Delta t}}{\mu\Delta t}\right) \Delta t = s_{\mu, \ell}(\Delta t). \quad (42)$$

*Proof.* Given  $0 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$ , remark that the functions

$$f_\mu^j(z) := \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} e^{-(\mu-z)t} dt - \frac{t_{j+1}-t_j}{2} (e^{-(\mu-z)t_j} + e^{-(\mu-z)t_{j+1}}) \text{ and } g_\mu(z) := \int_{t_\ell}^{\infty} e^{-(\mu-z)t} dt$$

are analytic whenever  $\mu = \Re(\mu) \geq \Re(z)$ . Thus, since  $L$  is stable, we have that

$$\|R_\mu - \tilde{R}_m\| = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} f_\mu^j(L) + g_\mu(L) \right\| \leq \|f_\mu^0(L)\| + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \|f_\mu^j(L)\| + \|g_\mu(L)\|.$$

Next, using that  $\|A_t\| \leq 1$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , we bound the first and last term as

$$\|f_\mu^0(L)\| \leq \int_0^{t_1} e^{-\mu t} dt + \frac{t_1}{2}(1 + e^{-\mu t_1}) = \left( \frac{1 - e^{-\mu t_1}}{\mu t_1} + \frac{1 + e^{-\mu t_1}}{2} \right) t_1 \leq 2t_1.$$

and

$$\|g_\mu(L)\| \leq \int_{t_\ell}^{\infty} e^{-\mu t} dt = \frac{e^{-\mu t_\ell}}{\mu}.$$

Finally, we bound  $f_\mu^j(L)$  using Crouzeix's theorem 3. To that end, we need to replace the unbounded operator  $L$  with its bounded Yoshida approximation  $L_s := s^2(sI - L)^{-1}L$ ,  $s > 0$ , for which we know that for every  $f \in \text{dom}(L)$   $L_s f \rightarrow Lf$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , Kato (2012). This implies that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists large enough  $s > 0$  so that

$$\mathbb{F}(L_s) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_\theta^- + \varepsilon.$$

Now, since  $f_{\mu+\varepsilon}^j$  is analytic over  $\mathbb{C}_\theta^- + \varepsilon$ , applying the Crouzeix's theorem 3 we conclude that

$$\left\| f_{\mu+\varepsilon}^j(L_s) \right\| \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{2} \sup_{z \in \text{cl } \mathbb{F}(L_s)} |f_{\mu+\varepsilon}^j(z)| \leq \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{2} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_\theta^-} |f_\mu^j(z)|.$$

So, since  $f_\mu^j$  is the error of approximating the integral of complex valued function  $t \mapsto e^{-(\mu-z)t}$  on the real interval  $[j\Delta t, (j+1)\Delta t]$  by the trapezoid rule with two points, we have that (see for instance Quarteroni et al. (2010), equation (9.12))

$$f_\mu^j(z) = -\frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)^3}{6} \partial_t^2 [e^{-(\mu-z)t}] (t_j(1-\xi) + \xi t_{j+1}) = -\frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)^3}{6} (\mu-z)^2 e^{-(\mu-z)(t_j(1-\xi) + \xi t_{j+1})},$$

for some  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ . Hence, for  $z \in \mathbb{C}_\mu^-$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &\leq \frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)^3}{6} |\mu - z|^2 e^{-(\mu - \Re(z))t_j} \leq \frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)^3}{6} (1 + \tan^2 \theta) (\mu - \Re(z))^2 e^{-(\mu - \Re(z))t_j} = \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + \tan^2 \theta) \Delta t^3 4e^{-2}}{6} = \frac{2}{3e^2 \cos^2 \theta} \frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)^3}{t_j^2} \leq \frac{2\kappa^2}{3e^2 \cos^2 \theta} \frac{\Delta t}{j^2}, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \|f_{\mu}^j(L_s)\| \leq \Delta t \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})}{3e^2 \cos^2 \theta} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{j^2} \leq \frac{\pi^2(1+\sqrt{2})}{18e^2 \cos^2 \theta} \Delta t,$$

and the proof follows by letting  $s \rightarrow \infty$  and noting that sequence of bounded operators  $(f_{\mu}^j(L_s))_s$  converges to a bounded operator  $f_{\mu}^j(L)$ .  $\square$

Now, appying the above result on the integration bias in (30) for the case without the rank reduction (reasonable when  $r = n$ ), we obtain

$$\left\| S_{\pi}(G_{\mu,\gamma} - \tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}) \right\| = \left\| S_{\pi} C_{\gamma}^{-1} S_{\pi}(R_{\mu} - \tilde{R}_m) S_{\pi} \right\| \leq \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \left( 2 + \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})\pi^2 \kappa^2}{18e^2 \cos^2(\theta)} \right) \Delta t + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{e^{-\mu t_{\ell}}}{\mu}, \quad (43)$$

which becomes arbitrarily small for  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  and  $t_{\ell} \rightarrow \infty$ .

On the other hand for the rank reduction case,

$$\left\| S_{\pi}(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \right\| = \left\| C^{1/2} C_{\gamma}^{-1} S_{\pi}^*(R_{\mu} S_{\pi} B_r - \tilde{R}_m S_{\pi} \tilde{P}_r) \right\| \leq \left\| (R_{\mu} - \tilde{R}_m) S_{\pi} \tilde{P}_r \right\| + \left\| R_{\mu} S_{\pi} (P_r - \tilde{P}_r) \right\| \quad (44)$$

that is,  $\left\| S_{\pi}(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \right\| \leq \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \left( 2 + \frac{(1+\sqrt{2})\pi^2 \kappa^2}{18e^2 \cos^2(\theta)} \right) \Delta t + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \frac{e^{-\mu t_{\ell}}}{\mu} + \frac{\|P_r - \tilde{P}_r\|}{\mu}$ , which can be controlled by bounding  $\|P_r - \tilde{P}_r\|$  via  $\|B^* B - \tilde{B}^* \tilde{B}\|$  using Theorem 4. Since in the analysis of the variance term similar construction should be performed for the orthogonal projector onto the leading singular subspace of the empirical operator  $\hat{B} = \hat{C}_{\gamma}^{-1/2} \hat{H}_m$ , in the following we jointly bound last to terms in (30).

### C.3 Estimator's variance

In this section, with the exception of Subsection C.7, we assume the single trajectory setting with uniform time-discretization, and analyze the last term in (30) developing concentration inequalities in Hilbert spaces for non-iid variables based on the notion of beta-mixing and the method of blocks introduced in (Yu, 1994). Before we begin, let us summarize the reminder of the terms, assuming the case of universal kernel together with **(BK)**, **(SD)** and **(RC)**

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \leq (c_{\alpha}/\mu)\gamma^{\alpha/2} + \sigma_{r+1}(B) + \left\| S_{\pi}(G_{\mu,\gamma}^r - \hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \right\|. \quad (45)$$

#### C.3.1 Reminder on Ergodic and Exponentially Mixing Markov Processes

We recall some fundamental results on ergodic, exponentially mixing Markov Processes.

**Definition 3** (Strict stationarity). *A Markov process  $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  with values in  $\mathcal{X}$  is strictly stationary if for every  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$  the marginal distribution of  $(X_{1+l}, \dots, X_{m+l})$  is the same as  $(X_1, \dots, X_m)$ .*

For a set  $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and a strictly stationary process  $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  we let  $\Sigma_I$  for the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\mu_I$  for the joint distribution of  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ . Notice that  $\mu_{I+i} = \mu_I$ . In this notation  $\pi = \mu_{\{1\}}$  and  $\rho_{\tau} = \mu_{\{1, 1+\tau\}}$ . We can now introduce the  $\beta$ -mixing coefficients

$$\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) = \sup_{B \in \Sigma_{\{1, 1+\tau\}}} |\mu_{\{1, 1+\tau\}}(B) - \mu_{\{1\}} \times \mu_{\{1+\tau\}}(B)|$$

which by the Markov property is equivalent to

$$\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) = \sup_{B \in \Sigma^I \otimes \Sigma^J} |\mu_{I \cup J}(B) - \mu_I \times \mu_J(B)|,$$

where  $I, J \subset \mathbb{N}$  with  $j > i + \tau$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $j \in J$ . The latter is the definition of the mixing coefficients for general strictly stationary processes.

It is well-known that a stationary, geometrically ergodic Markov process is  $\beta$ -mixing with  $\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) \rightarrow 0$  exponentially fast as  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , that is  $\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\tau) \leq \eta e^{-\gamma\tau}$ , for some  $\eta, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$  for all  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ . See e.g. (Bradley, 2007, vol. 2 Theorem 21.19 pp 325).

The following result exploits a block-process argument to extend concentration bounds from the iid setting to strictly stationary  $\beta$ -mixing Markov processes.

**Lemma 2** (Kostic et al. (2022), Lemma 1). *Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be strictly stationary with values in a normed space  $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|)$ , and let  $\bar{\tau}, m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m$  is the largest integer satisfyong  $n \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$ . Moreover, let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{m+1}$  be  $m+1$  independent copies of  $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{\tau}} X_i$ . Then for  $s > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right\| > s\right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Z_j\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Z_j + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} X'_i\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + 2m\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{\tau} - 1).$$

where we define  $k \in \llbracket 0, 2\bar{\tau} - 1 \rrbracket$  such that  $k = n - 2m\bar{\tau} = l\bar{\tau} + k'$  with  $l \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $k' \in \llbracket 0, \bar{\tau} - 1 \rrbracket$ , and  $X'_i = X_{(2m+l)\bar{\tau}+i}$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, k' \rrbracket$ .

*Proof.* Recall first the definition of the blocked variables

$$Y_j = \sum_{i=2(j-1)\bar{\tau}+1}^{(2j-1)\bar{\tau}} X_i \quad \text{and} \quad Y'_j = \sum_{i=(2j-1)\bar{\tau}+1}^{2j\bar{\tau}} X_i. \quad (46)$$

Then, we have,

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right\| = \left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Y_j + \sum_{j=1}^m Y'_j + \sum_{i=1}^k X_{2m\bar{\tau}+i}\right\| \leq \left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Y_j + \sum_{i=1}^{l\bar{\tau}} X_{2m\bar{\tau}+i}\right\| + \left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Y'_j + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} X_{2m\bar{\tau}+l\bar{\tau}+i}\right\|$$

where we let  $k = n - 2m\bar{\tau} = l\bar{\tau} + k'$  with  $l \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $k' \in \llbracket 0, \bar{\tau} - 1 \rrbracket$ , and we use the convention  $\sum_{i=1}^0 \cdot = 0$ . Thus, for  $s > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right\| > s\right\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{m+l} Z_j\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + (m-1+l)\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{\tau} - 1) + \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Y'_j + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} X'_i\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + m\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{\tau} - 1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{m+l} Z_j\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\|\sum_{j=1}^m Z_j + \sum_{i=1}^{k'} X'_i\right\| > \frac{s}{2}\right\} + 2m\beta_{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{\tau} - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined  $X'_i = X_{(2m+l)\bar{\tau}+i}$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, k' \rrbracket$  and we have used Kostic et al. (2022), Lemma 3 to get the first inequality.  $\square$

### C.3.2 Concentration for Transfer Operators

We consider the transfer operators  $T_{j\Delta t} = S_{\pi}^* e^{j\Delta t L} S_{\pi}$  for any  $j \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$  and their empirical versions

$$\hat{T}_{j\Delta t} = \frac{1}{n-j} \sum_{i=0}^{n-j-1} \phi(X_{i\Delta t}) \otimes \phi(X_{(i+j)\Delta t}).$$

We prove several concentration results on operators  $C$  and  $T_{j\Delta t}$ ,  $j \in [l]$  and  $\tilde{H}_m$ .

**Proposition 9.** *Assume that  $n-j \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$ . Let  $\delta > (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)$ . Let Assumption **(KE)** be satisfied. With probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi, X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\|C_{\gamma}^{-1/2}(\hat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t})\right\| \leq 8\sqrt{2c_{\mathcal{H}}} \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta - 2(m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)}\right) \sqrt{\frac{c_{\beta}^{\beta}}{(1-\beta)\gamma^{\beta}m} + \frac{c_{\tau}}{m^2\gamma^{\tau}}}. \quad (47)$$

*Proof of Proposition (9).* Set  $\xi(x) := C_\gamma^{-1/2}\phi(x)$ . Assume first for simplicity that  $n - j = 2m\bar{\tau}$ . We have

$$C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t}) := \frac{1}{n-j} \sum_{i=0}^{n-j-1} \xi(X_{i\Delta t}) \otimes \phi(X_{(i+j)\Delta t}) - \mathbb{E} [\xi(X_{i\Delta t}) \otimes \phi(X_{(i+j)\Delta t})].$$

Set  $A_i := \xi(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}) \otimes \phi(X_{(i-1+j)\Delta t})$ . Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_m$  be  $m$  iid copies of  $Z := \frac{1}{\bar{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{\tau}} A_i$ . For any  $k \geq 2$ , by triangular inequality and convexity of  $x \mapsto x^k$ , we have that  $\|Z\|_{\text{HS}}^k \leq \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{\tau}} \|A_i\|_{\text{HS}}\right)^k \leq \frac{1}{\bar{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{\tau}} \|A_i\|_{\text{HS}}^k$ . Observe next that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|A_i\|_{\text{HS}}^k] &= \mathbb{E}[\|\xi(X_{(i-1)\Delta t})\|^k \|\phi(X_{(i-1+j)\Delta t})\|^k] \leq \|\xi\|_\infty^{k-2} \|\phi\|_\infty^k \mathbb{E}[\|\xi(X_{(i-1)\Delta t})\|^2] \\ &= \|\xi\|_\infty^{k-2} \|\phi\|_\infty^k \text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1}C) \leq \frac{1}{2}k! \left(\gamma^{-\tau/2} \sqrt{c_\tau c_{\mathcal{H}}}\right)^{k-2} \left(\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}} \text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1}C)}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (Fischer and Steinwart, 2020, Lemma 11), we have under Condition **(SD)** when  $\beta < 1$  that

$$\text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1}C) \leq \frac{c_\beta^\beta}{1-\beta} \gamma^{-\beta}, \quad \forall \gamma > 0.$$

Consequently

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_{\text{HS}}^k] \leq \frac{1}{\bar{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{\tau}} \mathbb{E}[\|A_i\|_{\text{HS}}^k] \leq \frac{1}{2}k! \left(\gamma^{-\tau/2} \sqrt{c_\tau c_{\mathcal{H}}}\right)^{k-2} \left(\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{c_\beta^\beta}{1-\beta} \gamma^{-\beta}}\right)^2. \quad (48)$$

We apply (Kostic et al., 2023a, Proposition 9) to get with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m Z_i \right\| \leq 4\sqrt{2c_{\mathcal{H}}} \ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \sqrt{\frac{c_\beta^\beta}{(1-\beta)\gamma^\beta m} + \frac{c_\tau}{m^2\gamma^\tau}}.$$

Replacing  $\delta$  by  $\frac{\delta}{2} - (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X},\Delta t}(\bar{\tau}-1)$  and an union bound combining the last display with Lemma 2 gives the result.  $\square$

We assume now that the Markov process  $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot\Delta t} = (X_{i\Delta t})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is ergodic, exponentially mixing, that is, there exists  $c_{\text{mix}} \in (0, \infty)$ , such that for all  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\beta_{\mathbf{X},\Delta t}(\bar{\tau}) \leq c_{\text{mix}} e^{-\Delta t w_\star \bar{\tau}}, \quad \forall \bar{\tau} \geq 1, \quad (49)$$

where we recall that  $w_\star = -\lambda_2(L+L^*)/2 > 0$ .

For any  $n \geq 1$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , define the rate

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_n(\delta) := c \left( \frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{n}{\delta}\right)}{\Delta t w_\star n} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{n}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{\Delta t w_\star n}} \right), \quad (50)$$

where  $c = c(c_{\text{mix}}) > 0$  is a large enough numerical constant.

**Proposition 10.** *Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . Assume that  $(n-j)\Delta t w_\star \geq 4 \ln\left(\frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta}\right)$ . Let Condition 49 be satisfied. With probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi, X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot), i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| \widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t} \right\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_{n-j}(\delta). \quad (51)$$

*Proof.* We start from the following result (Kostic et al., 2022, Proposition 3) assuming  $n - j \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t} \right\| \leq \frac{48}{m} \ln \left( \frac{4m\bar{\tau}}{\delta - (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau}-1)} \right) + 12 \sqrt{\frac{2\|C\|}{m} \ln \frac{4m}{\delta - (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau}-1)}} \right) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (52)$$

For any  $j \in [l]$ , we take integers  $m_j, \bar{\tau}_j \geq 1$  such that  $n - j \geq 2m_j\bar{\tau}_j$  and  $\delta \geq 2(m_j - 1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau}_j - 1)$ . Hence we can pick

$$m_j := \left\lfloor \frac{(n-j)\Delta t w_\star}{2 \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta} \right)} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\tau}_j := \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\Delta t w_\star} \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(m_j - 1)}{\delta} \right) \right\rfloor. \quad (53)$$

Assuming that  $n$  is large enough such that  $(n-j)\Delta t w_\star \geq 4 \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta} \right)$ , we get

$$m_j \geq \frac{1}{4} (n-j)\Delta t w_\star / \ln \left( \frac{4e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta} \right).$$

We also have in view of (49) that  $(m_j - 1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau}_j - 1) \leq \delta/2$ . Replacing these quantities in (52), we get the result.  $\square$

Define for any  $n \geq 1$

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta) := c \left( \frac{c_\tau \ln(n\delta^{-1})}{n \Delta t w_\star \gamma^\tau} \mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta) + \sqrt{\frac{c_\tau \ln(n\delta^{-1})}{n \Delta t w_\star \gamma^\tau} \mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta)} \right), \quad (54)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta) := \ln \left( \frac{4}{\delta} \right) + \ln \left( \frac{\text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1}C)}{\|C_\gamma^{-1}C\|} \right),$$

where the numerical constant  $c > 0$  only depends on  $c_{\text{mix}}$ .

**Proposition 11.** *Let Assumption (KE) and Condition (49) be satisfied. Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{C} - C)C_\gamma^{-1/2} \right\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta).$$

*In addition, for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $n$  large enough such that  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\left\| C_\gamma^{1/2} \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1} C_\gamma^{1/2} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta)}.$$

*Finally, for any  $j \in [l]$  such that  $n - j \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$ , we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t})C_\gamma^{-1/2} \right\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta).$$

*Proof of Proposition 11.* Define for any  $m \geq 1$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$

$$\varepsilon_m^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta) := \frac{4c_\tau}{3m\gamma^\tau} \mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta) + \sqrt{\frac{2c_\tau}{m\gamma^\tau} \mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta)}, \quad (55)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}^1(\gamma, \delta) := \ln\left(\frac{4}{\delta}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{\text{tr}(C_\gamma^{-1}C)}{\|C_\gamma^{-1}C\|}\right).$$

Combining Lemma 2 with (Kostic et al., 2023a, Proposition 13), we obtain with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\|C_\gamma^{-1/2}(C - \widehat{C})C_\gamma^{-1/2}\right\| \leq 2\varepsilon_m^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta/2 - (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)). \quad (56)$$

Exploiting again the  $\beta$ -mixing assumption in (49), we take  $\bar{\tau}$  as the smallest integer such that

$$\bar{\tau} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{\Delta t w_\star} \ln\left(\frac{4c_{\text{mix}} n}{\delta}\right), \quad (57)$$

With this choice of  $\bar{\tau}$  and picking  $m$  as the largest integer such that  $n \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$ , then we get

$$2\varepsilon_m^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta/2 - (m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)) \leq 2\varepsilon_m^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta/4) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta),$$

provided that the numerical constant  $c = c(c_{\text{mix}}) > 0$  is large enough.

Finally, for  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $n$  large enough such that  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta) \in (0, 1)$  and observing that

$$1 - \left\|I - C_\gamma^{-1/2}\widehat{C}_\gamma C_\gamma^{-1/2}\right\| = \left\|C_\gamma^{-1/2}(C - \widehat{C})C_\gamma^{-1/2}\right\|,$$

we get

$$\left\|C_\gamma^{1/2}\widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2}\right\| = \left\|(C_\gamma^{-1/2}\widehat{C}_\gamma C_\gamma^{-1/2})^{-1}\right\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \left\|I - C_\gamma^{-1/2}\widehat{C}_\gamma C_\gamma^{-1/2}\right\|} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta)}.$$

The proof for the last result on  $\left\|C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t})C_\gamma^{-1/2}\right\|$  follows from the same argument.  $\square$

**Proposition 12.** *Let the assumptions of Proposition 9 and Condition (49) be satisfied. Assume in addition that  $\mu \Delta t \in (0, 1)$  and  $w_\star \Delta t \leq 1$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\|C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widetilde{H}_m - \widehat{H}_m)\right\| \leq \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,l}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta)}{\mu}, \quad (58)$$

where

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,l}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta) := c \left( \frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{n(l+1)}{\delta}\right)}{\Delta t w_\star \gamma^{\tau/2}} \frac{1}{n-l} + \frac{\ln^{3/2}\left(\frac{n(l+1)}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{\Delta t} w_\star} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma^\beta(n-l)}} \right), \quad (59)$$

where  $c = c(c_{\text{mix}}, c_{\mathcal{H}}, c_\tau, c_\beta, \beta) > 0$  is a large enough numerical constant.

*Proof of Proposition 12.* For any  $j \in [l]$ , we take integers  $m_j, \bar{\tau}_j \geq 1$  such that  $n - j \geq 2m_j\bar{\tau}_j$  and  $\delta \geq 4(m_j - 1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau}_j - 1)$ . We use the same choices as in (53).

Replacing these quantities in (47), we get with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t})\right\| &\leq 8\sqrt{2c_{\mathcal{H}}} \ln\left(\frac{8}{\delta}\right) \left( \sqrt{\frac{2c_\beta^\beta}{(1-\beta)\gamma^\beta(n-j)\Delta t w_\star}} \ln\left(\frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sqrt{2c_\tau}}{(n-j)\Delta t w_\star \gamma^{\tau/2}} \ln\left(\frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(n-j)}{\delta}\right) \right) =: \varepsilon_{n,j}^{(2)}(\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Next, by definition of  $\tilde{H}_m$ ,  $\hat{H}_m$  and an elementary union bound, we get with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\tilde{H}_m - \hat{H}_m) \right\| &\leq \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^l \omega_j \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{T}_{j\Delta t} - T_{j\Delta t}) \right\| e^{-\mu j \Delta t} \\ &\leq \Delta t \sum_{j=0}^l \omega_j \varepsilon_{n,j}^{(2)}(\delta/(l+1)) e^{-\mu j \Delta t} \\ &\leq C \left( \sqrt{\Delta t} \frac{\ln^{3/2} \left( \frac{n(l+1)}{\delta} \right)}{\sqrt{w_\star \gamma^\beta}} \sum_{j=0}^l \frac{e^{-\mu j \Delta t}}{\sqrt{n-j}} + \frac{\ln^2 \left( \frac{n(l+1)}{\delta} \right)}{w_\star \gamma^{\tau/2}} \sum_{j=0}^l \frac{e^{-\mu j \Delta t}}{n-j} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some large enough numerical constant  $C = C(c_{\mathcal{H}}, c_\tau, c_{\text{mix}}, c_\beta, \beta) > 0$  that can depend only on  $c_{\mathcal{H}}, c_\tau, c_{\text{mix}}, c_\beta, \beta$ .

We apply the well-known Abel transform formula

$$\sum_{k=0}^l f_k g_k = f_l \sum_{k=0}^l g_k - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} (f_{j+1} - f_j) \sum_{k=0}^j g_k,$$

to series  $\sum_{j=0}^l \frac{e^{-\mu j \Delta t}}{(n-j)^\alpha}$ , with  $\alpha \in \{1/2, 1\}$ . Since we assumed that  $\mu \Delta t \in (0, 1)$ , elementary computations give

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^l \frac{e^{-\mu j \Delta t}}{(n-j)^\alpha} &\leq \frac{1}{(n-l)^\alpha} \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\mu \Delta t}} - \sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \left( \frac{1}{(n-j-1)^\alpha} - \frac{1}{(n-j)^\alpha} \right) \sum_{k=0}^j e^{-\mu k \Delta t} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-l)^\alpha} \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\mu \Delta t}} \leq \frac{2}{\mu \Delta t (n-l)^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality  $e^{-x} \leq 1 - x + x^2/2$  true for any  $x \in (0, 1)$  in the last line.  $\square$

**Proposition 13.** *Let Assumption (KE) and Condition (49) be satisfied. Fix  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and assume in addition that  $n$  is large enough such that  $n \Delta t w_\star \geq 4 \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}} n}{\delta} \right)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{C} - C) \right\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,0}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta) \quad (61)$$

*Proof of Proposition 13.* Similarly to the proof of Proposition 9, we obtain, assuming that  $n \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,

$$\left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{C} - C) \right\| \leq 8 \sqrt{2c_{\mathcal{H}}} \ln \left( \frac{4}{\delta - 2(m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)} \right) \sqrt{\frac{c_\beta^\beta}{(1-\beta)\gamma^\beta m} + \frac{c_\tau}{m^2 \gamma^\tau}}. \quad (62)$$

We pick integers  $m, \bar{\tau} \geq 1$  such that  $n \geq 2m\bar{\tau}$  and  $\delta \geq 2(m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1)$ . Hence we pick

$$m := \left\lfloor \frac{n \Delta t w_\star}{2 \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}} n}{\delta} \right)} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\tau} := \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\Delta t w_\star} \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}}(m-1)}{\delta} \right) \right\rfloor, \quad (63)$$

Assuming that  $n$  is large enough such that  $n \Delta t w_\star \geq 4 \ln \left( \frac{2e^2 c_{\text{mix}} n}{\delta} \right)$ , we get

$$m \geq \frac{1}{4} n \Delta t w_\star / \ln \left( \frac{4e^2 c_{\text{mix}} n}{\delta} \right).$$

We also have in view of (49) that  $(m-1)\beta_{\mathbf{X}_{\Delta t}}(\bar{\tau} - 1) \leq \delta/2$ . Replacing these quantities in (62), we get the result.  $\square$

### C.3.3 Variance of Singular Values

We introduce the approximated and empirical KRR models as  $\tilde{G}_{m,\gamma} = C_\gamma^{-1}\tilde{H}_m$  and  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} = \hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}\hat{H}_m$ , respectively. We recall that  $\tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2}\llbracket C_\gamma^{-1/2}\tilde{H}_m \rrbracket_r$  and  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \hat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2}\llbracket \hat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2}\hat{H}_m \rrbracket_r$ . We also introduce  $B := C_\gamma^{-1/2}H_\mu$  and  $\hat{B} := \hat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2}\hat{H}_m$ , let denote  $P_r$  and  $\hat{P}_r$  denote the orthogonal projector onto the subspace of leading  $r$  right singular vectors of  $B$  and  $\hat{B}$ , respectively. Then we have  $\llbracket B \rrbracket_r = BP_r$  and  $\llbracket \hat{B} \rrbracket_r = \hat{B}\hat{P}_r$ , and, hence  $\tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \tilde{G}_{m,\gamma}\tilde{P}_r$  and  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r = \hat{G}_{m,\gamma}\hat{P}_r$ . Let us recall that  $G_{\mu,\gamma}^r = C_\gamma^{-1/2}\llbracket C_\gamma^{-1/2}H_\mu \rrbracket_r$ .

**Proposition 14.** *Let (RC), (SD) and (KE) hold for some  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\tau \in [\beta, 1]$ . Let  $B := C_\gamma^{-1/2}H_\mu$  and  $\hat{B} := \hat{C}_\gamma^{-1/2}\hat{H}_m$ . Given  $\delta > 0$  if  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta/3) < 1/2$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| \hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B \right\| \leq \frac{2}{\mu^2} \left( \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} + \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \mu s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \right) \left( \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \mu s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \right) \quad (64)$$

where  $\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) = \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,0}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta/3)c_\alpha c_{\mathcal{H}}^{(\alpha-1)/2}$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta)$  is defined in (59), and  $s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t)$  in (42). Consequently, for every  $i \in [n]$ , when  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3)/\mu + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \leq \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}}$  it holds that

$$|\sigma_i^2(\hat{B}) - \sigma_i^2(B)| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}}}{\mu} \left( \bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \mu s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \right). \quad (65)$$

*Proof.* We start from the Weyl's inequalities for the square of singular values

$$|\sigma_i^2(\hat{B}) - \sigma_i^2(B)| \leq \left\| \hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B \right\|, \quad i \in [n].$$

But, since,

$$\hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B = \hat{H}_m^*\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}\hat{H}_m - H_\mu^*C_\gamma^{-1}H_\mu = (\hat{H}_m - H_\mu)^*\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}\hat{H}_m + H_\mu^*C_\gamma^{-1}(\hat{H}_m - H_\mu) + H_\mu^*(\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1} - C_\gamma^{-1})\hat{H}_m,$$

denoting  $M = C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{H}_m - H_\mu)$ ,  $N = C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{C} - C)$  and  $R = C_\gamma^{1/2}(\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B &= M^*C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} + B^*M - B^*N\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} = B^*M + (M^*C_\gamma^{1/2} - B^*N)(\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} \pm G_{\mu,\gamma}) \\ &= B^*M + M^*B - B^*N\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} + (M^* - B^*NC_\gamma^{-1/2})R \\ &= (G_{\mu,\gamma})^*(\hat{H}_m - H_\mu) + (\hat{H}_m - H_\mu)G_{\mu,\gamma} - (G_{\mu,\gamma})^*(\hat{C} - C)G_{\mu,\gamma} + (M^* + (G_{\mu,\gamma})^*N^*)R. \end{aligned}$$

Note next by definition of  $G_{\mu,\gamma}$  and  $\hat{G}_{m,\gamma}$ , we have

$$\hat{G}_{m,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma} = C_\gamma^{-1/2} \left[ C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{H}_m - H_\mu) - C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{C} - C)C_\gamma^{-1/2}[C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2}][C_\gamma^{-1/2}\hat{H}_m] \right]. \quad (66)$$

Therefore, due to (66),  $R = C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2}(M - NG_{\mu,\gamma})$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B &= (G_{\mu,\gamma})^*(\hat{H}_m - H_\mu) + (\hat{H}_m - H_\mu)G_{\mu,\gamma} - (G_{\mu,\gamma})^*(\hat{C} - C)G_{\mu,\gamma} \\ &\quad + (M - NG_{\mu,\gamma})^*C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2}(M - NG_{\mu,\gamma}). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{B}^*\hat{B} - B^*B \right\| &\leq 2\|B\|\|M\| + \|B\|\|N\|\|G_{\mu,\gamma}\| + \left\| C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2} \right\| (\|M\| + \|N\|\|G_{\mu,\gamma}\|)^2 \\ &\leq \left[ 2\|B\| + \left\| C_\gamma^{1/2}\hat{C}_\gamma^{-1}C_\gamma^{1/2} \right\| (\|M\| + \|N\|\|G_{\mu,\gamma}\|) \right] (\|M\| + \|N\|\|G_{\mu,\gamma}\|) \end{aligned}$$

Now, noting that

$$\|M\| \leq \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{H}_m - \tilde{H}_m) \right\| + \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\tilde{H}_m - H_\mu) \right\| \leq \left\| C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\hat{H}_m - \tilde{H}_m) \right\| + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}}\|\tilde{R}_m - R_\mu\|,$$

and applying Propositions 8, 11, 12 and 13 we obtain (64), and, therefore, (65) follows.  $\square$



Remark that to bound singular values we can rely on the fact

$$|\sigma_i(\widehat{B}) - \sigma_i(B)| = \frac{|\sigma_i^2(\widehat{B}) - \sigma_i^2(B)|}{\sigma_i(\widehat{B}) + \sigma_i(B)} \leq \frac{|\sigma_i^2(\widehat{B}) - \sigma_i^2(B)|}{\sigma_i(\widehat{B}) \vee \sigma_i(B)}. \quad (68)$$

### C.3.4 Variance of RRR Estimator

**Proposition 15.** *Let (RC), (SD) and (KE) hold for some  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\tau \in [\beta, 1]$ . Given  $\delta > 0$  and  $\gamma > 0$ , if  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta) < 1/2$ , then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw  $X_0 \sim \pi$ ,  $X_{i\Delta t} \sim p(X_{(i-1)\Delta t}, \cdot)$ ,  $i \in [n]$ ,*

$$\left\| S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \right\| \leq \frac{2}{\mu} \left( \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} \mu s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \right) \left[ 1 + \frac{c_{\mathcal{H}}/\mu + (\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}}/\mu) \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t)}{\sigma_r^2(Z_\mu) - \sigma_{r+1}^2(Z_\mu) - (c_\alpha/\mu)^2 c_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha/2} \gamma^{\alpha/2}} \right]. \quad (69)$$

*Proof.* Start by observing that  $\left\| S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \right\| \leq \left\| C_\gamma^{1/2}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \right\|$  and

$$C_\gamma^{1/2}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) = (C_\gamma^{1/2} \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1} C_\gamma^{1/2}) \cdot \left[ C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{C} - C)G_{\mu,\gamma} + C_\gamma^{-1/2}(\widehat{H}_m - H_\mu) \right] \widehat{P}_r + B(\widehat{P}_r - P_r). \quad (70)$$

Hence, taking the norm, using that the norm of orthogonal projector  $\widehat{P}_r$  is bounded by one and applying Proposition 4, we obtain

$$\left\| S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \right\| \leq \left\| C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1} C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left[ \left\| C_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{C} - C) \right\| \left\| G_{\mu,\gamma} \right\| + \left\| C_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{H}_m - H_\mu \pm \widetilde{H}_m) \right\| \right] + \|B\| \frac{\left\| B^* B - \widehat{B}^* \widehat{B} \right\|}{\sigma_r^2(B) - \sigma_{r+1}^2(B)}.$$

To complete the proof it suffices to apply Propositions 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 together with Propositions 4 and 14.  $\square$

Remark that the previous proof simplifies when we do not have the rank reduction, that is we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma}) \right\| &\leq \left\| C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{C}_\gamma^{-1} C_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left[ \left\| C_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{C} - C) \right\| \left\| G_{\mu,\gamma} \right\| + \left\| C_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{H}_m - H_\mu \pm \widetilde{H}_m) \right\| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2 \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3)}{\mu} + 2\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

and further obtain that

$$\left\| \widehat{G}_{m,\gamma} \right\| \leq \left\| G_{\mu,\gamma} \right\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \left\| C_\gamma^{1/2}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma} - G_{\mu,\gamma}) \right\| \leq \frac{c_\alpha c_{\mathcal{H}}^{(\alpha-1)/2}}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \left( \frac{2 \bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3)}{\mu} + 2\sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}} s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \right). \quad (72)$$

## C.4 LaRRR operator norm error bounds

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $L$  be sectorial operator such that  $w_\star = -\lambda_2(L + L^*)/2 > 0$ . Let (BK), (RC) and (SD) hold for some  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , respectively, and  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi)) = \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . Given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $r \in [n]$ , let*

$$\gamma \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{n \Delta t w_\star} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}}, \quad \varepsilon_n^*(\delta) = \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{\mu^{\frac{2(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha}} n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\beta+3\alpha}} \quad (21)$$

$\Delta t = \varepsilon_n^*$  and  $1/l = o(\varepsilon_n^*)$ , then there exists a constant  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $\mathcal{H}$  and gap  $\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) > 0$  such that for large enough  $n \geq r$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \lesssim (\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1} \wedge \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi)) + c\varepsilon_n^*(\delta). \quad (22)$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Note first that under the gap condition  $\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) > 0$  and by choice of  $\gamma$  in (74), we have for  $n$  large enough that  $\sigma_r^2(Z_\mu) - \sigma_{r+1}^2(Z_\mu) - (c_\alpha/\mu)^2 c_{\mathcal{H}}^{\alpha/2} \gamma^{\alpha/2} \geq (\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi))/2 > 0$ .

Next we set  $l = n/2$ . By definition of the rates  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n(\delta)$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta)$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,l}^{(2)}(\gamma, \delta)$  and  $\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,l}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta)$ , and since  $\tau \in (\beta, 1]$ , we have for  $n$  large enough,  $\bar{\varepsilon}_n^{(1)}(\gamma, \delta/3) \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $n\mu\Delta t \gg 1$  and

$$\bar{\varepsilon}_{n,\ell}^{(3)}(\gamma, \delta/3) + \sqrt{c_{\mathcal{H}}}\mu s_{\mu,\ell}(\Delta t) \lesssim \frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{n}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{\Delta t} w_* \gamma^\beta n} + \Delta t \ll 1.$$

We note indeed that  $l = n/2$  satisfies the condition  $1/l = o(\varepsilon_n^*)$  for  $n$  large enough.

Hence, recalling the decomposition of the operator norm error in (45) and Proposition 15, we get with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \lesssim \sigma_{r+1}(B) + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\mu} \left( \gamma^{\alpha/2} + \frac{\ln^2\left(\frac{n}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{\Delta t} w_* \gamma^\beta n} + \Delta t \right)}_{\text{(B)}}. \quad (73)$$

By balancing **(A)** with respect to  $\gamma$  first and then **(B)** with respect to  $\Delta t$ , we derive the upper bound on **(B)**  $\leq \varepsilon_n^*(\delta)$  for the choices of  $\gamma$  and  $\Delta t$  given in (74).

Finally, if  $\sigma_{r+1}(B) = 0$  then we proved the result. Otherwise if  $\sigma_{r+1}(B) > 0$ , then an union bound combining (73) with (65) and (68) gives the final bound.  $\square$

## C.5 LaRRR spectral operator bounds

First, recalling Proposition 1, essentially proven in Kostic et al. (2022, 2023a), with the only difference that instead of applying it to TO, we apply it to the resolvent of IG. This exposes the perturbation level such that the pseudospectrum of  $R_\mu$  contains an eigenvalue of its estimator. The bound on the perturbation level comes in two forms: one specific to the targeted eigenvalue and one uniform over all leading  $r$  eigenvalues. Since we have resolved the bound on the operator norm error, the only term that remains is the metric distortion for which we have the following

$$\eta(\widehat{h}_i) \leq \frac{\|\widehat{G}\|}{\sigma_r(S_\pi \widehat{G})} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \widehat{\eta}_i - \eta(\widehat{h}_i) \right| \leq \left( \eta(\widehat{h}_i) \wedge \widehat{\eta}_i \right) \eta(\widehat{h}_i) \widehat{\eta}_i \left\| \widehat{C} - C \right\|.$$

Now, applying this to the LaRRR estimator, since we have that  $|\sigma_r(S_\pi \widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) - \sigma_r(S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}^r)| \leq \|S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r)\|$  and

$$\sigma_r(S_\pi G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \geq \sigma_r(C_\gamma^{1/2} G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) - \sqrt{\gamma} \|G_{\mu,\gamma}^r\| \geq \sigma_r(B) - \sqrt{\gamma} \|G_{\mu,\gamma}^r\|,$$

using Propositions 7, 15 together with (72) we obtain that for every  $i \in [r]$  metric distortion (in the worst case) is bounded by

$$\eta(\widehat{h}_i) \leq \frac{(c_\alpha/\mu) c_{\mathcal{H}}^{(\alpha-1)/2} + \gamma^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n^*(\delta)}{\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi)} + \frac{\varepsilon_n^*(\delta)}{\sigma_r^2(R_\mu S_\pi)},$$

which further ensures that

$$\eta(\widehat{h}_i) - \widehat{\eta}_i \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(\delta).$$

Hence, checking that

$$\gamma^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n^*(\delta) \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{n \Delta t w_\star} \right)^{\frac{-1}{2(\alpha+\beta)}} \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{\mu^{\frac{2(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha}} n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\beta+3\alpha}} \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{-1}{2(\alpha+\beta)}} \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{\mu^{\frac{2(\alpha+\beta)}{\alpha}} n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2\beta+3\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2(\alpha+\beta)}\right)}$$

that is

$$\gamma^{-1/2} \varepsilon_n^*(\delta) \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^3(n/\delta)}{n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{2\alpha^2+2\alpha\beta-2\alpha-2\beta}{2(\alpha+\beta)(3\alpha+2\beta)}} \mu^{-\frac{1+2\alpha+2\beta}{3\alpha+2\beta}}$$

remains bounded w.r.t.  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for  $\alpha \geq 1$ , we can apply Theorem 1 and Proposition 3 to obtain the statement of Theorem 2. Alternatively, we could apply Proposition 5 to obtain that for general (non-normal) sectorial operator the estimated eigenvalues satisfy

$$\frac{|\lambda_i - \widehat{\lambda}_i|}{|\mu - \lambda_i| |\mu - \widehat{\lambda}_i|} \lesssim \|F\| \|F^{-1}\| \left( \widehat{\sigma}_{r+1} \widehat{\eta}_i \wedge \frac{\sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi)}{\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi)} \right) + \varepsilon_n^*(\delta),$$

where  $F$  is the bounded operator with bounded inverse such that  $F^{-1} L F$  is diagonal operator.

## C.6 LaRRR bounds in the misspecified setting

In this section, we briefly discuss the case where the eigenfunctions of the generator do not belong to the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), i.e., the misspecified learning setting when  $\alpha < 1$ . First, we note that the misspecified setting for the learning of transfer operators was considered in Li et al. (2022) in terms of the excess risk (Hilbert-Schmidt norm) of kernel ridge regression (KRR), while the error (operator norm) of KRR, principal component regression (PCR), and reduced-rank regression (RRR) was addressed in Kostic et al. (2023a). In both works, risk/error could be made arbitrarily small for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , however at arbitrarily slow rate as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . By adapting our proofs, notably in (69) by avoiding the splitting of  $G_{\mu, \gamma}$  from the concentration result in Proposition 12, one can also derive of the operator norm error for learning of  $R_\mu$ .

On the other hand, recalling Proposition 1, the main challenge of the misspecified setting arises when developing spectral learning rates. Namely, since given any eigenfunction  $f \in \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X}) \setminus [\mathcal{H}]$ , for every sequence  $(h_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  of functions in  $\mathcal{H}$  that approximates it, i.e., such that  $\|f - S_\pi h_k\|_{\mathcal{L}_\pi^2} \rightarrow 0$ , metric distortions explode, that is  $\eta(h_k) \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, with current approaches, it is impossible to derive learning bounds for an eigenvalue whose corresponding right eigenfunction lies outside of the RKHS.

## C.7 LaRRR bounds for multiple unevenly sampled trajectories

Here we only derive a bound on the operator norm excess risk when we have access to multiple iid trajectories sampled unevenly, noting that spectral bounds then readily follow in the same fashion as above. Here  $n$  stands for the number of trajectories and  $\ell$  is the number of samples on each trajectory.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $L$  be sectorial operator such that  $w_\star = -\lambda_2(L+L^*)/2 > 0$ . Let **(BK)**, **(RC)** and **(SD)** hold for some  $\alpha \in [1, 2]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , respectively, and  $\text{cl}(\text{Im}(S_\pi)) = \mathcal{L}_\pi^2(\mathcal{X})$ . Given  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  and  $r \in [n]$ , let*

$$\gamma \asymp \left( \frac{\ln^2(\ell \delta^{-1})}{n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}}, \quad \varepsilon_n^*(\delta) = \left( \frac{\ln^2(\ell \delta^{-1})}{n w_\star} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2(\beta+\alpha)}}, \quad (74)$$

then there exists a constant  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $\mathcal{H}$  and gap  $\sigma_r(R_\mu S_\pi) - \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) > 0$ , such that for large enough  $n \geq r$  and  $l \geq 1$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  in the draw of  $\mathcal{D}_n$  it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) \leq \widehat{\sigma}_{r+1} \wedge \sigma_{r+1}(R_\mu S_\pi) + c \left( \frac{\varepsilon_n^*(\delta)}{\mu} + \kappa^2 \Delta t \right), \quad (75)$$

where  $\Delta t = \max_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1})$  is the maximal time-step,  $t_\ell$  is time-horizon and conditioning number  $\kappa = \max_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1}) / \min_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1}) \in [1, +\infty)$  quantifies the unevenness of the sampling.

*Proof.* We proceed with the same decomposition (30) of the excess as in the proof of Theorem 1. The steps **(0)**, **(I)** and **(II)** remain unchanged. The integration bias in **(III)** is again tackled with Proposition 8. As for the estimator variance in step **(IV)**, we now use concentration result for multiple iid trajectories instead of the results we derived in Section C.3 for a single  $\beta$ -mixing trajectory. Specifically, Proposition 9 is replaced by Proposition 14 in Kostic et al. (2023a). Proposition 11 is replaced by Proposition 13 in Kostic et al. (2023a) with  $n$  replaced by  $n(l+1)$ . Proposition 14 is replaced by Proposition 17 in Kostic et al. (2023a). Hence instead of Proposition 15, we obtain the following control on the variance term. For  $n$  and  $\ell$  large enough, in view of (41), we have with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\left\| S_\pi(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r - G_{\mu,\gamma}^r) \right\| \lesssim \frac{1}{\mu} \left( \frac{\ln\left(\frac{l}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{w_\star \gamma^\beta n}} \right) + \kappa^2 \Delta t + \frac{e^{-\mu t_\ell}}{\mu} \quad (76)$$

Thus we get w.p.a.l.  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{G}_{m,\gamma}^r) - \sigma_{r+1}(B) \lesssim \frac{1}{\mu} \underbrace{\left( \gamma^{\alpha/2} + \frac{\ln\left(\frac{l}{\delta}\right)}{\sqrt{w_\star \gamma^\beta n}} \right)}_{\text{(A)}} + \kappa^2 \Delta t + \frac{e^{-\mu t_\ell}}{\mu}, \quad (77)$$

We can balance **(A)** as in the proof of Theorem 1.

Next set  $\underline{\Delta t} = \min_{j \in [\ell+1]}(t_j - t_{j-1})$ . Note we have the following conservative bound for  $l$  large enough

$$\frac{e^{-\mu t_\ell}}{\mu} \leq \frac{e^{-\mu \underline{\Delta t} l}}{\mu \underline{\Delta t}} \Delta t \lesssim \Delta t.$$

The end of the proof follows from the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$