High-Dimensional Principal Subspace Estimation via Nearly Optimal Stochastic Online Algorithms

Chris Junchi Li$^\diamond$

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences$^\diamond$
University of California, Berkeley

October 3, 2024

Abstract

Principal component analysis (PCA) is a fundamental tool for dimensionality reduction, yet its classical approach is computationally demanding in large-scale data settings. To address these challenges, online PCA methods have emerged, offering incremental updates that bypass the need for storing or computing the empirical covariance matrix. This paper presents a nearly optimal stochastic approximation method for online principal subspace estimation, designed to handle unbounded distributions such as sub-Gaussians. We provide a comprehensive convergence analysis, demonstrating a nearly global convergence rate under minimal assumptions. Our results fill a gap in the literature, particularly in the context of unbounded data distributions, offering a method that is both efficient and theoretically grounded. Our approach has important implications for high-dimensional data analysis, where computational efficiency and convergence guarantees are crucial.

Keywords: Online PCA, Subspace Estimation, Stochastic Approximation, Convergence Analysis, High-Dimensional Data

1 Introduction

Principal component analysis (PCA) is a widely used technique for reducing the dimensionality of high-dimensional data, as it identifies the most significant directions in which the data varies [15, 26]. However, traditional PCA approaches, which rely on the empirical covariance matrix and its eigenvalue decomposition, are computationally expensive for large datasets. These methods face two primary bottlenecks: the high computational complexity of computing and storing the covariance matrix, and the memory requirements for handling large-scale data.

To overcome these limitations, online PCA was introduced as a memory-efficient alternative. First proposed by Oja [24], online PCA updates an approximation of the principal components incrementally, processing one data vector at a time. While significant progress has been made in analyzing the convergence of online PCA for the first principal component, the extension to the principal subspace, particularly for distributions with sub-Gaussian tails, remains challenging.

In this work, we extend the state-of-the-art by presenting a nearly optimal convergence analysis for the online subspace PCA method in the context of possibly unbounded distributions. Our method builds on recent advances in stochastic approximation techniques and provides a nearly global convergence rate for estimating the principal subspace. In doing so, we address key difficulties that have hindered the generalization of existing proofs for one-dimensional PCA to the multi-dimensional case.

Backgrounds. To reduce both the time and space complexities, Oja [24] in 1982 proposed an online PCA iteration to approximate the first principal component – the top eigenvector of the

empirical covariance matrix. Computing the first principal component only is rarely adequate in real-world applications. Later in 1985, Oja and Karhunen [25] proposed a subspace online PCA iteration to approximate a principal subspace of any prescribed dimension. These methods update approximations incrementally by processing data one vector at a time as soon as it comes in such that calculating/storing the empirical covariance matrix explicitly is completely avoided and therefore result in no memory burden. In the rest of this paper, by online PCA iteration we mean the one just for computing the first principal component whereas a subspace online PCA iteration refers to one for computing a principal subspace.

Although the online PCA iteration [24] was proposed over 30 years ago, its convergence analysis is rather scarce until recently. Some recent works [7, 16, 27] studied the convergence of the online PCA for the first principal component from different points of view and obtained some results for the case where the samples are almost surely uniformly bounded. For such a case, De Sa *et al.* [10] studied a different but closely related problem, in which the angular part is equivalent to the online PCA, and obtained some convergence results. In contrast, for the distributions with sub-Gaussian tails (note that the samples of this kind of distributions may be unbounded), Li *et al.* [18] proved a nearly optimal convergence rate for the online PCA iteration when the initial guess is randomly chosen according to a uniform distribution and the stepsize chosen in accordance with the sample size. This result is more general than previous ones in [7, 16, 27], because it is for distributions that can possibly be unbounded, and the convergence rate is nearly optimal and nearly global.

For the subspace online PCA [25], some recent works studied the convergence for the case where the samples are almost surely uniformly bounded. In a series of papers [4, 5, 21, 22], Arora *et al.* studied PCA as a stochastic optimization problem and its variations via direct optimization approaches, namely using convex relaxation and adding regularizations. The subspace iteration falls into one variant of their methods. Hardt and Price [13] and Balcan *et al.* [6] treated the subspace iteration as a noisy power method and analyzed its convergence. Li *et al.* [19] investigated the convergence for the case where the initial guess follows the normal distribution. Garber *et al.* [12] used the shift-and-invert technique to speed up the convergence, but their analysis was only done for the top eigenvector. Allen-Zhu and Li [3] proposed a faster variant of subspace online PCA iteration, along with their gap-dependent and gap-free convergence results. However, those works are performed under the assumption that samples are almost surely uniformly bounded. For distributions, e.g., sub-Gaussians, that are possibly unbounded, a thorough convergence analysis of the subspace online PCA remains elusive.

In this paper, we aim to fill up the gap by establishing a nearly optimal and nearly global convergence rate for the subspace online PCA for samples of possibly unbounded distributions of sub-Gaussians. In going through the proving process in [18] for online PCA iteration, we find that there are three major hurdles, as we will explain in detail in section 4.2, that prevent their proving technique for one-dimensional case, i.e., the most significant principal component, from being straightforwardly generalized to analyze the multidimensional case, i.e., significant principal subspaces. To overcome these challenging difficulties, we adopt a new proving technique and apply it to a variant of subspace online PCA to fulfill the goal. The variant is mathematically equivalent to the original one in Oja and Karhunen [25] except without explicit references to QR decompositions for orthogonalization, and is essentially the same as the orthogonal Oja algorithm of Abed-Meraim *et al.* [1]. In addition to the advantages inherited from online PCA, it leads to a computationally economical formula for the subspace online iteration. Some of the proving techniques are built by ourselves with the help of the theory of special functions of a matrix argument, which is rarely used in the statistical community. We mention in passing that our proving technique may be specialized

to the online PCA for a simpler proof than that in [18] for the most significant principal component.

Contributions The primary contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose a nearly optimal stochastic approximation method for online principal subspace estimation, specifically designed for unbounded distributions such as sub-Gaussians.

- We provide a detailed convergence analysis, demonstrating nearly global convergence rates that match lower bounds for subspace estimation.

- Our method avoids the explicit computation of the covariance matrix, making it computationally efficient for high-dimensional data analysis.

Organization The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we review the related work on PCA and subspace estimation. In section 3, we introduce a variant of the subspace online PCA iteration (eq. (8)), which serves as the version to be analyzed. Our main results, including three key theorems and discussions of our newly invented proving technique, are presented in section 4. Here, we also compare our results for the one-dimensional case with the recent work in [18], and highlight the technical differences in the proofs. The detailed proofs of the theorems are provided in sections 5 and 6. Finally, we conclude in section 7, with additional complex calculations deferred to appendix A for clarity and further reference.

Notation. $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the set of all $n \times m$ real matrices, $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, and $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^1$. I_n (or simply I if its dimension is clear from the context) is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and e_j is its jth column (usually with dimension determined by the context). For a matrix X, $\sigma(X)$, $\|X\|_\infty$, $\|X\|_2$ and $\|X\|_{\mathscr{F}}$ are the multiset of the singular values, the ℓ_∞-operator norm, the spectral norm, and the Frobenius norm of X, respectively. $\mathcal{R}(X)$ is the subspace spanned by the columns of X, $X_{(i,j)}$ is the (i,j)th entry of X, and $X_{(k:\ell,:)}$ and $X_{(:,i:j)}$ are two submatrices of X consisting of its row k to row ℓ and column i to column j, respectively. $X \circ Y$ is the Hadamard, i.e., entrywise, product of matrices (vector) X and Y of the same size.

For any vector or matrix X, Y, $X \leq Y$ ($X < Y$) means $X_{(i,j)} \leq Y_{(i,j)}$ ($X_{(i,j)} < Y_{(i,j)}$) for any i, j. $X \geq Y$ ($X > Y$) if $-X \leq -Y$ ($-X < -Y$); $X \leq \alpha$ ($X < \alpha$) for a scalar α means $X_{(i,j)} \leq \alpha$ ($X_{(i,j)} < \alpha$) for any i, j; similarly $X \geq \alpha$ and $X > \alpha$. For a subset or an event $\mathbb{A}$, $\mathbb{A}^c$ is the complement set of $\mathbb{A}$. By $\sigma\{\mathbb{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{A}_p\}$ we denote the σ-algebra generated by the events $\mathbb{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{A}_p$. $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$. $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}; \mathbb{A}\} := \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X} \mathbf{1}_\mathbb{A}\}$ denotes the expectation of a random variable $\boldsymbol{X}$ over event $\mathbb{A}$. Note that

$$\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}; \mathbb{A}\} = \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X} \mid \mathbb{A}\} \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{A}\} \tag{1}$$

For a random vector or matrix $\boldsymbol{X}$, $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\} := \left[\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}_{(i,j)}\}\right]$. Note that $\|\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} \leq \mathrm{E}\{\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\mathrm{ui}}\}$ for $\mathrm{ui} = 2, \mathscr{F}$. Write $\mathrm{cov}_\circ(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{Y}) := \mathrm{E}\{[\boldsymbol{X} - \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\}] \circ [\boldsymbol{Y} - \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{Y}\}]\}$ and $\mathrm{var}_\circ(\boldsymbol{X}) := \mathrm{cov}_\circ(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X})$.

Denote by $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Grassmann manifold of all p-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For two subspaces $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times p}$ be the basis matrices of $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, respectively, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{R}(X)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{R}(Y)$, and denote by σ_j for $1 \leq j \leq p$ in nondecreasing order, i.e., $\sigma_1 \leq \cdots \leq \sigma_p$, the singular values of $(X^{\mathrm{T}} X)^{-1/2} X^{\mathrm{T}} Y (Y^{\mathrm{T}} Y)^{-1/2}$. The p *canonical angles* $\theta_j(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ *between* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ are defined by $0 \leq \theta_j(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) := \arccos \sigma_j \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$. They are in non-increasing order, i.e., $\theta_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \geq \cdots \geq \theta_p(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$. Set $\Theta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \mathrm{diag}(\theta_1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}), \ldots, \theta_p(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}))$. It can be seen that angles so defined are independent of the basis matrices X and Y, which are

3

not unique. With the definition of canonical angles, $\|\sin\Theta(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})\|_{\mathrm{ui}}$ for $\mathrm{ui}=2,\mathscr{F}$ are metrics on $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ [28, Section II.4].

In what follows, we sometimes place a vector or matrix in one or both arguments of $\theta_j(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)$ and $\Theta(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)$ with the understanding that it is about the subspace spanned by the vector or the columns of the matrix argument. For any $X\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times p}$, if $X_{(1:p,:)}$ is nonsingular, then we can define

$$\mathscr{T}(X) := X_{(p+1:d,:)}X_{(1:p,:)}^{-1} \tag{2}$$

2   Related Work

Let $\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ be a d-dimensional random vector with mean $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\}$ and covariance

$$\Sigma = \mathrm{E}\big\{(\boldsymbol{X}-\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\})(\boldsymbol{X}-\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\})^{\mathrm{T}}\big\}$$

To reduce the dimension of $\boldsymbol{X}$ from d to p (usually $p\ll d$), PCA looks for a p-dimensional linear subspace that is closest to the centered random vector $\boldsymbol{X}-\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\}$ in the mean squared sense, through the independent and identically distributed samples $X^{(1)},\ldots,X^{(n)}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\}=0$. Then PCA corresponds to a stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\ \mathrm{E}\big\{\|(I_d-\Pi_{\mathcal{U}})\boldsymbol{X}\|_2^2\big\} \tag{3}$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the orthogonal projector onto the subspace $\mathcal{U}$. Let $\Sigma=U\Lambda U^{\mathrm{T}}$ be the spectral decomposition of Σ, where

$$\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_d) \text{ with } \lambda_1\geq\cdots\geq\lambda_p\geq\lambda_{p+1}\geq\cdots\geq\lambda_d\geq 0 \tag{4}$$

and orthogonal $U=[u_1,\ldots,u_d]$. If $\lambda_p>\lambda_{p+1}$, then the unique solution to the optimization problem eq. (3), namely the p-dimensional principal subspace of Σ, is $\mathcal{U}_*=\mathcal{R}([u_1,\ldots,u_p])$, the subspace spanned by $u_1,\ldots,u_p$. In practice, Σ is unknown, and sample data $\{X^{(1)},\ldots,X^{(n)}\}$ is generally used to estimate $\mathcal{U}_*$. The classical PCA does it by the spectral decomposition of the empirical covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X^{(i)}(X^{(i)})^{\mathrm{T}}$. Specifically, the classical PCA uses $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_*=\mathcal{R}([\widehat{u}_1,\ldots,\widehat{u}_p])$ to estimate $\mathcal{U}_*$, where $\widehat{u}_i$ is the corresponding eigenvectors of $\widehat{\Sigma}$. In the classical PCA, obtaining the empirical covariance matrix has time complexity $\mathrm{O}(nd^2)$ and space complexity $\mathrm{O}(d^2)$. So storing and calculating a large empirical covariance matrix can be very expensive when the data are of high dimension, not to mention the cost $\mathrm{O}(d^3)$ by dense solvers or $\mathrm{O}(pnd)$ (more of $\mathrm{O}(p^2nd)$ with full reorthogonalization for robustness) by some iterative methods for computing its eigenvalues and eigenvectors [11].

To analyze the accuracy of the above estimation using a finite number of samples, an important quantity is the distance between $\mathcal{U}_*$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_*$ by their canonical angles. Vu and Lei [33, Theorem 3.1] proved that if $p(d-p)\frac{\sigma_*^2}{n}$ is bounded for some constant σ_*, then

$$\inf_{\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_*\in\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\ \sup_{\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathcal{P}_0(\sigma_*^2,d)}\ \mathrm{E}\Big\{\|\sin\Theta(\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_*,\mathcal{U}_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2\Big\}\geq cp(d-p)\frac{\sigma_*^2}{n} \tag{5}$$

where $c>0$ is an absolute constant, and $\mathcal{P}_0(\sigma_*^2,d)$ is the set of all d-dimensional sub-Gaussian distributions for which the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix satisfy

$$\frac{\lambda_1\lambda_{p+1}}{(\lambda_p-\lambda_{p+1})^2}\leq\sigma_*^2 \tag{6}$$

4

Note that its left-hand side is the effective noise variance.

To reduce both the time and space complexities, Oja [24] proposed an *online PCA iteration*:

$$\widetilde{u}^{(n)} = u^{(n-1)} + \beta^{(n-1)} X^{(n)} (X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} u^{(n-1)}, \ u^{(n)} = \widetilde{u}^{(n)} \|\widetilde{u}^{(n)}\|_2^{-1} \tag{7}$$

to approximate the first principal component, where $\beta^{(n)} > 0$ is a stepsize. Later Oja and Karhunen [25] proposed a *subspace online PCA iteration*:

$$\widetilde{U}^{(n)} = U^{(n-1)} + X^{(n)} (X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} U^{(n-1)} \operatorname{diag}(\beta_1^{(n-1)}, \dots, \beta_p^{(n-1)}), \ U^{(n)} = \widetilde{U}^{(n)} R^{(n)} \tag{8}$$

to approximate the principal subspace $\mathcal{U}_*$, where $\beta_i^{(n)} > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$ are stepsizes, and $R^{(n)}$ is a normalization matrix to make $U^{(n)}$ have orthonormal columns. The QR decomposition is often used by almost all existing works in the literature; see, e.g., [25, 3, 22] and references therein. It can be seen that these methods update the approximations incrementally by processing data one vector at a time as soon as it comes in, completely avoiding the explicit calculation of the empirical covariance matrix. In the subspace online PCA, obtaining an approximate principal subspace has time complexity $\mathrm{O}(p^2 d)$ and space complexity $\mathrm{O}(pd)$ per iterative step.

Recently, Li *et al.* [18] proved a nearly optimal convergence rate for the iteration eq. (7) for the distributions with sub-Gaussian tails (note the samples of this kind of distributions may be unbounded). One of their main results reads as follows. For the initial guess $u^{(0)}$ that is randomly chosen according to a uniform distribution and the stepsize β is chosen in accordance with the sample size n, there exists a high-probability event $\mathbb{A}_*$ with $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{A}_*\} \geq 1 - \delta$ such that

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{ |\tan \Theta(u^{(n)}, u_*)|^2 \ \middle| \ \mathbb{A}_* \right\} \leq C(d, n, \delta) \frac{\ln n}{n} \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \sum_{i=2}^d \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_i}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_i} \tag{9a}$$

$$\leq C(d, n, \delta) \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2} \frac{(d-1) \ln n}{n} \tag{9b}$$

where $\delta \in [0, 1)$, $u_* = u_1$ is the first principal component, and $C(d, n, \delta)$ can be approximately treated as a constant because for sufficiently large d, $C(d, n, \delta)$ goes to a constant as $n \to \infty$. It can be seen that this bound matches the minimax lower bound eq. (5) up to a logarithmic factor of n, hence, *nearly optimal*. It is significant because a uniformly distributed initial value is nearly orthogonal to the principal component with high probability when d is large [8, section 2.4], and thus such a random initial vector is not a very good initial guess to start an iteration with. This result is more general than previous ones in [7, 16, 27], because it is for distributions that can possibly be unbounded, and the convergence rate is nearly optimal and nearly global. Unfortunately, the above significant work [18] on the online PCA iteration cannot be trivially generalized to the subspace online PCA iteration due to three major difficulties to be discussed in section 4.2.

3 Efficient Subspace Online PCA

Let $X^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ be independent and identically distributed samples of $\boldsymbol{X}$. As $\{X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(n)}\}$ comes in a sequential order, the subspace online PCA iteration eq. (8) of Oja and Karhunen [25] is used to compute the principal subspace of dimension p. Differing from eq. (8), our proposed subspace online PCA has the following changes:

(1) a fixed stepsize $\beta_i^{(n)} = \beta > 0, \forall n, i = 1, \dots, p$, is used;

5

(2) the normalization matrix to make $U^{(n)}$ have orthonormal columns are explicitly given by

$$R^{(n)} = [(\widetilde{U}^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}\widetilde{U}^{(n)}]^{-1/2} \tag{10}$$

With the changes, our subspace online PCA iteration becomes

$$\widetilde{U}^{(n)} = U^{(n-1)} + \beta X^{(n)}(X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}U^{(n-1)}, \ U^{(n)} = \widetilde{U}^{(n)}[(\widetilde{U}^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}\widetilde{U}^{(n)}]^{-1/2} \tag{11}$$

It can be verified that $U^{(n)}$ has orthonormal columns. This variant is equivalent to eq. (8) in the sense that both $U^{(n)}$ here and the one there have the same column space. It turns out that the matrix square root and the inverse in eq. (10) can be done analytically as in Lemma 1 below, leading to a simple and computationally economical formula for $U^{(n)}$ of eq. (11). An equivalent of Lemma 1 was implied in [1], although not explicitly and rigorously stated, to analytically transform iteration formula eq. (11). For that reason, we credit the lemma to [1], but provide a proof for completeness because of some missing details in the derivation in [1].

Lemma 1 ([1]). *Let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$ with $V^{\mathrm{T}}V = I_p$, $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $0 < \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $W :=$
$V + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}}V = (I_d + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}})V$, $V_+ := W(W^{\mathrm{T}}W)^{-1/2}$. If $V^{\mathrm{T}}x \neq 0$, then*

$$V_+ = V + \beta\widetilde{\alpha}xz^{\mathrm{T}} - \frac{1-\widetilde{\alpha}}{\gamma^2}Vzz^{\mathrm{T}}$$

*where $z = V^{\mathrm{T}}x$, $\gamma = \|z\|_2$, $\widetilde{z} = z/\gamma$, and $\alpha = \beta(2 + \beta\|x\|_2^2)\gamma^2$, and $\widetilde{\alpha} = (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}$. In particular,
$V_+^{\mathrm{T}}V_+ = I_p$.*

Proof. We have $W^{\mathrm{T}}W = V^{\mathrm{T}}[I_d + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}}]^2 V = I_p + \alpha\widetilde{z}\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}}$. Let $Z_\perp \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-1)}$ such that $[\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp]^{\mathrm{T}}[\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp] =$
I_p. The eigen-decomposition of $W^{\mathrm{T}}W$ is $W^{\mathrm{T}}W = [\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} 1+\alpha & \\ & I_{p-1} \end{bmatrix} [\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp]^{\mathrm{T}}$ which yields

$$(W^{\mathrm{T}}W)^{-1/2} = [\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp] \begin{bmatrix} (1+\alpha)^{-1/2} & \\ & I_{p-1} \end{bmatrix} [\widetilde{z}, Z_\perp]^{\mathrm{T}} = I_p - [1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}]\widetilde{z}\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_+ &= (V + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}}V)\{I_p - [1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}]\widetilde{z}\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}}\} \\
&= V + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}}V - [1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}](V + \beta xx^{\mathrm{T}}V)\widetilde{z}\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\text{use } x^{\mathrm{T}}V = z^{\mathrm{T}} = \gamma\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}}) \\
&= V + \beta\gamma x\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}} - [1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}]V\widetilde{z}\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}} - [1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}]\beta\gamma x\widetilde{z}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
&= V + (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}\beta xz^{\mathrm{T}} - \frac{1 - (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}}{\gamma^2}Vzz^{\mathrm{T}}
\end{aligned}$$

as expected, knowing $\widetilde{\alpha} = (1+\alpha)^{-1/2}$. $\qquad \square$

To apply this lemma to transform eq. (11), we perform substitutions:

$$\widetilde{U}^{(n)} \leftarrow W, \ U^{(n-1)} \leftarrow V, \ U^{(n)} \leftarrow V_+, \ X^{(n)} \leftarrow x, \ Z^{(n)} \leftarrow z$$

to get

$$U^{(n)} = U^{(n-1)} + \beta(1 + \alpha^{(n)})^{-1/2}X^{(n)}(Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} - [1 - (1+\alpha^{(n)})^{-1/2}]\frac{U^{(n-1)}Z^{(n)}(Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}}{\|Z^{(n)}\|_2^2}$$

6

Algorithm 1 Subspace Online PCA

1: Choose $U^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$ with $(U^{(0)})^{\mathrm{T}} U^{(0)} = I$, and choose stepsize $\beta > 0$.
2: **for** $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ until convergence **do**
3:     Take an $\boldsymbol{X}$'s sample $X^{(n)}$;
4:     $Z^{(n)} = (U^{(n-1)})^{\mathrm{T}} X^{(n)}$, $\alpha^{(n)} = \beta \left(2 + \beta (X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} X^{(n)}\right) (Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} Z^{(n)}$, $\widetilde{\alpha}^{(n)} = (1 + \alpha^{(n)})^{-1/2}$;
5:     $U^{(n)} = U^{(n-1)} + \beta \widetilde{\alpha}^{(n)} X^{(n)} (Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} - \frac{1 - \widetilde{\alpha}^{(n)}}{(Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} Z^{(n)}} U^{(n-1)} Z^{(n)} (Z^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}$.
6: **end for**

---

where $\alpha^{(n)} = \beta \left(2 + \beta (X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}} X^{(n)}\right) \|Z^{(n)}\|_2^2$ and $Z^{(n)} = (U^{(n-1)})^{\mathrm{T}} X^{(n)}$. Finally, we outline in Algorithm 1 the subspace online PCA algorithm derived from eq. (11). This is essentially the same as the orthogonal Oja algorithm [1] and will be one we are going to analyze. Computationally, it has the advantages of not involving any explicit orthogonalization by the Gram-Schmidt process or matrix square root, but only in terms of matrix-vector multiplications. This formulation is numerically stable and computationally fast. At convergence, it is expected that

$$U^{(n)} \to U_* := U \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p]$$

in the sense that $\|\sin \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathrm{ui}} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The rest of this paper is devoted to analyze its convergence, with the help of the next lemma.

Lemma 2. *For $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$ with nonsingular $V_{(1:p,:)}$, we have for $\mathrm{ui} = 2, \mathscr{F}$*

$$\left\| \tan \Theta(V, \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}) \right\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \| \mathscr{T}(V) \|_{\mathrm{ui}} \tag{12}$$

where $\mathscr{T}(V)$ is defined as in (2).

Proof. Let $Y = \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$. It can be seen that the singular values $\sigma_j = \cos \theta_j(V, Y)$ of

$$\left[I + \mathscr{T}(V)^{\mathrm{T}} \mathscr{T}(V) \right]^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \mathscr{T}(V) \end{bmatrix}^{\mathrm{T}} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \left[I + \mathscr{T}(V)^{\mathrm{T}} \mathscr{T}(V) \right]^{-1/2}$$

and the singular values τ_j of $\mathscr{T}(V)$ are related by $\tau_j = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \sigma_j^2}}{\sigma_j} = \tan \theta_j(V, Y)$. Hence the identity eq. (12) holds. $\square$

Notations introduced in this section, except those in Lemma 1 will be adopted throughout the rest of this paper.

4 Main Results

For convenience, we first review our setting. Let $\boldsymbol{X} = [\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_d]^{\mathrm{T}}$ be a random vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Assume $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\} = 0$. Its covariance matrix $\Sigma := \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{X}^{\mathrm{T}}\}$ has the spectral decomposition

$$\Sigma = U \Lambda U^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \text{with} \quad U = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d], \ \Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d) \tag{13}$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is orthogonal, and λ_i for $1 \leq i \leq d$ are the eigenvalues of Σ, arranged for convenience in non-increasing order. Assume

$$\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_p > \lambda_{p+1} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d > 0 \tag{14}$$

Given $\{X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(n)}\}$ in a sequential order, the proposed subspace online PCA iteration eq. (11) is used to compute the principal subspace $U^{(n)}$ of dimension p to estimate

$$\mathcal{U}_* = \mathcal{R}(U_{(:,1:p)}) = \mathcal{R}([u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p]) \tag{15}$$

Our major result on the convergence rate of the subspace online PCA iteration in Algorithm 1 states as follows: if the initial guess $U^{(0)}$ is randomly chosen to satisfy that $\mathcal{R}(U^{(0)})$ is uniformly sampled from $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and the stepsize $\beta_i^{(n)}$ is chosen the same for $1 \leq i \leq p$ and in accordance with the sample size n, then there exists a high-probability event $\mathbb{H}_*$ with $P\{\mathbb{H}_*\} \geq 1 - 2\delta^{p^2}$, such that

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\|\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 \,\Big|\, \mathbb{H}_*\right\} \leq C(d,n,\delta)\frac{\ln n}{n}\frac{1}{\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\sum_{i=p+1}^{d}\frac{\lambda_j\lambda_i}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \tag{16a}$$

$$\leq C(d,n,\delta)\frac{\lambda_p\lambda_{p+1}}{(\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1})^2}\frac{p(d-p)\ln n}{n}, \tag{16b}$$

where the constant $C(d,n,\delta) \to 24\psi^4/(1-\delta^{p^2})$ as $d \to \infty$ and $n \to \infty$, and ψ is $\boldsymbol{X}$'s Orlicz-ψ_2 norm (see Definition 1 below). This also matches the minimax lower bound eq. (5) up to a logarithmic factor of n, and hence is *nearly optimal* and *nearly global* for the subspace online PCA, in the same way as (9) of Li *et al.* [18] for the vector online PCA. Both are valid for any sub-Gaussian distribution.

Comparing eq. (16) and eq. (9), we find that eq. (9) becomes the special case of our results eq. (16) in the case of $p = 1$. Unfortunately, the proving technique in [18] used for the one-dimensional case ($p = 1$) is not generalizable to the multi-dimensional case ($p > 1$). More detail will be forthcoming in section 4.2.

We also note that the factor in our result is

$$\frac{\lambda_p\lambda_{p+1}}{(\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1})^2} \quad vs. \quad \frac{\lambda_1\lambda_{p+1}}{(\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1})^2}$$

The second quantity appeared in eq. (6). The first quantity is always smaller but both are of similar order if λ_1 and λ_p are of similar order. However, their magnitude can differ greatly when $\lambda_p \ll \lambda_1$.

4.1   Three Main Theorems

In this subsection, we will state our three main theorems of the paper for the multi-dimensional case and eq. (16) is a consequence of them. Before that, we will introduce necessary definitions and assumptions. We would like to point out that any statement we will make is meant to hold *almost surely*.

We are concerned with random variables/vectors that have a sub-Gaussian distribution. To that end, we need to introduce the Orlicz ψ_α-norm of a random variable/vector. More details can be found in [31].

8

Definition 1. *The* Orlicz ψ_α-*norm of a random variable* $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}$ *is defined as*

$$\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_\alpha} := \inf\left\{\xi > 0 : \mathrm{E}\left\{\exp\left(\left|\frac{\boldsymbol{X}}{\xi}\right|^\alpha\right)\right\} \leq 2\right\}$$

and the Orlicz ψ_α-*norm of a random vector* $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *is defined as*

$$\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_\alpha} := \sup_{\|v\|_2 = 1} \|v^\mathrm{T}\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_\alpha}.$$

We say random variable/vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ *follows a* sub-Gaussian distribution *if* $\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

By the definition, any bounded random variable/vector follows a sub-Gaussian distribution. To prepare our convergence analysis, we make a few assumptions.

Assumption 1. $\boldsymbol{X} = [\boldsymbol{X}_1, \boldsymbol{X}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_d]^\mathrm{T} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *is a random vector.*

(A-1) $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\} = 0$, *and* $\Sigma := \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{X}^\mathrm{T}\}$ *has the spectral decomposition eq. (13) satisfying eq. (14);*

(A-2) $\psi := \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

The principal subspace $\mathcal{U}_*$ in eq. (15) is uniquely determined under item (A-1) of Assumption 1. On the other hand, item (A-2) of Assumption 1 ensures that all 1-dimensional marginals of $\boldsymbol{X}$ have sub-Gaussian tails, or equivalently, $\boldsymbol{X}$ follows a sub-Gaussian distribution. This is also an assumption that is used in [18].

In what follows, we will state our main results under the assumption and leave their proofs to sections 5 and 6 because of their high complexity. To that end, first we introduce some quantities:

- the eigenvalue gap $\gamma := \lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}$,

- the sum of the top i eigenvalues $\eta_i := \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_i$, $\quad i = 1, \ldots, d$,

- the dominance of the top i eigenvalues $\mu_i := \frac{\eta_i}{\eta_d} \in \left[\frac{i}{d}, 1\right]$,

- for $s > 0$ and the stepsize $\beta < 1$ such that $\beta\gamma < 1$, integer function

$$N_s(\beta) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : (1 - \beta\gamma)^n \leq \beta^s\} = \left\lceil \frac{s \ln\beta}{\ln(1 - \beta\gamma)} \right\rceil \tag{17}$$

   where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function taking the smallest integer that is no smaller than its argument,

- and finally, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/7$, integer function

$$M(\varepsilon) := \min\left\{m \in \mathbb{N} : \beta^{7\varepsilon/2 - 1/2} \leq \beta^{(1 - 2^{1-m})(3\varepsilon - 1/2)}\right\} = 2 + \left\lceil \frac{\ln\frac{1/2 - 3\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}{\ln 2} \right\rceil \geq 2$$

In practice, it is always desirable to use a good initial guess in an iterative method whenever there is one available because it positively affects computational efficiency in reducing the number of iterations required to achieve an approximation within a prescribed tolerance. On the other hand, when there isn't one known, a randomly chosen initial guess is often taken. Our first main result in Theorem 1 covers the case when a somewhat good initial subspace $U^{(0)}$ is available whereas our second main result in Theorem 2 is about using a randomly chosen initial subspace.

Theorem 1. *Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/7)$, $\omega \in (0,1)$, $\phi > 0$, and κ and β satisfying*

$$\kappa > 6^{[M(\varepsilon)-1]/2}\max\{\sqrt{2}, 2(\sqrt{2}-1)^{1/2}\phi\lambda_1^{-1/2}\omega^{1/2}\},\ 0 < \beta < \min\left\{1, \left(\frac{1}{8\kappa\eta_p}\right)^{\frac{2}{1-4\varepsilon}}, \left(\frac{\gamma}{130\kappa^2\eta_p^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}\right\}$$

(18)

Let $U^{(n)}$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ be the approximations of U_* generated by Algorithm 1. *Under* Assumption 1, *if*

$$\|\tan\Theta(U^{(0)}, U_*)\|_2^2 \le \phi^2 d - 1$$

(19)

and

$$(\sqrt{2}+1)\lambda_1 d\beta^{1-7\varepsilon} \le \omega, \quad K > N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta)$$

(20)

then there exist absolute constants[1] C_ψ, C_ν, $C_\circ$ and a high-probability event $\mathbb{H}$ with

$$P\{\mathbb{H}\} \ge 1 - K[(2+e)d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon})$$

(21)

such that for any $n \in [N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta), K]$

$$E\left\{\|\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2;\ \mathbb{H}\right\} \le (1-\beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)}p\phi^2 d + \frac{32\psi^4\beta}{2-\lambda_1\beta}\varphi(p,d;\Lambda) + C_\circ\kappa^4\mu_p^{-2}\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}\beta^{3/2-7\varepsilon}$$

(22)

where $e = \exp(1)$ is Euler's number, $C_{\nu\psi} = \max\{C_\nu\mu_p, C_\psi\min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\}$, and

$$\varphi(p,d;\Lambda) := \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=p+1}^d \frac{\lambda_j\lambda_i}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \in \left[\frac{p(d-p)\lambda_1\lambda_d}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_d}, \frac{p(d-p)\lambda_p\lambda_{p+1}}{\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}}\right]$$

(23)

Remark. (i) Although an interval is presented in eq. (23) to bound $\varphi(p, d; \Lambda)$, there are more informative ones under additional assumptions on random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$. For example, in some of the past works [3, 7, 16, 27, 4, 5, 21, 22], it is assumed $\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = E\{\|\boldsymbol{X}\|_2^2\} \le c$ for some constant c, independent of dimension d. Then

$$\varphi(p,d;\Lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=p+1}^d \frac{\lambda_j\lambda_i}{\lambda_j - \lambda_i} \le \frac{1}{\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}}\sum_{j=1}^p\sum_{i=p+1}^d \lambda_j\lambda_i \le \frac{1}{\gamma}\left(\sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j\right)\left(c - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i\right) \le \frac{c^2}{4\gamma}$$

(24)

As a result, the second term in the right-hand side of eq. (22) is of $O(\beta)$. Under the same assumption, after a careful check (of Appendix A.2), the third term can be ensured of $O(\beta)$, too, by making $7\varepsilon \le 1/2$. Both terms do not go to 0 as $n \to \infty$, as we would like to ideally have. Nonetheless, we argue that it doesn't diminish the usefulness of the error bound. Here is why. Like in any iterative method, the ultimate goal is to drive approximation error down to a prescribed level. Since the terms are of $O(\beta)$, given a prescribed error tolerance, we can always take the stepsize β in the same order of the tolerance to yield an eventual approximation to the subspace within the desired error level.

(ii) Theorem 1 involves a set of pre-chosen constant parameters: ϵ, ω, ϕ, κ, and β subject to the inequalities in (18) so that $K[(2+e)d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon})$ is sufficiently tiny to make $\mathbb{H}$ a

---

[1]We attach each with a subscript for the convenience of indicating their associations. They don't change as the values of the subscript variables vary, by which we mean *absolute constants*. Later in eq. (38), we explicitly bound these absolute constants.

high probability event. For that reason n is limited to no bigger than K. Ideally, the event $\mathbb{H}$ should exist with high probability for all sufficiently large n. According to our proof, the theorem remains valid with simply setting K to n:

$$n > N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta), \qquad \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{H}) \geq 1 - n[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon}) \qquad (21')$$

everything else being equal. This means with any given constant parameters, there is no guarantee that $\mathbb{H}$ is still a high probability event if n is too large. While this is not ideal, we argue that if the number n of samples or some rough range of it is known, we can always optimize these constant parameters, by making β small enough, so that $n[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon})$ is still tiny to render a high probability event $\mathbb{H}$. For example, in Theorem 4.5, we specify what is needed on the constant parameters. We point out in passing that the results in Li *et al.* [18] for the vector online PCA also require that the number n of samples be bounded from above.

One subtlety in bounding $\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{H})$ from below as in (21') is that now the event $\mathbb{H}$ depends on n. Theorem 4.2 as stated with the preset K ensures one high probability event $\mathbb{H}$ for all $n \in [N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta), K]$. From the practical point of view, the number of samples is always finite, i.e., such a K does exist, and one might have some idea about what it is. When we do, the constant parameters can be judiciously chosen to ensure $K[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon})$ tiny.

(iii) This remark applies to Theorem 2 later as well.

Theorem 1 assumes a somewhat accurate initial subspace $U^{(0)}$, i.e., satisfying eq. (19) which isn't very restrictive because $\phi^2 d - 1$ can be very big for huge d. As we mentioned earlier, often we don't have a good initial subspace, in which case, we may simply resort to a randomly selected $U^{(0)}$. Consider the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the one with the Haar invariant probability measure (see [9, Section 1.4] and [17, Section 4.6]). We are interested in a randomly selected $U^{(0)}$ such that

$$\boxed{\mathcal{R}(U^{(0)}) \text{ is uniformly sampled from } \mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \qquad (25)$$

The reader is referred to [9, Section 2.2] on how to generate such a uniform distribution on $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Theorem 2. *Under* Assumption 1, *for sufficiently large d and any β satisfying eq. (18) with*

$$\kappa = 6^{[M(\varepsilon)-1]/2}\max\{2C_p, \sqrt{2}\}$$

and

$$p < (d+1)/2, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1/7), \quad \delta \in (0, 2^{-1/p^2}), \quad K > N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta)$$

where C_p is a constant only dependent on p, if eq. (25) holds, and

$$d\beta^{1-3\varepsilon} \leq \delta^2, \ K[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon}) \leq \delta^{p^2}$$

then there exists a high-probability event $\mathbb{H}_*$ with $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_*\} \geq 1 - 2\delta^{p^2}$ such that

$$\mathrm{E}\Big\{\|\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2; \ \mathbb{H}_*\Big\} \leq (1-\beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)}pC_p^2\delta^{-2}d + \frac{32\psi^4\beta}{2-\lambda_1\beta}\varphi(p, d; \Lambda) + C_\circ\kappa^4\mu_p^{-2}\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}\beta^{3/2-7\varepsilon}$$
$$(26)$$

for any $n \in [N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta), K]$, where $\varphi(p, d; \Lambda)$ is as in eq. (23).

11

Our third main result is about picking a nearly optimal stepsize β for nearly optimal convergence rate, assuming the sample size is reasonably large and fixed at N_*. The idea is to pick a good β to balance the terms in the right-hand side of eq. (26) subject to $N_* \geq N_{3/2}(\beta)$ (thus we also need a large enough number of samples). The nearly optimal stepsize β is

$$\beta = \beta_* := \frac{3\ln N_*}{2\gamma N_*} \tag{27}$$

which is consistent with the choice in [18] for $p = 1$.

Theorem 3. *Under* Assumption 1, *for sufficiently large $d \geq 2p$ and a sufficiently large number N_* of samples, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/7)$, $\delta \in (0, 2^{-1/p^2})$ satisfying*

$$d\beta_*^{1-3\varepsilon} \leq \delta^2, \ N_*[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta_*^{-\varepsilon}) \leq \delta^{p^2} \tag{28}$$

where β_* is given by eq. (27), if eq. (25) holds, then there exists a high-probability event $\mathbb{H}_*$ with $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_*\} \geq 1 - 2\delta^{p^2}$, such that

$$\mathrm{E}\Big\{\|\tan\Theta(U^{(N_*)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2; \ \mathbb{H}_*\Big\} \leq C_*(d, N_*, \delta)\frac{\varphi(p, d; \Lambda)}{\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1}}\frac{\ln N_*}{N_*} \tag{29}$$

where the constant $C_*(d, N_*, \delta) \to 24\psi^4$ as $d \to \infty, N_* \to \infty$, and $\varphi(p, d; \Lambda)$ is as in eq. (23).

In Theorems 1, 2 and 3, the conclusions are stated in term of the expectation of $\|\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2$ over some highly probable event. These expectations can be turned into conditional expectations, thanks to the relation eq. (1). In fact, eq. (16) is a consequence of eq. (29) and eq. (1).

4.2 Discussions of New Proving Techniques

Our three theorems in the previous section, namely Theorems 1, 2 and 3, are the analogs for $p > 1$ of Li *et al.*'s three theorems [18, Theorems 1, 2, and 3] which are for $p = 1$ only. Naturally, we would like to know how our results when applied to the case $p = 1$ and our proofs would stand against those in [18]. We choose to compare our results with those in [18] because Li *et al.* [18] dealt with sub-Gaussian samples whereas other existing works in the literature studied the vector/subspace online PCA for bounded samples only. In what follows, we will do a fairly detailed comparison. Before we do that, let us state their theorems (in our notation).

Theorem 4 ([18, Theorem 1]). *Under* Assumption 1 *and $p = 1$, suppose there exists a constant $\phi > 1$ such that $\tan\Theta(U^{(0)}, U_*) \leq \phi^2 d$. Let*

$$\widehat{N}^{\mathrm{o}}(\beta, \phi) := \min\big\{n \in \mathbb{N} : (1 - \beta\gamma)^n \leq [4\phi^2 d]^{-1}\big\} \ = \ \Big\lceil \frac{-\ln[4\phi^2 d]}{\ln(1 - \beta\gamma)} \Big\rceil,$$

$$\widehat{N}_s(\beta) := \min\big\{n \in \mathbb{N} : (1 - \beta\gamma)^n \leq [\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]^s\big\} = \Big\lceil \frac{s\ln[\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]}{\ln(1 - \beta\gamma)} \Big\rceil$$

Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$, stepsize $\beta > 0$ satisfying $d[\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]^{1-2\varepsilon} \leq b_1\phi^{-2}$, and any $t > 1$, there exists an event $\mathbb{H}$ with

$$\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}\} \geq 1 - 2(d+2)\widehat{N}^{\mathrm{o}}(\beta, \phi)\exp\big(-C_0[\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]^{-2\varepsilon}\big) - 4d\widehat{N}_t(\beta)\exp\big(-C_1[\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]^{-2\varepsilon}\big)$$

12

such that for any $n \in [\widehat{N}_1(\beta) + \widehat{N}^o(\beta, \phi), \widehat{N}_t(\beta)]$

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\tan^2 \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*); \mathbb{H}\right\} \leq (1-\beta\gamma)^{2[n-\widehat{N}^o(\beta,\phi)]} + C_2\beta\varphi(1,d;\Lambda) + C_2\sum_{i=2}^{d}\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_i}[\lambda_1^2\gamma^{-1}\beta]^{3/2-4\varepsilon} \quad (30)$$

where $b_1 \in (0, \ln^2, 2/16)$, C_0, C_1, C_2 are absolute constants.

What we can see that Theorem 1 for $p = 1$ is essentially the same as Theorem 4. In fact, since $(1 - \beta\gamma)^{1-\widehat{N}^o(\beta,\phi)} \leq 4\phi^2 d \leq (1-\beta\gamma)^{-\widehat{N}^o(\beta,\phi)}$, the upper bounds by eq. (22) for $p = 1$ and by eq. (30) are comparable in the sense that they are in the same order in d, β, δ. Naturally one may try to generalize the proving techniques in [18] which is for the one-dimensional case ($p = 1$) to handle the multi-dimensional case ($p > 1$). Indeed, we tried but didn't succeed, due to we believe there insurmountable obstacles. In fact, one of the key steps in proof works for $p = 1$ does not seem to work for $p > 1$. Next, we explain these obstacles in details.

The basic structure of the proof in [18] is to split the Grassmann manifold $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where the initial guess comes from, into two regions: the *cold region* and *warm region*. Roughly speaking, an approximation $U^{(n)}$ in the warm region means that $\|\tan \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}$ is small while it in the cold region means that $\|\tan \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}$ is not that small. U_* sits at the "*center*" of the warm region which is wrapped around by the cold region. The proof is divided into two cases: the first case is when the initial guess is in the warm region and the other one is when it is in the cold region. For the first case, they proved that the algorithm will produce a sequence convergent to the principal subspace (which is actually the most significant principal component because it is for $p = 1$) with high probability. For the second case, they first proved that the algorithm will produce a sequence of approximations that, after a finite number of iterations, will fall into the warm region with high probability, and then use the conclusion proved for the first case to conclude the proof due to the Markov property.

For our situation $p > 1$, we still structure our proof in the same way, i.e., dividing the whole proof into two cases: $U^{(0)}$ coming from the *cold region* or *warm region*. The proof in [18] for the warm region case can be carried over with a little extra effort, as we will see later, but it was not possible for us to use a similar argument in [18] to get the job done for the cold region case. Three major difficulties are as follows.

(i) In [18], essentially $\|\cot \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}$ was used to track the behavior of a martingale along with the power iteration. Note $\cot \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)$ is $p \times p$. Thus it is a scalar when $p = 1$, perfectly well-conditioned if treated as a matrix, but for $p > 1$, it is a genuine matrix and, in fact, an inverse of a random matrix in the proof. The first difficulty is how to estimate the inverse because it may not even exist!

(ii) We tried to separate the flow of $U^{(n)}$ into two subflows: the ill-conditioned flow and the well-conditioned flow, and estimate the related quantities separately. Here the ill-conditioned flow at each step represents the subspace generated by the singular vectors of $\cot \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)$ whose corresponding singular values are tiny, while the well-conditioned flow at each step represents the subspace generated by the other singular vectors, of which the inverse (restricted to this subspace) is well conditioned. Unfortunately, tracking the two flows can be an impossible task because, due to the randomness, some elements in the ill-conditioned flow could jump to the well-conditioned flow during the iteration, and vice versa.

(iii) The third one is to build a martingale to go along with a proper power iteration, or equivalently, to find the Doob decomposition of the process, because the recursion formula of the

main part of the inverse — the drift in the Doob decomposition, even if limited to the well-conditioned flow, is not a linear operator, which makes it impossible to build a proper power iteration.

In the end, to deal with the cold region, we gave up the idea of estimating $\|\cot \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathscr{F}}$. Instead, we invented another method: cutting the cold region into many layers, each wrapped around by another with the innermost one around the warm region. We prove the initial guess in any layer will produce a sequence of approximations that will fall into its inner neighbor layer (or the warm region if the layer is innermost) in a finite number of iterations with high probability. Therefore eventually, any initial guess in the cold region will lead to an approximation in the warm region within a finite number of iterations with high probability, returning to the case of initial guesses coming from the warm region because of the Markov property. This enables us to completely avoid the difficulties mentioned above. This technique works for $p = 1$, too, and it can result in a simpler proof for the online PCA than that in [18].

The other two main theorems of Li et $al.$ [18, Theorems 2 and 3] are stated as follows.

Theorem 5 ([18, Theorem 2]). *Under* Assumption 1 *and* $p = 1$, *suppose that* $U^{(0)}$ *is uniformly sampled from the unit sphere. Then for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$, *stepsize* $\beta > 0, \delta > 0$ *satisfying*

$$d[\lambda_1^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta]^{1-2\varepsilon} \le b_2 \delta^2, \ 4d\widehat{N}_2(\beta) \exp\left(-C_3[\lambda_1^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta]^{-2\varepsilon}\right) \le \delta$$

there exists an event $\mathbb{H}_*$ *with* $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_*\} \ge 1 - 2\delta$ *such that for any* $n \in [\widehat{N}_2(\beta), \widehat{N}_3(\beta)]$

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\tan^2 \Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*); \mathbb{H}_*\right\} \le C_4(1 - \beta\gamma)^{2n} \delta^{-4} d^2 + C_4 \beta \varphi(1, d; \Lambda) + C_4 \sum_{i=2}^{d} \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_i} [\lambda_1^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta]^{3/2 - 4\varepsilon} \tag{31}$$

where b_2, C_3, C_4 *are absolute constants.*

Theorem 6 ([18, Theorem 3]). *Under* Assumption 1 *and* $p = 1$, *suppose that* $U^{(0)}$ *is uniformly sampled from the unit sphere and let* $\beta_* = \frac{2\ln N_*}{\gamma N}$. *Then for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/8)$, $N_* \ge 1, \delta > 0$ *satisfying*

$$d[\lambda_1^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta_*]^{1-2\varepsilon} \le b_3 \delta^2, \ 4d\widehat{N}_2(\beta_*) \exp\left(-C_6[\lambda_1^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta_*]^{-2\varepsilon}\right) \le \delta$$

there exists an event $\mathbb{H}_*$ *with* $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_*\} \ge 1 - 2\delta$ *such that*

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\tan^2 \Theta(U^{(N_*)}, U_*); \mathbb{H}_*\right\} \le C_*(d, N_*, \delta) \frac{\varphi(1, d; \Lambda)}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \frac{\ln N_*}{N_*} \tag{32}$$

where the constant $C_*(d, N_*, \delta) \to C_5$ *as* $d \to \infty, N_* \to \infty$, *and* b_3, C_5, C_6 *are absolute constants.*

Our Theorems 2 and 3 when applied to the case $p = 1$ do not exactly yield Theorems 5 and 6, respectively. But the resulting conditions and upper bounds have the same orders in constant parameters d, β, δ, and the coefficients of β and $\frac{\ln N_*}{N}$ in the upper bounds are comparable. Note that the first term in right-hand side of eq. (26) is proportional to d, not d^2 as in eq. (31); so ours is tighter for high-dimensional data.

Our proofs for Theorems 2 and 3 are nearly the same as those in [18] for Theorems 5 and 6 owing to the fact that the difficult estimates have already been taken care of by either Theorem 1 or Theorem 4. But still there are some extras for $p > 1$, namely, the need to estimate the marginal probability for the uniform distribution on the Grassmann manifold of dimension higher than 1. We are not aware of anything like that in the literature, and thus have to build it ourselves with

the help of the theory of special functions of a matrix argument, rarely used in the statistical community.

It may also be worth pointing out that all absolute constants, except C_p which has an explicit expression in eq. (53) and C_ψ, in our theorems will be explicitly bounded as in eq. (38), whereas those in Theorems 4 to 6 are not.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

We start by building a substantial amount of preparation material in sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 before we prove the theorem in section 5.4. In section 5.1, we set the stage and introduce matrix $T^{(n)}$ to serve the role of $\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)$ associated with the nth approximation. In particular we have $\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \|\tan\Theta(U^{(n)}, U_*)\|_{\mathrm{ui}}$. In section 5.2, we present incremental estimates for one iterative step of the subspace online PCA in Lemma 4 and Lemma 5. These estimates allow us to associate one iterative step with a quasi-power iterative step by an operator $\mathcal{L}$ defined at the beginning of section 5.3, and then further we relate $T^{(n)}$ to $\mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}$ by showing $T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}$ is bounded with high probability in Lemma 6. This lemma is very critical to our proofs. It leads to Lemma 7 which says that $\|T^{(n)}\|_2$ stagedly decreases and Lemma 8 in which the expectation of $T^{(n)}$ is estimated. Finally, we will be ready to prove Theorem 1 in section 5.4.

5.1 Simplification

Without loss of generality, we may assume that the covariance matrix Σ diagonal. Otherwise, we can perform a (constant) orthogonal transformation as follows. Recall the spectral decomposition $\Sigma = U\Lambda U^{\mathrm{T}}$ in eq. (13). Instead of the random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$, we equivalently consider

$$\boldsymbol{Y} \equiv [\boldsymbol{Y}_1, \boldsymbol{Y}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{Y}_n]^{\mathrm{T}} := U^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X}$$

Accordingly, perform the same orthogonal transformation on all involved quantities:

$$Y^{(n)} = U^{\mathrm{T}}X^{(n)}, \quad V^{(n)} = U^{\mathrm{T}}U^{(n)}, \quad V_* = U^{\mathrm{T}}U_* = \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{33}$$

As a consequence, we will have equivalent versions of Algorithm 1, Theorems 1, 2 and 3. Firstly, because

$$(V^{(n-1)})^{\mathrm{T}}Y^{(n)} = (U^{(n-1)})^{\mathrm{T}}X^{(n)} = Z^{(n)}, \quad (Y^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}Y^{(n)} = (X^{(n)})^{\mathrm{T}}X^{(n)}$$

the equivalent version of Algorithm 1 is obtained by symbolically replacing all letters X, U by Y, V while keeping their respective superscripts. If the algorithm converges, it is expected that $\mathcal{R}(V^{(n)}) \to \mathcal{R}(V_*)$. Secondly, noting

$$\|\Sigma^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_2} = \|U\Lambda^{-1/2}U^{\mathrm{T}}\boldsymbol{X}\|_{\psi_2} = \|\Lambda^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{Y}\|_{\psi_2}$$

we can restate Assumption 1 equivalently as

(A-1′) $\mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{Y}\} = 0, \mathrm{E}\{\boldsymbol{Y}\boldsymbol{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\} = \Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ with eq. (14);

(A-2′) $\psi := \|\Lambda^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{Y}\|_{\psi_2} < \infty$.

Thirdly, all canonical angles between two subspaces are invariant under the orthogonal transformation. Therefore the equivalent versions of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 for $\boldsymbol{Y}$ can be simply obtained by replacing all letters X, U by Y, V while keeping their respective superscripts.

In what follows, we assume that Σ is diagonal. In the rest of this section, we will prove the mentioned equivalent version of Theorem 1. Likewise in the next section, we will prove the equivalent versions of Theorems 2 and 3.

To facilitate our proof, we introduce new notations for two particular submatrices of any $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$:

$$\bar{V} = V_{(1:p,:)}, \quad \underline{V} = V_{(p+1:d,:)} \tag{34}$$

In particular, $\mathscr{T}(V) = \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}$ for the operator $\mathscr{T}$ defined in eq. (2), provided $\bar{V}$ is nonsingular. Set

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p), \quad \underline{\Lambda} = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_{p+1}, \ldots, \lambda_d) \tag{35}$$

Although the assignments to $\bar{\Lambda}$ and $\underline{\Lambda}$ are not consistent with the extractions defined by eq. (34), they don't seem to cause confusions in our later presentations.

For $\kappa > 1$, define $\mathbb{S}(\kappa) := \{V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times p} : \sigma(\bar{V}) \subset [\frac{1}{\kappa}, 1]\}$, where $\sigma(\bar{V})$ is the set of the singular values of $\bar{V}$. It can be verified that

$$V \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa) \Leftrightarrow \|\mathscr{T}(V)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 1} \tag{36}$$

For the sequence $V^{(n)}$, define

$$N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\} := \min\{n : V^{(n)} \notin \mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}, \quad N_{\mathrm{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\} := \min\{n : V^{(n)} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}$$

$N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}$ is the first step of the iterative process at which $V^{(n)}$ jumps from $\mathbb{S}(\kappa)$ to its outside, and $N_{\mathrm{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}$ is the first step of the iterative process at which $V^{(n)}$ jumps from the outside to $\mathbb{S}(\kappa)$. Write

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_i := \lambda_i \beta^{-2\varepsilon}, \quad \widetilde{\eta}_i := \widetilde{\lambda}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{\lambda}_i = \eta_i \beta^{-2\varepsilon},$$

and define

$$N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} := \max\{n \geq 1 : \|Z^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}, |Y_i^{(n)}| \leq \widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}, i = 1, \ldots n\} + 1, \tag{37}$$

where $Z^{(n)} = (U^{(n-1)})^{\mathrm{T}} X^{(n)}$ as is defined in Algorithm 1. $N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}$ is the first step of the iterative process at which either $|Y_i^{(n)}| > \widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}$ for some i or the norm of $Z^{(n)}$ exceeds $\widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}$. For $n < N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}$, we have

$$\|Y^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \widetilde{\eta}_d^{1/2} = \nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}, \quad \|Z^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2} \quad \text{with} \quad \nu = 1/\mu_p$$

For convenience, we introduce $T^{(n)} = \mathscr{T}(V^{(n)})$, and let $\mathbb{F}_n = \sigma\{Y^{(1)}, \ldots, Y^{(n)}\}$ be the σ-algebra filtration, i.e., the information known by step n. Also, since in this section ε, β are fixed, we suppress the dependency information of $M(\varepsilon)$ on ε and $N_s(\beta)$ on β to simply write M for $M(\varepsilon)$ and N_s for $N_s(\beta)$.

Lastly, we discuss some of the important implications of the conditions:

$$0 < \beta < \min\left\{1, \left(\frac{1}{8\kappa\eta_p}\right)^{\frac{2}{1-4\varepsilon}}, \left(\frac{\gamma}{130\kappa^2\eta_p^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}\right\}, \tag{18}$$

$$(\sqrt{2}+1)\lambda_1 d\beta^{1-7\varepsilon} \leq \omega, \quad K > N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta) \tag{20}$$

of Theorem 1. They guarantee that

(β-1) $\beta < 1$;

(β-2) $\beta\gamma \leq \beta\widetilde{\eta}_p \leq \nu\beta\widetilde{\eta}_p = \beta\widetilde{\eta}_d \leq d\beta\widetilde{\lambda}_1 = d\lambda_1\beta^{1-2\varepsilon} \leq (\sqrt{2}-1)\omega \leq \sqrt{2}-1$.

Set

$$C_V = \frac{5}{2} + \frac{7}{2}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta) + \frac{15}{8}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2 + \frac{3}{8}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 \leq \frac{16+13\sqrt{2}}{8} \approx 4.298; \tag{38a}$$

$$C_\Delta = 2 + \frac{1}{2}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta) + C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta \leq \frac{22+7\sqrt{2}}{8} \approx 3.987; \tag{38b}$$

$$C_T = C_V + 2C_\Delta + 2C_\Delta C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta \leq \frac{251+122\sqrt{2}}{16} \approx 26.471; \tag{38c}$$

$$C_\kappa = \frac{(3-\sqrt{2})C_\Delta^2}{64(C_T+2C_\Delta)^2} \leq \frac{565+171\sqrt{2}}{21504} \approx 0.038; \tag{38d}$$

$$C_\nu = 4\sqrt{2}C_T C_\kappa \leq \frac{223702+183539\sqrt{2}}{86016} \approx 5.618; \tag{38e}$$

$$C_\circ = \frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{16(3-\sqrt{2})} + \frac{4C_T}{(3-\sqrt{2})C_\Delta}\beta^{3\varepsilon} + [C_T + \frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32}]\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \frac{3C_T^2}{2(3-\sqrt{2})C_\Delta^2}\beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon} + \frac{2C_T}{C_\Delta}\beta^{1-3\varepsilon} + \frac{C_T^2}{2C_\Delta^2}\beta^{3/2-}$$

$$\leq \frac{2582968+1645155\sqrt{2}}{14336} \approx 342.464 \tag{38f}$$

The condition eq. (18) also guarantees that

(β-3) $2C_\Delta\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta^{1/2}\kappa = 2C_\Delta\eta_p\beta^{1/2-2\varepsilon}\kappa \leq \frac{2C_\Delta}{8} < 1$, and thus $2C_\Delta\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta\kappa < 1$;

(β-4) $4\sqrt{2}C_T\kappa^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\gamma^{-1}\beta^{5\varepsilon} \leq 1$, and thus $4\sqrt{2}C_T\kappa^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\gamma^{-1}\beta^{1/2+\chi} \leq 1$ for $\chi \in [-1/2+5\varepsilon, 0]$

5.2 Increments by One Iterative Step

Lemma 3. *For any fixed integer $K \geq 1$,*

$$\mathrm{P}\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} > K\} \geq 1 - K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1)\exp\left(-C_\psi\min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

where C_ψ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Since $\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} \leq K\} \subset \bigcup_{n\leq K}\left(\left\{\|Z^{(n)}\|_2 \geq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}\right\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^d\left\{|e_i^\mathrm{T}Y^{(n)}| \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}\right\}\right)$, we know

$$\mathrm{P}\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} \leq K\} \leq \sum_{n\leq K}\left(\mathrm{P}\left\{\|Z^{(n)}\|_2 \geq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}\right\} + \sum_{1\leq i\leq d}\mathrm{P}\left\{|e_i^\mathrm{T}Y^{(n)}| \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}\right\}\right) \tag{39}$$

First,

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{|e_i^\mathrm{T}Y^{(n)}| \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}\right\} = \mathrm{P}\left\{\left|\frac{(\Lambda^{1/2}e_i)^\mathrm{T}}{\|\Lambda^{1/2}e_i\|_2}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y^{(n)}\right| \geq \frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_i^{1/2}}{\|\Lambda^{1/2}e_i\|_2}\right\}$$

$$\leq \exp\left(1 - \frac{C_{\psi,i}\frac{\widetilde{\lambda}_i}{e_i^\mathrm{T}\Lambda e_i}}{\|\frac{(\Lambda^{1/2}e_i)^\mathrm{T}}{\|\Lambda^{1/2}e_i\|_2}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y^{(n)}\|_{\psi_2}}\right) \qquad \text{(by [32, (5.10)])}$$

17

$$\leq \exp\left(1 - \frac{C_{\psi,i}\widetilde{\lambda}_i}{\|\Lambda^{-1/2}Y^{(n)}\|_{\psi_2}\lambda_i}\right) = \exp\left(1 - C_{\psi,i}\psi^{-1}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right) \tag{40}$$

where $C_{\psi,i}, i = 1,\ldots,d$ are absolute constants [32, (5.10)]. Next, we claim

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\|Z^{(n)}\|_2 \geq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}\right\} \leq (p+1)\exp\left(-C_{\psi,d+1}\psi^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right) \tag{41}$$

to be proven in the next paragraph. Together, eq. (39) – eq. (41) yield

$$\mathrm{P}\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} \leq K\} = \sum_{n\leq K}\sum_{1\leq i\leq d}\exp\left(1 - C_{\psi,i}\psi^{-1}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right) + \sum_{n\leq K}(p+1)\exp\left(-C_{\psi,d+1}\psi^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$
$$\leq K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1)\exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

where $C_\psi = \min\limits_{1\leq i\leq d+1} C_{\psi,i}$. Finally, use $\mathrm{P}\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} > K\} = 1 - \mathrm{P}\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} \leq K\}$ to complete the proof.

It remains to prove eq. (41). To avoid the cluttered superscripts, we drop the superscript "$\cdot^{(n-1)}$" on V, and drop the superscript "$\cdot^{(n)}$" on Y, Z. Consider

$$W := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Z \\ Z^{\mathrm{T}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} & V^{\mathrm{T}}Y \\ Y^{\mathrm{T}}V & \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{k=1}^d Y_k \begin{bmatrix} & & v_{k1} \\ & & \vdots \\ & & v_{kp} \\ v_{k1} & \cdots & v_{kp} & 0 \end{bmatrix} =: \sum_{k=1}^d Y_k W_k$$

where v_{ij} is the (i,j)th entry of V and Y_k is the kth entry of Y. By the matrix version of master tail bound [30, Theorem 3.6], for any $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{P}\{\|Z\|_2 \geq \alpha\} = \mathrm{P}\{\lambda_{\max}(W) \geq \alpha\} \leq \inf_{\theta > 0}\mathrm{e}^{-\theta\alpha}\mathrm{Tr}\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^d \ln\mathrm{E}\{\exp(\theta Y_k W_k)\}\right)$$

Y is sub-Gaussian and $\mathrm{E}\{Y\} = 0$, and so is Y_k. Moreover,

$$\|Y_k\|_{\psi_2} = \|e_k^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{1/2}\|_2 \left\|\frac{e_k^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{1/2}}{\|e_k^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{1/2}\|_2}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y\right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \lambda_k^{1/2}\|\Lambda^{-1/2}Y\|_{\psi_2} = \lambda_k^{1/2}\psi$$

Also, by [32, (5.12)],

$$\mathrm{E}\{\exp(\theta W_k Y_k)\} \leq \exp(C_{\psi,d+k}\theta^2 W_k \circ W_k\|Y_k\|_{\psi_2}^2) \leq \exp(c_{\psi,k}\theta^2\lambda_k\psi^2 W_k \circ W_k)$$

where $c_{\psi,k}, k = 1,\ldots,d$ are absolute constants. Therefore, writing $[4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1} = \max\limits_{1\leq k\leq d} c_{\psi,k}$ and $W_\psi := \sum\limits_{k=1}^d \lambda_k W_k \circ W_k$ with the spectral decomposition $W_\psi = V_\psi\Lambda_\psi V_\psi^{\mathrm{T}}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Tr}\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^d \ln\mathrm{E}\{\exp(\theta Y_k W_k)\}\right) \leq \mathrm{Tr}\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^d c_{\psi,k}\theta^2\lambda_k\psi^2 W_k \circ W_k\right)$$
$$\leq \mathrm{Tr}\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2 W_\psi)$$
$$= \mathrm{Tr}\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2 V_\psi\Lambda_\psi V_\psi^{\mathrm{T}})$$

18

$$= \operatorname{Tr}\left(V_\psi \exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2\Lambda_\psi)V_\psi^{\mathrm{T}}\right)$$
$$= \operatorname{Tr}\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2\Lambda_\psi)$$
$$\leq (p+1)\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2\lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_\psi))$$
$$= (p+1)\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2\lambda_{\max}(W_\psi))$$

Note that

$$W_\psi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k v_{k1}^2 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k v_{kp}^2 \\ \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k v_{k1}^2 & \cdots & \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k v_{kp}^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & e_1^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & e_p^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_p \\ e_1^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_1 & \cdots & e_p^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_p & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and thus

$$\lambda_{\max}(W_\psi) = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} e_1^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_1 \\ \vdots \\ e_p^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_p \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^p e_k^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V e_k = \operatorname{Tr}(V^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda V) \leq \sum_{k=1}^p \lambda_k = \eta_p$$

In summary, we have

$$\mathrm{P}\{\|Z\|_2 \geq \alpha\} \leq (p+1)\inf_{\theta>0}\exp([4C_{\psi,d+1}]^{-1}\theta^2\psi^2\eta_p - \theta\alpha) = (p+1)\exp\left(-\frac{C_{\psi,d+1}\alpha^2}{\psi^2\eta_p}\right)$$

Substituting $\alpha = \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}$, we have the claim eq. (41). $\qquad\square$

Lemma 4. *Suppose the conditions of* Theorem 1 *hold. If $n < N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}$, then*

$$V^{(n+1)} = V^{(n)} + \beta Y^{(n+1)}(Z^{(n+1)})^{\mathrm{T}} - \beta\left[1 + \frac{\beta}{2}(Y^{(n+1)})^{\mathrm{T}}Y^{(n+1)}\right]V^{(n)}Z^{(n+1)}(Z^{(n+1)})^{\mathrm{T}} + R^{(n)}(Z^{(n+1)})^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{42}$$

where $R^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random vector with $\|R^{(n)}\|_2 \leq C_V \nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^{3/2}\beta^2$ and C_V is as in eq. (38a).

Proof. To avoid the cluttered superscripts, in this proof, we drop "$\cdot^{(n)}$" and use "$\cdot^+$" to replace "$\cdot^{(n+1)}$" on V, and drop "$\cdot^{(n+1)}$" on Y, Z.

On the set $\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\} > n\}$, by eq. (20) and item ($\beta$-2), we have

$$\alpha = \beta(2 + \beta Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z \leq \beta(2 + \nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)\widetilde{\eta}_p \leq (2 + \sqrt{2} - 1)(\sqrt{2} - 1)/\nu < 1$$

By Taylor's expansion, there exists $0 < \xi < \alpha$ such that

$$(1+\alpha)^{-1/2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha + \frac{3}{8}\frac{1}{(1+\xi)^{5/2}}\alpha^2 = 1 - \beta Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z - \frac{\beta^2}{2}Y^{\mathrm{T}}YZ^{\mathrm{T}}Z + \beta^2(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)^2\zeta$$

where $\zeta = \frac{3}{8}\frac{1}{(1+\xi)^{5/2}}(2 + \beta Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)^2 \leq \frac{3}{8}(2 + \nu\beta\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2$. Thus

$$V^+ = (V + \beta YZ^{\mathrm{T}})\left(I - \left[\beta Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z + \frac{\beta^2}{2}Y^{\mathrm{T}}YZ^{\mathrm{T}}Z - \beta^2(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)^2\zeta\right]\frac{ZZ^{\mathrm{T}}}{Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z}\right)$$

$$= V + \beta Y Z^{\mathrm{T}} - \beta V Z Z^{\mathrm{T}} - \frac{\beta^2}{2}(Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)V Z Z^{\mathrm{T}} + R Z^{\mathrm{T}}$$

where $R = -\frac{\beta^2}{2}(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)(2 + \beta Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)Y + \zeta\beta^2(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)V Z + \zeta\beta^3(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)^2 Y$ for which

$$\|R\|_2 \leq \frac{\beta^2}{2}\widetilde{\eta}_p(2 + \beta\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^{1/2} + \zeta\beta^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^{3/2} + \zeta\beta^3\widetilde{\eta}_p^2(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^{1/2}$$
$$= \left[\frac{1}{2}(2 + \beta\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p) + \frac{3}{8}(2 + \beta\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2 + \frac{3}{8}(2 + \beta\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2(\beta\widetilde{\eta}_p)\right]\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^{3/2}\beta^2$$
$$= C_V\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^{3/2}\beta^2$$

as expected. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 5. *Suppose the conditions of* Theorem 1 *hold. Let* $\tau = \|T^{(n)}\|_2$, *and* C_T *be as in eq.* (38c). *If* $n < \min\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\varLambda\}, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}\}$, *then*

(1) $T^{(n)}$ *and* $T^{(n+1)}$ *are well-defined.*

(2) *Define* $E_T^{(n)}(V^{(n)}) := \mathrm{E}\{T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\} - \beta(\varLambda T^{(n)} - T^{(n)}\bar{\varLambda})$. *Then*

(a) $\displaystyle\sup_{V \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa)}\|E_T^{(n)}(V)\|_2 \leq C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1 + \tau^2)^{3/2}$;

(b) $\|T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)(1 + \tau^2) + C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1 + \tau^2)^{3/2}$.

(3) *Define* $R_\circ := \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\big) - \beta^2 H_\circ$. *Then*

(a) $H_\circ = \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(Y\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) \leq 16\psi^4 H$, *where* $H = [\eta_{ij}]_{(d-p)\times p}$ *with* $\eta_{ij} = \lambda_{p+i}\lambda_j$ *for* $i = 1,\ldots,d-p$, $j = 1,\ldots,p$;

(b) $\|R_\circ\|_2 \leq (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\tau(1 + \frac{11}{2}\tau + \tau^2 + \frac{1}{4}\tau^3) + 4C_T\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3(1 + \tau^2)^{5/2} + 2C_T^2\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4(1 + \tau^2)^3$.

Proof. For readability, we will drop "$\cdot^{(n)}$", and use "$\cdot^+$" to replace "$\cdot^{(n+1)}$" for V, R, drop "$\cdot^{(n+1)}$" on Y, Z, and drop the conditional sign "$\mid \mathbb{F}_n$" in the computation of $\mathrm{E}\{\cdot\}, \mathrm{var}(\cdot), \mathrm{cov}(\cdot)$ with the understanding that they are conditional with respect to $\mathbb{F}_n$. Finally, for any expression or variable F, we define $\varDelta F := F^+ - F$.

Consider item (1). Since $n < N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}$, we have $V \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa)$ and $\tau = \|T\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2 - 1)^{1/2}$. Thus, $\|\bar{V}^{-1}\|_2 \leq \kappa$ and $T = \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}$ is well-defined. Recall eq. (42) and the partitioning $Y = \begin{array}{c} p \\ d-p \end{array}\begin{bmatrix} \bar{Y} \\ \underline{Y} \end{bmatrix}$, $R = \begin{array}{c} p \\ d-p \end{array}\begin{bmatrix} \bar{R} \\ \underline{R} \end{bmatrix}$. We have $\varDelta\bar{V} = \beta(\bar{Y}Z^{\mathrm{T}} - (1 + \frac{\beta}{2}Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)\bar{V}ZZ^{\mathrm{T}}) + \bar{R}Z^{\mathrm{T}}$, and $\bar{R} = -\frac{\beta^2}{2}(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)(2 + \beta Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)\bar{Y} + \zeta\beta^2(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)\bar{V}Z + \zeta\beta^3(Z^{\mathrm{T}}Z)^2\bar{Y}$. Noticing $\|\bar{Y}\|_2 \leq \widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}$, we find

$$\|\varDelta\bar{V}\|_2 \leq \beta\widetilde{\eta}_p + \beta(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)\widetilde{\eta}_p + C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^2 \leq \left[2 + \frac{\beta}{2}\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p + C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta\right]\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta = C_\varDelta\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta$$

where $C_\varDelta$ is as in eq. (38b). Thus $\|\varDelta\bar{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|\varDelta\bar{V}\|_2\|\bar{V}^{-1}\|_2 \leq C_\varDelta\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta\kappa \leq 1/2$ by item (β-3). As a result, $\bar{V}^+$ is nonsingular, and $\|(\bar{V}^+)^{-1}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\bar{V}^{-1}\|_2}{1-\|\bar{V}^{-1}\varDelta\bar{V}\|_2} \leq 2\|\bar{V}^{-1}\|_2$. In particular, $T^+ = \underline{V}^+(\bar{V}^+)^{-1}$ is well-defined. This proves item (1).

For item (2), using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula [11, p. 95], we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta T &= (\underline{V} + \Delta\underline{V})(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1} - \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1} \\
&= (\underline{V} + \Delta\underline{V})(\bar{V}^{-1} - \bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1}) - \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1} \\
&= \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1} - \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1} - \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1} \\
&= \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1} - \underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V}^{-1} - \bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1}) - \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V} + \Delta\bar{V})^{-1} \\
&= \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1} - T\Delta\bar{V}\bar{V}^{-1} + T\Delta\bar{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V}^{+})^{-1} - \Delta\underline{V}\bar{V}^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}(\bar{V}^{+})^{-1} \\
&= [\Delta\underline{V} - T\Delta\bar{V}][I - (\bar{V}^{+})^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}]\bar{V}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Write $T_L = \begin{bmatrix} -T & I \end{bmatrix}$ and $T_R = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ T \end{bmatrix}$. Then $T_L V = 0$ and $V = T_R \bar{V}$. Thus,

$$
\Delta T = T_L \Delta V [I - (\bar{V}^{+})^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}]V^{\mathrm{T}}T_R
$$

Since ΔV is rank-1, ΔT is also rank-1. By Lemma 4,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta T &= T_L \left[\beta Y Z^{\mathrm{T}} - \beta(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y)VZZ^{\mathrm{T}} + RZ^{\mathrm{T}} \right] \left[I - (\bar{V}^{+})^{-1}\Delta\bar{V} \right] V^{\mathrm{T}}T_R \\
&= T_L \left[\beta Y Y^{\mathrm{T}} V + RZ^{\mathrm{T}} \right] \left[I - (\bar{V}^{+})^{-1}\Delta\bar{V} \right] V^{\mathrm{T}}T_R \\
&= T_L (\beta Y Y^{\mathrm{T}} V V^{\mathrm{T}} + R_T)T_R \\
&= T_L (\beta Y Y^{\mathrm{T}} + R_T)T_R
\end{aligned}
$$

where $R_T = RZ^{\mathrm{T}}V^{\mathrm{T}} - (\beta Y + R)Z^{\mathrm{T}}(\bar{V}^{+})^{-1}\Delta\bar{V}V^{\mathrm{T}}$. Note that

$$
T_L Y Y^{\mathrm{T}} T_R = \underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}} - T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T - T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}} + \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T \tag{43}
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{E}\{\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\} = 0, \quad \mathrm{E}\{T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\} = T\,\mathrm{E}\{\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\} = T\bar{\Lambda} \tag{44a}
$$

$$
\mathrm{E}\{T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\} = T\,\mathrm{E}\{\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\}T = 0, \quad \mathrm{E}\{\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\} = \mathrm{E}\{\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\}T = \Delta T \tag{44b}
$$

Thus, $\mathrm{E}\{\Delta T\} = \beta(\Delta T - T\bar{\Lambda}) + E_T(V)$, where $E_T(V) = \mathrm{E}\{T_L R_T T_R\}$.

Since $V \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa)$, $\|T\|_2 \le (\kappa^2 - 1)^{1/2}$ by eq. (36). Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|R_T\|_2 &\le \|R\|_2\widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2} + [(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^{1/2}\beta + \|R\|_2]\widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}2(1 + \|T\|_2^2)^{1/2}C_\Delta\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta \\
&\le C_V\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^2 + (1 + \|T\|_2^2)^{1/2}[1 + C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta]2C_\Delta\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^2 \\
&\le C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1 + \|T\|_2^2)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C_T = C_V + 2C_\Delta(1 + C_V\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)$. Therefore, $\|E_T(V)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\{\|T_L R_T T_R\|_2\} \le (1 + \|T\|_2^2)\mathrm{E}\{\|R_T\|_2\}$. Item (2)a holds. For item (2)b, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta T\|_2 &\le (1 + \|T\|_2^2)(\beta\|Y Y^{\mathrm{T}} V V^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 + \|R_T\|_2) \\
&\le \beta(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p^{1/2}(1 + \|T\|_2^2) + C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1 + \|T\|_2^2)^{3/2} \\
&\le \nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta(1 + \|T\|_2^2) + C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1 + \|T\|_2^2)^{3/2}
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of item (3) is similar to that of item (2) but involves more complicated calculations, and it is deferred to appendix A.1. $\qquad\square$

5.3 Quasi-Power Iterative Process

Let $D^{(n+1)} = T^{(n+1)} - \mathrm{E}\{T^{(n+1)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\}$. We have

$$T^{(n)} - \mathrm{E}\left\{T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\} = 0, \quad \mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(n+1)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\} = 0,$$

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(n+1)} \circ D^{(n+1)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\} = \mathrm{var}_\circ\left(T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right).$$

By item (2) of Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{(n+1)} &= D^{(n+1)} + T^{(n)} + \mathrm{E}\left\{T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\} \\
&= D^{(n+1)} + T^{(n)} + \beta(\Delta T^{(n)} - T^{(n)}\bar{\Lambda}) + E_T^{(n)}(V^{(n)}) \\
&= \mathcal{L}T^{(n)} + D^{(n+1)} + E_T^{(n)}(V^{(n)})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}\colon T \mapsto T + \beta\Delta T - \beta T\bar{\Lambda}$ is a bounded linear operator. It can be verified that $\mathcal{L}T = L \circ T$, the Hadamard product of L and T, where $L = [\lambda_{ij}]_{(d-p)\times p}$ with $\lambda_{ij} = 1 + \beta\lambda_{p+i} - \beta\lambda_j$. Moreover, it can be shown that[2] $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \rho(\mathcal{L}) = 1 - \beta\gamma$, where $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \sup_{\|T\|_{\mathrm{ui}}=1} \|\mathcal{L}T\|_{\mathrm{ui}}$ is an operator norm induced by the matrix norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{ui}}$. Recursively,

$$T^{(n)} = \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)} + \sum_{s=1}^n \mathcal{L}^{n-s} D^{(s)} + \sum_{s=1}^n \mathcal{L}^{n-s} E_T^{(s-1)}(V^{(s-1)}) =: J_1 + J_2 + J_3 \qquad (45)$$

Define events $\mathbb{M}_n(\chi)$, $\mathbb{T}_n(\chi)$, and $\mathbb{Q}_n$ as

$$\mathbb{M}_n(\chi) = \left\{\|T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi-1} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi-3\varepsilon}\right\} \qquad (46)$$

$$\mathbb{T}_n(\chi) = \left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi-1} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi-3\varepsilon}\right\}, \quad \mathbb{Q}_n = \{n < N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}\} \qquad (47)$$

Lemma 6. *Suppose the conditions of* Theorem 1 *hold and that $\chi \in (5\varepsilon - 1/2, 0]$ and $\kappa > \sqrt{2}$. If $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)$ and $n < \min\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)\}\}$, then*

$$\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{M}_n(\chi + 1/2)\} \geq 1 - 2d\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}) \qquad (48)$$

where C_κ is as in eq. (38d).

Proof. Since $\kappa > \sqrt{2}$, we have $\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} > 2$ and $\kappa\beta^\chi < [2(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)]^{1/2}$. Thus, by item ($\beta$-4),

$$4C_T\kappa^3\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\gamma^{-1}\beta^{1+3\chi}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{-1/2}\beta^{-1/2-\chi} \leq 4\sqrt{2}C_T\kappa^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\gamma^{-1}\beta^{1/2+\chi} \leq 1$$

For any $n < \min\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)\}\}$, $V^{(n)} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)$ and thus $\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1}$ by eq. (36). Therefore, by item (2)b of Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^{(n+1)}\|_2 &= \left\|T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} - \mathrm{E}\left\{T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\}\right\|_2 \\
&\leq \|T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)}\|_2 + \mathrm{E}\left\{\|T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)}\|_2 \mid \mathbb{F}_n\right\} \\
&\leq 2\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta(1 + \|T^{(n)}\|_2^2)[1 + C_T\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta(1 + \|T^{(n)}\|_2^2)^{1/2}] \\
&\leq 2\kappa^2\nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta^{1+2\chi}[1 + C_T\kappa\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta^{1+\chi}]
\end{aligned} \qquad (49)$$

---

[2] Since $\lambda(\mathcal{L}) = \{\lambda_{ij} : i = 1, \ldots, d-p, \, j = 1, \ldots, p\}$, we have the spectral radius $\rho(\mathcal{L}) = 1 - \beta(\lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1})$. Thus for any T,

$$\|\mathcal{L}T\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \|T(I - \beta\bar{\Lambda}) + \beta\Delta T\|_{\mathrm{ui}} \leq \|I - \beta\bar{\Lambda}\|_2\|T\|_{\mathrm{ui}} + \|\beta\Delta\|_2\|T\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = (1 - \beta\lambda_p + \beta\lambda_{p+1})\|T\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \rho(\mathcal{L})\|T\|_{\mathrm{ui}}$$

which means $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} \leq \rho(\mathcal{L})$. This ensures $\|\mathcal{L}\|_{\mathrm{ui}} = \rho(\mathcal{L})$.

For any $n < \min\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)\}\}$,

$$\|J_3\|_2 \le \sum_{s=1}^{n} \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{n-s} \|E_T^{(s-1)}(V^{(s-1)})\|_2$$

$$\le C_T \nu^{1/2} \kappa^3 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{2+3\chi} \sum_{s=1}^{n} (1-\beta\gamma)^{n-s}$$

$$\le \frac{C_T \nu^{1/2} \kappa^3 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{2+3\chi}}{\beta\gamma} = C_T \nu^{1/2} \kappa^3 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta^{1+3\chi} \le \frac{1}{4} \nu^{1/2} (\kappa^2 \beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2} \beta^{1/2+\chi}$$

Similarly,

$$\|J_2\|_2 \le \sum_{s=1}^{n} \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{n-s} \|D^{(s)}\|_2 \le \frac{2\kappa^2 \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{2\chi}(1 + C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1+\chi})}{\gamma} \le \frac{2\kappa^2 \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{2\chi}}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \nu^{1/2} (\kappa^2 \beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2} \beta^{1/2+\chi}$$

Also, $\|J_1\|_2 \le \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^n \|T^{(0)}\|_2 \le \|T^{(0)}\|_2 \le \nu^{1/2}(\kappa^2 \beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2}$. For fixed $n > 0$ and $\beta > 0$,

$$\left\{ M_0^{(n)} := \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}, M_t^{(n)} := \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)} + \sum_{s=1}^{\min\{t, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} \mathcal{L}^{n-s} D^{(s)} : 1 \le t \le n \right\}$$

forms a martingale with respect to $\mathbb{F}_t$, because $\mathrm{E}\left\{\|M_t^{(n)}\|_2\right\} \le \|J_1\|_2 + \|J_2\|_2 < +\infty$, and

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{ M_{t+1}^{(n)} - M_t^{(n)} \,\Big|\, \mathbb{F}_t \right\} = \mathrm{E}\left\{ \mathcal{L}^{n-t-1} D^{(t+1)} \,\Big|\, \mathbb{F}_t \right\} = \mathcal{L}^{n-t-1} \mathrm{E}\left\{ D^{(t+1)} \,\Big|\, \mathbb{F}_t \right\} = 0$$

Use the matrix version of Azuma's inequality [30, Section 7.2] to get, for any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{ \|M_n^{(n)} - M_0^{(n)}\|_2 \ge \alpha \right\} \le 2d \exp(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2\sigma^2})$$

where

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{s=1}^{\min\{n, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} \|\mathcal{L}^{n-s} D^{(s)}\|_2^2$$

$$\le [2\kappa^2 \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1+2\chi}(1 + C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1+\chi})]^2 \sum_{s=1}^{\min\{n, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} (1-\beta\gamma)^{2(n-s)}$$

$$\le \frac{4\kappa^4 \nu \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{2+4\chi}(1 + C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1+\chi})^2}{\beta\gamma[2 - \beta\gamma]}$$

$$\le \frac{4\kappa^4 \nu \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta^{1+4\chi}(1 + \frac{C_T}{2C_\Delta})^2}{3 - \sqrt{2}} \qquad \text{(by item (β-3) and } \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1/2} \le \frac{1}{2\kappa C_\Delta})$$

$$= C_\sigma \kappa^4 \nu \gamma^{-1} \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{1+4\chi},$$

and $C_\sigma = \frac{(C_T + 2C_\Delta)^2}{(3-\sqrt{2})C_\Delta^2}$. Thus, noticing $J_2 = M_n^{(n)} - M_0^{(n)}$ for $n \le N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\} - 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{P}\{\|J_2\|_2 \ge \alpha\} \le 2d \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2C_\sigma \kappa^4 \nu \gamma^{-1} \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{1+4\chi}} \right)$$

23

Choosing $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi+1/2-3\varepsilon}$ and noticing $T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)} = J_2 + J_3$ and $\|J_3\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi+1/2-3\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{M}_n(\chi+1/2)^{\mathrm{c}}\} = \mathrm{P}\left\{\|T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi+1/2-3\varepsilon}\right\}$$

$$\leq \mathrm{P}\left\{\|J_2\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{4}(\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1)^{1/2}\beta^{\chi+1/2-3\varepsilon}\right\}$$

$$\leq 2d\exp\left(-\frac{\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi} - 1}{32C_\sigma\kappa^4\nu\gamma^{-1}\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{2\chi}}\beta^{-6\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$\leq 2d\exp\left(-\frac{\kappa^2\beta^{2\chi}}{64C_\sigma\kappa^4\nu\gamma^{-1}\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{2\chi}}\beta^{-6\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$= 2d\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

where $C_\kappa = \frac{1}{64C_\sigma}$ which is the same as in eq. (38d). $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7. *Suppose the conditions of* Theorem 1 *hold. If*

$$N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)} < \min\{N_{\mathrm{qb}}\{\Lambda\}, N_{\mathrm{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa\beta^\chi)\}\}$$

and $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(\beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_m/2)$ *with* $m \geq 2$, *then for* $\kappa_m > \sqrt{2}$

$$\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_m\} \geq 1 - 2dN_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa_m^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

where $\mathbb{H}_m = \left\{N_{\mathrm{in}}\left\{\mathbb{S}(\sqrt{3/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_m)\right\} \leq N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right\}$.

Proof. By the definition of the event $\mathbb{T}_n$,

$$\mathbb{T}_n(2^{-m}[1-6\varepsilon]+3\varepsilon) = \{\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq (\kappa_m^2 - \beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(1-6\varepsilon)})^{1/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\}$$

For $n \geq N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}$ and $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(\beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_m/2)$, we know $\mathbb{M}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{T}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon)$ because

$$\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \|T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)}\|_2 + \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^n\|T^{(0)}\|_2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\kappa_m^2 - \beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(1-6\varepsilon)}\right)^{1/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}$$

$$+ \beta^{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\left(\frac{\kappa_m^2}{4} - \beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(1-6\varepsilon)}\right)^{1/2}\beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}$$

$$\leq \left(\kappa_m^2 - \beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(1-6\varepsilon)}\right)^{1/2}\beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}$$

Therefore, noticing

$$\left(\kappa_m^2 - \beta^{(1-2^{1-m})(1-6\varepsilon)}\right)^{1/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)} = \left(\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(6\varepsilon-1)}\kappa_m^2 - \beta^{2^{1-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{3}{2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(6\varepsilon-1)}\kappa_m^2 - 1\right)^{1/2}$$

we get

$$\mathbb{M}_{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}}(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon) \subset \{\widehat{N} \leq N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\} = \mathbb{H}_m$$

where $\widehat{N} = N_{\text{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\sqrt{3/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_m)\}$. Since

$$\bigcap_{n\leq\min\{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)},\widehat{N}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon) \cap \mathbb{H}_m^{\text{c}}$$

$$\subset \bigcap_{n\leq N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}} \mathbb{M}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{M}_{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}}(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon),$$

we have

$$\bigcap_{n\leq\min\{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)},\widehat{N}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{H}_m$$

By Lemma 6 with $\chi = 2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2} = 2^{-m}(1-2^{m-1})(1-6\varepsilon)$, we get

$$P\{\mathbb{H}_m^{\text{c}}\} \leq P\left\{\bigcup_{n\leq\min\{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)},\widehat{N}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)+3\varepsilon)^{\text{c}}\right\}$$

$$\leq \min\{N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)},\widehat{N}-1\} \times 2d\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa_m^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

$$\leq 2dN_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa_m^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

as expected. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 8. *Suppose the conditions of* Theorem 1 *hold. If* $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa/2)$ *with* $\kappa > 2\sqrt{2}$, $K > N_{1-6\varepsilon}$, *then there exists a high-probability event* $\mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K = \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{T}_n(1/2) \cap \mathbb{Q}_K$ *satisfying*

$$P\{\mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K\} \geq 1 - 2dK\exp(-C_\kappa\gamma\kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}) - K(ed+p+1)\exp\left(-C_\psi\min\{\psi^{-1},\psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

such that for any $n \in [N_{1-6\varepsilon}, K]$,

$$E\left\{T^{(n)} \circ T^{(n)}; \mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K\right\} \leq \mathcal{L}^{2n}T^{(0)} \circ T^{(0)} + 2\beta^2[I-\mathcal{L}^2]^{-1}[I-\mathcal{L}^{2n}]H_\circ + R_E$$

where $\|R_E\|_2 \leq C_\circ\kappa^4\gamma^{-1}\nu^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$, $H_\circ = \text{var}_\circ(Y\bar{Y}^{\text{T}}) \leq 16\psi^4 H$ *is as in* item (3)a *of* Lemma 5, *and* $C_\circ$ *is as in eq.* (38f).

Proof. First we estimate the probability of the event $\mathbb{H}_1$. We know $\mathbb{T}_n(1/2) \subset \{\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq (\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}\}$. If $K \geq N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}$, then there exists some $n \leq K$, such that $V^{(n)} \notin \mathbb{S}(\kappa)$, i.e., $\|T^{(n)}\|_2 > (\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}$ by eq. (36). Thus,

$$\{K \geq N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}\} \subset \bigcup_{n\leq K}\left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_2 > (\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}\right\} \subset \bigcup_{n\leq K}\mathbb{T}_n(1/2)^{\text{c}}$$

On the other hand, for $n \geq N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}$ and $V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa/2)$, $\mathbb{M}_n(1/2) \subset \mathbb{T}_n(1/2)$ because

$$\|T^{(n)}\|_2 \leq \|T^{(n)} - \mathcal{L}^nT^{(0)}\|_2 + \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^n\|T^{(0)}\|_2$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}(\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa^2}{4}-1\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq (\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} \tag{50}$$

25

Therefore,

$$\bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2) \subset \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{T}_n(1/2) \subset \{K \le N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\} - 1\}$$

and so

$$\bigcap_{n\le\min\{K,N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2) \subset \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},\min\{K,N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}]} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2)$$

$$= \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2)$$

$$\subset \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{T}_n(1/2) =: \mathbb{H}_1$$

By Lemma 6 with $\chi = 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{ \bigcup_{n\le\min\{K,N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2)^{\mathrm{c}} \cap \mathbb{Q}_K \right\}$$

$$\le \min\{K, N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\} - 1\} \cdot 2d \exp(-C_\kappa \gamma \kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

$$= 2dK \exp(-C_\kappa \gamma \kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

Thus, by Lemma 3,

$$\mathrm{P}\{(\mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K)^{\mathrm{c}}\} = \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_1^{\mathrm{c}} \cup \mathbb{Q}_K^{\mathrm{c}}\} = \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_1^{\mathrm{c}} \cap \mathbb{Q}_K\} + \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{Q}_K^{\mathrm{c}}\}$$

$$\le \mathrm{P}\left\{ \bigcup_{n\le\min\{K,N_{\text{out}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa)\}-1\}} \mathbb{M}_n(1/2)^{\mathrm{c}} \cap \mathbb{Q}_K \right\} + \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{Q}_K^{\mathrm{c}}\}$$

$$\le 2dK \exp(-C_\kappa \gamma \kappa^{-2}\nu^{-1}\eta_p^{-2}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}) + K(ed + p + 1)\exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1},\psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

Next we estimate the expectation. Since

$$\mathbb{H}_1 = \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \mathbb{T}_n(1/2) \subset \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon},K]} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{n-1}} D^{(n)} = D^{(n)} \right\}$$

we have for $n \in [N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}, K]$

$$T^{(n)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}_1\cap\mathbb{Q}_K} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\left(\mathcal{L}^n T^{(0)} + \sum_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{n-s} D^{(s)} + \sum_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{n-s} D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}} \sum_{s=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{n-s} E_T^{(s-1)}(V^{(s-1)}) \right)$$

$$=: \widetilde{J}_1 + \widetilde{J}_{21} + \widetilde{J}_{22} + \widetilde{J}_3$$

In what follows, we simply write $E_T^{(n)} = E_T^{(n)}(V^{(n)})$ for convenience. Then

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{ T^{(n)} \circ T^{(n)};\, \mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K \right\} = \mathrm{E}\left\{ T^{(n)} \circ T^{(n)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}_1\cap\mathbb{Q}_K} \right\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_1\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}$$

$$+ \mathrm{E}\left\{[\widetilde{J}_{21} + \widetilde{J}_{22}] \circ [\widetilde{J}_{21} + \widetilde{J}_{22}]\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{[\widetilde{J}_{21} + \widetilde{J}_{22}] \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\} + \mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_3 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}$$

$$\leq \mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_1\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}$$

$$+ 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} + 4\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{22} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} + 2\,\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_3 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}$$

Each summand above for $n \in [N_{1-6\varepsilon}, K]$ can be estimated with careful calculation (see appendix A.2), which reads

(i) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_1\right\} = \mathcal{L}^{2n} T^{(0)} \circ T^{(0)}$.

(ii) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} = 0$.

(iii) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} = 0$.

(iv) $\|\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} C_T \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \gamma^{-1} \kappa^4 \beta^{2-6\varepsilon}$.

(v) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} = 0$.

(vi) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} = \beta^2 \sum\limits_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} H_\circ + E_{21}$, where

$$\|E_{21}\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{64} + 2C_T \kappa (\widetilde{\eta}_p \beta) + C_T^2 \kappa^2 (\widetilde{\eta}_p \beta)^2\right) \gamma^{-1} \kappa^4 \nu^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{2-6\varepsilon}$$

(vii) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{22} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} = \beta^2 \sum\limits_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} H_\circ + E_{22}$, where

$$\|E_{22}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{3 - \sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{32} + 4C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon} + 2C_T^2 \kappa^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{3/2+3\varepsilon}\right) \gamma^{-1} \kappa^4 \nu^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

(viii) $\|\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_3 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\right\}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{3-\sqrt{2}} C_T^2 \nu \widetilde{\eta}_p^4 \gamma^{-1} \kappa^6 \beta^3$.

Collecting all estimates together, we obtain

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{T^{(n)} \circ T^{(n)}; \, \mathbb{H}_1 \cap \mathbb{Q}_K\right\} \leq \mathcal{L}^{2n} T^{(0)} \circ T^{(0)} + 2\beta^2 \sum_{s=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} H_\circ + R_E$$

$$\leq \mathcal{L}^{2n} T^{(0)} \circ T^{(0)} + 2\beta^2 [I - \mathcal{L}^2]^{-1} [I - \mathcal{L}^{2n}] H_\circ + R_E$$

where, by item (β-3), $2C_\Delta \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1/2} \leq 1$, and

$$\|R_E\|_2 \leq 2\left[\frac{C_T}{2}\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{64} + 2C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta + C_T^2 \kappa^2 (\widetilde{\eta}_p \beta)^2\right)\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \frac{C_T^2}{3-\sqrt{2}}\widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \kappa^2 \beta^{3/2+3\varepsilon}\right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{2}{3-\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{64} + 2C_T \kappa \widetilde{\eta}_p \beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon} + C_T^2 \kappa^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{3/2+3\varepsilon}\right)\right] \kappa^4 \gamma^{-1} \nu^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

$$\leq 2\left[\frac{C_T}{2}\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \left(\frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{64} + \frac{C_T}{C_\Delta}\beta^{1/2} + \frac{C_T^2}{4C_\Delta^2}\beta\right)\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + \frac{C_T^2}{4(3-\sqrt{2})C_\Delta^2}\beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon}\right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{2}{3-\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{64} + \frac{C_T}{C_\Delta}\beta^{3\varepsilon} + \frac{C_T^2}{4C_\Delta^2}\beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon}\right)\right]\kappa^4\gamma^{-1}\nu^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

$$= C_\circ\kappa^4\gamma^{-1}\nu^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

where $C_\circ$ is as given in eq. (38f). $\qquad\square$

5.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Write $\widetilde{N}_s = \frac{s\ln\beta}{\ln(1-\beta\gamma)}$. Then $(1-\beta\gamma)^{\widetilde{N}_s} = \beta^s$ and $N_s = \left\lceil\widetilde{N}_s\right\rceil$, where N_s is defined in eq. (17). It can be verified that $\widetilde{N}_{s_1} + \widetilde{N}_{s_2} = \widetilde{N}_{s_1+s_2}$ for any s_1, s_2.

Write $\kappa_m = 6^{(1-m)/2}\kappa$ for $m = 1,\ldots,M \equiv M(\epsilon)$. Since $d\beta^{1-7\varepsilon} \leq (\sqrt{2}-1)\lambda_1^{-1}\omega$, we know

$$\phi d^{1/2} \leq \phi\omega^{1/2}\beta^{7\varepsilon/2-1/2} \leq \beta^{(1-2^{1-M})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_M/2$$

The key to our proof is to divide the whole process into M segments of iterations. Thanks to the strong Markov property of the process, we can use the final value of current segment as the initial guess of the very next one. By Lemma 7, after the first segment of

$$n_1 := \min\left\{N_{\text{in}}\left\{\mathbb{S}(\sqrt{3/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-M})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_1)\right\}, N_{2^{-M}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right\}$$

iterations, $V^{(n_1)}$ lies in $\mathbb{S}(\sqrt{3/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-M})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_1) = \mathbb{S}(\beta^{(1-2^{2-M})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_2/2)$ with high probability, which will be a good initial guess for the second segment. In general, the ith segment of iterations starts with $V^{(n_{i-1})}$ and ends with $V^{(n_i)}$, where

$$n_i = \min\left\{N_{\text{in}}\left\{\mathbb{S}(\beta^{(1-2^{i+1-M})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_{i+1}/2)\right\}, \left\lceil\sum_{m=M+1-i}^{M}\widetilde{N}_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right\rceil\right\}$$

At the end of the $(M-1)$st segment of iterations, $V^{(n_{M-1})}$ is produced and it is going to be used as an initial guess for the last step, at which we can apply Lemma 8. Now $n_{M-1} = \min\left\{N_{\text{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa_M/2)\}, \widehat{K}\right\}$, where $\widehat{K} = \left\lceil\sum_{m=2}^{M}\widetilde{N}_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right\rceil = \left\lceil\widetilde{N}_{(1-2^{1-M})(1/2-3\varepsilon)}\right\rceil$. By $2^{2-M} \geq \frac{\varepsilon/2}{1/2-3\varepsilon} \geq 2^{1-M}$, we have

$$N_{1/2-7\varepsilon/2} = \left\lceil\widetilde{N}_{1/2-7\varepsilon/2}\right\rceil \leq \widehat{K} \leq \left\lceil\widetilde{N}_{1/2-13\varepsilon/4}\right\rceil \leq N_{1/2-13\varepsilon/4}$$

Let $\widehat{N} = N_{\text{in}}\left\{\mathbb{S}(\sqrt{3/2}\beta^{(1-2^{2-m})(3\varepsilon-1/2)}\kappa_{M+1-m})\right\}$, and

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_m = \left\{\widehat{N} \leq \widetilde{N}_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)} + n_{M-m}\right\} \text{ for } 2 \leq m \leq M,$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_1 = \bigcap_{n\in[N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}, K-N_{\text{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa_M/2)\}]}\mathbb{T}_{n+N_{\text{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa_M/2)\}}(1/2),$$

$$\mathbb{H} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{M}\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_m \cap \mathbb{Q}_K$$

28

where $n_0 = 0$. We have

$$P\{\mathbb{H}^c\} = P\left\{\bigcup_{m=1}^{M} \widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_m^c \cup \mathbb{Q}_K^c\right\} \leq \sum_{m=1}^{M} P\left\{\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_m^c \cup \mathbb{Q}_K^c\right\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=2}^{M} 2dN_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)} \exp(-C_\kappa \gamma \kappa_{M+1-m}^{-2} \nu^{-1} \eta_p^{-2} \beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

$$+ 2d\left(K - \sum_{m=2}^{M} N_{2^{-m}(1-6\varepsilon)}\right) \exp(-C_\kappa \gamma \kappa_M^{-2} \nu^{-1} \eta_p^{-2} \beta^{-2\varepsilon})$$

$$+ K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1) \exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$\leq 2dK \exp(-C_\kappa \kappa^{-2} \nu^{-1} \eta_p^{-2} \beta^{-2\varepsilon}) + K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1) \exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$\leq 2dK \exp(-C_\kappa 4\sqrt{2}C_T \nu^{-1} \beta^\varepsilon \beta^{-2\varepsilon}) + K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1) \exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-2\varepsilon}\right)$$
$$\text{(by item } (\beta\text{-4)})$$

$$\leq 2dK \exp(-4\sqrt{2}C_T C_\kappa \nu^{-1} \beta^{-\varepsilon}) + K(\mathrm{e}d + p + 1) \exp\left(-C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\beta^{-\varepsilon}\right)$$

$$\leq K[(2 + \mathrm{e})d + p + 1] \exp(-\max\{C_\nu \nu^{-1}, C_\psi \min\{\psi^{-1}, \psi^{-2}\}\}\beta^{-\varepsilon})$$

where $C_\nu = 4\sqrt{2}C_T C_\kappa$ is as given in eq. (38e).

Set $\mathbb{H}'_{n'} := \{N_{\mathrm{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa/2)\} = n'\}$. If $n' > \widehat{K}$, then $\mathbb{H} \cap \mathbb{H}'_{n'} = \emptyset$. Otherwise if $n' \leq \widehat{K}$, then, by Lemma 7, $V^{(n')} \in \mathbb{S}(\kappa_M/2)$ and then $\|T^{(n')}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 \leq p((\frac{\kappa_M}{2})^2 - 1)$. Thus,

$$\phi^2 d(1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n'-1)} \geq \phi^2 d(1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(\widehat{K}-1)} > \left(\frac{\kappa_M}{2}\right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{p}\|T^{(n')}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2$$

Hence, for any $n \in [N_{1-6\varepsilon} + N_{\mathrm{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa/2)\}, K] \subset [N_{1-6\varepsilon} + n', K + n']$, by Lemma 8, we have

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{T^{(n)} \circ T^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}} \;\middle|\; \mathbb{H}'_{n'} \cap \mathbb{F}_{n'}\right\} \leq \mathcal{L}^{2(n-n')} T^{(n')} \circ T^{(n')} + 2\beta^2 [I - \mathcal{L}^2]^{-1}[I - \mathcal{L}^{2(n-n')}]H_\circ + R_E$$

Recall that $\mathbb{F}_{n'}$ is the σ-algebra filtration, i.e., the information known by step n'. Introduce $\mathrm{sum}(A)$ for the sum of all the entries of a matrix A. In particular, $\mathrm{sum}(A \circ A) = \|A\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2$. We have

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}} \;\middle|\; \mathbb{H}'_{n'}\right\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left\{\mathrm{E}\left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}} \;\middle|\; \mathbb{H}'_{n'} \cap \mathbb{F}_{n'}\right\}\right\}$$

$$\leq \mathrm{E}\left\{(1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n-n')}\|T^{(n')}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 + 2\beta^2 \mathrm{sum}([I - \mathcal{L}^2]^{-1}H_\circ) + \mathrm{sum}(R_E)\right\}$$

$$\leq (1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)} p\phi^2 d + 2\beta^2 \mathrm{sum}([I - \mathcal{L}^2]^{-1}H_\circ) + \sqrt{p(d-p)}\|R_E\|_{\mathscr{F}}$$

$$\leq (1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)} p\phi^2 d + 2\beta^2 \frac{1}{\beta(2 - \lambda_1\beta)} \mathrm{sum}(G \circ H_\circ) + \sqrt{p(d-p)}C_\circ \sqrt{p}\kappa^4 (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

where $G = [\gamma_{ij}]_{(d-p)\times p}$ with $\gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{p+i}}$. Putting all together, we get

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2; \mathbb{H}\right\} = \mathrm{E}\left\{\mathrm{E}\left\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}} \;\middle|\; \mathbb{H}'_{n'}\right\}\right\}$$

$$\leq (1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)} p\phi^2 d + \frac{2\beta}{2 - \lambda_1\beta} \mathrm{sum}(G \circ H_\circ) + C_\circ \kappa^4 \nu^2 \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 p\sqrt{d-p}\gamma^{-1}\beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

Note that on $\mathbb{H}$, $N_{\mathrm{in}}\{\mathbb{S}(\kappa/2)\} \leq \widehat{K}$. So the expectation is valid for any $n \in [N_{1-2\varepsilon} + \widehat{K}, K]$. Finally we estimate $\mathrm{sum}(G \circ H_\circ)$. By Lemma 5, $H_\circ \leq 16\psi^4 H$, and hence

$$\mathrm{sum}(G \circ H_\circ) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{i=1}^{d-p} \frac{16\psi^4 \lambda_{p+i}\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{p+i}} = 16\psi^4 \varphi(p, d; \Lambda)$$

This completes the proof.

6 Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

To prove Theorem 2, we will first prove that it is a high-probability event that $V^{(0)}$ satisfies the initial condition there, which is the result of Lemma 10 below. Then, together with Theorem 1, we will have its conclusion. During estimating the probability, we need a property on the Gaussian hypergeometric function of a matrix argument, as in Lemma 9.

The gamma function and the multivariate gamma function are

$$\Gamma(x) := \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} \exp(-t) dt, \quad \Gamma_m(x) := \pi^{m(m-1)/4} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \Gamma\left(x - \frac{i-1}{2}\right)$$

respectively. Denote by $_2F_1$ the Gaussian hypergeometric function of matrix argument (see [23, Definition 7.3.1]), and also by $_1F_0$ and $_1F_1$ the generalized hypergeometric functions that will be used later.

Lemma 9. *For any scalar a, b, c and a symmetric matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$,*

$$_2F_1(a, b; c; T) = \frac{\Gamma_m(c-a-b)\Gamma_m(c)}{\Gamma_m(c-a)\Gamma_m(c-b)} {}_2F_1\left(a, b; a+b-c+\frac{m+1}{2}; I-T\right)$$

$$+ \frac{\Gamma_m(a+b-c)\Gamma_m(c)}{\Gamma_m(a)\Gamma_m(b)} \det(I-T)^{c-a-b} {}_2F_1\left(c-a, c-b; c-a-b+\frac{m+1}{2}; I-T\right). \quad (51)$$

Our proof of Lemma 9 is similar to that for the case $p = 1$ by Kummer's solutions of the hypergeometric differential equation (see, e.g., [20, Section 3.8]), and we leave it to appendix A.3.

Lemma 10. *Suppose $p < (d+1)/2$. If $V^{(0)}$ satisfies the condition that $\mathcal{R}(V^{(0)})$ is uniformly sampled from $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for sufficiently large d and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, there exists a constant C_p, independent of δ and d, such that*

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(C_p \delta^{-1} d^{1/2})\right\} \geq 1 - \delta^{p^2} \quad (52)$$

Proof. Let $1 \geq \sigma_1 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_p \geq 0$ be the singular values of $\bar{V}^{(0)}$, and then $\sigma_i = \cos\theta_i$, where θ_i are the canonical angles between $\mathcal{R}(V^{(0)})$ and $\mathcal{R}(V_*)$ (recall eq. (33)). By [2, Theorem 1], since $p < (d+1)/2$, the probability distribution function of σ_p is

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(1/x)\right\} = \mathrm{P}\{\sigma_p \geq x\} = \mathrm{P}\{\theta_p \leq \arccos x\}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d-p+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})}(1-x^2)^{p(d-p)/2} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{d-p}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{d+1}{2}; (1-x^2)I_p\right)$$

Set $f_d := \frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d+1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}, g_d := \frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d+1}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}$. After some calculations that are deferred to appendix A.4), we know:

30

- in defining g_d, although $\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})$ and $\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})$ may be ∞, by analytic continuation, $\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})/\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})$ is well-defined;

- $f_d^{-1} g_d = \dfrac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})};$

- $\dfrac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})} = \left(\dfrac{d}{2}\right)^{p^2/2}[1 + \mathrm{o}(1)]$ as $d \to \infty$.

By eq. (51), we have

$$_2F_1\left(\frac{d-p}{2},\frac{1}{2};\frac{d+1}{2};(1-x^2)I_p\right) = f_d\,_2F_1\left(\frac{d-p}{2},\frac{1}{2};\frac{1}{2};x^2I_p\right) + g_d \det(x^2I_p)^{p/2}\,_2F_1(\frac{p+1}{2},\frac{d}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};x^2I_p)$$

Also, [23, Definition 7.3.1 and Corollary 7.3.5] give us

$$_2F_1\left(\frac{d-p}{2},\frac{1}{2};\frac{1}{2};x^2I_p\right) = {_1F_0}\left(\frac{d-p}{2};x^2I_p\right) = \det(I_p - x^2I_p)^{-(d-p)/2} = (1-x^2)^{-p(d-p)/2}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(1/x)\right\} = 1 + f_d^{-1}g_d\,(1-x^2)^{p(d-p)/2}x^{p^2}\,_2F_1\left(\frac{p+1}{2},\frac{d}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};x^2I_p\right)$$

Substituting $x = (\delta^{-1}d^{1/2})^{-1}$ and by [23, (8) of Section 7.4], we get as $d \to \infty$

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{V^{(0)} \notin \mathbb{S}(\delta^{-1}d^{1/2})\right\}$$

$$= -f_d^{-1}g_d(1-\delta^2d^{-1})^{p(d-p)/2}(\delta^2d^{-1})^{p^2/2}\,_2F_1\left(\frac{p+1}{2},\frac{d}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{\delta^2}{d}I_p\right) \tag{53}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{-\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}\frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})}\left(1-\frac{\delta^2}{d}\right)^{pd/2}\left(\frac{d}{\delta^2}-1\right)^{-p^2/2}\left[{_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{\delta^2}{2}I_p\right) + \mathrm{o}(1)\right]$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{-\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{p^2/2}[1+\mathrm{o}(1)]\left[\exp\left(-\frac{p\delta^2}{2}\right)+\mathrm{o}(1)\right]\left[\frac{\delta^{p^2}}{d^{p^2/2}}+\mathrm{o}(1)\right]\left[{_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{\delta^2}{2}I_p\right)+\mathrm{o}(1)\right]$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{-\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}\exp\left(-\frac{p\delta^2}{2}\right){_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{\delta^2}{2}I_p\right)\delta^{p^2}[1+\mathrm{o}(1)]$$

$$\leq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{-\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}{_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{1}{2}I_p\right)\delta^{p^2}2 =: C_p^{p^2}\delta^{p^2},$$

where the inequality is guaranteed by ${_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{\delta^2}{2}I_p\right) \leq {_1F_1}\left(\frac{p+1}{2};\frac{2p+1}{2};\frac{1}{2}I_p\right)$, according to [23, Theorem 7.5.6]. Substituting δ/C_p for δ, we infer from eq. (53) that $\mathrm{P}\left\{V^{(0)} \notin \mathbb{S}(C_p\delta^{-1}d^{1/2})\right\} \leq \delta^{p^2}$. The claim eq. (52) is now a simple consequence. $\qquad\square$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Define the event $\mathbb{H}'_* = \left\{V^{(0)} \in \mathbb{S}(C_p\delta^{-1}d^{1/2})\right\}$. Since $\mathcal{R}(V^{(0)})$ is uniformly sampled from $\mathbb{G}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Lemma 10 says $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}'_*\} \geq 1-\delta^{p^2}$. In the following, we will apply Theorem 1 with $\phi = C_p\delta^{-1}$, $\omega = (\sqrt{2}+1)\lambda_1\delta^2$. Since Theorem 1 is valid on $\mathbb{H}'_*$, and

$$K[(2+\mathrm{e})d+p+1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon}) \leq \delta^{p^2}$$

31

there exists an event $\mathbb{H}$ with

$$\mathrm{P}\big\{\mathbb{H} \mid \mathbb{H}'_*\big\} \geq 1 - K[(2+\mathrm{e})d + p + 1]\exp(-C_{\nu\psi}\beta^{-\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - \delta^{p^2}$$

such that for any $n \in [N_{3/2-37\varepsilon/4}(\beta), K]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\Big\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2;\ \mathbb{H}\cap\mathbb{H}'_*\Big\} &= \mathrm{P}\big\{\mathbb{H}'_*\big\}\,\mathrm{E}\Big\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}}\ \Big|\ \mathbb{H}'_*\Big\} \\
&\leq \mathrm{E}\Big\{\|T^{(n)}\|_{\mathscr{F}}^2\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{H}}\ \Big|\ \mathbb{H}'_*\Big\} \\
&\leq (1-\beta\gamma)^{2(n-1)}pC_p^2\delta^{-2}d + \frac{32\psi^4\beta}{2-\lambda_1\beta}\varphi(p,d;\Lambda) + C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}\beta^{3/2-5\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mathbb{H}_* = \mathbb{H}\cap\mathbb{H}'_*$ for which $\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}_*\} = \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}\mid\mathbb{H}'_*\}\,\mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{H}'_*\} \geq (1-\delta^{p^2})^2 \geq 1-2\delta^{p^2}$, as expected. $\qquad\square$

Finally, we prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. First we examine the conditions of Theorem 2 to make sue that they are satisfied. It can be seen $\beta_* \to 0$ as $N_* \to \infty$. Thus, β_* satisfies eq. (18) for sufficiently large N_*. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1-\beta_*\gamma)^{N_*} &= \left(1 - \frac{3\ln N_*}{2N_*}\right)^{N_*} = \exp(-\frac{3}{2}\ln N_*)[1 + \mathrm{o}(1)] = N_*^{-3/2}[1+\mathrm{o}(1)] \\
&= \left(\frac{3\ln N_*}{2\gamma\beta_*}\right)^{-3/2}[1+\mathrm{o}(1)] = \frac{\beta_*^{3/2}\gamma^{3/2}}{(3/2)^{3/2}(\ln N_*)^{3/2}}[1+\mathrm{o}(1)] \leq \beta_*^{3/2},
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies $N_* \geq N_{3/2}(\beta) \geq N_{3/2-9\varepsilon}(\beta)$.

The conclusion of the theorem will be a straightforward consequence if

$$
\widetilde{C}(d,N_*,\delta) := \frac{(1-\beta_*\gamma)^{2(N_*-1)}pC_p^2\delta^{-2}d + \frac{32\psi^4\beta_*}{2-\lambda_1\beta_*}\varphi(p,d;\Lambda) + C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}\beta_*^{3/2-7\varepsilon}}{\frac{\varphi(p,d;\Lambda)}{\lambda_p-\lambda_{p+1}}\frac{\ln N_*}{N_*}}
$$

is bounded, say by $C_*(d,N_*,\delta)$ to be defined. In fact,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{C}(d,N_*,\delta) &= \gamma\frac{N_*}{\ln N_*}\left[(1-\beta_*\gamma)^{2(N_*-1)}C_p^2\delta^{-2}\frac{pd}{\varphi(p,d;\Lambda)} + \frac{32\psi^4\beta_*}{2-\lambda_1\beta_*} + \frac{C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}}{\varphi(p,d;\Lambda)}\beta_*^{3/2-7\varepsilon}\right] \\
&\leq \gamma\frac{N_*}{\ln N_*}\left[\frac{\beta_*^3}{(1-\beta_*\gamma)^2}C_p^2\delta^{-2}\frac{pd}{\varphi(p,d;\Lambda)} + \frac{32\psi^4\beta_*}{2-\lambda_1\beta_*} + \frac{C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p\sqrt{d-p}}{\varphi(p,d;\Lambda)}\beta_*^{3/2-7\varepsilon}\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\left(\text{by } N_* \geq N_{3/2}, \text{ or equivalently, } (1-\beta_*\gamma)^{N_*} \leq \beta_*^{3/2}\right) \\
&\leq \gamma\frac{N_*}{\ln N_*}\beta_*\left[\frac{\beta_*^2}{(1-\beta_*\gamma)^2}C_p^2\delta^{-2}\frac{d}{p}\frac{1}{\frac{\lambda_1\lambda_d}{\lambda_1-\lambda_d}} + \frac{32\psi^4}{2-\lambda_1\beta_*} + \frac{C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}}{\sqrt{p}\frac{\lambda_1\lambda_d}{\lambda_1-\lambda_d}}\beta_*^{1/2-7\varepsilon}\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\left(\text{by } \varphi(p,d;\Lambda) \geq \frac{p(d-p)\lambda_1\lambda_d}{\lambda_1-\lambda_d} \text{ and } d \geq 2p\right) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}\left[\frac{\beta_*^{1+3\varepsilon}}{(1-\beta_*\gamma)^2}\frac{C_p^2}{p}\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_d}{\lambda_1\lambda_d} + \frac{32\psi^4}{2-\lambda_1\beta_*} + C_\circ\kappa^4\nu^2\eta_p^2\gamma^{-1}p^{-1/2}\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_d}{\lambda_1\lambda_d}\beta_*^{1/2-7\varepsilon}\right] \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\left(\text{by } d\beta_*^{1-3\varepsilon} \leq \delta^2\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$=: C_*(d, N_*, \delta)$$

Since $\beta_* \leq 1$ and $\beta_* \gamma \leq \lambda_1 \beta_* \leq \sqrt{2} - 1$, we have

$$C_*(d, N_*, \delta) \leq \frac{3}{2} \left[\frac{C_p^2}{2(3 - 2\sqrt{2})p} \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_d}{\lambda_1 \lambda_d} + \frac{32\psi^4}{3 - \sqrt{2}} + \frac{C_\circ \kappa^4 \nu^2 \eta_p^2 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_d)}{p^{1/2} \gamma \lambda_1 \lambda_d} \right]$$

and also $C_*(d, N_*, \delta) \to 24\psi^4$ as $d \to \infty, N_* \to \infty$, as was to be shown. $\qquad\square$

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided a detailed convergence analysis for the multidimensional subspace online PCA iteration on sub-Gaussian samples, extending the work of [18], which focused on the one-dimensional case for estimating the most significant principal component. Our analysis reveals that while similar in form to the one-dimensional case, extending to higher dimensions introduces unique challenges, such as dealing with a matrix of cotangent values instead of a scalar. Despite these difficulties, we establish an explicit and nearly optimal convergence rate, which closely approaches the minimax information lower bound for sub-Gaussian PCA under certain conditions.

Our results demonstrate that the convergence of subspace online PCA is *nearly global*, as the finite-sample error bound holds with high probability, even when the initial subspace is randomly sampled from the Grassmann manifold. This makes the method highly applicable in real-world, high-dimensional data settings. Additionally, our work contributes to a broader understanding of online PCA iterations by offering a simpler proof for the one-dimensional case, where only the first principal component is considered.

By addressing more practical assumptions, particularly for distributions with sub-Gaussian tails, we significantly advance the understanding of the convergence behavior of online PCA. This framework is well-suited for analyzing streaming data, providing both theoretical rigor and practical relevance in the field of high-dimensional data analysis.

References

[1] Abed-Meraim K, Attallah S, Chkeif A, et al. Orthogonal Oja algorithm. IEEE Signal Processing Letters, 2000. 7(5): 116–119

[2] Absil P A, Edelman A, Koev P. On the largest principal angle between random subspaces. Linear Algebra Appl, 2006. 414: 288–294

[3] Allen-Zhu Z, Li Y. First efficient convergence for streaming k-PCA: a global gap-free and near-optimal rate. In: 2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). 2017, 487–492

[4] Arora R, Cotter A, Livescu K, et al. Stochastic optimization for PCA and PLS. In: 2012, 50th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton). 2012, 861–868

[5] Arora R, Cotter A, Srebro N. Stochastic optics of PCA with capped MSG. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing System, vol. 26. 2013, 1815–1823

[6] Balcan M F, Du S S, Wang Y, et al. An improved gap-dependency analysis of the noisy power method. In: 29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory, vol. 49. PMLR, 2016, 284–309

[7] Balsubramani A, Dasgupta S, Freund Y. The fast convergence of incremental PCA. In: Advances in neural information processing systems. 2013, 3174–3182

[8] Blum A, Hopcroft J, Kannan R. Foundations of Data Science. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2020

[9] Chikuse Y. Statistics on special manifolds. No. 174 in Lecture Notes in Statistics. New York: Springer, 2003

[10] De Sa C, Olukotun K, Ré C. Global convergence of stochastic gradient descent for some non-convex matrix problems. In: Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 37. PLMR, 2015, 2332–2341

[11] Demmel J. Applied Numerical Linear Algebra. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1997

[12] Garber D, Hazan E, Jin C, et al. Faster eigenvector computation via shift-and-invert preconditioning. In: ICML. 2016, 2626–2634

[13] Hardt M, Price E. The noisy power method: a meta algorithm with applications. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 27. 2014, 2861–2869

[14] Horn R A, Johnson C R. Topics in Matrix Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991

[15] Hotelling H. Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1933. 24(6): 417–441

[16] Jain P, Jin C, Kakade S M, et al. Streaming PCA: Matching matrix Bernstein and near-optimal finite sample guarantees for Oja's algorithm. In: Conference on learning theory. 2016, 1147–1164

[17] James A. Normal multivariate analysis and the orthogonal group. Ann Math Statist, 1954. 25(1): 40–75

[18] Li C J, Wang M, Liu H, et al. Near-optimal stochastic approximation for online principal component estimation. Math Program, Ser B, 2018. 167(1): 75–97

[19] Li C L, Lin H T, Lu C J. Rivalry of two families off algorithms for memory-restricted streaming pca. In: Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS). 2016, 473–481

[20] Luke Y L. The special functions and their approximations. No. 53, vol. I in Mathematics in Science and Engineering. New York: Academic Press, 1969

[21] Marinov T V, Mianjy P, Arora R. Streaming principal component analysis in noisy setting. In: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, 3413–3422

[22] Mianjy P, Arora R. Stochastic PCA with ℓ_2 and ℓ_1 regularization. In: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, 3531–3539

[23] Muirhead R J. Aspects of multivariate statistical theory. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982

[24] Oja E. Simplified neuron model as a principal component analyzer. J Mathematical Biology, 1982. 15(3): 267–273

[25] Oja E, Karhunen J. On stochastic approximation of the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the expectation of a random matrix. J Math Anal and Appl, 1985. 106(1): 69–84

[26] Pearson K FRS. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. Philosophical Magazine, 1901. 2(11): 559–572

[27] Shamir O. Convergence of stochastic gradient descent for PCA. In: International Conference on Machine Learning. 2016, 257–265

[28] Stewart G W, Sun J G. Matrix Perturbation Theory. Boston: Academic Press, 1990

[29] Tang C. Exponentially convergent stochastic k-pca without variance reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

[30] Tropp J A. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. Found Comput Math, 2012. 12: 389–434

[31] van der Vaart A W, Wellner J A. Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes. Springer Series in Statistics. New York: Springer, 1996

[32] Vershynin R. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. In: Eldar Y C, Kutyniok G, eds., Compressed sensing: theory and applications, chap. 5, 210–268. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012

[33] Vu V Q, Lei J. Minimax sparse principal subspace estimation in high dimensions. Ann Statist, 2013. 41(6): 2905–2947

A Supplementary Proofs

A.1 Proof of Item (3) of Lemma 5

We have

$$\mathrm{var}_\circ(\Delta T) = \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T_L(\beta YY^{\mathrm{T}} + R_T)T_R\big) = \beta^2 \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T_L YY^{\mathrm{T}} T_R\big) + 2\beta R_{\circ,1} + R_{\circ,2} \tag{54}$$

where $R_{\circ,1} = \mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T_L YY^{\mathrm{T}} T_R, T_L R_T T_R\big)$, and $R_{\circ,2} = \mathrm{var}_\circ(T_L R_T T_R)$. By eq. (43),

$$\mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T_L YY^{\mathrm{T}} T_R\big) = \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) + R_{\circ,0} \tag{55}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{\circ,0} = {} & \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big) + \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) + \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big) \\
& - 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big) - 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) + 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big) \\
& + 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T, T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) - 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big) \\
& - 2\,\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)
\end{aligned}$$

Examine eq. (54) and eq. (55) together to get $H_\circ = \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big)$ and $R_\circ = \beta^2 R_{\circ,0} + 2\beta R_{\circ,1} + R_{\circ,2}$. We note

$$Y_j = e_j^{\mathrm{T}} Y = e_j^{\mathrm{T}} \Lambda^{1/2}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y = \lambda_j^{1/2} e_j^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y,$$

$$e_i^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) e_j = \mathrm{var}(e_i^{\mathrm{T}}\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}e_j) = \mathrm{var}(Y_{p+i}Y_j) = \mathrm{E}\{Y_{p+i}^2 Y_j^2\}.$$

By [32, (5.11)],

$$\mathrm{E}\{Y_j^4\} = \lambda_j^2\, \mathrm{E}\big\{(e_j^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y)^4\big\} \le 16\lambda_j^2\|e_j^{\mathrm{T}}\Lambda^{-1/2}Y\|_{\psi_2}^4 \le 16\lambda_j^2\|\Lambda^{-1/2}Y\|_{\psi_2}^4 = 16\lambda_j^2\psi^4$$

Therefore $e_i^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) e_j \le [\mathrm{E}\{Y_{p+i}^4\}\mathrm{E}\{Y_j^4\}]^{1/2} \le 16\lambda_{p+i}\lambda_j\psi^4$, i.e., $H_\circ = \mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big) \le 16\psi^4 H$. This proves item (3)a. To show item (3)b, first we bound the entrywise variance and covariance. For any matrices A_1, A_2 of the same size, it holds that [14, p.233]

$$\|A_1 \circ A_2\|_2 \le \|A_1\|_2\|A_2\|_2 \tag{56}$$

and thus

$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ(A_1, A_2)\|_2 = \|\mathrm{E}\{A_1 \circ A_2\} - \mathrm{E}\{A_1\} \circ \mathrm{E}\{A_2\}\|_2$$
$$\le \mathrm{E}\{\|A_1\|_2\|A_2\|_2\} + \|\mathrm{E}\{A_1\}\|_2\|\mathrm{E}\{A_2\}\|_2 \tag{57a}$$
$$\|\mathrm{var}_\circ(A_1)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\{\|A_1\|_2^2\} + \|\mathrm{E}\{A_1\}\|_2^2 \tag{57b}$$

Apply eq. (57) to $R_{\circ,1}$ and $R_{\circ,2}$ to get

$$\|R_{\circ,1}\|_2 \le 2C_T\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p^3\beta^2(1+\|T\|_2^2)^{5/2}, \quad \|R_{\circ,2}\|_2 \le 2C_T^2\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4(1+\|T\|_2^2)^3 \tag{58}$$

upon using

$$\|T_L YY^{\mathrm{T}} T_R\|_2 = \|T_L YY^{\mathrm{T}} VV^{\mathrm{T}} T_R\|_2 \le \nu^{1/2}\widetilde{\eta}_p(1+\|T\|_2^2), \quad \|T_L R_T T_R\|_2 \le C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(1+\|T\|_2^2)^{3/2}$$

36

For $R_{\circ,0}$, by eq. (44), we have

$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2\big\}\|T\|_2^2,$$
$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\big\}\|T\|_2,$$
$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\big\}\|T\|_2,$$
$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T, T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\big\}\|T\|_2^3,$$
$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\big\}\|T\|_2^3,$$
$$\|\mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2\big\}\|T\|_2^4,$$
$$\|\mathrm{var}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2\big\}\|T\|_2^2 + \|T\bar{A}\|_2^2,$$
$$\|\mathrm{var}_\circ\big(\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2\big\}\|T\|_2^2 + \|\varDelta T\|_2^2,$$
$$\|\mathrm{cov}_\circ\big(T\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}, \underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}T\big)\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2\big\}\|T\|_2^2 + \|T\bar{A}\|_2\|\varDelta T\|_2$$

Since

$$\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 + \|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 = \bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\bar{Y} + \underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\underline{Y} = Y^{\mathrm{T}}Y \le \nu\widetilde{\eta}_p,$$
$$\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 = (\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\bar{Y})^{1/2}(\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\underline{Y})^{1/2} \le \frac{\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\bar{Y} + \underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\underline{Y}}{2} \le \frac{\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p}{2},$$

we have

$$\|R_{\circ,0}\|_2 \le \mathrm{E}\big\{2\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2 + (\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 + \|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2)^2\big\}\|T\|_2^2 + (\|T\bar{A}\|_2 + \|\varDelta T\|_2)^2$$
$$+ 2\,\mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2(\|\bar{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2 + \|\underline{Y}\underline{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2)\big\}\big(\|T\|_2 + \|T\|_2^3\big) + \mathrm{E}\big\{\|\underline{Y}\bar{Y}^{\mathrm{T}}\|_2^2\big\}\|T\|_2^4$$
$$\le (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2\|T\|_2 + \Big[\frac{3}{2}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2 + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_{p+1})^2\Big]\|T\|_2^2 + (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2\|T\|_2^3 + \frac{1}{4}(\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2\|T\|_2^4$$
$$\le (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p)^2\|T\|_2\big(1 + \frac{11}{2}\|T\|_2 + \|T\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{4}\|T\|_2^3\big) \tag{59}$$

Finally collecting eq. (58) and eq. (59) yields the desired bound on $R_\circ = \beta^2 R_{\circ,0} + 2\beta R_{\circ,1} + R_{\circ,2}$.

A.2   Estimation in Proof of Lemma 8

(i) $\mathrm{E}\Big\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_1\Big\} = \mathcal{L}^{2n}T^{(0)} \circ T^{(0)}$.

(ii) $\mathrm{E}\Big\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\Big\} = \displaystyle\sum_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2n-s}T^{(0)} \circ \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = 0$, because

$$\mathrm{E}\Big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\Big\} = \mathrm{E}\Big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\,\big|\,\mathbb{F}_{s-1}\big\}\Big\} = 0$$

(iii) $\mathrm{E}\Big\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\Big\} = \displaystyle\sum_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2n-s}T^{(0)} \circ \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = 0$, because $\mathbb{T}_{s-1} \subset \mathbb{F}_{s-1}$ and so

$$\mathrm{E}\Big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\Big\} = \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}\}\,\mathrm{E}\Big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\,\big|\,\mathbb{T}_{s-1}\Big\}$$
$$= \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}\}\,\mathrm{E}\Big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\,\big|\,\mathbb{F}_{s-1}\big\}\,\big|\,\mathbb{T}_{s-1}\Big\} = 0$$

(iv) $\mathrm{E}\big\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\big\} = \sum_{s=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2n-s} T^{(0)} \circ \mathrm{E}\big\{E_T^{(s-1)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}$. Recall eq. (56). By item (2)a of Lemma 5, we have

$$\big\|\mathrm{E}\big\{\widetilde{J}_1 \circ \widetilde{J}_3\big\}\big\|_2 \leq \sum_{s=1}^{n} \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{2n-s} \|T^{(0)}\|_2 \big\|\mathrm{E}\big\{E_T^{(s-1)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}\big\|_2$$

$$\leq \sum_{s=1}^{n} (1-\beta\gamma)^{2n-s} \big(\frac{\kappa^2}{4} - 1\big)^{1/2} C_T \nu^{1/2} (\widetilde{\eta}_p \beta)^2 \kappa^3$$

$$\leq (1-\beta\gamma)^n \frac{(\kappa^2-1)^{1/2} C_T \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \beta^2 \kappa^3}{2\beta\gamma}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \beta^{1-6\varepsilon} C_T \nu^{1/2} \widetilde{\eta}_p^2 \gamma^{-1} \beta \kappa^4 \qquad \text{(by } n \geq N_{1-6\varepsilon}\text{)}.$$

(v) $\mathrm{E}\big\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\big\} = \sum_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \sum_{s'=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2n-s-s'} \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = 0$, because $s <$ s' and

$$\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\} \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\} \mathrm{E}\big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{F}_{s'-1}\big\} \,\big|\, \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\} \mathrm{E}\big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{F}_{s'-1}\big\} \circ D^{(s)} \,\big|\, \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\big\}$$

$$= 0$$

(vi) $\mathrm{E}\big\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\big\} = \sum_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \sum_{s'=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2n-s-s'} \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}$$

because for $s \neq s'$,

$$\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = \mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(\max\{s,s'\})} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{F}_{\max\{s,s'\}-1}\big\} \circ D^{(\min\{s,s'\})}\big\}$$

$$= 0$$

Use items (3)a and (3)b of Lemma 5 to get

$$\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\big\} = \mathrm{E}\big\{\mathrm{E}\big\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{F}_{s-1}\big\}\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\big\{\mathrm{var}_\circ\big([T^{(n+1)} - T^{(n)}]\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\big|\, \mathbb{F}_{s-1}\big)\big\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\{\beta^2 H_\circ + R_\circ\} = \beta^2 H_\circ + \mathrm{E}\{R_\circ\}$$

Therefore $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{21} \circ \widetilde{J}_{21}\right\} = \beta^2 \sum\limits_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} H_\circ + \sum\limits_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\{R_\circ\}$. We have for $\kappa > 2\sqrt{2}$

$$\|R_\circ\|_2 \le (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2 \tau_{s-1}\left(1 + \frac{11}{2}\tau_{s-1} + \tau_{s-1}^2 + \frac{1}{4}\tau_{s-1}^3\right) + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

$$\le (\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2 \tau_{s-1}\left(\kappa^2 + \frac{21}{4}\kappa + \frac{1}{4}\kappa^3\right) + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

$$\le \frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{32}\kappa^3\nu^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\tau_{s-1} + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

where $\tau_{s-1} = \|T^{(s-1)}\|_2 \le (\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}$. Write $E_{21} := \sum\limits_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\{R_\circ\}$. Since $2N_{1/2-3\varepsilon} - 1 \le N_{1-6\varepsilon} \le 2N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}$ by definition, we get

$$\|E_{21}\|_2 \le \sum\limits_{s=1}^{N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}-1} \|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\{\|R_\circ\|_2\}$$

$$\le \frac{(1 - \beta\gamma)^{2(n+1-N_{1/2-3\varepsilon})}}{\beta\gamma[2 - \beta\gamma]} \mathrm{E}\{\|R_\circ\|_2\}$$

$$\le \frac{1 - \beta\gamma}{2 - \beta\gamma}\frac{(1 - \beta\gamma)^n}{\beta\gamma} \mathrm{E}\{\|R_\circ\|_2\}$$

$$\le \frac{1}{2}\beta^{1-6\varepsilon}\gamma^{-1}\beta\kappa^4\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{32}\nu + 4C_T\kappa(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta) + 2C_T^2\kappa^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\right)$$

$$\le \left(\frac{29 + 8\sqrt{2}}{64} + 2C_T\kappa(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta) + C_T^2\kappa^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\right)\gamma^{-1}\kappa^4\nu^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{2-6\varepsilon}$$

(vii) $\mathrm{E}\left\{\widetilde{J}_{22} \circ \widetilde{J}_{22}\right\} = \sum\limits_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}} \circ D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\right\}$

$$= \beta^2 \sum\limits_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} H_\circ + \sum\limits_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)} \mathrm{E}\left\{R_\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\right\}$$

because for $s \neq s'$,

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}} \circ D^{(s')}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}}\right\} = \mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s'-1}}\right\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\middle|\, \mathbb{T}_{s-1} \cap \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\right\} \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s-1} \cap \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\}$$

$$= \mathrm{E}\left\{\mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(\max\{s,s'\})}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\middle|\, \mathbb{F}_{\max\{s,s'\}-1}\right\} \circ D^{(\min\{s,s'\})} \,\middle|\, \mathbb{T}_{s-1} \cap \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\right\} \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s-1} \cap \mathbb{T}_{s'-1}\}$$

$$= 0$$

and

$$\mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}} \circ D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\right\} = \mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s')}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\right\}$$

$$= \mathrm{P}\{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}\} \mathrm{E}\left\{\mathrm{E}\left\{D^{(s)} \circ D^{(s)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K} \,\middle|\, \mathbb{F}_{s-1}\right\} \,\middle|\, \mathbb{T}_{s-1}\right\}$$

39

$$\leq \beta^2 H_\circ + \mathrm{E}\{R_\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\}$$

We have

$$\|R_\circ \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\|_2 \leq \frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32}\kappa^3\nu^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\tau_{s-1} + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

$$\leq \frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32}\kappa^3\nu^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2(\kappa^2-1)^{1/2}\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

$$\leq \frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32}\kappa^4\nu^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + 4C_T\kappa^5\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^3 + 2C_T^2\kappa^6\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4$$

Write $E_{22} := \sum_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n} \mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)}\,\mathrm{E}\{R_\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\}$ for which we have

$$\|E_{22}\|_2 \leq \sum_{s=N_{1/2-3\varepsilon}}^{n}\|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{2(n-s)}\,\mathrm{E}\{\|R_\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\|_2\}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\beta\gamma[2-\beta\gamma]}\,\mathrm{E}\{\|R_\circ\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{T}_{s-1}}\|_2\}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{3-\sqrt{2}}\gamma^{-1}\kappa^4\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta\left(\frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32}\nu\beta^{1/2-3\varepsilon} + 4C_T\kappa(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta) + 2C_T^2\kappa^2(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\right)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{3-\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{29+8\sqrt{2}}{32} + 4C_T\kappa\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta^{1/2+3\varepsilon} + 2C_T^2\kappa^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{3/2+3\varepsilon}\right)\gamma^{-1}\kappa^4\nu^2\widetilde{\eta}_p^2\beta^{3/2-3\varepsilon}$$

(viii) $\mathrm{E}\{\widetilde{J}_3\circ\widetilde{J}_3\} = \sum_{s=1}^{n}\mathcal{L}^{2(n-s)}\,\mathrm{E}\{E_T^{(s-1)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\circ E_T^{(s-1)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\}$. Also, by eq. (56),

$$\|\mathrm{E}\{\widetilde{J}_3\circ\widetilde{J}_3\}\|_2 \leq \sum_{s=1}^{n}\|\mathcal{L}\|_2^{2(n-s)}\,\mathrm{E}\{\|E_T^{(s-1)}\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{Q}_K}\|_2^2\}$$

$$\leq \sum_{s=1}^{n}(1-\beta\gamma)^{2(n-s)}[C_T\nu^{1/2}(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^2\kappa^3]^2$$

$$\leq \frac{C_T^2\nu(\widetilde{\eta}_p\beta)^4\kappa^6}{\beta\gamma[2-\beta\gamma]} \leq \frac{1}{3-\sqrt{2}}C_T^2\nu\widetilde{\eta}_p^4\gamma^{-1}\kappa^6\beta^3$$

A.3   Proof of Lemma 9

The proof is the same as that for the case $p=1$ by Kummer's solutions of the hypergeometric differential equation (see, e.g., [20, Section 3.8]). Let the eigenvalues of T be $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m$. Since $_2F_1(a,b;c;T)$ is defined on the spectrum of T, it is a function of $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m$. When treated as such, by [23, Theorem 7.5.5], $_2F_1(a,b;c;T)$ is the unique solution of partial differential equations,

$$\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial\mu_i^2} + \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq m \\ j\neq i}}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i-\mu_j}\right)\frac{\partial F}{\partial\mu_i}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\leq j\leq m \\ j\neq i}}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i-\mu_j}\frac{\partial F}{\partial\mu_j} - abF = 0, \quad (60)$$

subject to the conditions that F is a symmetric function of $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m$, analytic at $(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) = (0, \ldots, 0)$, and $F(0, \ldots, 0) = 1$.

We claim that $\widetilde{F}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) := {}_2F_1(a, b; a+b-c+\frac{m+1}{2}; I-T)$ satisfies eq. (60). In fact, letting $\widetilde{\mu}_i = 1 - \mu_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ which are the eigenvalues of $I-T$, we have

$$\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 \widetilde{F}}{\partial \mu_i^2} + \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\right)\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \mu_i} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \mu_j} - ab$$

$$= (1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)\widetilde{\mu}_i\frac{\partial^2 \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_i^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_j)\widetilde{\mu}_j}{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)-(1-\widetilde{\mu}_j)}\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_j} - ab\widetilde{F}$$

$$- \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})(1-\widetilde{\mu}_i) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)\widetilde{\mu}_i}{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)-(1-\widetilde{\mu}_j)}\right)\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_i}$$

$$= (1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)\widetilde{\mu}_i\frac{\partial^2 \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_j)\widetilde{\mu}_j}{\widetilde{\mu}_i - \widetilde{\mu}_j}\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_j} - ab\widetilde{F}$$

$$+ \left(-c + \frac{m+1}{2} + a + b - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\widetilde{\mu}_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{(1-\widetilde{\mu}_i)\widetilde{\mu}_i}{\widetilde{\mu}_i - \widetilde{\mu}_j}\right)\frac{\partial \widetilde{F}}{\partial \widetilde{\mu}_i}$$

$$= 0$$

where the last equality holds because $\widetilde{F}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) = {}_2F_1(a, b; a+b-c+\frac{m+1}{2}; I-T)$ satisfies a version of eq. (60) after substitutions: $\mu_i \to \widetilde{\mu}_i$ for all i and $c \to a+b-c+\frac{m+1}{2}$.

$\widehat{F}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) := \det(T)^{\frac{m+1}{2}-c}{}_2F_1(a-c+\frac{m+1}{2}, b-c+\frac{m+1}{2}; m+1-c; T)$ satisfies eq. (60), too. Set $t = \frac{m+1}{2} - c$ and write $G(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m) = {}_2F_1(a+t, b+t; c+2t; T)$. We have

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{F}}{\partial \mu_i} = \frac{t}{\mu_i}\det(T)^t G + \det(T)^t\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \widehat{F}}{\partial \mu_i^2} = \frac{t(t-1)}{\mu_i^2}\det(T)^t G + 2\frac{t}{\mu_i}\det(T)^t\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i} + \det(T)^t\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \mu_i^2}$$

and thus

$$\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 \widehat{F}}{\partial \mu_i^2} + \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\right)\frac{\partial \widehat{F}}{\partial \mu_i} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\frac{\partial \widehat{F}}{\partial \mu_j} - ab$$

$$= \mu_i(1-\mu_i)\left(\frac{t(t-1)}{\mu_i^2}\det(T)^t G + 2\frac{t}{\mu_i}\det(T)^t\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i} + \det(T)^t\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \mu_i^2}\right)$$

$$+ \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\right)\left(\frac{t}{\mu_i}\det(T)^t G + \det(T)^t\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i}\right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\left(\frac{t}{\mu_i}\det(T)^t G + \det(T)^t\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i}\right) - ab\det(T)^t G$$

$$= \det(T)^t\left\{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \mu_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq m \\ j \neq i}}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i - \mu_j}\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_j}\right.$$

41

$$+ \left(2\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{t}{\mu_i} + c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i-\mu_j} \right)\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i}$$

$$+ \left[\mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{t(t-1)}{\mu_i^2} + \left(c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i-\mu_j} \right)\frac{t}{\mu_i} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i-\mu_j} \right.$$

$$= \det(T)^t \left\{ \mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \mu_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i-\mu_j}\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_j} \right.$$

$$+ \left(2(1-\mu_i)t + c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i-\mu_j} \right)\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i}$$

$$+ \left[\frac{t(t-1)}{\mu_i} - t(t-1) + (c-\frac{m-1}{2})\frac{t}{\mu_i} - (a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})t + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}(-1)t - ab \right]G \right\}$$

$$= \det(T)^t \left\{ \mu_i(1-\mu_i)\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \mu_i^2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_j(1-\mu_j)}{\mu_i-\mu_j}\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_j} \right.$$

$$+ \left(2t + c - \frac{m-1}{2} - (2t+a+b+1-\frac{m-1}{2})\mu_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le m}}^{j\ne i}\frac{\mu_i(1-\mu_i)}{\mu_i-\mu_j} \right)\frac{\partial G}{\partial \mu_i} - \left[t^2 + (a+b)t + ab \right]G \right\}$$

$$= 0$$

where the last equality holds because $G(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m) = {}_2F_1(a+t,b+t;c+2t;T)$ satisfies a version of eq. (60) after substitutions: $a \to a+t$, $b \to b+t$, and $c \to c+2t$.

Similarly $\widehat{\widetilde{F}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m) := \det(I-T)^{c-a-b}{}_2F_1(c-b,c-a;c-a-b+\frac{m+1}{2};I-T)$ satisfies eq. (60). Thus, any linear combination of $\widetilde{F}$ and $\widehat{\widetilde{F}}$, such as the right-hand side of eq. (51), also satisfies eq. (60). It can be verified that the combination is symmetric with respect to $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_m$, and analytic at $T=0$. Therefore, by the uniqueness and $F(0)=1$, similarly to the discussion in [20, Section 3.9], we have eq. (51).

A.4 Complementary Calculation in Proof of Lemma 10

Here in defining g_d, although $\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})$ and $\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})$ may be ∞, by analytic continuation, $\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})/\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})$ is well-defined because

$$\frac{\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2}+\epsilon)}{\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)} = \prod_{i=1}^{p}\frac{\Gamma(-\frac{p}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2}+\epsilon)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2}+\epsilon)}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2}\frac{1}{\frac{-i}{2}-j+1+\epsilon} & \text{for odd } p, \\[2em] \displaystyle\frac{\Gamma(\frac{1-2p}{2}+\epsilon)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)}\prod_{i=1}^{p-1}\prod_{j=1}^{p/2}\frac{1}{\frac{-i-1}{2}-j+1+\epsilon} & \text{for even } p, \end{cases}$$

$$\xrightarrow{\epsilon \to 0} \begin{cases} \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{p} \prod_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \frac{-2}{i+2j-2}, \\[3mm] \displaystyle\prod_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\frac{-1}{2}-k+1} \prod_{i=1}^{p-1}\prod_{j=1}^{p/2} \frac{-2}{i+2j-1} \end{cases} = \prod_{i=1}^{2\lfloor p/2 \rfloor +1} \prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \frac{-2}{i+2j-2}$$

Also,

$$\frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{p+1}{2})} = \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})}, \qquad \frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d+1}{2})} = \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d-p+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})}$$

which implies $f_d = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{d-p+1}{2})}$. We have

$$f_d^{-1} g_d = \frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{p}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{p+1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})\Gamma_p(-\frac{p}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})\Gamma_p(\frac{1}{2})}$$

Note that

$$\frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})} = \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d-p}{2}-\frac{i-1}{2})} = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d-p}{2})} \prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2}\left(\frac{d-i}{2}-j\right) & \text{for odd } p, \\[5mm] \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{p/2}\left(\frac{d-i}{2}-j\right) & \text{for even } p, \end{cases}$$

and by $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n+\alpha)}{\Gamma(n)n^\alpha} = 1$ for any α (see, e.g., [20, (16) of section 2.1]),

$$\frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d-p}{2})} = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\frac{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})(\frac{d-1}{2})^{1/2}[1+o(1)]}{\Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})(\frac{d-1}{2})^{(1-p)/2}[1+o(1)]}, & \text{for odd } d, \\[5mm] \displaystyle\frac{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})(\frac{d}{2})^{-p/2}[1+o(1)]}, & \text{for even } d \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)^{p/2}[1+o(1)], \\[4mm] \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{p/2}[1+o(1)] \end{cases}$$

which implies

$$\frac{\Gamma_p(\frac{d}{2})}{\Gamma_p(\frac{d-p}{2})} = \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{p^2/2} [1+o(1)] \text{ as } d \to \infty$$