Submitted to the Annals of Statistics
arXiv: arXiv:0000.0000

arXiv:1704.02381v3 [stat.ME] 29 Oct 2018

ADAPTIVE ESTIMATION OF THE RANK OF THE COEFFICIENT MATRIX IN HIGH DIMENSIONAL MULTIVARIATE RESPONSE REGRESSION MODELS

By Xin Bing and Marten H. Wegkamp

Cornell University

We consider the multivariate response regression problem with a regression coefficient matrix of low, unknown rank. In this setting, we analyze a new criterion for selecting the optimal reduced rank. This criterion differs notably from the one proposed in Bunea et al. (2011) in that it does not require estimation of the unknown variance of the noise, nor does it depend on a delicate choice of a tuning parameter. We develop an iterative, fully data-driven procedure, that adapts to the optimal signal-to-noise ratio. This procedure finds the true rank in a few steps with overwhelming probability. At each step, our estimate increases, while at the same time it does not exceed the true rank. Our finite sample results hold for any sample size and any dimension, even when the number of responses and of covariates grow much faster than the number of observations. We perform an extensive simulation study that confirms our theoretical findings. The new method performs better and is more stable than the procedure of Bunea et al. (2011) in both low- and high-dimensional settings.

1. Introduction.

1.1. *Background.* We study the multivariate response regression model

$$Y = XA + E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$$

with $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ of $\text{rank}(X) = q$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$ of unknown $\text{rank}(A) = r$. We assume that the entries E_{ij} of E are i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ distributed with $\sigma^2 < \infty$. Section 5 discusses extensions to general, heavy tailed distributions of the errors E_{ij}.

Standard least squares estimation is tantamount to regressing each response on the predictors separately, thus ignoring the multivariate nature of the possibly correlated responses. In large dimensional settings (m and p are large relative to the sample size n), it is desirable to achieve a dimension reduction in the coefficient matrix A. One popular way of achieving

Primary 62H15, 62J07

Keywords and phrases: Multivariate response regression, reduced rank estimator, self-tuning, adaptive rank estimation, rank consistency, dimension reduction, oracle inequalities

this goal, is to find a common subset of $s \leq p$ covariates that are relevant for prediction, using penalized least squares with a ℓ_1/ℓ_2 (group lasso) type penalty on the regression coefficients, see, for instance, Bunea et al. (2012); Bühlmann and Van de Geer (2011); Lounici et al. (2011); Obozinski et al. (2011); Yuan and Lin (2006) to recover the support of the set of s rows for which A is non-zero.

Reduced rank regression is a different approach to achieve necessary dimension reduction. The main premise is that A has low rank, so that we can write $A = A_1 A_2$ for a $p \times r$ matrix A_1 and a $r \times m$ matrix A_2. Then only few linear combinations $X^* = XA_1$ of X are needed to explain the variation of Y. Izenman (1975) coined the term *reduced-rank regression* for this class of models, but its history dates back to Anderson (1951b). There are many works on this topic in the classical setting of *fixed* dimensions m and p, and sample size $n \to \infty$, see Anderson (1951a); Rao (1978); Robinson (1973, 1974) and more recently, Anderson (2002). A comprehensive overview on reduced rank regression is given by Reinsel and Velu (1998). Only recently, the high-dimensional case has been discussed: Bunea et al. (2011, 2012); Giraud (2011, 2015); Negahban and Wainwright (2011); Rohde and Tsybakov (2011).

The main topic of this paper is the estimation of the unknown rank. Determination of the rank of the coefficient matrix is the first key step for the estimation of A. For known rank r, Anderson (1951a) derives the asymptotic distribution of the reduced rank regression coefficient matrix estimator $\widehat{A}_r$ in the asymptotic setting with m, p fixed and $n \to \infty$. The estimator $\widehat{A}_k$ is the matrix corresponding to minimizing the squared Frobenius or Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|Y - XB\|^2$ over all $p \times m$ matrices B of rank k and has a closed form, due to the Eckart-Young theorem (Eckart and Young, 1936; Schmidt, 1907). It is crucial to have the true rank $k = r$ for obtaining a good fit for both $\|XA - X\widehat{A}_k\|^2$ and $\|A - \widehat{A}_k\|^2$. In general, however, the rank r is unknown *a priori*. The classical approach to estimate the rank r uses the likelihood ratio test, see Anderson (1951b). An elementary calculation shows that this statistic coincides with Bartlett's test statistic as a consequence of the relation between reduced rank regression and canonical correlation analysis, see Anderson (1951b); Rudelson and Vershynin (2010). Our main goal in this study is to develop a non-asymptotic method to estimate r that is easy to compute, adaptively from the data, and valid for any values of m, n and p, especially when the number of predictors p and the number of responses m are large. The resulting estimator of A can then be used to construct a possibly much smaller number of new transformed predictors, or the most important canonical variables based on the original X

and Y, see (Izenman, 2008, Chapter 6) for a historical account. Under weak assumptions on the signal, our estimate of r can be shown to be equal to r with overwhelming probability, to wit, $1-\exp(-\theta_1 mn)-\exp(-\theta_2(m+q))$, for some positive, finite constants θ_1, θ_2, so that the selection error is small compared to the overall error in estimating A.

1.2. *Recent developments.* Bunea et al. (2011, 2012) proposed

$$\min_A \left\{ \|Y - XA\|^2 + \mu \cdot \operatorname{rank}(A) \right\} \tag{1.1}$$

and recommended the choice $\mu = C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2$ with constant $C > 1$ for the tuning parameter μ. In particular, Bunea et al. (2011) established a convenient closed form for the $\operatorname{rank}(\widehat{A}) = \widehat{r}$ of the matrix $\widehat{A}$ that minimizes criterion (1.1). They gave sufficient conditions on the level of the smallest non-zero singular value of XA to guarantee that $\widehat{r}$ consistently estimates r. The disadvantage of this method is that a value for σ^2, in addition to the tuning parameter C, is required for μ. Bunea et al. (2011) proposed to use the unbiased estimator

$$\widetilde{\sigma}^2 := \frac{\|Y - PY\|^2}{nm - qm} \tag{1.2}$$

based on the projection PY of Y onto the range space of X. However, this becomes problematic when $(n-q)m$ is not large enough, or even infeasible when $n = q$. Giraud (2011) introduces another estimation scheme, that does not require estimation of σ^2. Unfortunately, a closed form for the minimizer as in Bunea et al. (2011) is lacking, and rank consistency in fact fails, as our simulations reveal in Appendix F.2 in the supplementary materials. Moreover, the procedures in both Bunea et al. (2011) and Giraud (2011) are rather sensitive to the choices of their respective tuning parameters involved. We emphasize that Giraud (2011) studies the error $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2$ and not the rank of his estimator $\widehat{A}$.

1.3. *Proposed Research.* This paper studies a third criterion,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 := \frac{\|Y - (PY)_k\|^2}{nm - \lambda k}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here $(PY)_k = \sum_{j=1}^k d_j(PY) u_j v_j^T$ is the truncated singular value decomposition of PY based on the (decreasing) singular values $d_j(PY)$ of the projection PY and their corresponding singular vectors u_j, v_j. The range over which we minimize (1.3) is $\{0, 1, \ldots, K\}$ with $K = K_\lambda := \lfloor (nm-1)/\lambda \rfloor \wedge q \wedge m$

to avoid a non-positive denominator. The purpose of this paper is to show that this new criterion produces a consistent estimator of the rank. It turns out that the choice of the optimal tuning parameter λ involves a delicate trade-off. On the one hand, λ should be large enough to prevent overfitting, that is, prevent selecting a rank that is larger than the true rank r. On the other hand, if one takes λ too large, the selected rank will typically be smaller than r as the procedure will not be able to distinguish the unknown singular values $d_j(XA)$ from the noise for $j > s$, for some $s = s(\lambda) < r$. To effectively deal with this situation, we refine our initial procedure using our new criterion (1.3) by an iterative procedure in Section 4 that provenly finds the optimal value of λ and consequently of the estimate of r. This method does not require any data-splitting and our simulations show that it is very stable, even for general, heavy tailed error distributions. To our knowledge, it is rare feat to have a feasible algorithm that finds the optimal tuning parameter in a fully data-driven way, without data-splitting, and with mathematically proven guarantees.

While our main interest is to provide consistent estimators of the rank, we briefly address estimation of the mean XA, which is the principal problem in Bunea et al. (2011, 2012); Giraud (2011). Our selected rank $\widehat{k}$ automatically yields the estimate $X\widehat{A} := (PY)_{\widehat{k}}$. We prove in Theorem 10 in Appendix D of the supplement that on the event $\widehat{k} = r$, the inequality $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \le 4rd_1^2(PE)$ holds, for our selected rank $\widehat{k}$. This provides a direct link between rank consistency and optimal estimation of the mean, because $d_1^2(PE) \le 2(m+q)\sigma^2$ with overwhelming probability, see (3.1) and (3.2) below. (In fact, this bound continues to hold, up to a multiplicative constant, for subGaussian errors, using Theorem 5.39 of Vershynin (2012).) Hence we can estimate XA at the rate $r(m+q)$, which is proportional to the number of parameters in the low rank model and minimax optimal (Bunea et al., 2011, 2012; Giraud, 2011). Simulations in Appendix F.3 of the supplement show that our procedures in fact provide better estimates of XA than their competitors, even in approximately low-rank models.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows that the minimizer of (1.3) has a closed form. The main results are discussed in Sections 3 and 4. It obtains rank consistency in case of no signal ($XA = 0$) and in case of sufficient signal. For the latter, we develop a key notion of signal-to-noise ratio that is required for rank consistency. A sufficient, easily interpretable condition will be presented that corresponds to a computable value (estimate) of the tuning parameter λ. We develop in Section 4 an iterative, fully au-

tomated procedure, which has a guaranteed recovery of the true rank (with overwhelming probability) under *increasingly milder* conditions on the signal. The first step uses the potentially suboptimal estimate $\widehat{k}_0$ developed in Section 3, but which is less than r, with overwhelming probability. This value $\widehat{k}_0$ is used to update the tuning parameter λ. Then we minimize (1.3) again, and obtain a new estimate $\widehat{k}_1$, which in turn is used to update λ. The procedure produces each time a smaller λ, thereby selecting a larger rank k than the previous one, whilst each time we can guarantee that the selected rank doesn't exceed the true rank r. This is a major mathematical challenge and its proof relies on highly non-trivial monotonicity arguments. The procedure stops when the selected rank does not change after an iteration. Our results hold with high probability (exponential in mn and $m+q$) which translates into extremely accurate estimates under a weak signal condition.

Section 5 describes several extensions of the developed theory, allowing for non-Gaussian errors E_{ij}.

A large simulation study is reported in Section 6. It confirms our theoretical findings, and shows that our method improves upon the methods proposed in Bunea et al. (2011).

The proofs are deferred to Supplement to "Adaptive estimation of the rank of the coefficient matrix in high dimensional multivariate response regression models".

1.4. *Notation.* For any matrix A, we will use $A_{k\ell}$ to denote the k,ℓth element of A (i.e., the entry on the kth row and ℓth column of A), and we write $d_1(A) \geq d_2(A) \geq \cdots$ to denote its ordered singular values.

The Frobenius or Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on the space of matrices is defined as $\langle A, B \rangle = \mathrm{tr}(A^T B)$ for commensurate matrices A, B. The corresponding norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|^2$, and we recall that $\|A\|^2 = \mathrm{tr}(A^T A) = \sum_j d_j^2(A)$ for any matrix A. Moreover, it is known (Schmidt (1907); Eckart and Young (1936), see also the review by Stewart (1993)) that minimizing $\|A - B\|^2$ over B with $r(B) \leq r$ is achieved for $B = (A)_r = UD_rV^T$ based on the singular value decomposition of $A = UDV^T$ where D_r denotes the diagonal matrix with $[D]_{ii} = d_i(A)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Hence, $\min_{B:\ r(B)=r} \|A - B\|^2 = \sum_{j>r} d_j^2(A)$.

For other norms on matrices, we use $\|\cdot\|_2$ to denote the operator norm and $\|\cdot\|_*$ the nuclear norm (i.e., the sum of singular values). We have the inequalities $< A, B >= \mathrm{tr}(A^T B) \leq \|A\|_2 \|B\|_*$ and $\|A\|_* \leq \sqrt{\mathrm{rank}(A)}\|A\|$.

For two positive sequences a_n and b_n, we denote by $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists constant $C > 0$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n \leq C$. If $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n \to 0$, we write $a_n = o(b_n)$.

For general $m \times n$ matrices A and B, Weyl's inequality (Weyl, 1912) implies that $d_{i+j-1}(A+B) \le d_i(A)+d_j(B)$ for $1 \le i, j, \le q$ and $i+j \le q+1$ with $q = \min\{m, n\}$.

We denote the projection matrix onto the column space of X by P and we write $q := \operatorname{rank}(X)$ and $N := \operatorname{rank}(PY) = q \wedge m$. We set $\widehat{\sigma}_0^2 := \|Y\|^2/(nm)$, by defining $(PY)_0 := 0$ and define $\widehat{\sigma}^2 := \|E\|^2/(nm)$. Throughout the paper, we use A to denote the true coefficient matrix and r to denote its true rank.

2. Properties of the minimizer of the new criterion. At first glance, it seems difficult to describe the minimizer $\widehat{k}$ of $k \mapsto \widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ because *both* the numerator and denominator in $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ are decreasing in k. However, it turns out that there is a unique minimizer with a neat explicit formula. First we characterize the comparison between $\widehat{\sigma}_i$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_j$ for $i \neq j$.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$ with $i < j$. Then*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_i^2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{j-i}\sum_{k=i+1}^{j} d_k^2(PY) \ge \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_j^2. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad d_j^2(PY) \ge \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_j^2, \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$d_j^2(PY) \le \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad d_j^2(PY) \le \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^2. \tag{2.3}$$

This result and the monotonicity of the singular values $d_1(PY) \ge d_2(PY) \ge \cdots$ readily yield the following statement.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Then*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_{k-1}^2 \iff \widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_\ell^2 \qquad \text{for all } \ell \le k-1. \tag{2.4}$$

$$\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \ge \widehat{\sigma}_{k-1}^2 \iff \widehat{\sigma}_\ell^2 \ge \widehat{\sigma}_{k-1}^2 \qquad \text{for all } \ell > k-1. \tag{2.5}$$

It is clear that if $\widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \ge \widehat{\sigma}_0^2$, then $k = 0$ minimizes $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$. Likewise, if $\widehat{\sigma}_K^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_{K-1}^2$, then $k = K$ minimizes the criterion $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$. After a little reflexion, we see that $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ is minimized at the last k for which $d_k^2(PY) \ge \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ holds. That is,

$$\widehat{k} = \max\left\{0 \le k \le K : d_j^2(PY) \ge \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 \text{ for all } j \le k \text{ and } d_{k+1}^2(PY) < \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{k+1}^2\right\} \tag{2.6}$$

minimizes $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ with the convention that the maximum of the empty set is 0. Properties (2.4) and (2.5) ensure that $d_j^2(PY) \geq \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_j^2$ must hold automatically for all $j \leq k$ as well as $d_\ell^2(PY) < \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_\ell^2$ for all $\ell > k$. That is, $\widehat{k}$ has an even more convenient closed form

$$\widehat{k} = \max\left\{0 \leq k \leq K : \ d_k^2(PY) \geq \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \ \right\} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} 1\left\{d_k^2(PY) \geq \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \ \right\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Summarizing, we have shown the following result.

THEOREM 3. *There exists a unique minimizer $\widehat{k}$ of (1.3), given by (2.7), such that $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ is monotone decreasing for $k \leq \widehat{k}$, and monotone increasing for $k \geq \widehat{k}$.*

It is interesting to compare the choice $\widehat{k}$ in (2.7) with $\widehat{r}$ in Bunea et al. (2011). In that paper, it is shown that (1.1) is equivalent with

$$\min_k \left\{\|Y - (PY)_k\|^2 + \mu k\right\} \tag{2.8}$$

based on the truncated singular value decomposition UD_kV^T of the projection $PY = UDV^T$ with $D_k = \mathrm{diag}(D_{11}, \ldots, D_{kk}, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Furthermore, Bunea et al. (2011) uses this formulation to derive a closed form for $\widehat{r}$, to wit,

$$\widehat{r} = \sum_{k \geq 1} 1\{d_k^2(PY) \geq \mu\} \tag{2.9}$$

based on the singular values $d_1(PY) \geq d_2(PY) \geq \cdots$ of the projection PY. The main difference between (2.7) and (2.9) is that $\widehat{k}$ counts the number of singular values of PY above a *variable* threshold, while $\widehat{r}$ counts the number of singular values of PY above a *fixed* threshold. Another difference is that the fixed threshold is proportional to the unknown variance σ^2, while the variable threshold is proportional to $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2$, which can be thought of as an estimate of σ^2 only for k close to r.

To further illustrate the existence and uniqueness of $\widehat{k}$, we perform one experiment to show how the $d_k(PY)$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_k$ vary across different k, see Figure 1. The plot first displays the monotone property of $\widehat{\sigma}_k$ for $k \leq \widehat{k}$ and $k \geq \widehat{k}$. It also justifies the definition of $\widehat{k}$ in (2.7) since the rank which minimizes $\widehat{\sigma}_k$ is exactly what we defined.




Fig 1: Plot of $d_k(PY)$ and $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_k$ versus k. In this experiment, we used $n = 150, m = 30, p = 20, q = 20, r = 5, \eta = 0.1, b_0 = 0.2$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$, using the notation and simulation setup of Section 6.3.

3. Rank consistency.

3.1. *The null case $XA = 0$.* We treat the case $XA = 0$ separately as the case $XA \neq 0$ requires a lower bound on the non-zero singular values of XA.

THEOREM 4. *Assume $XA = 0$. Then, on the event $\{d_1^2(PE) \leq \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2\}$, we have $\widehat{k} = 0$.*

We particularize Theorem 4 to the case where the entries of E are independent $N(0, \sigma^2)$. In that case, general random matrix theory and Borel's inequality for suprema of Gaussian processes, respectively, give

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1(PE)] \leq \sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\{d_1(PE) \geq \mathbb{E}[d_1(PE)] + \sigma t\} \quad \leq \quad \exp(-t^2/2) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \tag{3.2}$$

see Lemma 3 in Bunea et al. (2011). Moreover, $(nm)\widehat{\sigma}^2$ has a central χ^2_{mn} distribution, so that general tail bounds (Johnstone (2001)) yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq \sigma^2(1-\varepsilon)\right\} \quad \leq \quad \exp\left(-mn\varepsilon^2/4\right), \quad 0 \leq \varepsilon < 1 \tag{3.3}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{\sigma}^2 \geq \sigma^2(1+\varepsilon)\right\} \quad \leq \quad \exp\left(-3mn\varepsilon^2/16\right), \quad 0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/2. \tag{3.4}$$

We immediately obtain the following corollary by using (3.2) – (3.4).

COROLLARY 5. *For any $\lambda > (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} = 0\} \to 1$ exponentially fast as $nm \to \infty$ and $m + q \to \infty$.*

3.2. *The general case $XA \neq 0$.* The range over which we minimize (1.3) is $\{0, 1, \ldots, K\}$ depends on λ as the largest possible value is

$$K = K_\lambda := \left\lfloor \frac{nm-1}{\lambda} \right\rfloor \wedge m \wedge q \tag{3.5}$$

to avoid a non-positive denominator in criterion (1.3).

THEOREM 6. *Assume $r \leq K_\lambda$. On the event*

$$d_1^2(PE) \leq \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_r^2 := \frac{\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2}{(nm/\lambda) - r}, \tag{3.6}$$

we have $\widehat{k} \leq r$. If $r > K_\lambda$, then trivially $\widehat{k} \leq r$ holds, with probability one.

The restriction $r \leq K_\lambda$ guarantees that $\widehat{\lambda}\sigma_r^2$ is positive, that is, the event (3.6) is non-empty. If $r > K_\lambda$, then $\widehat{k} \leq r$, holds trivially, with probability one, as $\widehat{k}$ is selected from $\{0, \ldots, K_\lambda\}$.

While the quantity $\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$ is a natural one in this problem, it depends on the unknown rank r. It turns out that quantifying $\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$ is not trivial.

PROPOSITION 7. *Assume $r \leq K_\lambda$. On the event*

$$2d_1^2(PE) \leq \lambda \widehat{\sigma}^2, \tag{3.7}$$

we have

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq \widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \leq \frac{nm}{nm - \lambda r} \widehat{\sigma}^2. \tag{3.8}$$

This result combined with Theorem 6 tells us that if λ is chosen large enough, we can guarantee that $\widehat{k} \leq r$. Moreover, this choice is independent of both r and σ^2. Indeed, for matrices E with independent $N(0, \sigma^2)$ Gaussian entries, any choice $\lambda > 2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ suffices:

THEOREM 8. *For $\lambda = C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ with any numerical constant $C > 2$, $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} \leq r\} \to 1$ as $mn \to \infty$ and $m + q \to \infty$.*

The convergence rate in Theorem 8 is exponentially fast in nm and $m+q$. Again, if $r > K_\lambda$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} \leq r\} = 1$ holds trivially.

Consistency of $\widehat{k}$ can be achieved under a suitable signal to noise condition.

THEOREM 9. *For $1 \leq s \leq r \leq K_\lambda$, on the event*

$$d_s(XA) \geq d_1(PE) + \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r \tag{3.9}$$

intersected with the event (3.6), we further have $\widehat{k} \in [s, r]$.

This theorem, combined with Proposition 7, immediately yields the following corollary.

COROLLARY 10. *For $1 \le s \le r \le K_\lambda$, on the event*

$$\left\{2d_1^2(PE) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2\right\} \cap \left\{ d_s(XA) \ge \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}\left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm-\lambda r}}\right]\right\},$$

we have $\widehat{k} \in [s, r]$.

The choice of λ impacts the possible values for $\widehat{k}$, the minimizer of criterion (1.3), and we see that the range $\{0, 1, \ldots, K_\lambda\}$ increases as λ decreases. If the true rank is rather large ($r > K_\lambda$), then no guarantees for $\widehat{k}$ can be made, except for the trivial, yet important observation that $\widehat{k} \le r$. On the other hand, if $r < K_\lambda$, which is arguably the more interesting case for *low rank* regression, then consistency guarantees can be made under a suitable condition on the r-th singular value $d_r(XA)$ of XA. This condition becomes milder if λ decreases.

Let $\delta > 0$. A slightly stronger restriction for the upper bound on r,

$$r < \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\frac{nm}{\lambda} \wedge m \wedge q \tag{3.10}$$

translates into a bound for the ratio

$$\frac{nm}{nm - \lambda r} \le 1 + \delta \tag{3.11}$$

appearing in the lower bound for the *signal* $d_s(XA)$. We can further particularize to the Gaussian setting.

THEOREM 11. *Let $\lambda = 2C(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ for some numerical constant $C > 1$. Assume further that r and δ satisfy (3.10) and*

$$d_s(XA) \;\ge\; C'\sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) \tag{3.12}$$

for some $s \le r$ and some numerical constant $C' > \sqrt{C}(1 + \sqrt{2(1+\delta)})$. Then $\mathbb{P}\{s \le \widehat{k} \le r\} \to 1$ as $mn \to \infty$ and $m + q \to \infty$.
In particular, if (3.12) holds for $s = r$, then $\widehat{k}$ consistently estimates r.

The convergence rate in Theorem 11 is exponentially fast in nm and $m+q$. This shows that the above procedure is highly accurate, which is confirmed in our simulation study. From the oracle inequality in the supplement, the fit $\|X\widehat{A}_{\widehat{k}} - XA\|^2$, for $s \le \widehat{k} \le r$, differs only within some constant levels of the *noise level* $d_1^2(PE)$.

4. Self-tuning procedure. From Theorem 6 in Section 3, we need to take λ, or in fact $\lambda\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$, as $\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$ depends on λ, large enough to prevent overfitting, that is, to avoid selecting a $\widehat{k}$ larger than the true rank r. On the other hand, we would like to keep λ small to be able to detect a small signal level. Indeed, (3.6) in Theorem 6 states that we need

$$d_1(PE) \le \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r = \sqrt{\frac{\|Y-(PY)_r\|^2}{nm/\lambda - r}}. \tag{4.1}$$

The term on the right is decreasing in λ, so we should choose λ as small as possible such that $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r$ is close to $d_1(PE)$. Without any prior knowledge on r, it is difficult to find the optimal choice for λ. However, Theorem 6 and Proposition 7 tell us that an initial λ_0 satisfying $\{2d_1^2(PE) \le \lambda_0\widehat{\sigma}^2\}$ yields an estimated rank $\widehat{k}_0$ with $\widehat{k}_0 \le r$. Our idea is to use this lower bound $\widehat{k}_0$ for r to reduce our value λ_0 to λ_1. This, in turn, will yield a possibly larger estimated rank $\widehat{k}_1$, which still obeys $\widehat{k}_1 \le r$. More precisely, we propose the following *Self-Tuning Rank Selection* (STRS) procedure. Let Z be a $q \times m$ matrix with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries and define $S_j = \mathbb{E}[d_j^2(Z)]$ with the convention $S_j := 0$ for $j > N = q \wedge m$. Moreover, let $\widehat{K}_t := (nm/\widehat{\lambda}_t) \wedge N$ for given $\widehat{\lambda}_t$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we define

$$\widehat{\lambda}_0 := 2(1+\varepsilon)S_1 \tag{4.2}$$

$$\widehat{k}_0 := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{0\le k\le \widehat{K}_0} \frac{\|Y-(PY)_k\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_0 k} \tag{4.3}$$

as starting values, and if $\widehat{k}_0 \ge 1$, for $t \ge 0$, we update

$$\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} := \frac{nm}{(1-\varepsilon)\widehat{R}_t \,/\, \widehat{U}_t + \widehat{k}_t} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\widehat{k}_{t+1} := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\widehat{k}_t\le k\le \widehat{K}_{t+1}} \frac{\|Y-(PY)_k\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} k} \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\widehat{R}_t := (n-q)m + \sum_{j=2\widehat{k}_t+1}^{N} S_j, \qquad \widehat{U}_t := S_1 \vee \left(S_{2\widehat{k}_t+1} + S_{2\widehat{k}_t+2}\right). \tag{4.6}$$

The procedure stops when $\widehat{k}_{t+1} = \widehat{k}_t$. The entire procedure is free of σ^2 and both $\widehat{R}_t$ and $\widehat{U}_t$ can be numerically evaluated by Monte Carlo simulations. Alternatively, we provide an analogous procedure with analytical expressions

in the supplement, but its performance in our simulations is actually slightly inferior to the original procedure that utilizes Monte Carlo simulations.

Regarding the computational complexity, we emphasize that the above STRS procedure has almost *the same* level of computational complexity as the methods in (1.1) and (1.3). This is due to the fact that the computationally expensive singular value decomposition only needs to be computed once. Additionally, in order to find the new rank in step (4.5), we only need to consider values that are larger than (or equal to) the previously selected rank. This avoids a lot of extra computation.

The following proposition is critical for the feasibility of STRS.

PROPOSITION 12. *We have* $\widehat{\lambda}_t > \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}$ *and* $\widehat{k}_t \le \widehat{k}_{t+1}$, *for all* $t \ge 0$. *More importantly,* $\widehat{k}_t \le r$ *for all* $t \ge 0$, *holds with probability tending to* 1 *exponentially fast as* $(q \vee m) \to \infty$ *and* $nm \to \infty$.

The increasing property of $\widehat{k}_t$ immediately yields the following theorem.

THEOREM 13. *Let numerical constant* $C > 2$. *Let* $\widetilde{k}$ *be the minimizer of (1.3) using* $\lambda = C(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ *and* $\widehat{k}$ *be the final selected rank of STRS starting from the same value* $\widehat{\lambda}_0 = \lambda$. *Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\widetilde{k} \le \widehat{k} \le r\right\} \to 1,$$

as $nm \to \infty$ *and* $(q \vee m) \to \infty$.

We find that STRS always selects a rank closer to the true rank than the (one step) Generalized Rank Selection procedure (GRS) from the previous section that uses (1.3) as its criterion.

The decreasing property of $\widehat{\lambda}_t$, stated in Proposition 12, implies an increasingly milder condition on the required signal. Meanwhile, the way of updating λ in step (4.4) is carefully chosen to maintain $\widehat{k}_t \le r$. We refer to the proof for more explanations. Thus, if a proper sequence of signal-to-noise condition is met, we expect that STRS finds the rank consistently. The following theorem confirms this.

THEOREM 14. *Let* $k_0 < k_1 < \cdots < k_T = r$ *be a strictly increasing subsequence of* $\{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ *of length* $T + 1 \le r$. *Define* λ_0 *as (4.2) and* λ_{t+1} *obtained from (4.4) by using* k_t *in lieu of* $\widehat{k}_t$, *for* $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$. *Assume* r *and* δ *satisfy (3.10) for* λ_0. *Then, on the event*

$$d_{k_t}(XA) \ge C''\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_t}, \qquad t = 0, \ldots, T \tag{4.7}$$

for some numerical constant $C'' > 1/\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{1+\delta}$, *there exists* $0 \le T' \le T$ *such that* $\widehat{k}_{T'} = r$, *with probability tending to* 1, *where* $\widehat{k}_0 \le \widehat{k}_1 \le \cdots \le \widehat{k}_{T'}$ *are from (4.5).*

The sequence of $\{k_0, \ldots, k_T\}$ plays an important role for interpreting the above theorem. It can be regarded as a underlying sequence bridge starting from 1 and leading towards the true rank. The ideal case is $\{k_0, \ldots, k_T\} = \{r\}$ which leads to a one-step recovery, but requires a comparatively stronger signal-to-noise condition (4.7). At the other extreme, it could take r steps to recover the true rank. We emphasize that the latter case requires the *mildest* signal-to-noise condition by the following two observations:

(1) Proposition 12 guarantees that each time the updated λ_t *is decreasing;*

(2) The signal condition (4.7) is becoming milder as λ_t *gets smaller.*

From display (3.8) in Proposition 7 and from Corollary 10, it is clear that we use the string of inequalities $\widehat{\sigma}^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le nm/(nm - \lambda r)\widehat{\sigma}^2$ to derive the required signal-to-noise condition. The second inequality becomes loose for large r such that $nm - \lambda r$ is small, or equivalently, δ is large from (3.11), which further implies a possible larger decrement of the required signal-to-noise condition by using STRS. To illustrate this phenomenon concretely, we study to a special case where $r \ge N/2$ and $\{k_0, \ldots, k_T\} = \{\lceil N/2 \rceil, r\}$, and show in the theorem below that the signal condition for recovering r can be relaxed significantly when δ is large.

THEOREM 15. *Define* $\lambda_0 = 2C(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ *with* $C = 8/7$. *Assume* r *and* δ *satisfy (3.10) for* λ_0 *and*

$$d_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}(XA) \ge C' \left[1 + \sqrt{2(1+\delta)}\right] \sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) \tag{4.8}$$

$$d_r(XA) \ge C' \left[1 + \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1+\delta/8}}\right] \sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q}) \tag{4.9}$$

for some numerical constant $C' > 2\sqrt{2/7}$. *Then either* $\widehat{k}_0 = r$ *or* $\widehat{k}_1 = r$, *with probability tending to* 1, *as* $N = q \wedge m \to \infty$. *Here* $\widehat{k}_0$ *and* $\widehat{k}_1$ *are selected from (4.3) and (4.5).*

The lower bound condition (4.8) is condition (3.12) with $s = \lceil N/2 \rceil < r$. As a simple numerical illustration, we compare (4.8) (and therefore (3.12)) with (4.9) for $\delta = 4$ and 100. If $\delta = 4$, we obtain

$$d_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}(XA) \ge 4.17C'(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})\sigma, \qquad d_r(XA) \ge 2.83C'(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})\sigma,$$

while if $\delta = 100$, we have

$$d_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}(XA) \geq 15.3C'(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})\sigma, \qquad d_r(XA) \geq 3.74C'(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})\sigma.$$

As we can see, for small δ, the signal-to-noise condition decreases slightly. However, for larger δ, $\sqrt{1+\delta}$ could be quite large, while $\sqrt{(1+\delta)/(1+\delta/8)}$ is always bounded above by $2\sqrt{2}$. To further elaborate the implications of small/large δ, we consider two cases by recalling the rank constraint (3.10):

(1) If $nm/\lambda_0 \geq (1+\delta)N/\delta$, the rank constraint (3.10) reduces to simply $r \leq N$. From (3.11), a smaller value for δ leads to a smaller value for $nm/(nm-\lambda_0 r)$, provided $r \leq N$. Therefore, $\widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq \widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \leq nm/(nm-\lambda_0 r)\widehat{\sigma}^2$ should be tight and we expect a smaller reduction of the signal condition for smaller values of δ. On the other hand, when nm and $\lambda_0 N$ are close, meaning δ is large, we expect a considerable relaxation of the signal condition for comparatively large r. These two points are clearly reflected in (4.8) and (4.9).

(2) If $nm/\lambda_0 \leq (1+\delta)N/\delta$, it follows that $r \leq \{\delta/(1+\delta)\}(nm/\lambda_0)$. Then a smaller δ means a stronger restriction on r which implies $\widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq \widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \leq nm/(nm-\lambda_0 r)\widehat{\sigma}^2$ becomes tight and we expect a modest relaxation of the signal condition. If δ is large, then $nm-\lambda_0 r$ could be small for a comparatively large r. Thus $nm/(nm-\lambda_0 r)$ would explode and we expect a significant decrease in the lower bound (4.9) for the signal. Both these observations agree with our results. It is worth mentioning that when nm is small comparing to $\lambda_0 N$, δ is likely to be large. For instance, when $m = q = n$ is moderate, taking $\lambda_0 = 2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ yields $nm/\lambda_0 = q/8$ which is not quite large already. Imposing a small δ in this case would further restrict the range of r.

Recall that the range of allowable rank $\{0,\ldots,K_\lambda\}$ in (3.5) increases as λ decreases. This means that, after a few iterations, the true rank could be selected even when it was out of the possible range $\{0,\ldots,K_{\lambda_0}\}$ at the beginning. This phenomenon is clearly supported by our simulations in Section 6.5. In addition, the following proposition proves that K_{λ_0} can be extended to $N = q \wedge m$ in some settings even when (3.10) is not met for λ_0.

PROPOSITION 16. *Let $\lambda_0 = 2C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ with $C = 8/7$ and assume $nm/\lambda_0 \geq 3N/4$. Suppose the first selected rank from (4.3) by using λ_0 satisfies $\widehat{k}_0 \geq N/2$ and*

$$d_r(XA) \geq C'(1+2\sqrt{3})(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})\sigma,$$

for some numerical constant $C' > 2\sqrt{2/7}$. Then, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k}_1 = r\} \to 1$ for any $N/2 \leq r \leq N$, as $N = q \wedge m \to \infty$.

In order to be able to select among ranks from $N/2$ to N in the first step, (3.11) requires $nm/\lambda_0 \geq (1+\delta)N/\delta$. However, Proposition 16 relaxes this to $nm/\lambda_0 \geq 3N/4$ from Proposition 16.

5. Extension to heavy tailed error distributions. Most results in this paper are finite sample results and apply to any matrix E. Only Corollary 5, Theorem 11 and the results in Section 4 require Gaussian errors. They appeal to precise concentration inequalities of $d_1(PE)$ around $\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q}$, making use of the fact that $d_1(PE) = d_1(\Lambda U^T E)$ based on the eigen decomposition of $P = U\Lambda U^T$, and the fact that $\Lambda U^T E$ in turn is again Gaussian. In general, if E has independent entries, then the transformations PE or $\Lambda U^T E$ no longer have independent entries, although their columns remain independent. Regardless, our simulations reported in Sections 6.7 and 6.8 support our conjecture that our iterative method is flexible and our results continue to hold for general distributions, such as t-distributions with 6 degrees of freedom, for independent errors E_{ij}. For some important special cases we are able to formally allow for errors with finite fourth moments only.

5.1. *Heavy tailed errors distributions with $n/q \to 1$.* We first consider the case $n/q \to 1$, which is likely to occur in high-dimensional settings ($p >> n$). The following theorem guarantees the rank recovery via the GRS procedure for errors with heavy tailed distributions.

THEOREM 17. *Let $\lambda > 2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$. Assume that the entries of E are i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and finite fourth moments. Furthermore, assume $n/q \to 1$, r and δ satisfy (3.10) and*

$$d_s(XA) \geq C\sigma(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q}), \tag{5.1}$$

for some $s \leq r$ and some numerical constant $C > 1+\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}$. Then, we have $\mathbb{P}\{s \leq \widehat{k} \leq r\} \to 1$ as $n \vee m \to \infty$, where $\widehat{k}$ is selected from (1.3). In particular, if (5.1) holds for $s = r$, then $\widehat{k}$ consistently estimates r.

For a special case, that of skinny matrices XA, that is, $m = O(n^\alpha)$ or $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, we propose the following *Simplified Self-Tuning Rank Selection* (SSTRS) procedure. Given any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we set

$$\widehat{\lambda}_0 := 2(1+\varepsilon)(m \vee q), \qquad \widehat{k}_0 := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{0 \leq k \leq \widehat{K}_0} \frac{\|Y - (Y)_k\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_0 k} \tag{5.2}$$

as starting values, and if $\widehat{k}_0 \geq 1$, for $t \geq 0$, we update

(5.3)
$$\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} := \frac{nm}{(1-\varepsilon)\big[(m \wedge q)/2 - \widehat{k}_t\big]_+ + \widehat{k}_t}, \quad \widehat{k}_{t+1} := \underset{\widehat{k}_t \leq k \leq \widehat{K}_{t+1}}{\arg\min} \frac{\|Y - (Y)_k\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} k}$$

where $[x]_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$ and $\widehat{K}_t := (nm/\widehat{\lambda}_t) \wedge q \wedge m$ for $t = 0, 1, \ldots$. The procedure stops when $\widehat{k}_t = \widehat{k}_{t+1}$ and we have the following result.

THEOREM 18. *Assume E_{ij} are i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and finite fourth moments. Suppose that $n/q \to 1$ and either $m = O(n^\alpha)$ or $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Let $\{k_t\}_{t=0}^T$ be defined as Theorem 14. Define λ_0 as (5.2) and λ_{t+1} obtained from (5.3) by using k_t in lieu of $\widehat{k}_t$, for $t \geq 0$. Assume r and δ satisfy (3.10) for λ_0.*
Then, on the event

$$d_{k_t}(A) \geq C\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_t}, \qquad t = 0, \ldots, T \tag{5.4}$$

for some numerical constant $C > 1 + \sqrt{2(1+\delta)}$, there exists $0 \leq T' \leq T$ such that $\widehat{k}_{T'} = r$, with probability tending to 1, as $n \vee m \to \infty$. Here $\widehat{k}_0 \leq \widehat{k}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \widehat{k}_{T'}$ are given in (5.2) and (5.3).

REMARK. As mentioned earlier, the entries of PE no longer inherit the independence from E when the distribution of the independent entries E_{ij} is not Gaussian. Nevertheless, by exploiting the independence of columns of PE, Theorem 5.39 in Vershynin (2012) shows that $d_1(PE) \leq C_E\sqrt{q} + \sqrt{m}$ with high probability, provided the entries of E are independent sub-Gaussian random variables with unit variance. The constant C_E above unfortunately involves the unknown sub-Gaussian norm, which differs from σ^2. However, provided $q = o(m)$ and E has i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries, we simply have $d_1(PE) \leq (1 + o(1))\sqrt{m}$. Hence, for this case, it should be clear that our STRS procedure based on (4.2) - (4.5) can be directly applied with statistical guarantees stated in Section 4.

5.2. *A special model: $Y = A + E$.* We emphasize that our procedure can be applied to the important special model $Y = A + E$ where the entries of E are i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and finite fourth moments. The following results guarantee that our procedure can consistently estimate the rank of A. They are essentially the same statements as Theorems 17 and 18 for the case $Y = XA + E$, but this time *without* the disclaimer $n/q \to 1$.

THEOREM 19. *Assume the entries of $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ are i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and finite fourth moments. Assume further that r and δ satisfy (3.10) and*

$$d_s(A) \geq C\sigma(\sqrt{n}+\sqrt{m}) \tag{5.5}$$

for some $s \leq r$ and some numerical constant $C > 1+\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}$. Then $\mathbb{P}\{s \leq \widehat{k} \leq r\} \to 1$ as $m \vee n \to \infty$, where $\widehat{k}$ is selected from (5.2) by using $\widehat{\lambda}_0 = \lambda > 2(\sqrt{n}+\sqrt{m})^2$.
In particular, if (5.5) holds for $s = r$, then $\widehat{k}$ consistently estimates r.

In particular, when A is skinny, that is, $m = O(n^\alpha)$ or $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, our newly proposed SSTRS in (5.2) - (5.3) maintains the rank consistency for this model.

THEOREM 20. *Let E_{ij} be i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and finite fourth moments, $m = O(n^\alpha)$ or $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0,1)$, and assume r and δ satisfy (3.10) for λ_0 given in (5.2). Let $\{k_t\}_{t=0}^T$ be defined as Theorem 14 and λ_{t+1} obtained from (5.3) by using k_t in lieu of $\widehat{k}_t$, for $t \geq 0$. Then, on the event*

$$d_{k_t}(A) \geq C\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_t}, \qquad t = 0,\dots,T \tag{5.6}$$

for some numerical constant $C > 1+\sqrt{2(1+\delta)}$, there exists $0 \leq T' \leq T$ such that $\widehat{k}_{T'} = r$, with probability tending to 1, as $m \vee n \to \infty$. Here $\widehat{k}_0 \leq \widehat{k}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \widehat{k}_{T'}$ are defined in (5.2) and (5.3).

6. Empirical study. The simulations in Sections 6.4 and 6.5 compare the methods discussed in this paper with some existing methods. Sections 6.6 – 6.8 verify our results for the proposed method. Our conclusions are summarized in Section 6.9. In Section 6.10, we perform an additional simulation to check the tightness of signal-to-noise condition in (3.9). In the supplement, more simulations compare STRS using Monte Carlo simulations with STRS using deterministic bounds in Appendix F.1. We also present an example in Appendix F.2 to show that the method proposed by Giraud (2011) fails to recover the rank. Finally, simulations in Appendix F.3 compare STRS with other competing methods in terms of the errors $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|$, $\|\widehat{A} - A\|$ and the selected rank.

6.1. *Methods and notations.* We first introduce the methods in our simulation. Bunea et al. (2011) proposed the method in (1.1) to select the optimal rank by using $\mu = Cd_1^2(Z)\widetilde{\sigma}^2$, where Z has $q \times m$ i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries and $\widetilde{\sigma}^2$

in (1.2) is the unbiased estimator of σ^2. The leading constant $C > 1$ needs to be specified. A deterministic upper bound which could be used instead is $C(m+q)\widetilde{\sigma}^2$. Bunea et al. (2011) suggests to use $C = 2$ based on its overall performance. However, there is no reason for one particular choice of C being globally optimal, which was confirmed in our simulations. Another option for choosing the tuning parameter is to use k-fold cross-validation. However, there is no theoretical guarantee of the feasibility for cross-validation, especially if the rows $X_{i\cdot}$ of X are non-i.i.d.. In contrast, our proposed procedures (with and without self-tuning) are completely devoid of choosing a tuning parameter and estimating σ^2.

NOTATION. We use BSW to denote the method proposed in Bunea et al. (2011). For those methods proposed in this paper, we denote by GRS, STRS and SSTRS the method without self-tuning in (1.3), the one with self-tuning from (4.2) - (4.5) and the simpler version also with self-tuning from (5.2) - (5.3), respectively. We further use BSW-C to denote BSW with specified leading constant C.

6.2. *Task description.* We divide the simulation study up into five parts. In the first part, we show that there is no optimal constant C for the BSW-C method which works for all r. In the second part, we compare the performance of STRS and BSW-C (for various choices of C). The third part demonstrates the improvement of STRS over GRS shown in Section 4, in terms of requiring a smaller signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and enlarging the range of possible selected ranks. The fourth part verifies the performance of GRS, STRS and SSTRS for non-Gaussian errors corresponding to our results and settings of Section 5. The last part extends the fourth part and supports our conjecture that STRS continues to work for general heavy tailed distributions under general settings.

6.3. *Simulation setup.* In general, we consider three settings. The first setting is the more favorable one where the sample size n is larger than the number of covariates p. The other two are high-dimensional, $n < p$, and hence more challenging, with the last setting focussing on the worst case scenario of n close to q for a moderate m.

Our experiments are inspired by those of Bunea et al. (2011). When $n \geq p$, the $n \times p$ design matrix X is generated by independently drawing n times p-dimensional Gaussian vectors with mean zero and covariance matrix specified by $\Sigma_{i,j} = \eta^{|i-j|}$ with $\eta \in (0,1)$, for $i,j = 1,\ldots,p$. When $n < p$, we let $X = X_1 X_2 \Sigma^{1/2}$ where $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times q}$ and $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times p}$ have i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries. The regression coefficient matrix A is given by $A = b_0 M_{p\times r} M_{r\times m}$

where the entries of M are i.i.d. $N(0,1)$. As before, r denotes the rank of A and satisfies $r \leq q \wedge m$. Regarding the error matrix E, each entry is generated from $N(0,1)$ except in Sections 6.7 and 6.8 where we use t_ν-distributions with ν degrees of freedom.

The difference with Bunea et al. (2011) lies in the way we vary the signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) defined as $d_r(XA)/\mathbb{E}[d_1(PE)]$. Instead of using various combinations of η and b_0, we vary the SNR by generating A with different ranks. Specifically, for given η and b_0, we first generate X, and then, for each r in some specified range, we generate A of rank r. For each pair (X, A), we generate 200 error matrices E, calculate the SNR, and record the rank recovery rate and the mean selected rank for various methods in the 200 replications.

6.4. *Experiment 1.* We compare the rank recovery of BSW-C for C in $\{0.7, 0.9, 1.1, 1.3, 1.5\}$ with STRS in both low- and high-dimensional settings. In the low-dimensional case, we consider $n = 150$, $m = 30$, $p = q = 20$, $r \in \{0, \ldots, 20\}$ and $\eta = 0.1$. For b_0, we choose from $\{0.15, 0.20, 0.25\}$ to illustrate, more clearly, the effect of r on the recovery rate. The high-dimensional setting has $n = 100$, $m = 30$, $p = 150$, $q = 20$, $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = \{0.03, 0.05, 0.07\}$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 20\}$. The rank recovery rate and mean selected ranks for both low- and high-dimensional cases are shown in Figures 2 and 3, respectively.

RESULT: Both figures demonstrate that BSW-C with a smaller C, say 0.7 or 0.9, performs better when the true rank r is large, in the sense of requiring a smaller SNR, but tends to overfit for small r. In contrast, BSW-C with a larger C does a better job in preventing overfitting for small r, but requires a larger SNR. The performance of BSW-C does not seem to depend on r as we separate the effect of SNR away from this phenomenon by varying b_0. This suggests that there is no optimal leading constant C for BSW-C to guarantee consistent rank estimation for all possible r. On the other hand, STRS performs globally better and more stable than BSW-C in all settings. It prevents overfitting for both small and large r and requires a smaller SNR than BSW-1.3 and BSW-1.5. Finally, the role of SNR for the rank recovery is striking. If it is too small (less than 0.8), we completely fail to recover the rank. This justifies the signal-to-noise condition in (3.9) and is explained by the (fast) exponential tail bounds in our main results.

6.5. *Experiment 2.* Based on the results in Section 6.4, we compare BSW-1.1 and BSW-1.3 with STRS. Figures 2 and 3 show the advantage of STRS over BSW-C in both low- and high-dimensional settings when n is not too small compared to q. Here we focus on the worst case sce-

nario of $n \approx q$ and set $n = 150$, $m = 30$, $p = 200$, $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = 0.011$, $q \in \{143, 145, 147, 149\}$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 22\}$. The recovery rates are shown in Figure 4.




Fig 2: Comparison of BSW-C and STRS in the low-dimensional setting of Experiment 1. Here b_0 is 0.15 (top), 0.20 (middle) and 0.25 (bottom).




Fig 3: Comparison of BSW-C and STRS in the high-dimensional setting of Experiment 1. Here b_0 is 0.03 (top), 0.05 (middle) and 0.07 (bottom).

RESULT: We see that, for moderate m, BSW-C performs worse as n gets closer to q. Indeed, estimation of σ^2 is problematic for small values of $(n-q)m$. The same problem for choosing different C persists: BSW-1.1 requires a smaller SNR, but overfits more than BSW-1.3 at small r, while

STRS performs perfectly as long as r lies in the allowable range (its largest recoverable rank is between 11 and 13, depending on the particular choice of q).

In addition, we verify the feasibility of STRS when $n = q$. In this case, BSW is infeasible. We consider $p = 200$, $b_0 = 0.011$, $\eta = 0.1$, $n = q \in \{50, 100, 150\}$, $m \in \{50, 125, 200\}$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 50\}$. In each setting, the signal is large enough (SNR> 3) to eliminate the effect of the signal-to-noise ratio on rank recovery. Figure 5 shows that STRS recovers the rank for all combinations of n and m as long as r is within the recoverable range (which increases in m).




Fig 4: Plots of Experiment 2 on rank recovery rate for BSW-1.1, BSW-1.3 and STRS. The plots from left to right and top to bottom have $\{143, 145, 147, 149\}$ for q.

6.6. *Experiment 3.* Figure 6 demonstrates the advantages of STRS over GRS, stated in Theorem 15 and Proposition 16, in three settings. The first setting is the same low-dimensional scenario considered in Experiment 1




Fig 5: Rank recovery rate for STRS when $n = q$ in Experiment 2.

with $b_0 = 0.25$. The second setting uses the same high-dimensional setting considered in Experiment 1 with $b_0 = 0.07$. The third setting focuses on the case when $nm \leq \lambda_0 N$, which incurs the rank constraint (3.10), and we set $n = 50$, $m = 50$, $p = 300$, $q = 30$, $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = 2$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 30\}$. In this setup, $K_{\lambda_0} = 7$.

RESULT: The top two figures in Figure 6 indicate that STRS requires a SNR of about 1, while GRS needs a SNR of about 2 for correct recovery. The bottom two plots in Figure 6 show that GRS fails to recover the rank r if $r > K_{\lambda_0}$, whereas STRS perfectly recovers all possible ranks. This confirms that when nm is not too small compared to $(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$, STRS can get rid of the rank constraint (3.10). (The tuning parameter λ_t in STRS reduces from 198 to 83 and 66 in the first two cases, respectively, and from 315 to 69 in the third case.) These findings confirm our theoretical results in Section 4.

6.7. *Experiment 4.* We verify the results of Section 5 by comparing the performance of GRS, STRS and SSTRS for both models $Y = XA + E$ and $Y = A + E$ with errors E_{ij} generated from a t_ν-distribution with various degrees of freedom ν.

For model $Y = XA + E$, we consider the case $n/q \to 1$ with different m. We set $\eta = 0.1$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 15\}$ for all settings. The first plot in Figure 7 depicts mean selected ranks of GRS and STRS when we further set $n = q = 150$, $m = 100$, $p = 250$, and $b_0 = 0.002$ and $\nu = 6$ (degrees of freedom of the t_ν distribution). We also verify the rank consistency of SSTRS by generating E_{ij} from t_ν-distributions with $\nu \in \{6, 8, 10\}$. The second row in Figure 7 depicts mean selected ranks of SSTRS and is based on $n = 300 \approx q = 280 >> m = 50$, $p = 400$ and $b_0 = 0.0015$. The third




Fig 6: Comparison of GRS and STRS in Experiment 3 in the first setting (top left), second setting (top right) and third setting (bottom).

row in Figure 7 shows the same quantities and is based on $n = 80$, $q = 60$, $p = 150$, $m = 400$ and $b_0 = 0.003$. We varied the closeness of n and q, but since the results didn't change, we only report for one pair of n and q for each setting.

For model $Y = A + E$, we present two cases of skinny A when $n = O(m^\alpha)$ and $m = O(n^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Specifically, we consider $n = 500$, $m = 80$ in the first setting and $n = 80$, $m = 500$ in the second one. We set $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = 0.25$, $r \in \{0, \ldots, 20\}$ and $\nu \in \{6, 8, 10\}$ in both cases. The mean selected ranks of SSTRS are plotted in the last row of Figure 7.

RESULT: In both models, all three procedures work perfectly for heavy tailed errors under very mild SNR, although the rank constraint (3.10) impacts GRS. In addition, STRS and SSTRS can handle a larger range of r under a milder SNR and their performance seems very stable under various

error distributions.




Fig 7: Plots of mean selected ranks related to Experiment 4. The first plot compares GRS and STRS in model $Y = XA + E$. The middle row evaluates SSTRS in model $Y = XA + E$ for various error distributions with $n = 300$, $q = 280$, $m = 50$ (left) and $n = 80$, $q = 60$, $m = 400$ (right). The bottom row plots mean selected ranks of SSTRS in model $Y = A + E$ with $n = 500$, $m = 80$ (left) and in $m = 80$, $n = 500$ (right).

6.8. *Experiment 5.* The stable performance of GRS, STRS and SSTRS leads us to make the following conjecture:

$$\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)] \;\approx\; \mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)], \qquad \text{for all } j = 1, \ldots, q \wedge m \tag{6.1}$$

where $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times m}$ has i.i.d. $N(0,1)$, P is the projection matrix based on X with $\operatorname{rank}(P) = q$ and entries of $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ are i.i.d. mean zero random variables with $\mathbb{E}[E_{ij}^2] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[E_{ij}^4] < \infty$. The result is striking since the projection P destroys the independence of E_{ij}, hence one would not necessarily expect the Bai-Yin law (Bai and Yin, 1993) continue to hold for PE which only has independent columns. Proving (6.1) is beyond the scope of the current paper and we leave it for future research. Instead, we verify this conjecture in simulations for two cases: (1) $n = 150$, $p = 250$, $q = 50$, $m = 50$; (2) $n = 50$, $p = 40$, $q = 40$, $m = 150$. In both cases, $\eta \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ and we generate E from t_ν-distributions with degrees of freedom $\nu \in \{5, 8, 12\}$. For each setting, we generate X and P for a given η, and we generate 100 pairs of matrices E and Z. Averaged ratios of $d_j(PE)/d_j(Z)$ are calculated for each j and Figure 8 shows that the ratios of $d_j(PE)/d_j(Z)$ are highly concentrated around 1. We only report the case of $\eta = 0.9$ as the other cases gave essentially the same picture.




Fig 8: Panel of $\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)]/\mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)]$ in Experiment 5 with $n = 150$, $p = 250$, $m = q = 50$ (left) and $n = 50$, $p = q = 40$, $m = 150$ (right).

In light of this, we further conjecture that our procedures work in general settings with heavy tailed error distributions. We consider both low- and high-dimensional settings to verify this claim. The low-dimensional setting considers $n = 150$, $p = q = m = 30$ and $b_0 = 0.15$ and the high-dimensional setting considers $n = 100$, $p = 150$, $q = m = 30$ and $b_0 = 0.015$. We generate E from t_ν-distribution with $\nu \in \{6, 8, 10\}$ and we set $\eta = 0.1$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, 20\}$ in both cases. The plots in Figure 9 show that STRS

consistently estimates the rank in both settings under a very mild SNR ratio and its performance is quite stable for different heavy tailed t-distributions.




Fig 9: Performance of STRS for heavy tails in Experiment 5 in the low-dimensional (top) and the high-dimensional setting (bottom).

6.9. *Conclusions of the simulation studies.*

- In general, STRS outperforms BSW-C in both low-dimensional and high-dimensional settings. The performance of BSW-C is influenced by the true rank r and there is no globally optimal tuning parameter C for BSW-C. STRS is stable in general as long as the true rank r lies in its allowable range.
- In the most challenging setting of Experiment 2, when $n \approx q$ and estimation of σ^2 is problematic, the advantage of STRS over BSW-1.1 and BSW-1.3 becomes more prominent. If $n = q$, BSW-C is no longer feasible, while STRS only fails in the rare situation when nm is small compared to $m + q$ and r is large. Of course, reduced rank regression only makes sense for relatively small r.
- Experiment 3 verifies that STRS has clear advantages over GRS. It requires a smaller signal-to-noise ratio and allows for larger values of r, which confirms our theoretical result in Section 4.

- Experiment 4 confirms our results in Section 5, that our procedures (GRS, STRS, SSTRS) continue to consistently estimate the true rank for heavy tailed distributions in certain settings, considered in Section 5. Moreover, Experiment 5 confirms our conjecture that STRS works in more general settings, even if the errors are generated from heavy tailed distributions.

6.10. *Tightness check of signal-to-noise condition.* Akin to the discussion in (Bunea et al., 2011, Section 4.2, p. 1303), we can empirically verify the tightness of the signal-to-noise condition in (3.9). Specifically, from (2.7), we have

$$\{\widehat{k} \neq r\} = \{d_{r+1}(PY) \geq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r\} \cup \{d_r(PY) \leq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r\}. \tag{6.2}$$

By using identity (6.2) and Weyl's inequality, we observe that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} \neq r\} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{d_r(XA) + d_1(PE) \leq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r\right\}.$$

Hence we conclude that $\mathbb{P}\{d_r(XA) \leq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r - d_1(PE)\} > 0$ implies $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} = r\} < 1$. This suggests $d_r(XA)$ cannot be smaller than $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r - d_1(PE)$. To empirically verify this conjecture, we generate different pairs of (X, A) through changing b_0, η, n, m, p, q and r. For each pair of (X, A), we record the rth largest singular value of XA as $d_r(XA)$ and we search along a grid of λ to find the largest λ such that minimizing (1.3) recovers the true rank (recall that $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r$ is increasing in λ). Finally, we plot $\lambda\widehat{\sigma}_r$ and $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r - d_1(PE)$ against $d_r(XA)$ for all pairs of (X, A) in Figure 10. This plot collaborates our conjecture that the signal-to-noise condition in (3.9) is tight.




Fig 10: Plot of $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r$ and $\sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r - d_1(PE)$ versus $d_r(XA)$ for each pair of (X, A). The value for λ is the largest one (on a grid) that correctly found the true rank.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank the Editor, Associate Editor and two referees for constructive remarks. Wegkamp's research was supported in part by NSF grant DMS 1712709.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplement to "Adaptive estimation of the rank of the coefficient matrix in high dimensional multivariate response regression models":
(doi: COMPLETED BY THE TYPESETTER). The supplementary document includes the oracle inequality for the fit, additional simulation results and all proofs.

References.

Anderson, T. (1951a). Asymptotic distribution of the reduced rank regression estimator under general conditions. *Annals of Statistics* 1141–1154.

Anderson, T. (1951b). Estimating linear restrictions on regression coefficients for multivariate normal distributions. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 327–351.

Anderson, T. (2002). Specification and misspecification in reduced rank regression. *Sankya* 193–205.

Bai, Z. D. and Yin, Y. Q. (1993). Limit of the smallest eigenvalue of a large dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Ann. Probab.* **21** 1275–1294.

Birgé, L. and Massart, P. (2007). Minimal penalties for gaussian model selection. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **138** 33–73.

Bühlmann, P. and Van de Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data.* Springer.

Bunea, F., She, Y. and Wegkamp, M. (2011). Optimal selection of reduced rank estimators of high-dimensional matrices. *Annals of Statistics* **39** 1282–1309.

Bunea, F., She, Y. and Wegkamp, M. (2012). Joint variable and rank selection for parsimonious estimation of high-dimensional matrices. *Annals of Statistics* **40** 2359–2388.

Eckart, C. and Young, G. (1936). The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank. *Psychometrika* **1**.

Giraud, C. (2011). Low rank multivariate regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **5** 775–799.

Giraud, C. (2015). *Introduction to high-dimensional statistics.* Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability.

Horn, R. and Johnson, C. (2013). *Matrix analysis.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Izenman, A. (1975). Reduced-rank regression for the multivariate linear model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **5** 248–262.

Izenman, A. (2008). *Modern Multivariate. Statistical Techniques: Regression, Classification and Manifold Learning.* Springer.

Johnstone, I. M. (2001). Chi-square oracle inequalities, in M. de Gunst, C. Klaassen A. van der Vaart, eds, Festschrift for Willem R. van Zwet. *Institute of Mathematical Statistics* **36** 399–418.

Lounici, K., Pontil, M., Tsybakov, A. and Van de Geer, S. (2011). Oracle inequalities and optimal inference under group sparsity. *Annals of Statistics* **39** 2164–2204.

Negahban, S. and Wainwright, M. (2011). Estimation of (near) low-rank matrices with noise and high-dimensional scaling. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 1069–1097.

Obozinski, G., Wainwright, M. and Jordan, M. (2011). Support union recovery in high-dimensional multivariate regression. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 1–47.

Rao, C. (1978). Matrix approximations and reduction of dimensionality in multivariate statistical analysis. *Multivariate Analysis V.* .

Reinsel, G. and Velu, R. (1998). *Multivariate Reduced-Rank Regression: Theory and Applications*. Springer.

Robinson, P. (1973). Generalized canonical analysis for time series. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **3** 141–160.

Robinson, P. (1974). Identification, estimation and large sample theory for regression containing unobservable variables. *International Economic Review* **15** 680–692.

Rohde, A. and Tsybakov, A. (2011). Estimation of high-dimensional low-rank matrices. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 887–930.

Rudelson, M. and Vershynin, R. (2010). Non-asymptotic theory of random matrices: extreme singular values. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians* **III** 1576–1602.

Schmidt, E. (1907). Zur theorie der linearen und nichtlinearen integralgleichungen. i. teil: Entwicklung willkrlicher funktionen nach systemen vorgeschriebener. *Mathematische Annalen* **63** 433–476.

Stewart, G. (1993). On the early history of the singular value decomposition. *SIAM REVIEW* **35** 551–566.

Vershynin, R. (2012). *Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices*. Cambridge University Press, 210–268.

Weyl, H. (1912). Das asymptotische Verteilungsgesetz der Eigenwerte linearer partieller Differentialgleichungen. *Mathematische Annalen* **71** 441–479.

Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2006). Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **68** 49–67.

APPENDIX A: PROOFS OF SECTIONS 2 & 3

A.1. Proof of Proposition 1. We first note that, since $(PY)_i = P(PY)_i$, see Giraud (2015) (page 124), and Pythagoras' identity

$$\begin{aligned}\|Y-(PY)_i\|^2 &= \|Y-PY\|^2+\|PY-(PY)_i\|^2 \\ &= \|Y-PY\|^2+\sum_{k=i+1}^{j} d_k^2(PY)+\sum_{k>j} d_k^2(PY) \\ &= \|Y-(PY)_j\|^2+\sum_{k=i+1}^{j} d_k^2(PY).\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Consequently, with $i<j$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\sigma}_i^2 \geq \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 &\iff \frac{\|Y-(PY)_i\|^2}{nm-\lambda i} \geq \frac{\|Y-(PY)_j\|^2}{nm-\lambda j} \\ &\iff \frac{\|Y-(PY)_j+\sum_{k=i+1}^{j} d_k^2(PY)}{(nm-\lambda j)+\lambda(j-i)} \geq \frac{\|Y-(PY)_j\|^2}{nm-\lambda j} \\ &\iff \frac{\sum_{k=i+1}^{j} d_k^2(PY)}{\lambda(j-i)} \geq \frac{\|Y-(PY)_j\|^2}{nm-\lambda j}=\widehat{\sigma}_j^2\end{aligned}$$

using the simple fact that $(a+b)/(c+d) \geq a/c \iff (b/d) \geq (a/c)$ for any positive numbers a,b,c,d. This proves (2.1). Claim (2.2) follows from (2.1) by taking $i=j-1$. Finally,

$$\frac{d_j^2(PY)}{\lambda} \leq \frac{\|Y-(PY)_j\|^2}{nm-\lambda j} = \frac{\|Y-(PY)_{j-1}\|^2-d_j^2(PY)}{nm-\lambda(j-1)-\lambda}$$

is equivalent with

$$\frac{d_j^2(PY)}{\lambda} \leq \frac{\|Y-(PY)_{j-1}\|^2}{nm-\lambda(j-1)}=\widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^2$$

using the above elementary manipulation again and (2.3) follows. This completes our proof. □

A.2. Proof of Proposition 2. We first show (2.4). Suppose $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \leq \widehat{\sigma}_{k-1}^2$. We observe

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{k-\ell}\sum_{j=\ell+1}^{k} d_j^2(PY) &\geq d_k^2(PY) \quad \text{by } d_1(PY) \geq d_2(PY) \geq \cdots \\ &\geq \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \quad \text{by (2.2)}\end{aligned}$$

so that (2.1) implies $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \le \widehat{\sigma}_\ell^2$ for all $\ell \le k-1$. This proves the non-trivial direction of (2.4).

Next, we show (2.5). Suppose $\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \ge \widehat{\sigma}_{k-1}^2$. Then, by (2.2) and $d_{k+1}(PY) \ge d_k(PY)$, we get

$$d_k^2(PY) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad d_{k+1}^2(PY) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_k^2 \quad \overset{(2.3)}{\Longleftrightarrow} \quad d_{k+1}^2(PY) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_{k+1}^2.$$

Note that the last inequality further implies $\widehat{\sigma}_{k+1}^2 \ge \widehat{\sigma}_k^2$ by (2.2) again. Repeating the same reasoning completes our proof. □

A.3. Proof of Theorem 4. By Theorem 3, it suffices to show $d_1^2(PY) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_1^2$. This is equivalent to $d_1^2(PY) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_0^2$ by criterion (2.3) in Proposition 1. The latter, in turn, is equivalent to $d_1^2(PE) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2$ as $XA = 0$ implies $d_1^2(PE) = d_1^2(PY)$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_0^2 = \widehat{\sigma}^2$. □

A.4. Proof of Corollary 5. We can write $\lambda := C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ for some $C = (1+C_0)^2/(1-C_1) > 1$ with $C_0 > 0$ and $0 < C_1 < 1$. By Theorem 4, (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{k} \ne 0\} &\le \mathbb{P}\left\{d_1^2(PE) \ge \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2\right\} \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\left\{d_1^2(PE) \ge (1+C_0)^2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{\sigma}^2 \le (1-C_1)\sigma^2\right\} \\
&\le \exp\left\{-C_0^2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/2\right\} + \exp\left\{-C_1^2 nm/4\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. □

A.5. Proof of Theorem 6. By Proposition 1, for $\widehat{k} \le r$, we need to show that $d_{r+1}^2(PY) < \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1}^2$. We observe that

$$d_{r+1}^2(PY) < \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_{r+1}^2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \lambda > d_{r+1}^2(PY)/\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$$

by statement (2.3). Again, on the event (3.6), an application of Weyl's inequality and observing that $d_{r+1}(XA) = 0$ yield

$$\lambda \;\ge\; d_1^2(PE)/\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \;\ge\; d_{r+1}^2(PY)/\widehat{\sigma}_r^2$$

which is exactly what needed to be shown. □

A.6. Proof of Proposition 7. To show (3.8), on the one hand, we use the Eckhart-Young theorem and the fact that $r(XA) \le r$ to deduce $\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2 \le \|Y - XA\|^2 = \|E\|^2$. Hence

$$\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{nm}{nm - \lambda r}\widehat{\sigma}^2$$

On the other hand, Weyl's inequality shows that $d_{r+i}(PY) \ge d_{2r+i}(PE)$ for $0 \le i \le N - r$ by defining $d_k(PE) := 0$ for $k > N$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 &= \frac{\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2}{nm - \lambda r} = \frac{\|Y - PY\|^2 + \sum_{j=r+1}^{N} d_j^2(PY)}{nm - \lambda r} \\
&\ge \frac{\|E - PE\|^2 + \sum_{j=2r+1}^{N} d_j^2(PE)}{nm - \lambda r} \\
&= \frac{\|E - (PE)_{2r\wedge N}\|^2}{nm - \lambda r}. \qquad \text{(A.2)}
\end{aligned}$$

If $2r \ge N$, then

$$\frac{\|E - (PE)_{2r\wedge N}\|^2}{nm - \lambda r} = \frac{\|E - PE\|^2}{nm - \lambda r} \ge \frac{\|E - (PE)_N\|^2}{nm - \lambda N/2}.$$

We conclude the proof by invoking (A.4) in Lemma 21. □

LEMMA 21. *For any given $1 \le k \le r$ and $2k \le N - 2$, if λ satisfies*

$$\lambda \ge \frac{nm}{\|E - (PE)_{2k}\|^2 / \left[d_{2k+1}^2(PE) + d_{2k+2}^2(PE)\right] + k},$$

then

$$\frac{\|E - (PE)_{2k}\|^2}{nm - \lambda k} \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_{2r}\|^2}{nm - \lambda r} \qquad \text{(A.3)}$$

In particular, on the event $\{\lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2 \ge d_1^2(PE) + d_2^2(PE)\}$, we have

$$\frac{\|E\|^2}{nm} \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_2\|^2}{nm - \lambda} \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_4\|^2}{nm - 2\lambda} \le \cdots \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_N\|^2}{nm - \lambda N/2}. \qquad \text{(A.4)}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 21. We first show (A.4) by using the same argument as in Propositions 1 and 2. For any $0 \le k \le (N/2 - 1)$, we define

$$e_k := \frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2k)}\|^2}{nm - \lambda k}. \qquad \text{(A.5)}$$

Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
e_k \le e_{k+1} & \\
&\iff \frac{\|E-(PE)_{(2k)}\|^2}{nm-\lambda k} \le \frac{\|E-(PE)_{(2k+2)}\|^2}{nm-\lambda(k+1)} \\
&\iff \frac{\|E-(PE)_{(2k)}\|^2}{nm-\lambda k} \le \frac{\|E-(PE)_{(2k)}\|^2 - d_{2k+1}^2(PE) - d_{2k+2}^2(PE)}{nm-\lambda k-\lambda} \\
&\iff \frac{d_{2k+1}^2(PE)+d_{2k+2}^2(PE)}{\lambda} \le \frac{\|E-(PE)_{2k}\|^2}{nm-\lambda k} = e_k. \qquad \text{(A.6)}
\end{aligned}
$$

For $k=0$, we find that $e_0 \le e_1$ is equivalent with $d_1^2(PE)+d_2^2(PE) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2$, which is precisely our condition on λ. From the decreasing property of singular values, (A.6) implies

$$
\frac{d_{2k+3}^2(PE)+d_{2k+4}^2(PE)}{\lambda} \le \frac{\|E-(PE)_{2k+2}\|^2}{nm-\lambda(k+1)} = e_{k+1},
$$

which is, by the same argument above, equivalent with $e_{k+1} \le e_{k+2}$. We conclude that $e_0 \le e_1 \le e_2 \le e_3 \le \ldots$, proving (A.4). *In fact, this proves the sequence of* $\{e_k\}$ *could only be either globally monotonic or decreasing first and then increasing.*

Finally, since $k \le r$, (A.3) follows immediately from (A.6) and the monotone or two-sided monotone property of $\{e_k\}$. □

A.7. Proof of Theorem 8. From Theorem 6 and Proposition 7, it suffices to show $\{2d_1^2(PE) \le \lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2\}$ holds with high probability. The proof follows exactly the same arguments as the proof of Corollary 5 by adapting to the constant 2.

A.8. Proof of Theorem 9. To show $\widehat{k} \ge s$, it suffices to prove $d_s^2(PY) \ge \lambda\widehat{\sigma}_s^2$. Identity (A.1) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|Y-(PY)_s\|^2 &= \|Y-(PY)_r\|^2 + \sum_{j=s+1}^{r} d_j^2(PY) \\
&\le \|Y-(PY)_r\|^2 + (r-s)d_{s+1}^2(PY).
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently,

$$
d_s^2(PY) \ge \lambda \cdot \frac{\|Y-(PY)_s\|^2}{nm-\lambda s}
$$

is implied by

$$d_s^2(PY) \quad \geq \quad \lambda \cdot \frac{\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2 + (r-s)d_s^2(PY)}{nm - \lambda s}$$

which in turn, after a little algebra, is seen to be equivalent to

$$d_s^2(PY) \quad \geq \quad \lambda \cdot \frac{\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2}{nm - \lambda r} = \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_r^2.$$

By Weyl's inequality, on the event (3.9), we have

$$d_s(PY) \geq d_s(XA) - d_1(PE) \geq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r,$$

which shows $d_s^2(PY) \geq \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_s^2$. □

A.9. Proof of Corollary 10. The proof follows immediately by noting the events in this corollary combined with (3.8) imply (3.6) and (3.9). □

A.10. Proof of Theorem 11. We define $\mathcal{C} = \left\{(1 - C_1)\sigma^2 \leq \widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq (1 + C_1)\sigma^2\right\}$ for any $0 < C_1 < 1$. Choose $C' = (1 + C_1)\sqrt{C}(1 + \sqrt{2(1+\delta)})$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that $C = (1 + C_0)^2/(1 - C_1)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left\{\lambda \leq 2d_1^2(PE)/\widehat{\sigma}^2 \quad \text{or} \quad d_s(XA) \leq \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm - \lambda r}}\,\right]\right\} \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{d_1^2(PE) \geq (1 + C_0)^2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2\right\} \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left\{d_s(XA) \leq C'\sigma(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})\right\} + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{C}^c\} \\
&\quad = \mathbb{P}\left\{d_1^2(PE) \geq (1 + C_0)^2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2\right\} + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{C}^c\} \\
&\quad \leq \exp\left\{-C_0^2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2/2\right\} + 2\exp\left\{-3C_1^2 nm/16\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

using (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4). Invoking Corollary 10 concludes the proof. □

APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF SECTION 4

We first present several lemmas which are repeatedly used in the following proofs.

LEMMA 22. *Let c_i be some positive constants for $i = s, s+1, \ldots, t$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$,*

$$\sum_{i=s}^{t} (c_i + \varepsilon S)^2 \le (1+\varepsilon)^2 \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2,$$
$$\sum_{i=s}^{t} (c_i - \varepsilon S)^2 \ge (1-\varepsilon)^2 \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2,$$

where $S = \sqrt{\sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2/(t-s)}$.

PROOF. Working out the square yields

$$\sum_{i=s}^{t} (c_i + \varepsilon S)^2 = \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2 + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2 + 2\varepsilon S \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i \le (1 + \varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon) \sum_{i=s}^{t} c_i^2$$

using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. This proves the first statement. The second one follows by the same arguments. □

LEMMA 23. *(Interlacing inequality Horn and Johnson (2013)) Let A be a given $m \times n$ matrix, and let A_r denote a submatrix of A obtained by deleting a total of r rows and/or columns from A. Then*

$$d_k(A) \ge d_k(A_r) \ge d_{k+r}(A), \quad k = 1, \ldots, \min\{m,n\}$$

where for $M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ we set $d_j(M) = 0$ if $j \ge \min\{p,q\}$.

LEMMA 24. *Let $n \times m$ matrix E have i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries and P be any $n \times n$ projection matrix with rank equal to q. Suppose $q \le m$. Then, one has*

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1^2(PE)] \ge m \tag{B.1}$$

and, for any $2 \le k \le q$,

$$\mathbb{E}[d_k(PE)] \le \sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q-k+1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[d_k(PE)] \ge \sqrt{m} - \sqrt{k}. \tag{B.2}$$

Moreover, for any $1 \le k \le q$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\left|d_k(PE) - \mathbb{E}[d_k(PE)]\right| \ge t\right\} \le 2\exp(-t^2/2), \quad \forall\ t \ge 0. \tag{B.3}$$

For the case $m < q$, similar results hold for any $1 \le k \le m$, by switching q and m.

PROOF OF LEMMA 24. We only prove the case when $q \le m$. The complementary case $q > m$ can be derived using the fact $d_k(M) = d_k(M^T)$ for any matrix M.

We start by writing the eigenvalue decomposition of P as $P = U\Lambda U^T$ with orthogonal matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and diagonal matrix Λ whose first q diagonal elements are 1 and 0 elsewhere. Thus, for any $1 \le j \le q$, $d_j^2(PE) = \lambda_j(E^TPE) = d_j^2(\Lambda U^T E)$ where $\lambda_j(M)$ denotes the jth largest eigenvalue of M. Note that $Z = \Lambda U^T E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ has $q \times m$ submatrix with i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries while the remaining $(n-q)\times m$ entries are all 0. For any $1 \le k \le q$, by Lemma 23, we have $d_k(Z) \le d_1(\overline{Z}_{q-k+1})$ and $d_k(Z) \ge d_k(\overline{Z}_k)$, where $\overline{Z}_j$ denotes the matrix made of the first j rows of Z. Then (B.2) follows immediately from Theorem 5.32 of Vershynin (2012).

Concentration inequality (B.3) follows from the Gaussian concentration inequality of (Giraud, 2015, page 221) and the fact that each singular value function is 1-Lipschitz with respect to the Frobenius norm.

Finally, $\mathbb{E}[d_1^2(PE)] \ge \mathbb{E}[d_1^2(\overline{Z}_1)]$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[d_1^2(\overline{Z}_1)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\overline{Z}_1^T\overline{Z}_1\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{Z}_{1i}^2\right] = m$$

implying (B.1). This completes the proof. □

The next lemma proves one-side concentration of $\|PE - (PE)_k\|$ around its mean.

LEMMA 25. *Let $n\times m$ matrix E have i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ entries and P be any $n\times n$ projection matrix with rank equal to q. Assume $q \le m$. Then, for any $1 \le k < q$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|PE - (PE)_k\|^2 \le (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\|PE - (PE)_k\|^2]\right\} \le e^{-Cm}.$$

Similar results hold by switching q and m when $m < q$ for $1 \le k < m$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 25. Fix $1 \le k < q$. Note that

$$\|PE - (PE)_k\|^2 = \|PE\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE).$$

We first study $\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE)$. From (B.3) in Lemma 24, for any $k \le j \le q$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{d_j^2(PE) \ge (\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)] + t)^2\right\} \le \exp(-t^2/2), \quad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

This further implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE) \le \sum_{j=1}^{k}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)]+t)^2\right\} \ge 1-k\exp(-t^2/2).$$

Let $c>0$ be sufficiently small and choose $t^2=(c^2/k)\sum_{j=1}^{k}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2$. Invoking Lemma 22 and using $\mathbb{E}[d_j^2(PE)] \ge (\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}&\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE) \le (1+c)^2\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathbb{E}[d_j^2(PE)]\right\}\\ &\ge \mathbb{P}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE) \le (1+c)^2\sum_{j=1}^{k}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2\right\}\\ &\ge 1-k\exp\left[-\frac{c^2\sum_{j=1}^{k}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2}{2k}\right].\end{aligned}$$

From $(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2 \ge \mathbb{E}[d_j^2(PE)]-1$ in the proof of Lemma 1 of Giraud (2011), observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{k}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2 &\ge \frac{k}{q}\sum_{j=1}^{q}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(PE)])^2 \ge \frac{k}{q}\sum_{j=1}^{q}(\mathbb{E}[d_j^2(PE)]-1)\\ &= \frac{k}{q}\cdot\mathbb{E}[\|PE\|^2]-k = k(m-1).\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we use the fact that $\|PE\|^2$ has a central χ^2_{qm} distribution. This further implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j^2(PE) \le (1+c)^2\sum_{j=1}^{k}\mathbb{E}[d_j^2(PE)]\right\} \ge 1-e^{-Cm}$$

for some constant $C=C(c)>0$. On the other hand, since $\|PE\|^2 \sim \chi^2_{qm}$, using (3.3) yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|PE\|^2 \ge (1-c)^2\mathbb{E}\left[\|PE\|^2\right]\right\} \ge 1-\exp(-c^2qm/4).$$

Combining these two displays concludes our proof. □

B.1. Proof of Proposition 12. We first show that $\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} := \widehat{\lambda}_{\widehat{k}_t}$ defined in (4.4) is decreasing in $\widehat{k}_t$. To simplify notation, we write k for $\widehat{k}_t$. Since it is immediate to verify the decreasing property when $2k \geq N$, we consider $1 \leq k < N/2$ only. It suffices to show $(1-\varepsilon)\widehat{R}_t/\widehat{U}_t + k$ is increasing. Recall that $S_j = \mathbb{E}[d_j^2(Z)]$ for any $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $\widehat{R}_t$ and $\widehat{U}_t$ are defined as

$$\widehat{R}_t \;:=\; (n-q)m + \sum_{j=2k+1}^{N} S_j, \qquad \widehat{U}_t \;:=\; S_1 \vee (S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2})\,, \tag{B.4}$$

by using k in lieu of $\widehat{k}_t$. First, we show

$$a_k := \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\left[(n-q)m + \sum_{j=2k+1}^{N} S_j\right]}{S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2}} + k \tag{B.5}$$

is increasing. This follows from

$$\frac{a_k - a_{k-1}}{1-\varepsilon} \geq \frac{(n-q)m + \sum_{j=2k+1}^{N} S_j}{S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2}} - \frac{(n-q)m + \sum_{j=2k+1}^{N} S_j}{S_{2k-1} + S_{2k}} > 0.$$

It remains to show, if $S_1 \geq S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2}$, the sequence

$$b_k := \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\left[(n-q)m + \sum_{j=2k+1}^{N} S_j\right]}{S_1} + k \tag{B.6}$$

is increasing in k. This is guaranteed by the fact that b_k starts increasing after k such that $S_1 \geq S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2}$. This proves $\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}$ is decreasing in $\widehat{k}_t$. We conclude the proof of $\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} < \widehat{\lambda}_t$ for any $t \geq 0$ by noting that $\widehat{\lambda}_0$ is greater than the λ obtained from (4.4) by using $\widehat{k}_t = 0$.

Next, we show that, for given $\widehat{\lambda}_t > \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}$, we have $\widehat{k}_t \leq \widehat{k}_{t+1}$. Suppose $\widehat{k}_t > \widehat{k}_{t+1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_{t+1}}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}\widehat{k}_{t+1}} \leq \frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_t}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}\widehat{k}_t} \iff \frac{\sum_{j=\widehat{k}_{t+1}}^{\widehat{k}_t} d_j^2(PY)}{\widehat{k}_t - \widehat{k}_{t+1}} \leq \frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_t}\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_{t+1} - \widehat{k}_t}$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_{t+1}}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_t\widehat{k}_{t+1}} \geq \frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_t}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_t\widehat{k}_t} \iff \frac{\sum_{j=\widehat{k}_{t+1}}^{\widehat{k}_t} d_j^2(PY)}{\widehat{k}_t - \widehat{k}_{t+1}} \geq \frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}_t}\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_t - \widehat{k}_t}$$

which is a contradiction as $\widehat{\lambda}_t > \widehat{\lambda}_{t+1}$.

Finally, we show $\widehat{k}_t \le r$ for all $0 \le t \le T$. We start defining the event

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \bigcap_{k=1}^{N} \mathcal{E}_k \right\} \bigcap \left\{ 2d_1^2(PE) \le \widehat{\lambda}_0 \widehat{\sigma}^2 \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \left\{ \frac{\|E - (PE)_{2k\wedge N}\|^2}{d_1^2(PE) \vee \left[d_{2k+1}^2(PE) + d_{2k+2}^2(PE) \right]} \ge \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\widehat{R}_t}{\widehat{U}_t} \right\} \tag{B.7}$$

with $\widehat{\lambda}_0$ chosen as (4.2) and $\widehat{R}_t$ and $\widehat{U}_t$ defined in (4.6). We will work on this event in the remainder of the proof. From Theorem 6 and Proposition 7, we know $1 \le \widehat{k}_0 \le r$ where $\widehat{k}_0$ is the selected rank from (4.3). Let $\widehat{\lambda}_1$ be updated via (4.4) using $\widehat{k}_0$. In order to guarantee $\widehat{k}_1 \le r$, from (4.1) and (A.2), it suffices to show

$$d_1^2(PE) \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2r)\wedge N}\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_1 - r}. \tag{B.8}$$

On the one hand, the choice of $\widehat{\lambda}_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\lambda}_1 &= \frac{nm}{(1-\varepsilon)\widehat{R}_t/\widehat{U}_t + \widehat{k}_0} \\ &\overset{\mathcal{E}}{\ge} \frac{nm}{\|E - (PE)_{(2\widehat{k}_0)\wedge N}\|^2 / \left(d_{2\widehat{k}_0+1}^2(PE) + d_{2\widehat{k}_0+2}^2(PE) \right) + \widehat{k}_0} \end{aligned}$$

by which (A.3) in Lemma 21 guarantees

$$\frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2\widehat{k}_0)\wedge N}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_1 \widehat{k}_0} \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2r)\wedge N}\|^2}{nm - \widehat{\lambda}_1 r} \tag{B.9}$$

provided that $\widehat{k}_0 \le r$. On the other hand,

$$\widehat{\lambda}_1 \overset{\mathcal{E}}{\ge} \frac{nm}{\|E - (PE)_{(2\widehat{k}_0)\wedge N}\|^2 / d_1^2(PE) + \widehat{k}_0}$$

which is equivalent with

$$d_1^2(PE) \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2\widehat{k}_0)\wedge N}\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_1 - \widehat{k}_0}. \tag{B.10}$$

Combining (B.9) with (B.10) proves (B.8). After repeating this argument, on the event $\mathcal{E}$, we find

$$d_1^2(PE) \le \frac{\|E - (PE)_{(2r)\wedge N}\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_t - r} \le \frac{\|Y - (PY)_r\|^2}{nm/\widehat{\lambda}_t - r} \tag{B.11}$$

for any $t \geq 1$, which implies $\widehat{k}_t \leq r$.

To conclude our proof, we show that $\mathcal{E}$ holds with probability tending to 1. Again, we only prove for $q \leq m$ since the case of $q > m$ can be obtained similarly. The proof of Lemma 24 shows that there exists a $q \times m$ matrix Z with i.i.d. standard normal entries such that $d_k(PE) = \sigma d_k(Z)$ for any $1 \leq k \leq q$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\sigma = 1$. We first consider the event $\{2d_1^2(Z) \leq \widehat{\lambda}_0 \widehat{\sigma}^2\}$. From (B.3) and using $\mathbb{E}[d_1^2(Z)] \geq m$ in Lemma 24, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{ d_1^2(Z) \leq (1 + C_1)^2 \mathbb{E}\left[d_1^2(Z)\right] \Big\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(-C_1^2 m/2\right). \tag{B.12}$$

Then, using (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left\{2d_1^2(Z) \leq \widehat{\lambda}_0 \widehat{\sigma}^2\right\} &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}\Big\{ d_1^2(Z) \geq (1 + C_1)^2 \mathbb{E}\left[d_1^2(Z)\right] \Big\} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}\{\widehat{\sigma}^2 \leq (1 - C_2)\} \\
&\geq 1 - \exp\left(-C_1^2 m^2/2\right) - \exp\left(-C_2^2 nm/4\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < C_1, C_2 < 1$ satisfying $(1 + C_1)^2/(1 - C_2) = 1 + \varepsilon$.

Next we quantify the event $\mathcal{E}_k$ in (B.7) which is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{E}_k := \left\{ \frac{\|E - (PE)_{2k \wedge N}\|^2}{d_1^2(Z) \vee \left[d_{2k+1}^2(Z) + d_{2k+2}^2(Z)\right]} \geq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)\widehat{R}_t}{\widehat{U}_t} \right\}.$$

We will proceed to to show, that each of the random quantities concentrate around their means. We shall only consider when $n > q$ since $n = q$ is easy to obtain by using the same arguments and the fact $\|E - PE\| = 0$ for $n = q$.

Fix $1 \leq k \leq r$ and consider two cases:

(1) When $2k < q$, observe that

$$\|E - (PE)_{2k}\|^2 = \|E - PE\|^2 + \|PE - (PE)_{2k}\|^2.$$

Since $\|E - PE\|^2$ has a central $\chi^2_{(n-q)m}$ distribution, inequality (3.3) gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|E - PE\|^2 \leq (1 - C_3)(n - q)m\right\} \leq \exp\left(-C_3^2 (n - q)m/4\right) \tag{B.13}$$

for any $C_3 \in (0, 1)$. This bound together with Lemma 25 yield

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\|E - (PE)_{2k}\|^2 \leq (1 - C_3)\widehat{R}_t \sigma^2\Big\} \leq \exp\left(-C_3^2 (n - q)m/4\right) + \exp\left(-C_3' m\right)$$

with some constant $C_3' > 0$.

On the other hand, recall that $\widehat{U}_t = S_1 \vee (S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2})$ from (B.4). If $d_1^2(Z) \le d_{2k+1}^2(Z) + d_{2k+2}^2(Z)$ such that $\widehat{U}_t = S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2}$, the concentration inequality (B.3) in Lemma 24 gives

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{ d_{2k+1}^2(Z) + d_{2k+2}^2(Z) \le \sum_{j=2k+1}^{2k+2} (\mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)] + t)^2 \Big\} \ge 1 - 2\exp(-t^2/2),$$

for any $t \ge 0$. Take $t^2 = (C_4^2/2)\sum_{j=2k+1}^{2k+2}(\mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)])^2$ with arbitrary $C_4 \in (0,1)$ and invoke Lemma 22 to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{ d_{2k+1}^2(Z) + d_{2k+2}^2(Z) \le (1+C_4)^2 \widehat{U}_t \Big\} \ge 1 - 2\exp\left(-C_4^2 m/2\right).$$

For the exponent in the probability tail, we use $(\mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)])^2 \ge \mathbb{E}[d_j^2(Z)] - 1 = S_j - 1$ from the proof of Lemma 1 in Giraud (2011) and $S_1 \ge m$ from Lemma 24 to obtain

$$\sum_{j=2k+1}^{2k+2} (\mathbb{E}[d_j(Z)])^2 \ge S_{2k+1} + S_{2k+2} - 2 \ge S_1 - 2 \ge m - 2.$$

If $d_1^2(Z) \ge d_{2k+1}^2(Z) + d_{2k+2}^2(Z)$, the concentration inequality (B.12) gives a similar result as above. Choose $1 - \varepsilon = (1 - C_3)/(1 + C_4)^2$ and conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_k^c) \le 2\exp\left(-C_4^2 m/2\right) + \exp\left(-C_3^2(n-q)m/4\right) + \exp\left(-C_3' m\right),$$

for any $2k < q$.

(2) If $2k \ge q$, we immediately have $\widehat{R}_t = (n-q)m$ and $\widehat{U}_t = S_1$. Therefore, (B.12) and (B.13) give

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_k^c\} &= \mathbb{P}\left\{ \frac{\|E - PE\|^2}{d_1^2(Z)} \le \frac{(1-C_3)\widehat{R}_t}{(1+C_4)^2 \widehat{U}_t} \right\} \\ &\le \exp\left(-C_4^2 m/2\right) + \exp\left(-C_3^2(n-q)m/4\right).\end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all $1 \le k \le r$ concludes our proof. □

B.2. Proof of Theorem 13. The choice $\widehat{\lambda}_0 = C(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ is feasible by using

$$\mathbb{E}[d_1^2(Z)] \le (\mathbb{E}[d_1(Z)])^2 + 1 \le (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2 + 1$$

and choosing ε such that

$$2(1+\varepsilon)[(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2+1] \le C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2.$$

This implies $\widetilde{k} \le \widehat{k}$ from the proof of Proposition 12. Invoking Proposition 12 once again concludes the proof of Theorem 13. □

B.3. Proof of Theorem 14. We work on the event

$$\mathcal{E}' = \{\widehat{\sigma} \le (1+\varepsilon)\sigma\} \cap \mathcal{E}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is defined in (B.7). From (3.4) and the proof of Proposition 12, $\mathcal{E}'$ holds with probability tending to 1.
Let $\widehat{k}_0, \widehat{k}_1, \ldots$ be the sequence of selected ranks from (4.3) and (4.5). Our assumption

$$\begin{aligned} d_{k_0}(XA) &\ge C''\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_0} \ge (1+\varepsilon)\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_0}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}+\sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm-\lambda_0 r}}\right) \\ &\overset{\mathcal{E}'}{\ge} d_1(PE) + \frac{\|E\|}{\sqrt{nm/\lambda_0 - r}} \ge d_1(PE) + \frac{\|Y-(PY)_r\|}{\sqrt{nm/\lambda_0 - r}} \end{aligned}$$

implies that $\widehat{k}_0 \in [k_0, r]$ by Theorem 9 under the rank constraint (3.10). This, in turn, from the decreasing property of $\widehat{\lambda}_t$ in Proposition 12, yields $\widehat{\lambda}_1 \le \lambda_1$, where $\widehat{\lambda}_1$ is computed from (4.4) by using $\widehat{k}_0$. Moreover, $\lambda_1 \le \lambda_0$ implies r also satisfies (3.10) for λ_1. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{k_1}(XA) &\ge C''\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_1} \ge (1+\varepsilon)\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}+\sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm-\lambda_1 r}}\right) \\ &\ge (1+\varepsilon)\sigma\sqrt{\widehat{\lambda}_1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}+\sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm-\widehat{\lambda}_1 r}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and by the same argument above, we have $\widehat{k}_1 \in [k_1, r]$. Now the proof follows by repeating these arguments and the fact that $k_T = r$. □

B.4. Proof of Theorem 15. We work on the event

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{d_1(Z) = \sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q}\}$$

which holds almost surely as $N = q \wedge m \to \infty$ from the celebrated result of Bai and Yin (1993).

We only prove the result for $q \le m$ since the case $q > m$ can be derived in a similar way. From the first signal condition (4.8), Theorem 14 immediately implies $\widehat{k}_0 \ge q/2$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\widehat{k}_0 = q/2$, and q is even for notational simplicity. Step (4.4) implies the following update

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{nm}{(1-c)(n-q)m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 + q/2}. \tag{B.14}$$

To show $\widehat{k}_1 = r$, from (9), it suffices to show

$$d_r(XA) \ge d_1(PE) + \sqrt{\lambda_1}\widehat{\sigma}_r. \tag{B.15}$$

Observe that, with high probability,

(B.16)
$$\lambda_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 = \frac{\|Y-(PY)_r\|^2}{nm/\lambda_1 - r} \le \frac{\|E\|^2}{nm/\lambda_1 - r} \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon)nm(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2}{7(n-q)m/8 - (r-q/2)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, by choosing $c = 7/8$ and using (3.4) in the last inequality. We consider two cases:

Case 1:

$$\frac{nm}{\lambda_0} \ge \frac{1+\delta}{\delta}q \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad nm \ge \frac{1+\delta}{\delta}2C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 q. \tag{B.17}$$

This implies $r \le q$ from the rank constraint (3.10). Hence,

$$\lambda_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon)nm(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2}{7(n-q)m/8 - (q/2)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2} \le \frac{C(1+\varepsilon)(1+\delta)}{1+5\delta/16}(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2$$

by using (B.17), $m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 \le 1$ and $C \ge 8/7$. This further implies

$$d_1(PE) + \sqrt{\lambda_1}\widehat{\sigma}_r \le C'\left[1 + \sqrt{\frac{1+\delta}{1+5\delta/16}}\right](\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})\sigma$$

by taking $C' = \sqrt{C(1+\varepsilon)}$. Thus, (B.15) holds under the assumed signal condition (4.9).

Case 2:

$$\frac{nm}{\lambda_0} \le \frac{1+\delta}{\delta}q \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad nm \le \frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\cdot 2C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 q. \tag{B.18}$$

It follows that

$$r \le \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\frac{nm}{\lambda_0} = \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\cdot\frac{nm}{2C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}.$$

Plugging the above upper bound of r into (B.16) yields

$$\lambda_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2}{7/8-\delta/(2C(1+\delta))-(q/n)[7/8-(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/(2m)]}. \tag{B.19}$$

If $7/8 \le (\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/(2m)$, we further have

$$\lambda_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2}{7/8-\delta/(2C(1+\delta))} \le \frac{C(1+\varepsilon)(1+\delta)}{1+3\delta/8}(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2$$

by using $C \ge 8/7$. By repeating the same arguments before, (B.15) holds. Finally, we show (B.15) still holds when $7/8 \ge (\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/(2m)$. Recall that $\widehat{k}_0 = q/2$ which implies

$$\frac{q}{2} \le \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\frac{nm}{\lambda_0} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \frac{q}{n} \le \frac{\delta m}{C(1+\delta)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}.$$

Combining this with (B.19) gives

$$\lambda_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{C(1+\varepsilon)(1+\delta)}{1+\delta/8}(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2.$$

Repeating the same arguments proves (B.15), hence concludes the proof. □

B.5. Proof of Proposition 16. Again, we work on the event $\mathcal{Z}$, defined in the proof of Theorem 14 and we only prove the case $q \le m$ since the complementary case follows by the same arguments.

Since $\widehat{k}_0 \ge N/2$, we assume $\widehat{k}_0 = N/2$ so this is the most difficult case. We take N even for simplicity. Thus, step (4.4) implies the update of λ as

$$\widehat{\lambda}_1 = \frac{nm}{(1-\varepsilon)(n-q)m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2+q/2} = \frac{nm}{(7/8)(n-q)m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2+q/2}$$

by taking $\varepsilon = 1/8$. On the one hand, a little algebra shows that

$$\widehat{K}_1 \;=\; \frac{nm}{\widehat{\lambda}_1} \;=\; \frac{7(n-q)m}{8(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}+\frac{q}{2} \;\ge\; \frac{9}{8}q$$

by using our assumption

$$\frac{nm}{\lambda_0} = \frac{nm}{2C(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2} \ge \frac{3}{4}q. \tag{B.20}$$

with $C = 8/7$ and $m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 \le 1$. Hence $\widehat{k}_2$ is selected from $[q/2,\ q]$ according to (4.5). On the other hand, similar as (B.16) and by using $r \le q$, we have

$$\widehat{\lambda}_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon')nm}{7(n-q)m/8-(q/2)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2$$

with high probability for any $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1/4)$. Using (B.20), $m/(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2 \le 1$ and $C > 8/7$ yields

$$\widehat{\lambda}_1\widehat{\sigma}_r^2 \le 12C(1+\varepsilon')(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2.$$

Taking $C' = \sqrt{C(1+\varepsilon')}$ concludes

$$d_1(PE) + \sqrt{\widehat{\lambda}_1}\widehat{\sigma}_r \le C'(1+2\sqrt{3})(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})\sigma,$$

which, by using our signal condition and invoking Theorem 9, completes the proof. □

APPENDIX C: PROOFS OF SECTION 5

The following lemmas are critical for extending the previous results to general errors with heavy tail distributions.

LEMMA 26. *Let $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ have independent entries with mean zero, variance σ^2 and fourth moment $\gamma < \infty$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\big|\|E\|^2 - nm\sigma^2\big| > \varepsilon nm\sigma^2\Big\} \ \le\ \frac{\gamma/\sigma^4 - 1}{\varepsilon^2 nm}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 26. Since $\|E\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^m E_{ij}^2$ with $\mathbb{E}[\|E\|^2] = nm\sigma^2$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\|E\|^2) = nm(\gamma-\sigma^4)$, the result follows from the Bienaymé-Chebyshev inequality. □

LEMMA 27. *Let E has independent entries with mean zero and unit variance. Assume $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0,1)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, one has*

$$(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{m} \le d_k(E) \le (1+\varepsilon)\sqrt{m}, \qquad \text{for all } 1 \le k \le n \tag{C.1}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-c\varepsilon^2 m^{1-\alpha})$ where $c > 0$ is some absolute constant. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\|E - (E)_k\|^2 \ge (1-\varepsilon)^2(n-k)m, \qquad \text{for all } 1 \le k \le n \tag{C.2}$$

with probability converging to 1 as $m \to \infty$. Similar results hold for $m = O(n^\alpha)$ with m and n switched.

PROOF OF LEMMA 27. Let us first consider $n = O(m^\alpha)$ for some $0 \le \alpha < 1$. Fix any $1 \le k \le n$. Lemma 23 implies $d_k(\overline{E}_k) \le d_k(E) \le d_1(\overline{E}_{n-k+1})$ where $\overline{E}_j$ is the matrix made of the first j rows of E for any $1 \le j \le n$. For notational simplicity, we write $F^j = (\overline{E}_j)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times j}$. Notice that, F^j still has independent entries, each row $F^j_{i\cdot}$ of F^j has $j \times j$ identity covariance matrix and

$$\|F^j_{i\cdot}\|_2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{j} \left(F^j_{i\ell}\right)^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{j} E^2_{\ell i} = j, \quad a.s.$$

by the law of large number. Thus, we can invoke Theorem 5.41 in Vershynin (2012) for F^{n-k+1} and F^k to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left\{d_1(F^{n-k+1}) \ge \sqrt{m} + t\sqrt{n-k+1}\right\} &\le (n-k+1)\exp(-c_0t^2), \quad t \ge 0,\\ \mathbb{P}\left\{d_1(F^k) \le \sqrt{m} - t\sqrt{k}\right\} &\le k\exp(-c_1t^2), \quad t \ge 0,\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_0, c_1 > 0$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, choose $t = \varepsilon\sqrt{m}/\sqrt{n-k+1}$ in the first display and $t = \varepsilon\sqrt{m}/\sqrt{k}$ in the second display, and get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left\{(1-\varepsilon)\sqrt{m} \le d_k(E) \le (1+\varepsilon)\sqrt{m}\right\}\\ &\quad\ge 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{c_0\varepsilon^2 m}{n-k+1} + \log(n-k+1)\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{c_1\varepsilon^2 m}{k} + \log k\right)\\ &\quad\ge 1 - 2\exp\left(-c_2\varepsilon^2 m^{1-\alpha}\right)\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$. We use $n = O(m^\alpha)$ in the last inequality. Taking the union bound over $1 \le k \le n$ concludes the proof of (C.1).

If $m = O(n^\alpha)$, write $F = E^T$. Using Lemma 23 again gives $d_k(\overline{F}_k) \le d_k(F) \le d_1(\overline{F}_{n-k+1})$ for any $1 \le k \le m$. We observe that $(\overline{F}_j)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times j}$ has independent entries, identity covariance matrix and the ℓ_2 norm of each row equal to $\sqrt{j}$ almost surely. Repeating the previous arguments will prove (C.1).

We proceed to show (C.2) for $n = O(m^\alpha)$ only since the case $m = O(n^\alpha)$ can be easily extended. For any $1 \le k \le n$, notice that $\|E - (E)_k\|^2 = \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} d_j^2(E)$. (C.2) follows immediately from (C.1) and Lemma 26. This completes the proof. □

C.1. Proof of Theorem 17. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathbb{E}[E_{ij}^2] = 1$. We start by defining the following event

$$\mathcal{E}'' := \{|\|E\|^2 - nm| \le \varepsilon nm\} \cap \{d_1(E) = \sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n}\}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. By Lemma 26 and Bai and Yin (1993), we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}'') \to 1$ as $n, m \to \infty$. To show $\widehat{k} \le r$, from Theorem 7, it suffices to show (3.7). This is indeed the case since

$$\text{(C.3)} \qquad \frac{2d_1^2(PE)}{\widehat{\sigma}^2} \le \frac{2d_1^2(E)}{\widehat{\sigma}^2} \overset{\mathcal{E}''}{\le} \frac{2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{n})^2}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2}{1-\varepsilon}(1+o(1))$$

by using $d_1(PE) \le d_1(P)d_1(E) = d_1(E)$ in the first inequality and choosing $\lambda = 2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/(1-\varepsilon)$. On the other hand, to show $\widehat{k} \ge s$, from Theorem 9, we need to verify (3.9). By using (3.8), (3.10) and (C.3), it follows that

$$d_1(PE) + \sqrt{\lambda}\widehat{\sigma}_r \le \sqrt{\lambda}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \sqrt{1+\delta}\right]\widehat{\sigma} \overset{\mathcal{E}}{\le} C\sigma(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q}) \le d_s(XA)$$

by choosing $C = \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon)}(1+\sqrt{2(1+\delta)})$. This completes the proof. □

C.2. Proof of Theorem 18. Without loss of generality, we assume E_{ij} has unit variance. As in the proof of Theorem 14, we first need to check the following two properties for $\widehat{\lambda}_t$ and $\widehat{k}_t$ obtained in (5.2) and (5.3): (1) $\widehat{\lambda}_t$ is decreasing; (2) $\widehat{k}_t \le r$. Obviously, (1) is straightforward from (5.2) and (5.3). To show (2), we only prove the case $n = O(m^\alpha)$ since the case $m = O(n^\alpha)$ is similar to derive.

We define the following event which is analogous to (B.7) in the proof of Proposition 12.

$$\mathcal{E}''' := \bigcap_{k=1}^{q}\left\{\frac{\|E-(E)_{(2k)\wedge n}\|^2}{d_1^2(E)\vee\left[d_{2k+1}^2(E)+d_{2k+2}^2(E)\right]} \ge (1-\varepsilon)[n/2-k]_+\right\} \bigcap \left\{2d_1^2(E) \le \widehat{\lambda}_0\widehat{\sigma}^2\right\}$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}'''$, $\widehat{k}_t \le r$ follows by the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 12 except PE and PY are now replaced by E and Y, respectively. Thus, it suffices to show $\mathcal{E}'''$ holds with high probability. First, observe that, for any $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0,1)$, and some constant c, c',

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left\{2d_1^2(E) \le \widehat{\lambda}_0\widehat{\sigma}^2\right\} &\ge 1 - \mathbb{P}\{d_1^2(E) \ge (1+\varepsilon_1)^2 m\} - \mathbb{P}\{\widehat{\sigma}^2 \le (1-\varepsilon_2)nm\} \\ &\ge 1 - \exp(-c\varepsilon_1^2 m) - c'(\varepsilon_2^2 nm)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

We use Lemmas 26 and 27 in the second inequality. Choosing ε in $\widehat{\lambda}_0$ such that $1+\varepsilon = (1+\varepsilon_1)^2/(1-\varepsilon_2)$ proves the last event in $\mathcal{E}'''$. For the other

intersect event, the event holds trivially if $2k \geq q$. If $2k < q$, Lemma 27 guarantees $\mathcal{E}'''$ holds with probability tending 1.

Finally, the results of Theorem 17 follow from the same arguments in the proof of Theorem 14 except PE and PY are now replaced by E and Y, respectively. □

C.3. Proofs of Theorems 19 and 20. Recall that we use $d_1(PE) \leq d_1(E)$ in the proof of Theorems 17 and 18. Thus, the proofs for Theorems 19 and 20 remain the same as those for Theorems 17 and 18. □

APPENDIX D: ORACLE INEQUALITY

While our main interest is the study of the rank estimator $\widehat{k}$, we briefly mention an oracle inequality for our estimators $X\widehat{A} := (PY)_{\widehat{k}}$ based on GRS and STRS of the mean XA.

THEOREM 28. *Let $C > 2$. On the event $\lambda \geq Cd_1^2(PE)/\widehat{\sigma}^2$, we have*

$$\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \leq \frac{C+2}{C-2} \min_{0 \leq k \leq K_\lambda} \left\{ \left(\frac{C+2}{C-2} + 8(\rho - 1) \right) \sum_{j>k} d_j^2(XA) + 3\rho\lambda\widehat{\sigma}^2 k \right\},$$

with $\rho := (nm)/(nm - \lambda K_\lambda)$.

PROOF. First we notice that

$$\frac{\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}}\|^2}{nm - \lambda\widehat{k}} \leq \frac{\|Y - (PY)_k\|^2}{nm - \lambda k} \leq \frac{\|Y - (XA)_k\|^2}{nm - \lambda k}.$$

The first inequality follows from the optimality of $\widehat{k}$; the second inequality is a consequence of Pythagoras' identity and the Eckart and Young (1936) inequality. Rewriting the above display yields

$$\|Y - (PY)_{\widehat{k}}\|^2 \leq \|Y - (XA)_k\|^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{2\lambda k}{nm - \lambda k} - \frac{\lambda(k + \widehat{k})}{nm - \lambda k} \right\},$$

and after working out the squares, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(PY)_{\widehat{k}} - XA\|^2 \leq{}& \|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 + \frac{2\lambda k}{nm - \lambda k}\|Y - (XA)_k\|^2 \\ &- \frac{\lambda(k + \widehat{k})}{nm - \lambda k}\|Y - (XA)_k\|^2 + 2\langle E, (PY)_{\widehat{k}} - (XA)_k \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

Since both $(XA)_k$ and $(PY)_{\widehat{k}}$ are in the column space of P, see, for instance, (Giraud, 2015, page 124), we have $2\langle E, (PY)_{\widehat{k}} - (XA)_k\rangle = 2\langle PE, (PY)_{\widehat{k}} - (XA)_k\rangle$, and the norm duality and the elementary inequality $2xy \le ax^2 + y^2/a$ for $a > 0$, yield

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle E, (PY)_{\widehat{k}} - (XA)_k\rangle \le\ & 2d_1(PE)\cdot\sqrt{k+\widehat{k}}\cdot\|(PY)_{\widehat{k}} - (XA)_k\| \\ \le\ & (a+b)(k+\widehat{k})d_1^2(PE) + \frac{1}{a}\|(PY)_{\widehat{k}} - XA\|^2 + \frac{1}{b}\|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

for any $a, b > 0$. Moreover, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y - (XA)_k\|^2 &= \|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 + \|E\|^2 + 2\langle E, XA - (XA)_k\rangle \\ &\le 3\|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 + \frac{3}{2}\|E\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{D.3}$$

and

$$\|Y - (XA)_k\|^2 \ge \frac{1}{2}\|E\|^2 - \|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 \tag{D.4}$$

Finally, combining (D.1) with (D.2), (D.3) and (D.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a-1}{a}\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \le & \left[\frac{b+1}{b} + \frac{6\lambda k}{(nm-\lambda k)} + \frac{\lambda(k+\widehat{k})}{(nm-\lambda k)}\right]\|XA - (XA)_k\|^2 \\ & + \frac{3\lambda k}{nm-\lambda k}\|E\|^2 + (k+\widehat{k})\left[(a+b)d_1^2(PE) - \frac{\lambda/2}{nm-\lambda k}\|E\|^2\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By using $(nm)/(nm-\lambda\ell) \le (nm)/(nm-\lambda K_\lambda)$ for all $\ell \le K_\lambda$ and setting $a = 1 + b$ and $b = C/2$, the claim follows after a little algebra. □

Contrary to the rank consistency results in Sections 3 and 4, no lower bound on the non-zero singular values $d_j(XA)$ of the signal XA, nor any assumption on X is required. It is clear that our selected estimator achieves the optimal bias-variance tradeoff, as discussed in Bunea et al. (2011); Giraud (2011, 2015). In the above oracle inequality, the quantity

$$\rho := \frac{nm}{nm - \lambda K_\lambda}$$

could be large under some circumstances. Nevertheless, the mild rank constraint (3.10) with $\delta > 0$ guarantees the upper bound $\rho \le 1 + \delta$. Theorem 28 and the exponential inequalities in (3.2) – (3.4) immediately yield the following corollary.

COROLLARY 29. *Suppose E has i.i.d. $N(0,\sigma^2)$ entries. For $\lambda > 2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$, the event*

$$\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \lesssim \rho \min_{0\le k\le K_\lambda} \left\{ \sum_{j>k} d_j^2(XA) + \lambda\sigma^2 k \right\} \tag{D.5}$$

holds with probability tending to 1, as $nm \to \infty$ and $q+m \to \infty$.

We use the notation $\lesssim$ for inequalities that hold up to multiplicative constants. The probability of event (D.5) converges (to 1) exponentially fast in mn and $m+q$.

PROOF. We can write $\lambda := C'(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ for some $C' = C(1+C_0)^2/(1-C_1) > 2$ with $C_0 > 0$, $0 < C_1 < 1$ and C equal to the one in Theorem 28. From inequalities (3.2) – (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left\{ C d_1^2(PE) \ge \lambda \frac{\|E\|^2}{nm} \right\} \le\ & \mathbb{P}\left\{ d_1^2(PE) \ge (1+C_0)^2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2\sigma^2 \right\} \\
& + \mathbb{P}\left\{ \|E\|^2 \le (1-C_1)nm\sigma^2 \right\} \\
\le\ & \exp\left\{ -C_0^2(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2/2 \right\} + \exp\left\{ -C_1^2 nm/4 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. □

For GRS and STRS, $\widehat{k} = r$ holds with overwhelming probability. On this event, Theorem 30 provides a cleaner and tighter bound for the fit $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|$.

THEOREM 30. *On the event $\widehat{k} = r$, we have*

$$\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \le 4r d_1^2(PE)$$

PROOF. From the optimality of $X\widehat{A}$, we have

$$\|Y - X\widehat{A}\|^2 \le \|Y - (XA)_r\|^2 = \|E\|^2$$

on the event $\{\widehat{r} = r\}$. This implies

$$\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \le 2|\langle E, X\widehat{A} - (XA)_r\rangle| \le 2\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|(\sqrt{r} d_1(PE))$$

and the result follows. □

Specialized to our STRS procedure, we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 31. *Assume E has i.i.d. $N(0,\sigma^2)$ entries. On the event (4.7) in Theorem 14, if we choose and update λ according to (4.2) and (4.4), then we have $\widehat{k} = r$ with overwhelming probability. Hence, for some constant $C > 4$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|^2 \le Cr(\sqrt{q}+\sqrt{m})^2\sigma^2\right\} \to 1$$

as $n \to \infty$ and $(q \vee m) \to \infty$.

The convergence rate in Corollary 31 is exponentially fast. The proof follows immediately from Theorem 14, Theorem 30, (3.2) and $\mathbb{E}[d_1(PE)] \le \sigma(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})$.

APPENDIX E: STRS WITH DETERMINISTIC BOUNDS

When E has i.i.d. $N(0,\sigma^2)$ entries, a deterministic bound for updating λ in Section 4 can be derived as follows. We define $M := m \vee q$ and recall that $N = q \wedge m$. For any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we choose $\widetilde{\lambda}_0 = 2(1+\varepsilon)(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2$ and let $\widetilde{k}_0$ be selected from (1.3) by using $\widetilde{\lambda}_0$. For given $\widetilde{k}_t \ge 1$ with $t \ge 0$, we set

(E.1)
$$\widetilde{\lambda}_{t+1} = \begin{cases} nm \Big/ \left[(1-\varepsilon)\widetilde{R}_t/\widetilde{U}_t + \widetilde{k}_t\right], & \text{if } 2\widetilde{k}_t \le N; \\ nm \Big/ \left[(1-\varepsilon)(n-q)m/((\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2+1) + \widetilde{k}_t\right], & \text{if } 2\widetilde{k}_t \ge N \end{cases}$$

with

$$\widetilde{R}_t := \max\left\{nm - \sum_{j=1}^{2\widetilde{k}_t}\left(\sqrt{M}+\sqrt{N-j+1}\right)^2 - 2\widetilde{k}_t,\right. \\ \left.(n-q)m + \sum_{j=2\widetilde{k}_t+1}^{N}\left(\sqrt{M}-\sqrt{j}\right)^2\right\} \tag{E.2}$$

and

$$\widetilde{U}_t := \max\left\{(\sqrt{m}+\sqrt{q})^2+1, \sum_{j=2\widetilde{k}_t+1}^{2\widetilde{k}_t+2}\left(\sqrt{M}+\sqrt{N-j+1}\right)^2+2\right\}. \tag{E.3}$$

After updating $\widetilde{\lambda}_t$, we select $\widetilde{k}_t$ as

$$\widetilde{k}_t := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\widetilde{k}_{t-1} \le k \le \widetilde{K}_t} \frac{\|Y - (PY)_k\|^2}{nm - \widetilde{\lambda}_t k}$$

where $\widetilde{K}_t := \lfloor nm/\widetilde{\lambda}_t \rfloor \wedge q \wedge m$. The procedure stops when $\widetilde{k}_t = \widetilde{k}_{t+1}$. For this deterministic self-tuning procedure, we show that results analogous to Proposition 12 and Theorem 14 are still guaranteed.

PROPOSITION 32. *For all $t \geq 0$, we have $\widetilde{\lambda}_{t+1} \leq \widetilde{\lambda}_t$ and $\widetilde{k}_{t+1} \geq \widetilde{k}_t$. Moreover, $\widetilde{k}_t \leq r$ holds with probability converging to 1 as $(q \vee m) \to \infty$ and $n \to \infty$.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 32. We first show $\widetilde{\lambda}_t$ is decreasing in $\widetilde{k}_t$. For notational simplicity, we write k for $\widetilde{k}_t$ and assume $q \leq m$. The case $q > m$ can be obtained similarly. The decreasing property of (E.1) is easily seen if $2k \geq N$. Hence we focus on the case $2k < N$ and consider two sub-cases:

(1) Suppose $\widetilde{U}_t = \sum_{j=2k+1}^{2k+2} (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q-j+1})^2 + 2$. It suffices to show

$$A_k := \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\widetilde{R}_t}{\sum_{j=2k+1}^{2k+2} (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q-j+1})^2 + 2} + k$$

is increasing in k. It has the same form as (B.5) in the proof of Proposition 12. By repeating the arguments there, we can similarly show that A_k is increasing. Hence $\widetilde{\lambda}_t$ is decreasing.

(2) Suppose $\widetilde{U}_t = (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2 + 1$. This is similar to (B.6). Therefore, the same arguments can be used to prove that $\widetilde{\lambda}_k$ is decreasing. By the same reasoning as the proof of Proposition 12, we have $\widetilde{k}_{t+1} \geq \widetilde{k}_t$. Finally, the proof for $\widetilde{k}_t \leq r$ follows immediately from Proposition 12 by observing that $\widetilde{\lambda}_t \geq \widehat{\lambda}_t$ using Lemma 24. □

THEOREM 33. *Assume E has i.i.d. $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries. For any subsequence $k_0 < \cdots < k_T = r$ of $\{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ with $T \leq r - 1$, we let $\lambda_0 = 2(1+\varepsilon)(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{q})^2$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Denote by λ_t the updated λ according to (E.1) by using k_t, for $t = 0, 1, \ldots, T-1$. On the event,*

$$\text{(E.4)} \quad d_{k_t}(XA) \geq C\sigma\sqrt{\lambda_t} \left[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{nm}{nm - \lambda_t r}} \right], \quad t = 0, 1, \ldots, T.$$

for some $C > 1$, there exists $T' \leq T$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{\widetilde{k}_{T'} = r\} \to 1$, where $\widetilde{k}_0, \widetilde{k}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{k}_{T'}$ are the selected ranks from the procedure above.

PROOF OF THEOREM 33. The proof follows the same arguments as the proof of Theorem 14 by using Proposition 32. □

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL SIMULATIONS

F.1. Simulations of Monte Carlo simulations vs deterministic bounds. Depending on whether we update λ by Monte Carlo simulations (MC) or by the Deterministic Bounds (DB) in Section E, we denote by STRS-MC the procedure using MC and by STRS-DB the one using DB. We compare their performance for some non-Gaussian distributions. In particular, we generate E from either uniform$(-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3})$ or t_ν-distribution (d.f. $\nu = 6$). For each distribution, both low- and high-dimensional settings are considered. The low-dimensional case sets $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = 0.1$, $n = 300$, $m = p = q = 50$ and varies r between 0 and 15. For the high-dimensional case, we consider $\eta = 0.1$, $b_0 = 0.003$, $n = 200$, $m = 60$, $p = 300$, $q = 30$ and $0 \le r \le 15$. The mean selected ranks and rank recovery rate of the two methods for each setting are shown in Figure 11.




Fig 11: Comparison of STRS-MC and STRS-DB in the low-dimensional setting (top) and high-dimensional setting (bottom) for the uniform errors (left) and t_6 errors (right).

Both STRS-MC and STRS-DB work perfectly when the SNR is not small (say greater than 1.6). STRS-DB seems to require a slightly larger SNR, as expected, since the deterministic bounds are upper bounds of those in STRS-MC leading to a larger updated λ.

More importantly, we emphasize that STRS-MC is using Monte Carlo simulations based on $N(0,1)$. It also supports our conjecture that STRS-MC works for other distributions with heavier tails.

F.2. Simulation for KF methods. Giraud (2011) proposed to minimize

$$\frac{\|Y-(PY)_k\|^2}{nm-1-C\left(\mathbb{E}[\|G\|_{(2,k)}]\right)^2} \tag{F.1}$$

with $\|G\|_{2,k}^2=\sum_{i=1}^k d_i^2(G)$ and some tuning parameter $C>1$. It does not require to estimate σ^2 but still needs the selection of leading constant C. Giraud (2011) recommended to use $C=2$ based on Birgé and Massart (2007). We use KF to denote this method. In particular, we define KF-2 for choosing leading constant $C=2$ and KF-CV for choosing C via cross-validation. The simulation setting is slightly different from the low dimensional one in Experiment 1 and aims to give an example of an easy situation where KF fails to select the correct rank. Here we have $n=300$, $m=40$ and $p=q=35$. For illustration, we only vary the true rank from 10 to 35. We set $\eta=0.1$ and $b_0=20$. Note $b_0=20$ ensures a large SNR which should be the most ideal case for rank recovery. We compare the performance of KF-2, KF-CV and STRS. The plot of rank recovery and mean selected rank versus the true rank for different methods are shown in Figure 12. From the result, it is clear that neither KF-2 nor KF-CV consistently recovers the true rank while STRS does. But since KF was not developed for rank recovery, nor did it claim to have this property, this does not contradict the results in Giraud (2011).




Fig 12: Plot of rank recovery rate and mean selected rank for KF and STRS.

F.3. Simulations to compare the error $\|\boldsymbol{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{A}} - \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{A}\|$. In this section, we compare three methods, STRS-MC, BSW-1.3 and KF-2, based on two criterions: (1) the fit $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|/\sqrt{nm}$; (2) the selected rank.

In the low-dimensional setting, when X^TX is invertible, we also compute the prediction error $\|\widehat{A} - A\|/\sqrt{pm}$. We consider both situations when the model is correctly specified and when the model approximately holds.

F.3.1. *Exact low rank model.* We first consider the scenario when A has an exact low rank structure, in both low- and high-dimensional settings. In the low-dimensional setting, we choose $\rho = 0.1$, $n = 200$, $m = p = q = 50$, $r = 10$ and $b_0 \in \{0.02, 0.022, 0.024, \ldots, 0.046\}$. In the high-dimensional setting, we specify $\rho = 0.1$, $n = 150$, $p = 300$, $m = q = 50$, $r = 10$ and $b_0 \in \{0.0015, 0.0016, \ldots, 0.003\}$. Different grids of b_0 are chosen to maintain similar signal-to-noise ratio. The random additive errors in both settings are generated from $N(0, 1)$. Within each setting, we repeat 100 times. The averaged results are reported in Figure 13 demonstrating how criterions (1) and (2) of the three methods vary with b_0 in both low- and high-dimensional settings. STRS-MC dominates the other two methods as it produces a smaller error and it always selects a rank closer to the true rank than the other two methods.




Fig 13: Criterions (1) and (2) of STRS-MC, KF-2 and BSW-1.3 as b_0 varies in the low-dimensional setting (first row) and high-dimensional setting (second row).

F.3.2. *Approximate low rank model.* We devote this part to testing the performance of different approaches when the model is mis-specified in that A doesn't have an exact low rank structure, but rather has a small effective rank with non-zero decaying singular values. To generate this type of A, we first generate an exact low rank matrix A^* with specified rank r based on our data generating mechanism described in Section 6.3. Next, we compute its singular value decomposition $A^* = UDV^T$ with $D = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_r, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and add polynomial decaying noise to the (zero valued) singular values d_j for $j \geq r$. Specifically, we take $d_j = d_r \cdot \gamma(j - r + 1)^{-\beta}$ for $j \geq r + 1$, with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and some positive integer β. The matrix $A = U\widetilde{D}V^T$ is our approximate low rank matrix with $\widetilde{D} = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_r, d_{r+1}, d_{r+2}, \ldots)$. Since the results are similar for different choices of γ and β, we only present the results of $\gamma = 0.8$ and $\beta = 1$. The rest of our simulation setup stays the same as in the exact low rank model case above. Criterions (1) and (2) for both low- and high-dimensional settings are shown in Figure 14. We find the same conclusion as before when the model is mis-specified: STRS-MC continues to outperform the other two methods by yielding the smallest $\|X\widehat{A} - XA\|$ and selecting a rank closer to the effective rank (of 10).




Fig 14: Criterions (1) and (2) of STRS-MC, KF-2 and BSW-1.3 as b_0 varies in the low-dimensional setting (top) and the high-dimensional setting (bottom).

F.3.3. *The prediction error* $\|\widehat{A} - A\|$. We compute the prediction error $\|\widehat{A} - A\|/\sqrt{pm}$ in the low-dimensional setting for both the exact low rank model and the approximate low rank model. Figure 15 shows that STRS-MC dominates the other two methods, demonstrating the importance of selecting a better rank.




Fig 15: Plots of $\|\widehat{A} - A\|$ in the exact low-rank model (left) and in the approximate low-rank model (right).

Xin Bing
Department of Statistical Science
Cornell University
301D Malott Hall
Ithaca, New York 14853-3801
United States of America
E-mail: xb43@cornell.edu

Marten H. Wegkamp
Department of Mathematics &
Department of Statistical Science
Cornell University
432 Malott Hall
Ithaca, New York 14853-3801
United States of America
E-mail: marten.wegkamp@cornell.edu