

Nonparametric covariance estimation for mixed longitudinal studies, with applications in midlife women's health

Anru R. Zhang^{1,2} and Kehui Chen³

¹Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison

²Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University

³Department of Statistics, University of Pittsburgh

(July 9, 2020)

Abstract

Motivated by applications of mixed longitudinal studies, where a group of subjects entering the study at different ages (cross-sectional) are followed for successive years (longitudinal), we consider nonparametric covariance estimation with samples of noisy and partially-observed functional trajectories. The proposed algorithm is based on a sequential-aggregation scheme, which is non-iterative, with only basic matrix operations and closed-form solutions in each step. The good performance of the proposed method is supported by both theory and numerical experiments. We also apply the proposed procedure to a midlife women's working memory study based on the data from the Study of Women's Health Across the Nation (SWAN).

Key words and phrases: longitudinal studies, cross-sectional, partial trajectories, functional data, covariance estimation, consistency.

1 Introduction

A mixed longitudinal study is a mixture of a longitudinal study and a cross-sectional one (Berger, 1986; Helms, 1992). Suppose the researchers intend to study the social and cognitive development of children aged 4 - 12. In an ideal longitudinal design, a group of 4-year-old children will be recruited and followed during 8 successive years. Alternatively, in a mixed longitudinal design, one may recruit a group of children aged between 4 - 8 and follow them for 4 years (within a typical funding period). Since the age requirement is more flexible at recruitment, this type of mixed longitudinal design results in shorter completion time and potentially larger group size. However, this type of mixed longitudinal design also brings new challenges for statistical analysis, because the trajectory is only partially observed for each subject.




Figure 1: Left: For each of the 2016 subjects, measurements were between age x to $x + 5$ for some $x \in [48, 58]$. Right: The design plots for covariance $G(s, t)$, i.e, the assembled pairs of (t_{ij}, t_{il}) for $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j < l \leq n_i$. The pooled pairs do not fill the entire domain \mathcal{T}^2 since there are no measurements available for any pairs of (t_{ij}, t_{il}) whenever $|j - l| > 5$.

Specifically, we consider the data example from the Study of Women’s Health Across the Nation (SWAN). SWAN is a community-based, longitudinal study of midlife women. Women aged between 42 to 52 years were enrolled around 1996/97 and followed annually thereafter. Currently, SWAN data up to the 10th follow up visit are available in a publicly accessible repository managed by ICPSR, at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/00253>. Although there were many other studies of cognitive functioning in midlife, there are

few longitudinal ones, and most of them were based on three or fewer cognition assessments (Karlman et al., 2017). Thus the study of within-person longitudinal declines in cognitive performance in those under 60 years of age is underdeveloped (Hedden and Gabrieli, 2004; Rönnlund et al., 2005). In contrast, the SWAN data contain more follow-ups and a wider age range, which provide a nice opportunity for a longer-term study of women’s midlife health. Particularly, we focus on working memory measurements available from Visits 6 - 10. By pooling all subjects together, the age range under consideration is a span of 15 years: $\mathcal{T} = [48, 62]$. However, with a mixed longitudinal design, the longitudinal follow-ups of each subject in SWAN only capture a small piece of the chronological aging trajectory, and the shape might have complex interaction with age (Rönnlund et al., 2005; Fuh et al., 2006); as we can see from the left panel of Figure 1, the measurements for each subject are only a subset within a period of at most 5 years. Traditional parametric models such as LMM (with age as a between-subject effect, and the time of follow-ups as a within-subject effect) often assume a linear trend over time, but the individual chronological aging trajectories of working memory might have a complex shape. For example, the working memory might improve first and then decline, and the age that the working memory starts to decline varies among subjects. Therefore, we believe that nonparametric modelings such as functional principal component analysis may reveal interesting features.

We particularly consider a mixed longitudinal design for n subjects, where for each subject k , measurements are obtained at times t_{kj} for $k = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, n_k$. We use the notation

$$X_k(t_{kj}) = Z_k(t_{kj}) + \epsilon_{kj}, \quad t_{kj} \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (1)$$

where ϵ_{kj} are zero mean i.i.d. measurement errors that are uncorrelated with all other random components and satisfy $\text{var}(\epsilon_{kj}) = \sigma^2$. $Z(t), t \in \mathcal{T}$ is assumed to be a square-integrable random process with mean and covariance functions $\mu(t)$ and $G(s, t) = \text{Cov}(Z(s), Z(t))$. In a mixed longitudinal design, the observed time points $\{t_{kj}\}_{j=1, \dots, n_k}$ for each subject k are restricted to a subject-specific partial domain. As shown in the right panel of Figure 1, we do not have the within-subject correlation information for any two points that are more than 5 years apart in the SWAN data example. To apply a functional data approach for mixed longitudinal studies, the main methodological challenge is to non-parametrically estimate the covariance structure G of the underlying process.

The estimation of the mean and covariance functions plays fundamentally important roles in functional data analysis. Useful tools such as functional principal component analysis often rely on a consistent covariance function estimation (Yao et al., 2005; Hall and Hosseini-Nasab, 2006; Li and Hsing, 2010). For conventional functional data, where the pooled design (right panel of Figure 1) for covariance is complete, various methods based on kernel smoothing and splines have been proposed (e.g., Rice and Silverman (1991); Yao et al. (2005); Peng and Paul (2009); Xiao et al. (2013)). In some previous studies where the covariance information is incomplete, Fan et al. (2007) considered a semi-parametric covariance estimation where the variance function $G(t, t) = \sigma^2(t)$ is modeled non-parametrically under smoothness conditions, while the off-diagonal correlation structures are assumed to have a parametric form $\rho(s, t, \theta)$. We would like to mention that this problem is different from the banded covariance estimation considered in previous literature such as Bickel and Levina (2008); Cai et al. (2010); Cai and Yuan (2012); Cai et al. (2016) and the references therein since there is no bandable covariance structure in our scenario, though the design pairs are only within a banded area.

We propose to estimate the covariance via a sequential-aggregation scheme (detailed in Section 2). The proposed algorithm is non-iterative, with closed-form solutions and only basic matrix operations (such as matrix multiplication and singular value decomposition) in each step. We prove that under moderate conditions as specified in Section 3, the proposed method can consistently recover the nonparametric covariance structure based on data within a banded area. One key step of the proposed procedure is solving the orthogonal Procrustes's or Wahba's problem (Wahba, 1965), i.e. finding a rotation matrix to best align two sets of points in two different Euclidean coordinate systems. This problem was first motivated by satellite attitude determination, then later applied to many other applications. To theoretically analyze the procedure, we introduce a new error bound for the solution to Wahba's problem (Lemma 1). In the theoretical analysis, we also introduced a series of technical tools on perturbation inequalities of singular subspaces, including Lemmas 3, 5, 7, and 8, which may be of independent interest.

The analysis of fragmentary functional observations have been studied under other modeling assumptions, for example Delaigle and Hall (2013) and Delaigle and Hall (2016). Very recently, two manuscripts Descary and Panaretos (2018) and Kneip and Liebl (2017) considered covariance estimation and reconstruction from fragmentary functional observations using an optimization

framework. The implementations of both works involve iterations. In particular, Descary and Panaretos (2018) formulates the problem as a non-convex optimization, which aims to minimize the error within the observable diagonal band under rank constraint. Distinct from the previous approaches in the literature, in this paper, we introduce a novel sequential-aggregation approach that provides more explicit solutions and new insights into the covariance estimation problem. We also include numerical comparisons with their method in the simulation section. In addition, this problem is also related to several recent works on high-dimensional covariance estimation with missing values. For example, Loh and Wainwright (2012); Lounici et al. (2014) considered the linear regression or covariance matrix estimation where the observations are missing randomly with a fixed rate, while Kolar and Xing (2012); Cai and Zhang (2016) considered a more general setting that allows a non-random missing pattern, but still requires that each pair of covariates simultaneously appear in a sufficient number of samples. The problem discussed in this paper is distinct from these existing settings since a large portion of covariate pairs will never appear in the same sample (such as the pairs between the earlier and latest observations in the longitudinal studies) by the nature of the design. Bishop and Byron (2014) has studied a similar sequential-aggregation scheme for matrix completion, however, they mainly consider the completion of high-dimensional low rank positive semidefinite matrix in a deterministic setting, while we provide a statistical guarantee for covariance estimation from partially-observed noisy functional data.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. The methodology and algorithm are described in Section 2, followed by theoretical analyses in Section 3. In Section 4, we present a series of numerical experiments, including the application to SWAN data. The proofs are collected in the supplementary materials.

2 Covariance Estimation for Mixed Longitudinal Design

We briefly introduce the notation that will be used throughout the paper. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ or bivariate function G , let $\{\sigma_1(A), \sigma_2(A), \dots\}$ and $\{\sigma_1(G), \sigma_2(G), \dots\}$ be the singular values in non-increasing order. We adapt the R syntax to indicate matrices/functions restricted to the subsets of indices/domains: if $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$, $a \leq b, c \leq d$ are four positive integers, we use

$A_{[a:b,c:d]}$ to denote the submatrix of A formed by its a -th to b -th rows and c -th to d -th columns; “:” alone represents the entire index set, so $A_{[:,1:r]}$ and $A_{[a:b,:]}$ represent the first r columns of A and the $\{a, \dots, b\}$ -th rows of A , respectively; similarly $G_{[\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2]}$ represents function G with domain $\mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2$. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ be the Lebesgue measure of any domain \mathcal{T} . Let $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|$ be the matrix Frobenius norm and operator norms, respectively: $\|A\|_F = \left(\sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} = \left(\sum_i \sigma_i^2(A)\right)^{1/2}$, $\|A\| = \sigma_{\max}(A)$. Denote $I_{r \times r}$ as the r -by- r identity matrix and $\mathbb{O}_{p,r} = \{V : V^\top V = I_{r \times r}\}$ as the set of all p -by- r matrices with orthonormal columns. In particular, the set of all r -by- r orthogonal matrices can be denoted as $\mathbb{O}_r = \mathbb{O}_{r,r}$. Denote $\|G\|_{HS} = \left(\iint |G(s_1, s_2)|^2 ds_1 ds_2\right)^{1/2}$ as the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the bivariate function G . Finally, we use $C, C_0, C_1, c, c_0, \dots$ to represent generic constants, whose exact values may vary from line to line.

Suppose \mathcal{T} is the entire period of interest. Consider an equally spaced grid of time points $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$ on the time domain \mathcal{T} . In a mixed-longitudinal design, suppose \mathcal{T}_k is the observational period for subject k and we observe $X_k(T_k)$ in the contiguous band of the domain \mathcal{T}_k :

$$\mathcal{T}_k \subseteq \mathcal{T}, \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_k)}{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})} = \delta, \quad T_k \subseteq T \cap \mathcal{T}_k = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\} \cap \mathcal{T}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Here, the fraction of observation δ is assumed to be a constant between 0 and 1 and T_k might not be consecutive due to missing values. If T_k is complete with no missing values, the number of observations is d with $\delta = d/p$. Suppose the signal-noise decomposition (1) holds for each observation: $X_k(t_{kj}) = Z_k(t_{kj}) + \epsilon_{kj}$. Let Σ_0 denote the $p \times p$ discretized version of covariance G , i.e., the (i, j) -th entry of Σ_0 equals $\text{Cov}(Z(t_i), Z(t_j)) = G(t_i, t_j)$. We fulfill the estimation of G via the discretized version Σ_0 . Suppose G has approximate rank r . Then, we will also have $\Sigma_0 \approx AA^\top$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ can be regarded as the factors of Σ_0 .

We consider a sequential-aggregation-based algorithm. We first divide \mathcal{T} into a series of overlapping sub-domains, then obtain estimates of A on each sub-domain. Next, we aggregate all estimates on sub-intervals into a full estimate of A . Here, a crucial rotation operation is involved in the aggregation step to ensure that the estimates of A on each sub-domain are aligned. Finally, one can obtain an estimate of Σ_0 from $\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top$, where \tilde{A} is an estimate of A up to a rotation. Then G is recovered by a standard interpolation technique. The detailed steps are described as follows and illustrated in Figure 2. For any sub-index set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$, we use the notation $T(I) = \{t_i : i \in I\}$ and $(X_k)_I = X_k(T(I))$.




Figure 2: Illustration of the procedure

Step 1 For a chosen band parameter b and an increment parameter a satisfying $1 \leq a \leq b - r \leq b \leq d$, we construct the following sub-index set:

$$I_l = \{(l-1)a + 1, \dots, \{(l-1)a + b\} \wedge p\}, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (2)$$

Here $l_{\max} = 1 + \lceil (p-b)/a \rceil$ is the total number of sub-index sets. Each of I_l except the last one contains b indices and the last one contains at most b indices.

Step 2 For $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}$, we search for all samples that have full observations in I_l and denote the set of such samples as J_l :

$$J_l = \{1 \leq k \leq n : T(I_l) \subseteq T_k\}.$$

Then the sample covariance matrix for indices in I_l is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times |I_l|}, \quad \hat{\Sigma}_l &= \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l}) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l})^\top, \\ n_l^* &= |J_l|, \quad \bar{X}_{I_l} = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (X_k)_{I_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Step 2' Alternative to only using the subjects that have full observations in I_l , we can also implement the option that using all the data available for the pair $(I_l(i), I_l(j))$ when computing $\hat{\Sigma}_{l,[ij]}$. This scheme is preferred to Step 2 when large portions of subjects have missing values, i.e., $X_k(T_k)$ are not complete consecutive observations (see Theorem 1 and Remark 4 for more discussions): $\hat{\Sigma}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times |I_l|}, \bar{X}_{I_l} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l|}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_{l,[ij]} &= \frac{\sum_{k: T(I_l(i)), T(I_l(j)) \in T_k} ((X_k)_{I_l(i)} - \bar{X}_{I_l(i)}) ((X_k)_{I_l(j)} - \bar{X}_{I_l(j)})}{(n^*)_{i,j,l}}, \\ n_{i,j,l}^* &= |\{k : T(I_l(i)), T(I_l(j)) \in T_k\}|, \\ \bar{X}_{I_l(i)} &= \frac{\sum_{k: T(I_l(i)), T(I_l(j)) \in T_k} (X_k)_{I_l(i)}}{n_{i,l}^*}, \quad n_{i,l}^* = |\{k : T(I_l(i)) \in T_k\}|. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Step 3 Evaluate the eigenvalue decomposition and the rank- r truncation of $\hat{\Sigma}_l$ as

$$\hat{\Sigma}_l = \hat{U}_l \hat{D}_l \hat{U}_l^\top, \quad \hat{\Sigma}_l^{(r)} = \hat{U}_{l,[:,1:r]} \hat{D}_{l,[1:r,1:r]} \hat{U}_{l,[:,1:r]}^\top. \quad (5)$$

Then for $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}$, we evaluate $\hat{\sigma}_l^2 = (\frac{1}{|I_l| - r} \sum_{i=r+1}^{|I_l|} \hat{D}_{l,[i,i]}) \vee 0$ as the sample variance of the noise and

$$\hat{A}_l = U_{l,[:,1:r]} \{(D_{l,[1:r,1:r]} - \hat{\sigma}_l^2 \cdot I_{r \times r}) \vee 0\}^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times r} \quad (6)$$

as the estimate of A on the sub-domain I_l . Here $I_{r \times r}$ is the r -by- r identity matrix. By these calculations, we expect that $\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top \approx \Sigma_{0,l} = (\Sigma_0)_{[I_l, I_l]}$.

Step 4 We construct a suitable right rotation on \hat{A}_l so that all the pieces can be aligned. Specifically, we first let $\hat{O}_1 = I_{r \times r}$, then calculate \hat{O}_{l+1} sequentially as

$$\hat{O}_{l+1} = \arg \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \left\| (\hat{A}_l)_{[(a+1):b,:]} \hat{O}_l - (\hat{A}_{l+1})_{[1:(b-a),:]} O \right\|_F^2, l = 1, \dots, l_{\max} - 1. \quad (7)$$

Here, the row indices of $(\hat{A}_l)_{[(a+1):b,:]}$ and $(\hat{A}_{l+1})_{[1:(b-a),]}$ both correspond to $[la + 1, (l - 1)a + b] \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$. (7) is actually the orthogonal Procrustes's or Wahba's problem (Wahba, 1965), which can be solved by

$$\hat{O}_{l+1} = \tilde{U} \tilde{V}^\top, \text{ where } \tilde{U} \tilde{\Sigma} \tilde{V}^\top = (\hat{A}_{l+1})_{[1:(b-a),:]}^\top (\hat{A}_l)_{[(a+1):b,:]} \hat{O}_l \text{ is the SVD.} \quad (8)$$

Step 5 In this step, we aggregate all pieces $\hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l$ into one complete factor $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$. For convenience of notation, we “frame” the $|I_l|$ -by- r matrix \hat{A}_l to its original p -by- r factor scale, $\hat{A}_l^* \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$, $\hat{A}_{l,[I_l,:]}^* = \hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l$, and $\hat{A}_{l,[I_l^c,:]}^* = 0$. For $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$, we calculate

$$\tilde{A}_{[i,j]} = \frac{\sum_{l:i \in I_l} \hat{A}_{l,[i,j]}^*}{|\{l : i \in I_l\}|}. \quad (9)$$

Step 6 After the sequential aggregation, we finally estimate Σ_0 by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_0 = \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \quad (10)$$

then linear interpolate between grid points to obtain \hat{G} (Press et al., 1992, Chapter 3.6). Some smoothing instead of linear interpolation might be useful in data applications for smoother results and better visualization.

Computation and Tuning Parameters: In summary, the proposed algorithm is non-iterative with only basic matrix calculations such as matrix multiplications and SVD, which can be implemented efficiently. The algorithm need the input of a , b , and the rank r . According to our simulation studies in Section 4, the performance of the method is not very sensitive to the selection of a and b . In numerical implementation, we suggest to select b to be slightly smaller than bandwidth d and select a to be a small increment (in practice $a = 0.1 \times d$ usually provides

good enough result). In the following, we describe the random sub-sampling cross-validation method (Picard and Cook, 1984) to select the rank r .

We first randomly split n observations $\{X_k(T_k)\}_{k=1}^n$ into the training and testing groups of sizes $n_1 \approx \frac{(K-1)n}{K}$ and $n_2 \approx \frac{n}{K}$ for T times. For the t -th split, let $J_{\text{train}}^{(t)}$ and $J_{\text{test}}^{(t)}$ be the index sets for training and testing groups, respectively. For each $r \in \{1, \dots, b-a\}$, we apply the proposed procedure on the training dataset $\{X_k(T_k)\}_{k \in J_{\text{train}}^{(t)}}$ and denote the outcome as $\hat{\Sigma}^{(t)}(r)$. Then we calculate the sample covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ based on the samples from the testing group,

$$(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}^{(t)})_{[i,j]} = \begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{k \in J_{\text{test}}^{(t)} \\ T_k \ni T(i), T(j)}} (X_{ik} - \bar{X}_i)(X_{jk} - \bar{X}_j) / \sum_{\substack{k \in J_{\text{test}}^{(t)} \\ T_k \ni T(i), T(j)}} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{\substack{k \in J_{\text{test}}^{(t)} \\ T_k \ni T(i), T(j)}} 1 \geq n_0, \\ \text{NA}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where n_0 is the lower threshold in evaluating testing sample covariance matrix. Then we evaluate the prediction error as

$$E(r) = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}^{(t)})_{[i,j]} \neq \text{NA}} \left((\hat{\Sigma}^{(t)}(r))_{[i,j]} - (\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}^{(t)})_{[i,j]} \right)^2.$$

Here to improve accuracy, we only evaluate the prediction errors on those (i, j) pairs where $(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}^{(t)})_{[i,j]}$ is evaluated based on at least n_0 samples. Finally, we choose $\hat{r} = \arg \min_{1 \leq r \leq b-a} E(r)$ and apply the proposed procedure with \hat{r} to obtain the final estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_0$. In our simulations, we used $K = 5$, $T = 10$ and $n_0 = 4$, and other cross-validation methods are expected to yield similar results.

In practice, we propose to use the cross-validation method because this usually prevents under-selection. We observed a slight over-selection of r in simulations, but over-selection is not a problem for covariance estimation as the components (eigenvalues) beyond r are all assumed to be very small. The numerical performance of the proposed procedure based on cross-validation and the effect of tuning parameters will be further investigated in Section 4.

3 Theoretical Analysis

Before presenting the main theoretical results, we first introduce the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. *There is a positive integer r such that the eigenvalues of G satisfy $\lambda_1(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r(G) > \lambda_{r+1}(G) \geq \dots \geq 0$. Let $G^{(r)}$ be the best rank- r approximation for G and $G^{(-r)} = G - G^{(r)}$. We also assume $\|G\|_{HS} < \infty$, $\|G^{(-r)}\|_{HS} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n^*}}$, where n^* is the effective sample size defined later in Theorem 1.*

The rank r is allowed to increase slowly as n and p grow. The (approximate) reduced rank covariance structure has been explored by James et al. (2000) and Peng and Paul (2009) for sparse functional data, where only a few irregularly (randomly) spaced observations are available on each subject. They view the rank restriction as a form of regularization to avoid over-parametrization. The same reasoning applies to our scenario, as only a fraction of trajectories are observed for each subject.

Assumption 2. *For any contiguous subdomain $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, we define $G_{[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}]}^{(r)} = G^{(r)}(s, t)_{s \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, t \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}}$. There exists a constant $0 < \kappa < \delta$ such that*

$$\gamma = \max_{\frac{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})}{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})} \geq \kappa} \left\{ \text{tr}(G) \frac{\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})}{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})} / \lambda_r \left(G_{[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}]}^{(r)} \right) \right\} \text{ satisfies } \gamma = o((n^*)^{1/2}).$$

Intuitively speaking, this assumption imposes a lower bound of C/γ on the r -th eigenvalues of $G_{[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}]}$. It essentially ensures that G restricted on different contiguous subdomain $[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}]$ is non-singular, so that the estimation of G only through segments of functional observations is possible. For a counter-example, if G have two ‘‘spikes’’ in the sense that only $G_{[0.0.2, 0.0.2]}$ and $G_{[0.8:1, 0.8:1]}$ have significant amplitudes, while $G_{[0.2:0.8, 0.2:0.8]}$ is zero. Then the estimation of the cross-covariance parts $G_{[0.0.2, 0.8:1]}$ and $G_{[0.8:1, 0.0.2]}$ is impossible when one can only observe functional segments of length no more than 0.6. In addition, γ is allowed to increase moderately as n and p grow. Note that $\gamma \geq r$ and in the scenarios that γ/r is big, the method using complete observations only (step 2) is better than step 2’.

Assumption 3. *Assume X satisfies moment condition $\sup_t \mathbb{E}|X(t)|^4 \leq C$.*

Assumption 4. *There exists $L > 0$ such that $|G(s, t) - G(s', t')| \leq L \max(|s - s'|, |t - t'|)$, $\forall s, s', t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Since we used sample covariance approach and interpolate between observed grid points, Lipschitz condition is almost necessary. It is easy to satisfy as we work with a finite domain \mathcal{T} , and is weaker than second differentiable conditions usually used in smoothing methods.

We can now state the main results of this paper.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1-4 hold. We take $b = \beta p, a = \alpha p$ for some constants $0 < \alpha < \beta \leq \delta < 1$. Assume $\beta - \alpha \geq \kappa \geq 2r/p$ (κ and r were defined in the assumptions), $n \geq Cp, p \geq C\gamma$, then the proposed procedure yields*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{G} - G\|_{HS} = O\left(\sqrt{\gamma^2/n^*} + p^{-1}\right). \quad (11)$$

Here, $n^* = \min_l n_l^*$ and n_l^* is defined in (3), if we use complete samples to calculate $\hat{\Sigma}_l$ via (3) of Step 2; $n^* = \min_{i,j,l} n_{i,j,l}^*$ and $n_{i,j,l}^*$ is defined in (4), if we use both complete and incomplete samples to calculate $\hat{\Sigma}_l$ by (4) of Step 2'.

Remark 1. The first error term in (11) is due to estimating errors of the discretized covariance Σ_0 . The second error term p^{-1} is from the linear interpolation of the discretized Σ_0 .

Remark 2. Theorem 1 provides theoretical guarantees for the proposed procedure under general mixed longitudinal designs (conditional on T_k), where the effective sample size, i.e., n^* , is driven by the minimum number of samples that cover each sub-interval I_l . In a balanced design where $T_k \subseteq T(\{w_k, \dots, w_k + d - 1\})$ with w_k evenly chosen from $\{1, \dots, p - d + 1\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, the boundary sub-intervals I_1 and $I_{l_{\max}}$ will have less effective sample size than the middle ones, which will yield a higher estimation error for the boundary part of G . To overcome such the bottleneck, we recommend a boundary-enriched design: beyond the balanced design as mentioned above, we include $n_a = cn$ additional ones with $T_k = T(\{1, \dots, d\})$ or $T(\{p - d + 1, \dots, p\})$ for a small constant $0 \leq c \leq 1$. Alternatively, one can apply an extended-domain design: for each $k = 1, \dots, n$, $T_k = T(\{w_k, \dots, w_k + d - 1\}) \cup T(\{1, \dots, p\})$ with w_k uniformly chosen from $\{(2 - d), \dots, p\}$. Under both the boundary-enriched and extended-domain designs, the result of Theorem 1 yields (11).

Remark 3 (Proof sketch of Theorem 1). After introducing a series of notation, we develop error bounds for \hat{A}_l (the outcome of Step 3), \hat{O}_l (the outcome of Step 4), \tilde{A} (the outcome of Step 5), then $\hat{\Sigma}_0$ and the final estimator \hat{G} (the outcome of Step 6). In particular, Step 4 of the proposed procedure involves solving the orthogonal Procrustes problem (or Wahba's problem) (7). To derive the error bound of \hat{O}_l from the error bound of \hat{A}_l , we introduce the following key Lemma 1 that provides a theoretical guarantee for the solution of (7). In addition, Lemma 1 is

stronger than the previous results (c. f., (Bishop and Byron, 2014, Lemma 16)), which may be of independent interest.

Lemma 1 (Perturbation bound for Wahba's problem). *Suppose $A_1, A_2, A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}$, $O_1, O_2 \in \mathbb{O}_r$, $\|A_1 - AO_1\|_F \leq a_1$, $\|A_2 - AO_2\|_F \leq a_2$, $\sigma_r(A) \geq \lambda$. Suppose \hat{O} is the solution to Wahba's problem,*

$$\hat{O} = \arg \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|A_2 O - A_1\|_F,$$

or equivalently $\hat{O} = UV^\top$, if $A_2^\top A_1 = U\Sigma V^\top$ is the SVD.

Then \hat{O} satisfies

$$\|\hat{O} - O_2^\top O_1\|_F \leq \frac{2(a_1 + a_2)}{\lambda}. \quad (12)$$

The next Proposition 1 provides a sharper convergence rate when Step 2 is applied (with only complete pieces) and the random scores are sub-Gaussian distributed.

Proposition 1. *Suppose $Z(t) = \mu(t) + \sum_{k \geq 1} \xi_k \phi_k(t)$ is the Karhunen-Loève decomposition, where $\{\phi_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is the fixed eigen-function and $\{\xi_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ are random scores. In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 1, we further assume the normalized leading r scores, $\tilde{\xi} = \{\xi_k / \lambda_k^{1/2}(G)\}_{k=1}^r$, is sub-Gaussian distributed such that $\mathbb{E} \exp(t \tilde{\xi}^\top u) \leq \exp(C\|u\|_2^2)$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^r$, the tail part $Z^{(-r)}(t) = \sum_{k \geq r+1} \xi_k \phi_k(t)$ satisfies $\sup_t \mathbb{E}|Z^{(-r)}(t)|^4 \leq Cr/(n^* \gamma)$, and the noise satisfies $(\mathbb{E}|\epsilon|^4)^{1/2} \leq Cr/\gamma$. Then the proposed procedure with Step 2 yields the following rate of convergence,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{G} - G\|_{HS} = O\left(\sqrt{r\gamma/n^*} + p^{-1}\right). \quad (13)$$

Here, $n^* = \min_l n_l^*$ and n_l^* is defined in (3).

Remark 4. We briefly compare the convergence rates of step 2 and step 2'. First, n^* when using complete sample is no greater than that of using both complete and incomplete subjects. On the other hand, the factor γ^2 in (11) is greater than $r\gamma$ in the counterpart of (13). This is because the \hat{A}_l calculated via the standard sample covariance matrix as in Step 2 possesses sharper convergence rate than the one calculated via extended sample covariance matrix as in Step 2', as demonstrated by Lemma 7. Therefore, there is a trade off between using Steps 2 or 2'. Generally speaking, we recommend using Step 2' when most subjects are with noncontiguous observations (missing values); otherwise Step 2 is preferred.

4 Numerical Experiments

Simulations: In this section, we investigate the numerical performance for the proposed procedure by a series of simulation studies. For each setting, we generate $X_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^K \xi_{ik} \phi_k(t_{ij}) + \epsilon_{ij}$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and t_{ij} are equally spaced p values on $[0, 1]$. We observe a contiguous ($\delta = d/p$) portion of trajectory for each subject. All simulation results are based on 100 repetitions.

The first simulation setting is designed to assess the basic performance of the proposed method and explore the choices of tuning parameters. Particularly, we set $p = 30$, the true rank $K = 3$ and the eigenfunctions $\{\phi_k(t)\}$ as linear combinations of $M = 10$ cubic B-splines with equally spaced knots as visualized in Figure 3. The random scores $\{\xi_{ik}\}$ are i.i.d normal with variances $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = (4^2, 3^2, 2^2)$. The errors ϵ_{ij} are i.i.d normal with variance 1. We let the length of observation band $d = 10$, so that each observation band covers one-third (d/p) of the total domain. We further let each contiguous subset of length d be observable by $n_{rep} = \{10, 20, 50\}$ subjects, which means the total sample size $n = n_{rep} \times (p - d + 1) = 210, 420, 1050$. We apply the proposed method in Section 2 with the rank r selected by cross-validation as described in Section 2, and report relative estimation errors for different choices of tuning parameters b and a in Table 1. Here, the relative estimation error in all simulation settings is defined as $\|\hat{G} - G\|_{HS} / \|G\|_{HS}$. We can see that the estimation error decreases as sample size increases, and the performance is not sensitive to the values of (b, a) as long as b is slightly smaller than bandwidth d and a is small. The cross-validation of the proposed method tends to slightly over-select r , but over-selection does not affect much the RMSE of covariance estimation in our simulation settings. In the following simulations, we always use bandwidth $b = \lceil 0.7 \cdot d \rceil$ and incremental parameter $a = \lceil 0.1 \cdot d \rceil$.

The second simulation setting further explores the performance under different settings. Particularly, let $p = 30$ and the fraction of observable domain $\delta = \{1/5, 1/3, 1/2\}$. In addition to the previous setting with $K = 3$, we also consider another one such that $K = 10$, the score variances $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{10}) = (4^2, 3^2, 2^2, 2^{-4}, \dots, 2^{-10})$, ϕ_1, ϕ_2, ϕ_3 are the same as previous settings, and $\phi_k(t) = \sqrt{2} \sin(k\pi t)$ for $k = 4, \dots, 10$ (and all 10 functions are orthonormalized). Similarly to the first simulation setting, we implement the proposed procedure with r selected by cross-




Figure 3: The first three eigenfunctions used in the simulations to generate the data.

Table 1: Results for simulation 1: the average relative error over 100 simulations are shown, with the standard error in parentheses. Here a and b are different choices of tuning parameters, and the results are stable.

	$n_{rep} = 10$	$n_{rep} = 20$	$n_{rep} = 50$
$b = 7, a = 1$	0.324 (0.17)	0.224 (0.14)	0.123 (0.06)
$b = 7, a = 2$	0.325 (0.16)	0.221 (0.13)	0.132 (0.1)
$b = 8, a = 1$	0.314 (0.17)	0.23 (0.14)	0.13 (0.09)
$b = 8, a = 2$	0.364 (0.17)	0.292 (0.19)	0.126 (0.08)
$b = 9, a = 1$	0.326 (0.16)	0.227 (0.15)	0.119 (0.07)
$b = 9, a = 2$	0.347 (0.15)	0.214 (0.11)	0.145 (0.11)

validation, $b = \lceil 0.7 \cdot d \rceil$ and $a = \lceil 0.1 \cdot d \rceil$, then report the results in Table 2. We can see that the proposed procedure still performs well when there are moderate deviations to the reduced-rank structure. The estimation error decreases as the observed partial trajectory covers a larger fraction of the entire trajectory. It is worth mentioning that the selected rank r for the cases $K = 10$ increases as sample size increases, with an average value $r = 4.25$ for $d/p = 1/3$ and $n_{rep} = 50$.

The third simulation explores the performance when there are further missing values within the observable fraction of the domain. The setting is the same as in the first simulation, except that the data have 5%, 10% or 15% missing rate. The same as the previous two simulations, we implement the proposed procedure with r selected by cross-validation, $b = \lceil 0.7 \cdot d \rceil$ and

Table 2: Results for simulation 2: the average relative error over 100 simulations are shown, with the standard error in parentheses. Here K is the total number of eigenfunctions used to generate the covariance and δ denotes the fraction of domains observed.

	$K = 3$			$K = 10$		
	$n_{rep} = 10$	$n_{rep} = 20$	$n_{rep} = 50$	$n_{rep} = 10$	$n_{rep} = 20$	$n_{rep} = 50$
$\delta = 1/5$	0.43 (0.17)	0.397 (0.2)	0.294 (0.21)	0.461 (0.16)	0.403 (0.18)	0.304 (0.19)
$\delta = 1/3$	0.341 (0.17)	0.237 (0.16)	0.135 (0.1)	0.322 (0.16)	0.248 (0.14)	0.143 (0.06)
$\delta = 1/2$	0.243 (0.11)	0.17 (0.07)	0.113 (0.05)	0.248 (0.1)	0.165 (0.05)	0.114 (0.04)

$a = \lceil 0.1 \cdot d \rceil$, then report the results in Table 3. We can see that the proposed procedure performs reasonably well when there are moderate amount of missing values, and the performance improves as sample size goes large.

Table 3: Results for simulation 3: the average relative error over 100 simulations are shown, with the standard error in parentheses. Here “missing” is the percentage of missing values within the observed domain.

missing	$n_{rep} = 10$	$n_{rep} = 20$	$n_{rep} = 50$	$n_{rep} = 100$
5%	0.36 (0.14)	0.24 (0.12)	0.16 (0.07)	0.12 (0.06)
10%	0.39 (0.16)	0.29 (0.13)	0.19 (0.08)	0.13 (0.05)
15%	0.42 (0.13)	0.32 (0.13)	0.22 (0.1)	0.16 (0.06)

The fourth simulation compares the performance of the proposed method with the matrix completion method proposed in Descary and Panaretos (2018). The data generating procedure is the same as the one in previous simulations. The matrix completion method is implemented using the Matlab code downloaded from authors’ website. The method requires an input of rank r , and they propose using a scree-plot to manually determine the rank (looking for an ‘elbow’ in the plot). Since this approach is not feasible in simulation settings, we use the true rank r in this simulation setting for both methods. The results are reported in Table 4. The relative performance depends on the fraction of domain observed. For $\delta = 1/2$, both methods work fine, and the matrix completion method is slightly better in a small sample size ($n_{rep} = 10$). For $\delta = 1/3$, both methods work fine, the proposed method is slightly better in larger sample sizes. For $\delta = 1/5$, neither of the methods work well for a small sample size ($n_{rep} = 10$), although

the error for the matrix completion method is not as large as for the proposed method. When n increases, the error of the proposed method decreases to a reasonably small level; the matrix completion method is less satisfactory in this case.

Table 4: Results for simulation 4: the average relative error over 200 simulations are shown, with the standard error in parentheses. Here “MatComp” is the matrix completion method proposed in Descary and Panaretos (2018), and δ denotes the fraction of domains observed.

		$n_{rep} = 10$	$n_{rep} = 20$	$n_{rep} = 50$	$n_{rep} = 100$
$\delta = 1/5$	proposed	0.37 (0.11)	0.27 (0.09)	0.17 (0.06)	0.12 (0.04)
	MatComp	0.32 (0.06)	0.27 (0.04)	0.23 (0.02)	0.22 (0.02)
$\delta = 1/3$	proposed	0.26 (0.10)	0.2 (0.06)	0.12 (0.04)	0.08 (0.03)
	MatComp	0.29 (0.08)	0.2 (0.05)	0.14 (0.03)	0.11 (0.02)
$\delta = 1/2$	proposed	0.26 (0.11)	0.18 (0.07)	0.12 (0.05)	0.08 (0.03)
	MatComp	0.24 (0.08)	0.17 (0.05)	0.11 (0.03)	0.08 (0.02)

Application to midlife women’s working memory study: We downloaded the data from SWAN database (link: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/00253>). The study examines the physical, biological, psychological and social health of women during their middle years. In this section, we focus on the measurement of working memory, i.e., the ability to manipulate information held in memory. In this study, working memory was assessed by digit span backwards (DSB) (Corporation, 1997): participants repeat strings of single-digit numbers backwards, with 2 trials at each string length, increasing from 2 to 7, stopped after errors in both trials at a string length, and scored as the number of correct trials (range, 0-12). The testing was first administered at the 4th follow-up to 2709 women, and repeated in 6th and subsequent visits. The data up to the 10th visit are publicly available. We exclude those subjects who had dropped out before the 10th follow-up visit, leaving us a sample size of $n = 2016$. Following previous literature, we did not use the first measurement to alleviate the practice effect on testing results (Karlman et al., 2017). Instead, we focused on the age range $\mathcal{T} = [48, 62]$. Each subject has up to five years of consecutive data, and the average number of follow-ups is 3.3. We applied the proposed method as described in Section 2 to estimate the covariance function, using a rank $r = 3$ selected by cross-validation, a band parameter $b = 4$ and an increment parameter $a = 1$.




Figure 4: Left: The estimated covariance surface of the working memory data for women aged between 48 to 62. Right: The estimated mean function and the estimated eigenfunctions corresponding to the largest three modes of variation, where the dashed lines are 95% bootstrap simultaneous confidence bands.

The estimated covariance surface is shown in the left panel of Figure 4. We can see that the variance is bigger at the middle part around age 55.

The nonparametric covariance estimation serves as a stepping stone for further functional data analysis. In the following, we perform functional principal component analysis for the working memory trajectories and examine how the shape of trajectories depends on education (less than high school, high school, some college/technical school, college graduate, postgraduate), controlling for race (Black, Chinese, Japanese, Caucasian/White Non-Hispanic, Hispanic) and difficulty paying for basics (no hardship, somewhat hard, very hard). These are just for illustration of the functional data methods, and a thorough analysis for this complex data set is beyond the scope of this paper.

Given the estimated covariance, we conducted functional principal component analysis based on Karhunen-Loève expansion $Z(t) = \mu(t) + \sum_j \xi_j \phi_j(t)$. Here $\{\phi_j(t), j \geq 1\}$ is an orthonormal basis which consists of eigenfunctions of G , and $\{\xi_j = \int (Z(t) - \mu(t)) \phi_j(t) dt : j \geq 1\}$ are (random) scores. Intuitively, the first K terms expansion, $\mu(t) + \sum_{j=1}^K \xi_j \phi_j(t)$, forms a K -

dimensional representation of $Z(t)$ with the smallest unexplained variance. The smoothed mean function and the first three estimated eigenfunctions $\{\phi_j(t), j = 1, 2, 3\}$ are visualized in the right panel of Figure 4. We also constructed 95% confidence bands for these quantities using the nonparametric bootstrap method as outlined in Hall and Hosseini-Nasab (2006). Best linear prediction methods as used in Yao et al. (2005) were applied to obtain estimates of ξ_j .

The mean function shows that working memory function for a middle-age woman is, on average, decreasing as one gets older. With longitudinal declines on average, there are individual differences in working memory aging and possible improvements in performance over multiple years. The first eigenfunction $\phi_1(t)$ is close to a horizontal line. Therefore $\phi_1(t)$ can be interpreted as a size component: subjects with positive score in the direction of this eigenfunction have better working memory function than an average woman for all ages between 48-62. Regression analysis show that this component is significantly positively correlated with education level, which means that people with higher education tend to have higher working memory scores over the entire period. The other two covariates, financial status and race, are also statistically significant. The second eigenfunction $\phi_2(t)$ has a reversed U-shape with the maximum at around age = 55. This can be interpreted as a contrast of changing pattern before and after Age 55, which possibly relates to the menopausal transition, resilience and compensatory mechanisms (Fuh et al., 2006; Greendale et al., 2009; Hahn and Lachman, 2015). Subjects with positive score in the direction of this eigenfunction have an increase in working memory before Age 55 and a fast decline after Age 55. Regression analysis show that education is a significant factor, with the post graduate education group having a more prominent reversed U-shape pattern. The other two covariates are not statistically significant. The third component $\phi_3(t)$ crosses the zero line around Age 55, representing a complementary effect to the second component.

This functional data analysis perspective differs from traditional linear mixed effect models, because the modes of variation for individual chronological aging trajectories are extracted non-parametrically from the data (FPC components), and one can examine how the shape of the trajectories interacts with other covariates. In comparison, traditional linear mixed effect models (Karamangla et al., 2017) often control these covariates as fixed main effects.

5 Discussions

In this paper, we focused on data observed on a regular equally-spaced grid; while the proposed sequential aggregating method can be readily extended to the setting where the observational times are irregular and random. Adjustments need to be made to step 2. Especially, the sample covariance estimate for Σ_l in step 2 is not applicable if data is irregularly observed. One can first adopt a bivariate local linear smoothing method (Yao et al., 2005) to estimate the covariance on the observable part (the diagonal banded area), say $\tilde{G}(s, t)$, for $|s - t| < \delta$. Then for each piece l , take the corresponding sub-piece from $\tilde{G}(s, t)$, evaluate that on a pre-defined regular grid I_l , use that as $\hat{\Sigma}_l$. All other steps remain the same.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank the editor and two anonymous referees for their helpful comments, which greatly help improve the presentation of this paper.

References

- Berger, M. P. (1986). A comparison of efficiencies of longitudinal, mixed longitudinal, and cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 11(3):171–181.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008). Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 199–227.
- Bishop, W. E. and Byron, M. Y. (2014). Deterministic symmetric positive semidefinite matrix completion. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2762–2770.
- Cai, T. T., Ren, Z., and Zhou, H. H. (2016). Estimating structured high-dimensional covariance and precision matrices: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):1–59.
- Cai, T. T. and Yuan, M. (2012). Adaptive covariance matrix estimation through block thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(4):2014–2042.

- Cai, T. T. and Zhang, A. (2016). Minimax rate-optimal estimation of high-dimensional covariance matrices with incomplete data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 150:55–74.
- Cai, T. T., Zhang, C.-H., and Zhou, H. H. (2010). Optimal rates of convergence for covariance matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(4):2118–2144.
- Corporation, P. (1997). Wais-iii and wms-iii: Technical manual. *San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation/Harcourt Brace*.
- Delaigle, A. and Hall, P. (2013). Classification using censored functional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(504):1269–1283.
- Delaigle, A. and Hall, P. (2016). Approximating fragmented functional data by segments of markov chains. *Biometrika*, 103(4):779–799.
- Descary, M.-H. and Panaretos, V. M. (2018). Recovering covariance from functional fragments. *Biometrika*, 106(1):145–160.
- Fan, J., Huang, T., and Li, R. (2007). Analysis of longitudinal data with semiparametric estimation of covariance function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(478):632–641.
- Fan, K. (1950). On a theorem of weyl concerning eigenvalues of linear transformations ii. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1):31–35.
- Fuh, J.-L., Wang, S.-J., Lee, S.-J., Lu, S.-R., and Juang, K.-D. (2006). A longitudinal study of cognition change during early menopausal transition in a rural community. *Maturitas*, 53(4):447–453.
- Greendale, G., Huang, M., Wight, R., Seeman, T., Luetters, C., Avis, N., Johnston, J., and Karlamangla, A. (2009). Effects of the menopause transition and hormone use on cognitive performance in midlife women. *Neurology*, 72(21):1850–1857.
- Hahn, E. A. and Lachman, M. E. (2015). Everyday experiences of memory problems and control: The adaptive role of selective optimization with compensation in the context of memory decline. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 22(1):25–41.
- Hall, P. and Hosseini-Nasab, M. (2006). On properties of functional principal components analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(1):109–126.

- Hedden, T. and Gabrieli, J. D. (2004). Insights into the ageing mind: a view from cognitive neuroscience. *Nature reviews neuroscience*, 5(2):87–96.
- Helms, R. W. (1992). Intentionally incomplete longitudinal designs: I. methodology and comparison of some full span designs. *Statistics in medicine*, 11(14-15):1889–1913.
- James, G. M., Hastie, T. J., and Sugar, C. A. (2000). Principal component models for sparse functional data. *Biometrika*, 87(3):587–602.
- Karlamangla, A. S., Lachman, M. E., Han, W., Huang, M., and Greendale, G. A. (2017). Evidence for cognitive aging in midlife women: Study of women’s health across the nation. *PloS one*, 12(1):e0169008.
- Kneip, A. and Liebl, D. (2017). On the optimal reconstruction of partially observed functional data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10099*.
- Kolar, M. and Xing, E. P. (2012). Consistent covariance selection from data with missing values. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-12)*, pages 551–558.
- Li, Y. and Hsing, T. (2010). Uniform convergence rates for nonparametric regression and principal component analysis in functional/longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3321–3351.
- Loh, P.-L. and Wainwright, M. J. (2012). High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1637–1664.
- Lounici, K. et al. (2014). High-dimensional covariance matrix estimation with missing observations. *Bernoulli*, 20(3):1029–1058.
- Peng, J. and Paul, D. (2009). A geometric approach to maximum likelihood estimation of the functional principal components from sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 18(4):995–1015.
- Picard, R. R. and Cook, R. D. (1984). Cross-validation of regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(387):575–583.

- Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T., and Flannery, B. P. (1992). *Numerical Recipes in C (2Nd Ed.): The Art of Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.
- Rice, J. A. and Silverman, B. W. (1991). Estimating the mean and covariance structure non-parametrically when the data are curves. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 233–243.
- Rönnlund, M., Nyberg, L., Bäckman, L., and Nilsson, L.-G. (2005). Stability, growth, and decline in adult life span development of declarative memory: cross-sectional and longitudinal data from a population-based study. *Psychology and aging*, 20(1):3.
- Vershynin, R. (2010). Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*.
- Wahba, G. (1965). A least squares estimate of satellite attitude. *SIAM review*, 7(3):409–409.
- Weyl, H. (1949). Inequalities between the two kinds of eigenvalues of a linear transformation. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 35(7):408–411.
- Xiao, L., Li, Y., and Ruppert, D. (2013). Fast bivariate p-splines: the sandwich smoother. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 75(3):577–599.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2005). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(470):577–590.

Supplement to “Nonparametric covariance estimation for mixed longitudinal studies, with applications in midlife women’s health”

Anru Zhang and Kehui Chen

Abstract

In this supplement, we provide the proofs for theoretical results of the paper.

A Proof of Theorem 1.

We prove Theorem 1 by steps. Some key technical procedures are postponed to Lemmas 4, 7, and 8.

Step 1 Since we can always rescale the time domain, let $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$ throughout the proof without loss generality. We introduce some notations and prove basic properties in this step. Recall $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$ is a regular grid on \mathcal{T} . Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \text{Cov}((X(t_1), \dots, X(t_p))^\top), & \Sigma_0 &= \text{Cov}((Z(t_1), \dots, Z(t_p))^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \\ \Sigma_l &= \text{Cov}(X_{I_l}), & \Sigma_{0l} &= \text{Cov}(Z_{I_l}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times |I_l|}, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_0 + \sigma^2 I_p, \quad \Sigma_l = \Sigma_{0l} + \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|},$$

Σ_l and Σ_{0l} are submatrices of Σ and Σ_0 ,

$$\Sigma_l = \Sigma_{[I_l, I_l]}, \quad \Sigma_{0l} = (\Sigma_0)_{[I_l, I_l]}, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (15)$$

For each subject k , recall $X_k(T) = (X_k(t_1), \dots, X_k(t_p))^\top$ is the discretization of the sample path X_k . Given $G = G^{(r)} + G^{(-r)}$, we also decompose $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_0^{(r)} + \Sigma_0^{(-r)}$, where $(\Sigma_0^{(r)})_{ij} = G^{(r)}(t_i, t_j)$, $(\Sigma_0^{(-r)})_{ij} = G^{(-r)}(t_i, t_j)$. Suppose the eigenvalue decomposition’s of $\Sigma_0^{(r)}$ and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0^{(r)} &= UDU^\top, \quad U \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}, \quad D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r} \text{ is diagonal}; \\ \Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} &= (\Sigma_0^{(r)})_{[I_l, I_l]}, \quad \Sigma_{0l}^{(-r)} = (\Sigma_0^{(-r)})_{[I_l, I_l]}, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Namely, $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}$ and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(-r)}$ are the submatrices of $\Sigma_0^{(r)}$ and $\Sigma_0^{(-r)}$. Then $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} + \Sigma_{0l}^{(-r)} = \Sigma_{0l}$ and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} = U_{[I_l, :]} D U_{[I_l, :]}^\top$. It is also noteworthy that $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}$ and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(-r)}$ are not necessarily orthogonal, and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}$ is not necessarily the best rank- r approximation of Σ_{0l} . We also define

$$\begin{aligned} A &= U D^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}, \quad A_l = U_{[I_l, :]} D^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times r}, l = 1, \dots, l_{\max} \\ \text{then } \Sigma_0^{(r)} &= A A^\top, \quad \Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} = A_l A_l^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Especially, A and A_l can be seen as the factors of Σ_0 and Σ_{0l} .

Since $G(s_1, s_2)$ is Liptchitz, by Weyl's inequality (Weyl, 1949),

$$|\sigma_j(\Sigma_0)/p - \sigma_j(G)| \leq O(1/p), \quad \forall j; \quad \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F/p \leq C \|G_0^{(-r)}\|_{HS} + O(1/p), \quad (18)$$

$$\|\Sigma_0\| \leq p \cdot \sigma_1(G) + O(1) \leq Cp, \quad (19)$$

$$\|\Sigma_0^{(r)}\|_F \leq \|\Sigma_0\|_F \leq p \cdot \|G\|_{HS} + O(1) \leq Cp. \quad (20)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|X(T)\|_2^4 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p X(T(i))^2 \right)^2 \stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} p \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} X(T(i))^4 \\ &\leq Cp^2 \sup_t \mathbb{E}|X(t)|^4 \leq Cp^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Let $\mathcal{I}_l = [t_{(l-1)a+1} - 1/(2p), \{t_{(l-1)a+b} + 1/(2p)\} \wedge 1]$, then \mathcal{I}_l is the time sub-domain corresponding to the grid indices subset I_l . By the construction of I_l in (2), $I_l \cap I_{l+1} = \{la + 1, \dots, (l-1)a + b\}$, so $|I_l \cap I_{l+1}| = b - a$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1}) \geq \frac{b-a}{p} \geq \kappa$ (introduced in Assumption 2), thus

$$\sigma_r(G_{[\mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1}, \mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1}]}) \geq c/\gamma \cdot \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1})}{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})}$$

based on the assumption. Provided that $p > C\gamma$ for large constant $C > 0$, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r \left(\Sigma_{0, [I_l \cap I_{l+1}, I_l \cap I_{l+1}]}^{(r)} \right) &= \sigma_r \left(G_{[\mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1}, \mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1}]}^{(r)} \right) \cdot p + O(1) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assumption 2}}{\geq} \text{tr}(G)p/\gamma \cdot \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_l \cap \mathcal{I}_{l+1})}{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})} + O(1) \geq cp/\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The constant c here may depend on constant κ . Provided that $\|D\|/p = \sigma_1(\Sigma_0)/p \leq \sigma_1(G) + O(1/p) \leq C$, $A_{[I_l \cap I_{l+1}, :]} A_{[I_l \cap I_{l+1}, :]}^\top = \Sigma_{0, [I_l \cap I_{l+1}, I_l \cap I_{l+1}]}^{(r)}$, we further have

$$\sigma_r(A_{[I_l \cap I_{l+1}, :]}) = \sqrt{\sigma_r \left(\Sigma_{0, [I_l \cap I_{l+1}, I_l \cap I_{l+1}]}^{(r)} \right)} \geq c\sqrt{p/\gamma}, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (23)$$

$$\|A\| \leq \sqrt{\sigma_1(\Sigma_0)} \leq C\sqrt{p}. \quad (24)$$

Step 2 Our aim in this step is to develop a perturbation bound for \hat{A}_l , i.e. to characterize the distance between \hat{A}_l and A_l for each $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}$. Recall $\Delta_l = \|\hat{\Sigma}_l - \Sigma_l\|_F$, $\lambda = \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F$. By Lemma 4 and $b \geq 2r$,

$$\left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - \Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} \right\|_F = \left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - A_l A_l^\top \right\|_F \leq C \left(\Delta_l + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right), l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (25)$$

By Lemma 7, there exists $Q_l \in \mathbb{O}_r$ such that

$$\left\| \hat{A}_l - A_l Q_l \right\|_F \leq \frac{\left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - A_l A_l^\top \right\|_F}{\sqrt{\sigma_r(A_l) \sigma_r(\hat{A}_l)}} \leq \frac{C(\Delta_l + \lambda)}{\sqrt{\sigma_r(A_l) \sigma_r(\hat{A}_l)}} \wedge \sqrt{\|\hat{A}_l\|_F^2 + \|A_l\|_F^2}. \quad (26)$$

We analyze each term in (26) as follows. By (23),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r(A_l) &\geq c\sqrt{p/\gamma}; \\ \sigma_r^2(\hat{A}_l) &= \sigma_r(\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top) \stackrel{(25)}{\geq} \sigma_r(\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}) - C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \\ &\stackrel{(22)}{\geq} cp/\gamma - C(\Delta_l + \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_l\|_F^2 &= \text{tr}(A_l A_l^\top) = \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}) \leq \sqrt{r} \|\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}\|_F \leq \sqrt{r} \|\Sigma_0^{(r)}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(20)}{\leq} \sqrt{r}(p \cdot \|G\|_{HS} + O(1)) \leq Cp\sqrt{r}, \\ \|\hat{A}_l\|_F^2 &= \text{tr}(\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top) \leq \sqrt{r} \|\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top\|_F \stackrel{(25)}{\leq} \sqrt{r} \|\Sigma_{0l}\|_F + C\sqrt{r}(p + \Delta_l + \lambda) \\ &\leq C\sqrt{r}(p + \Delta_l + \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

By combining the previous inequalities, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{A}_l - A_l Q_l \right\|_F &\leq \frac{C(\Delta_l + \lambda)}{\left(\frac{p}{\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{\gamma} - C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \right)_+ \right)^{1/4}} \wedge C \left\{ r^{1/4}(p^{1/2} + \lambda^{1/2} + \Delta_l^{1/2}) \right\} \\ &:= \tilde{\Delta}_l, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}$ and some uniform constant $C > 0$. Here $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Step 3 In this step, we assume (28) hold. Recall \hat{O}_l is calculated sequentially. In this step, we study how the statistical error of \hat{O}_l is accumulated based on (28) in this step. Ideally speaking, \hat{O}_{l+1} can be seen as an estimation of $(Q_{l+1}^\top Q_1 \hat{O}_1)$. Specifically, we aim to show that there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| Q_{l+1} \hat{O}_{l+1} - Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \leq \frac{C\tilde{\Delta}}{\sqrt{p/\gamma}}, \quad l = 0, \dots, l_{\max} - 1. \quad (29)$$

and

$$\left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F \leq C \sqrt{\gamma} \tilde{\Delta}_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}. \quad (30)$$

Here, $\tilde{\Delta} = \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \tilde{\Delta}_l$. First, for each $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max} - 1$, we introduce

$$B_l^{(2)} := (\hat{A}_l)_{[(a+1):b,:]} \cdot \hat{O}_l \in \mathbb{R}^{(b-a) \times r}, \quad B_{l+1}^{(1)} := (\hat{A}_{l+1})_{[1:(b-a),:]} \in \mathbb{R}^{(b-a) \times r}.$$

Essentially, $B_l^{(2)}$ contains the last $(b-a)$ rows of \hat{A}_l after rotation and $B_{l+1}^{(1)}$ contains the first $(b-a)$ rows of \hat{A}_{l+1} before rotation. According to the proposed procedure (7),

$$\hat{O}_{l+1} = \arg \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \left\| B_l^{(2)} - B_{l+1}^{(1)} \cdot O \right\|_F. \quad (31)$$

Since $B_l^{(2)}$ and $B_{l+1}^{(1)}$ are submatrices of \hat{A}_l and \hat{A}_{l+1} respectively, they also satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| B_l^{(2)} - A_{l,[(a+1):b,:]} Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F &= \left\| \hat{A}_{l,[(a+1):b,:]} \hat{O}_l - A_{l,[(a+1):b,:]} Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F = \left\| \hat{A}_l - A_l Q_l \right\|_F \stackrel{(28)}{\leq} \tilde{\Delta}_l. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| B_{l+1}^{(1)} - A_{l+1,[1:(b-a),:]} Q_{l+1} \right\|_F &= \left\| \hat{A}_{l+1,[1:(b-a),:]} - A_{l+1,[1:(b-a),:]} Q_{l+1} \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{A}_{l+1} - A_{l+1} Q_{l+1} \right\|_F \stackrel{(28)}{\leq} \tilde{\Delta}_{l+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

More importantly, $A_{l,[(a+1):b,:]} = A_{l+1,[1:(b-a),:]} = A_{[I_l \cap I_{l+1},:]}$, as they actually represent the same submatrix of A . Then (31)–(33) and Lemma 1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{O}_{l+1} - Q_{l+1}^\top Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F &= \left\| Q_{l+1} \hat{O}_{l+1} - Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{2 \left(\left\| B_l^{(2)} - A_{l,[(a+1):b,:]} Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F + \left\| B_{l+1}^{(1)} - A_{l+1,[1:(b-a),:]} Q_{l+1} \right\|_F \right)}{\sigma_r(A_{I_l \cap I_{l+1}})} \\ &\leq \frac{2(\tilde{\Delta}_l + \tilde{\Delta}_{l+1})}{\sigma_r(A_{[I_l \cap I_{l+1},:]})} \stackrel{(23)}{\leq} \frac{C(\tilde{\Delta}_l + \tilde{\Delta}_{l+1})}{\sqrt{p/\gamma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Recall $\tilde{\Delta} = \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \tilde{\Delta}_l$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| Q_l \hat{O}_l - Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \left\| Q_{k+1} \hat{O}_{k+1} - Q_k \hat{O}_k \right\|_F \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \frac{C(\tilde{\Delta}_k + \tilde{\Delta}_{k+1})}{\sqrt{p/\gamma}} = \frac{C\tilde{\Delta}}{\sqrt{p/\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

which has finished the proof for (29). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \leq \left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_l \hat{O}_l \right\|_F + \left\| A_l Q_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \\
& \leq \left\| \hat{A}_l - A_l Q_l \right\|_F + \|A_l\| \cdot \left\| Q_l \hat{O}_l - Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \\
& \stackrel{(28)(29)}{\leq} \tilde{\Delta}_l + \|\Sigma_{0l}\|^{1/2} \cdot \frac{C\tilde{\Delta}}{\sqrt{p/\gamma}} \stackrel{(19)}{\leq} C\sqrt{\gamma}\tilde{\Delta}
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

for $l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}$, which has finished the proof for (30).

Step 4 In this step, we develop the error bound from sequential aggregation based on (30). Recall

$$\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}, \quad \tilde{A}_{[i,:]} = \frac{\sum_{l:i \in I_l} \hat{A}_{l,[i,:]}}{|\{l : i \in I_l\}|}. \tag{36}$$

The direct way to analyze \tilde{A} is complicated. We instead consider the following half integers between $1/2$ and $p + 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} &= \{.5, a + .5, \dots, (l_{\max} - 1)a + .5\} \\
&\cup \{b + .5, b + a + .5, \dots, b + (l_{\max} - 1)a + .5\},
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and divide the whole index set $\{1, \dots, p\}$ into pieces, say K_1, \dots, K_m , by inserting “bars” with the half integers in (37). For example, when $p = 10, b = 5, a = 3$, then $\mathcal{B} = \{.5, 3.5, 6.5\} \cup \{5.5, 8.5, 11.5\}$, and $\{1, \dots, 10\}$ is divided as the following subsets

$$K_1, \dots, K_5 = \{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6\}, \{7, 8\}, \{9, 10\}.$$

Such a division has two important properties,

- Given $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2l_{\max}$ and $0.5 \in \mathbb{B}$, $\{1, \dots, p\}$ is divided into at most $2l_{\max}$ intervals, so $m \leq 2l_{\max}$.
- For any piece K_s and two indices $i, j \in K_s$, we must have

$$\{l : i \in I_l\} = \{l : j \in I_l\},$$

namely Indices i and j belong to the same set of sub-intervals $\{I_l\}$. Thus, we can further denote $J_{K_s} = \{l : i \in I_l, \forall i \in K_s\}$ as the sub-intervals that covers K_s . Then the following equality holds,

$$\tilde{A}_{[K_s,:]} = \frac{1}{|J_{K_s}|} \sum_{l \in J_{K_s}} \hat{A}_{l,[K_s,:]}. \tag{38}$$

Based on the definition of J_{K_s} , we also know

$$\forall l \in J_{K_s}, \quad K_s \subseteq I_l. \tag{39}$$

Based on these two points, we analyze \tilde{A} on each piece K_s and then aggregate as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{A} - A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F &= \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^m \left\| \tilde{A}_{[K_s, :]} - A_{[K_s, :]} Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F^2} \\ &\stackrel{(38)}{=} \sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^m \left\| \frac{1}{|J_{K_s}|} \sum_{l \in J_{K_s}} \left(\hat{A}_{l, [K_s, :]}^* - A_{l, [K_s, :]} Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right) \right\|_F^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Now for each $s = 1, \dots, m$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{|J_{K_s}|} \sum_{l \in J_{K_s}} \left(\hat{A}_{l, [K_s, :]}^* - A_{l, [K_s, :]} Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right) \right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|J_{K_s}|} \sum_{l \in J_{K_s}} \left\| \left(\hat{A}_{l, [K_s, :]}^* - A_{l, [K_s, :]} Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right) \right\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(39)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|J_{K_s}|} \sum_{l \in J_{K_s}} \left\| \left(\hat{A}_l \hat{O}_l - A_l Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right) \right\|_F \stackrel{(30)}{\leq} C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Combining (40) and (41), we obtain

$$\left\| \tilde{A} - A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \leq C \sqrt{m} \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \leq C l_{\max} \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta}. \quad (42)$$

By definition of l_{\max} , $b/p \leq C l_{\max}^{-1}$, thus $l_{\max} \leq C$. Provided that $\sigma_{\max}(A) = \|\Sigma_0\|$ and $n^* \geq C \gamma^2$ for large constant C ,

$$\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{A}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A Q_1 \hat{O}_1) + \left\| \tilde{A} - A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \right\|_F \stackrel{(42)}{\leq} C p^{1/2} + C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta}.$$

Then the following inequality holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0^{(r)} \right\|_F &= \left\| \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\top - A A^\top \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left\| \tilde{A} \tilde{A}^\top - A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \tilde{A}^\top \right\|_F + \left\| A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \tilde{A}^\top - A Q_1 \hat{O}_1 \hat{O}_1^\top Q_1^\top A^\top \right\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(42)}{\leq} \sigma_{\max}(\tilde{A}^\top) \cdot C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} + \sigma_{\max}(A) \cdot C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \\ &\leq C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \left(C p^{1/2} + C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Given $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_0^{(r)} + \Sigma_0^{(-r)}$ and $\|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \leq \lambda$, in summary, we have proved the upper bound

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \leq C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \left(C p^{1/2} + C \gamma^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} \right) + \lambda = C (\gamma p)^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} + C \gamma \tilde{\Delta}^2 + \lambda.$$

Step 5 It remains to develop the expected error upper bound for $\hat{\Sigma}_0$ and \hat{G} . Recall $\text{Cov}(X_{I_l}) = \Sigma_l$.

If $\hat{\Sigma}_l$ is calculated from complete samples by (3) in Step 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Delta_l^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l}) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l})^\top - \Sigma_l \right\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \left\| ((X_k)_{I_l} - \mu(I_l)) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \mu(I_l))^\top - \Sigma_l \right\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \| (X_k)_{I_l} (X_k)_{I_l}^\top \|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \| X(T) \|_2^4 \stackrel{(21)}{\leq} \frac{Cp^2}{n_l^*}.\end{aligned}\tag{44}$$

Under the incomplete observation scenario (Step 2'), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Delta_l^2 &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{|I_l|} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k: I_l(i), I_l(j) \in T_k} (X_k(I_l(i)) - \bar{X}(I_l(i))) (X_k(I_l(j)) - \bar{X}(I_l(j)))}{(n^*)_{i,j,l}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \Sigma_{l,ij} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{|I_l|} \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ (X(I_l(i)) - \mu(I_l(i))) (X(I_l(j)) - \mu(I_l(j))) - \Sigma_{l,ij} \}^2}{(n^*)_{i,j,l}} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i,j=1}^{|I_l|} \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ X(I_l(i)) \cdot X(I_l(j)) \}^2}{(n^*)_{i,j,l}} \leq C \sum_{i,j=1}^{|I_l|} \frac{\mathbb{E} X(I_l(i))^4 + \mathbb{E} X(I_l(j))^4}{2n_{i,j}^*} \\ &\leq \frac{C|I_l|^2}{n^*} \sup_t \mathbb{E} X(t)^4 \leq \frac{Cp^2}{n^*}.\end{aligned}\tag{45}$$

Now we analyze $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0\|_F$ in two scenarios under the complete sample case (Step 2). The incomplete sample case (Step 2') similarly follows. Recall the definitions of $\tilde{\Delta}_l$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_l = \frac{C(\Delta_l + \lambda)}{\left(\frac{p}{\gamma} \left(\frac{p}{\gamma} - C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \right)_+ \right)^{1/4}} \wedge C \left\{ r^{1/4} (p^{1/2} + \lambda^{1/2} + \Delta_l^{1/2}) \right\}, \tilde{\Delta} = \sum_l \tilde{\Delta}_l.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}B &= \{ p/\gamma - C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \geq p/(2\gamma), \forall l = 1, \dots, l_{\max} \} \\ &= \{ C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \leq p/(2\gamma), \forall l = 1, \dots, l_{\max} \}\end{aligned}\tag{46}$$

be a ‘‘good’’ event. By Markov’s inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(B^c) \leq \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ C(\Delta_l + \lambda) \}^2}{p^2/(2\gamma)^2} \stackrel{(44)(45)}{\leq} \frac{Cl_{\max}p^2/n^*}{p^2/\gamma^2} \leq C\gamma^2/n^*.\tag{47}$$

When B holds, note that $n^* \geq Cp$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \mathbf{1}_B \leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ C(\gamma p)^{1/2} \tilde{\Delta} + Cr \tilde{\Delta}^2 + \lambda \right\} \mathbf{1}_B \\
& \leq C(\gamma p)^{1/2} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \mathbb{E} \frac{(\Delta_l + \lambda)}{(p/\gamma)^{1/2}} + C\gamma \cdot \mathbb{E} \frac{\left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} (\Delta_l + \lambda) \right\}^2}{(p/\gamma)} + \lambda \\
& \leq C\gamma \sqrt{p^2/n^*} + C\gamma p/n^* \leq Cp \sqrt{\gamma^2/n^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

When B^c holds, given $n^* \geq \gamma^2, p \geq \gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \mathbf{1}_{B^c} \leq \mathbb{E} C \left\{ \gamma^{1/4} (p^{1/2} + \lambda^{1/2} + \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \Delta_l^{1/2}) \right\} \mathbf{1}_{B^c} \\
& \leq CP(B^c) \gamma^{1/4} p^{1/2} + \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} C\gamma^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E}(\Delta_l^{1/2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \cdot (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{B^c}^2)^{1/2} \\
& \leq \frac{C\gamma^{9/4} p^{1/2}}{n^*} + Cl_{\max} \gamma^{1/4} \left(p/(n^*)^{1/2} \cdot \gamma^2/n^* \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq \frac{C\gamma^{9/4} p^{1/2}}{n^*} + \frac{C\gamma^{5/4} p^{1/2}}{(n^*)^{3/4}} \leq Cp \sqrt{\gamma^2/n^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \leq Cp \sqrt{\gamma^2/n^*}.$$

Finally, since Σ_0 is a p -by- p linear interpolation for G , we finally have

$$\left\| \hat{G} - G \right\|_{HS} \leq \frac{1}{p} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F + O(p^{-1}) = O(\sqrt{\gamma^2/n^*} + p^{-1}).$$

□

B Proof of Proposition 1

The key of developing a sharper rate for $\hat{\Sigma}$ is on a better estimation bound for $\|\hat{A}_l - A_l O\|_F$, where \hat{A}_l is the estimated factor computed in Step 3 of the proposed procedure. The essence of the sharper bound relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Suppose all conditions in Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 hold. Recall \hat{A}_l is the estimation of the factor of each piece calculated in Step 3 in the proposed procedure. Then there exists a “good event” B_* (defined later in Equation 65) that happens with probability at least $1 - C\gamma r/n^*$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \left\| \hat{A}_l - A_l O \right\|_F^2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{B_* \text{ holds}\}} \leq Cpr/n_l^*, \quad \forall l = 1, \dots, l_{\max}.$$

Proof of Lemma 2. We assume $\mu(t) = 0$ without changing the covariance estimators essentially. Note that the sample covariance $\hat{\Sigma}_l$ is calculated in Step 2 as

$$\hat{\Sigma}_l = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} ((X_k)_{I_l} - (\bar{X})_{I_l}) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l})^\top.$$

The proof of this lemma is divided into steps.

Step 1 We introduce a series of notation in addition to the symbols in the proof of Theorem 1 here. Based on Karhunen-Loève decomposition, the continuous sample trajectory $X_k(t) = Z_k(t) + \epsilon_k(t)$ can be decomposed into three parts: the leading part of signal, the non-leading part of signal, and the noise:

$$X_k(t) = \sum_{j=1}^r \xi_{jk} \phi_j(t) + \sum_{j \geq r+1} \xi_{jk} \phi_j(t) + \epsilon_k(t), \quad k \in J_l. \quad (48)$$

Then, $\lambda_j(G) = \text{Var}(\xi_{kj})$. Let $\bar{\xi}_{jk} = \xi_{jk} / \lambda_j^{1/2}(G)$ be the normalized score. We further define

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\xi}_{11} & \cdots & \bar{\xi}_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \bar{\xi}_{r1} & \cdots & \bar{\xi}_{rn} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}, \quad (49)$$

$$\Phi_l = \begin{bmatrix} (\phi_1)_{I_l(1)} \cdot \lambda_1^{1/2}(G) & \cdots & (\phi_1)_{I_l(1)} \cdot \lambda_r^{1/2}(G) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ (\phi_1)_{I_l(|I_l|)} \cdot \lambda_1^{1/2}(G) & \cdots & (\phi_1)_{I_l(|I_l|)} \cdot \lambda_r^{1/2}(G) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times r}$$

as the matrix of leading scores and the discretized loadings, respectively. Then, Φ_l matches the definition (15) in Theorem 1 as

$$\Phi_l \Phi_l^\top = \Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times |I_l|}. \quad (50)$$

We further let $Z_k^{(-r)}(t) = \sum_{j \geq r+1} \xi_{jk} \phi_j(t)$ be the tail part of sample. By restricting (48) onto the index set I_l , one has

$$\begin{aligned} (X_k)_{I_l} &= \sum_{j=1}^r \xi_{jk} (\phi_j)_{I_l} + \sum_{j \geq r+1} \xi_{jk} (\phi_j)_{I_l} + (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} \\ &= \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} + (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}, \quad k \in J_l. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the proof of Theorem 1, $\text{rank}(\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}) = r$ and

$$\sigma_j^2(\Phi) \stackrel{(50)}{=} \sigma_j(\Sigma_{01}^{(r)}) \stackrel{(22)}{=} p \sigma_j(G_{[\mathcal{I}_l, \mathcal{I}_l]}^{(r)}) + O(1), \quad j = 1, \dots, r,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi\|_F &= (\text{tr}(\Phi\Phi^\top))^{1/2} = \left(\text{tr}(\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)})\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(p \cdot \text{tr}(G_{[I_l, I_l]}^{(r)}) + O(r)\right)^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Assumption 2}}{\leq} Cp^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

In particularly,

$$\sigma_r(\Phi) = \sigma_r(A_l) = \sqrt{\sigma_r(\Sigma_{0, [I_l, I_l]}^{(r)})} \stackrel{(22)}{\geq} c\sqrt{p/\gamma}. \quad (52)$$

Recall the central goal of this proposition is to provide an upper bound for $\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - A_l O\|_F$. One can only show $\min_O \|\hat{A}_l - A_l O\|_F^2 \leq Cp\gamma/n_l^*$ by directly applying Lemma 7 on $\hat{\Sigma}_{0l}$ and $\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}$. Instead, we introduce a ‘‘bridge’’ covariance in this proof

$$\bar{\Sigma}_{0l} = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (\Phi_l S_{[:,k]}) (\Phi_l S_{[:,k]})^\top = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \Phi_l S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top \Phi_l^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times |I_l|}. \quad (53)$$

Let $\bar{A}_l = \Phi_l S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}$. Then for all $Q \in \mathbb{O}_r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - A_l O\|_F &\leq \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \left\{ \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l Q\|_F + \|\bar{A}_l Q - A_l O\|_F \right\} \\ &= \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l Q\|_F + \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\bar{A}_l - A_l O Q^\top\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

By taking the infimum over $Q \in \mathbb{O}_r$, we obtain the following triangle inequality,

$$\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - A_l O\|_F \leq \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l O\|_F + \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\bar{A}_l - A_l O\|_F. \quad (54)$$

In the next two steps, we give upper bounds for $\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\bar{A}_l - A_l O\|_F$ and $\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l O\|_F$, respectively.

Step 2 Since $\text{rank}(S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top / n_l^*) = r$, we can further factorize

$$S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top / n_l^* = F_l F_l^\top$$

for some $F_l \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}) &= \sqrt{\sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top / n_l^*)} = \sigma_{\min}(F_l), \\ \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}) &= \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top / n_l^*)} = \sigma_{\max}(F_l). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose

$$F = U_F \Sigma_F V_F^\top, \quad U_F, V_F \in \mathbb{O}_r, \quad \Sigma_F \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$$

is the singular value decomposition. Since Σ_F is diagonal, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_F - I_{r \times r}\| &\leq \max\{\sigma_{\max}(F_l) - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(F_l)\} \\ &= \max\{\sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}) - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

We set $\bar{A}_l = \Phi_l F_l \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times r}$, then

$$\bar{\Sigma}_{0l} = \Phi_l F_l F_l^\top \Phi_l^\top = \bar{A}_l \bar{A}_l^\top.$$

On the other hand, we also recall that the true factor A_l satisfies

$$A_l A_l^\top = \Sigma_{0l}^{(r)} = \Phi_l \Phi_l^\top. \quad (56)$$

Since $\text{rank}(\Sigma_{0l}^{(r)}) = r$ and both $A_l, \Phi_l \in \mathbb{R}^{|I_l| \times r}$, there exists an orthogonal matrix $V_l \in \mathbb{O}_r$ such that $\Phi_l = A_l V_l$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\bar{A}_l - A_l O\|_F^2 &= \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\Phi_l F_l - \Phi_l V_l^\top O\|_F^2 \\ &= \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\Phi_l U_F \Sigma_F V_F^\top - \Phi_l V_l^\top O\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \|\Phi_l U_F \Sigma_F V_F^\top - \Phi_l V_l^\top V_l U_F V_F^\top\|_F^2 = \|\Phi_l U_F (\Sigma_F - I_{r \times r}) V_F^\top\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \|U_F (\Sigma_F - I) V_F^\top\|^2 \cdot \|\Phi_l\|_F^2 \stackrel{(51)}{\leq} Cp \|\Sigma_F - I\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(55)}{\leq} Cp \max \{ \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} \}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Let $T = \max \{ \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} \}$. Since $(\bar{\xi}_{1k}, \dots, \bar{\xi}_{rk})$ is a sub-Gaussian vector, by random matrix theory (c.f. Theorem 5.39 in Vershynin (2010)),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(T \geq C \sqrt{r/n_l^*} + t \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\max \{ \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l}) / \sqrt{n_l^*} \} \geq C \sqrt{r/n_l^*} + t \right) \\ &\leq 1 - \mathbb{P} \left(1 - C \sqrt{r/n_l^*} - t \leq \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}) \leq \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l} / \sqrt{n_l^*}) \right) \\ &\leq 1 + C \sqrt{r/n_l^*} + t \\ &\leq C \exp(-cn_l^* t^2), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}T^2 &= \int_0^\infty 2t\mathbb{P}(T \geq t)dt \leq \int_0^{C\sqrt{r/n_l^*}} 2t \cdot 1 \cdot dt + \int_{C\sqrt{r/n_l^*}}^\infty 2t\mathbb{P}(T \geq t) dt \\
&\leq Cr/n_l^* + \int_0^\infty 2 \left(t + C\sqrt{r/n_l^*} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(T \geq C\sqrt{r/n_l^*} + t \right) \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty C \left(C\sqrt{r/n_l^*} + t \right) \exp(-cn_l^*t^2)dt \\
&= Cr/n_l^* + C\sqrt{r/n_l^*} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_l^*}} \cdot \int_0^\infty \exp(-ct^2)dt + \int_0^\infty \frac{C}{n_l^*} t \exp(-ct^2)dt \\
&\leq Cr/n_l^*.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\bar{A}_l - A_l O\|_F^2 \\
&\stackrel{(57)}{\leq} Cp \mathbb{E} \max \left\{ \sigma_{\max}(S_{J_l})/\sqrt{n_l^*} - 1, 1 - \sigma_{\min}(S_{J_l})/\sqrt{n_l^*} \right\}^2 \\
&\leq Cp \mathbb{E}T^2 \leq Cpr/n_l^*.
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Step 3 Then we consider $\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l O\|_F$ in this step. We apply Lemma 4 to $\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top$ and $\bar{\Sigma}_{0l} + \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} \right\|_F^2 &\leq C|I_l|/(|I_l| - r) \left(\|\hat{\Sigma}_l - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

By setting $M = \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} = \bar{A}_l \bar{A}_l^\top$, $\hat{M} = \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top$ in Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l O\|_F^2 &\leq \frac{\|\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l}\|_F^2}{\sigma_r(\bar{A}_l)\sigma_r(\hat{A}_l)} \wedge \left(\|\hat{A}_l\|_F^2 + \|\bar{A}_l\|_F^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{C \|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2}{\sigma_r(\bar{A}_l)\sigma_r(\hat{A}_l)} \wedge \left(\|\hat{A}_l\|_F^2 + \|\bar{A}_l\|_F^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Step 4 In this step, we give an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2$. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l}) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l})^\top - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F \\
& = \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (X_k)_{I_l} (X_k)_{I_l}^\top - \bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l}^\top - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} \left(\Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} + (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} \right) \left(\Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} + (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} \right)^\top \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{n_l^*} (\Phi_l S_{[:,k]}) (\Phi_l S_{[:,k]})^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F + \left\| \bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F \\
& \leq 2 \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F + \frac{1}{n_l^*} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F \\
& \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F \\
& \quad + \frac{2}{n_l^*} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} \left(\Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} \right) (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F + \left\| \bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

We analyze each term separately.

- Since $S_{[:,k]}$ and $Z_k^{(-r)}(t)$ correspond to different scores in the Karhunen-Loève decomposition, they must be with mean zero and uncorrelated, which implies that $\mathbb{E} \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} Z_k^{(-r)}(t) = 0$. In addition, $\left\{ \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} Z_k^{(-r)}(t) \right\}$ are i.i.d. for different k . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{(n_l^*)^2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{(n_l^*)^2} \sum_{k \in J_l} \mathbb{E} \left\| \Phi_l S_{[:,k]} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \left\| \Phi_l S_{[:,1]} (Z_1^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left\| \Phi_l S_{[:,1]} \right\|_2^2 \cdot \left\| (Z_1^{(-r)})_{I_l} \right\|_2^2 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{n_l^*} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \Phi_l S_{[:,1]} \right\|_2^4 \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\| (Z_1^{(-r)})_{I_l} \right\|_2^4 \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|(Z_1^{(-r)})_{I_l}\|_2^4 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in I_l} Z_1^{(-r)}(T(I_l(i)))^2 \right)^2 \stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} |I_l| \sum_{i \in I_l} Z_1^{(-r)}(T(I_l(i)))^4 \\
&\leq |I_l|^2 \cdot \sup_t \mathbb{E}(Z_1^{(-r)}(t))^4 \leq Cp^2r/(n^*\gamma),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption of this proposition.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|\Phi_l S_{[:,1]}\|_2^4 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \|X_{I_l} - (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l} - (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \|X_{I_l}\|_2^4 + \|(Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}\|_2^4 + (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 \right) \\
&\leq C |I_l| \left(\sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E} |X(T(I_l(i)))|^4 + \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E} |Z^{(-r)}(T(I_l(i)))|^4 + \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E} |\epsilon(T(I_l(i)))|^4 \right) \\
&\leq C |I_l|^2 \left(\sup_t \mathbb{E} X(t)^4 + \sup_t \mathbb{E} Z^{(-r)}(t)^4 + \mathbb{E} \epsilon^4 \right) \leq Cp^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Provided that $n^* \geq C\gamma^2 \geq Cr\gamma$, we have

$$\frac{1}{(n_l^*)^2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} \Phi_l S_{[k,:]} (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{C}{n_l^*} (p^2r/(n_l^*\gamma) \cdot p^2)^{1/2} \leq \frac{Cp^2r}{\gamma n_l^*}.$$

- With the assumption that $(\mathbb{E} \epsilon^4)^{1/2} \leq Cr/\gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|(\epsilon_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in I_l} \epsilon_k(T(I_l(i)))^2 \right)^2 \stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} |I_l| \cdot \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E} \epsilon_k(T(I_l(i)))^4 \\
&\leq Cp^2(r/\gamma)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

$$\sigma^4 = (\mathbb{E} \epsilon^2)^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \epsilon^4 \leq C(r/\gamma)^2.$$

Given $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_k)_{I_l}(\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{(n_l^*)^2} \sum_{k \in J_l} \mathbb{E} \left\| (\epsilon_k)_{I_l} (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \left\| \epsilon_{I_l} \epsilon_{I_l}^\top - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2}{n_l^*} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \epsilon_{I_l} \epsilon_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 + \left\| \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{2}{n_l^*} (\mathbb{E} \|\epsilon_{I_l}\|_2^4 + \sigma^4 p) \leq \frac{2}{n_l^*} \left(|I_l| \cdot \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E} \epsilon_k(T(I_l(i)))^4 + \sigma^4 p \right) \leq \frac{Cp^2r}{n_l^*\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

- With the assumption that $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}X(t)^4 \leq C$, and $X_k(t) = Z_k(t) + \epsilon_k(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|(Z_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 &\leq C\mathbb{E}\|(X_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 + C\mathbb{E}\|(\epsilon_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i \in I_l} X_k(T(I_l(i)))^2\right)^2 + C\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i \in I_l} \epsilon_k(T(I_l(i)))^2\right)^2 \\
&\stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} C|I_l| \cdot \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E}X_k(T(I_l(i)))^4 + C|I_l| \cdot \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E}\epsilon_k(T(I_l(i)))^4 \\
&\leq C|I_l|^2 \leq Cp^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Given $\mathbb{E}\epsilon_k = 0$, ϵ_k and $(S_k, Z_k^{(-r)}(t))$ are uncorrelated, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}\right) (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top = 0 \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\frac{1}{(n_l^*)^2} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} \left(\Phi_l S_{[:,k]} + (Z_k^{(-r)})_{I_l}\right) (\epsilon_k)_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{n_l^*} \mathbb{E} \left\| (Z_k)_{I_k} \cdot (\epsilon_k)_{I_k}^\top \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{n_l^*} \|(Z_k)_{I_k}\|_2^2 \cdot \|(\epsilon_k)_{I_k}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n_l^*} (\mathbb{E}\|(Z_k)_{I_k}\|_2^4 \cdot \mathbb{E}\|(\epsilon_k)_{I_k}\|_2^4)^{1/2} \\
&\stackrel{(62)(63)}{\leq} \frac{Cp^2r}{n_l^* \gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Given $\mathbb{E}X_k(t) = 0$ and $X_1(t), \dots, X_n(t)$ are independent,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left\| \bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l}^\top \right\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{(n_l^*)^4} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{k \in J_l} (X_k)_{I_l} \right\|_2^4 \leq \frac{C}{(n_l^*)^2} \mathbb{E}\|(X_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 \\
&\leq \frac{C}{(n_l^*)^2} \cdot |I_l| \cdot \sum_{i \in I_l} \mathbb{E}X_k(T(I_l(i)))^4 \leq \frac{C|I_l|^2}{(n_l^*)^2} \leq \frac{Cp^2}{(n_l^*)^2} \leq \frac{Cp^2}{n_l^*} \cdot \frac{r}{\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{Cp^2r}{\gamma n_l^*}. \tag{64}$$

Step 4 In this step, we further introduce the following “good” event,

$$B_* = \left\{ \sigma_r^2(\hat{A}_l) \geq \sigma_r^2(A_l)/4, \sigma_r^2(\bar{A}_l) \geq \sigma_r^2(A_l)/2, \forall 1 \leq l \leq l_{\max} \right\}. \tag{65}$$

Then we develop the upper bound under this good event to finalize the proof. First, we aim to show B_* happens with high chance. By (60), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top - \bar{A}_l \bar{A}_l^\top \right\|_F \leq C \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F \\
&\Rightarrow \sigma_r^2(\hat{A}_l) \geq \sigma_r^2(\bar{A}_l) - C \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|} \right\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition,

$$\sigma_r^2(\bar{A}_l) = \sigma_r \left(\frac{1}{n_l^*} \Phi_l S_{J_l} S_{J_l}^\top \Phi_l^\top \right) \geq \sigma_{\min}^2(\Phi_l) \sigma_r^2(S_{J_l}/\sqrt{n_l}).$$

In addition,

$$\sigma_r^2(A_l) \stackrel{(56)}{=} \sigma_{\min}^2(\Phi_l) \stackrel{(52)}{\geq} cp/\gamma.$$

Thus, B_* holds if the following two conditions hold for some small constant $c > 0$:

$$\forall l, \quad \sigma_r^2(S_{J_l}/\sqrt{n_l}) \geq 1/2, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F \leq cp/\gamma. \quad (66)$$

By Markov's inequality and the sub-Gaussian random matrix tail bound (58),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B_* \text{ holds}) &\geq \mathbb{P}((66) \text{ holds}) \\ &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\exists l, \sigma_r^2(S_{J_l}/\sqrt{n_l}) < 1/2) + \mathbb{P}(\exists l, C\|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F \geq cp/\gamma) \\ &\stackrel{(58)}{\geq} 1 - l_{\max} \exp(-cn_l^*) - l_{\max} \frac{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2}{c(p/\gamma)^2} \\ &\stackrel{(64)}{\geq} 1 - C \exp(-cn^*) - Cr\gamma/n^* \\ &\geq 1 - Cr\gamma/n^*. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

When B_* holds, we must have

$$\sigma_r(A_l), \sigma_r(\bar{A}_l), \sigma_r(\hat{A}_l) \geq c\sqrt{p/\gamma}.$$

By combining (61), (64), and the previous inequality, we have for all $1 \leq l \leq l_{\max}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{A}_l - \bar{A}_l O\|_F^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{B_* \text{ holds}\}} &\leq \frac{C\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2}{\sigma_r(\bar{A}_l)\sigma_r(\hat{A}_l)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{B_* \text{ holds}\}} \\ &\leq \frac{C\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_{0l} - \bar{\Sigma}_{0l} - \sigma^2 I_{|I_l|}\|_F^2}{p/\gamma} \leq \frac{Cpr}{n_l^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Finally, (54), (59), and (68) conclude the statement of this lemma. \square

Now we consider the proof of Proposition 1. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1, we develop an upper bound on the probability of the ‘‘bad case,’’ i.e., B_* does not hold. To this end, we

define $w \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $w_i = |\{l : i \in I_l\}|^{-1}$ as the weight in Equation (9). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Sigma}_0\|_F &\leq \|\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top\|_F = \left\| \text{diag}(w) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \hat{A}_l^* \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \hat{A}_l^* \right)^\top \text{diag}(w) \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \hat{A}_l^* \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \hat{A}_l^* \right)^\top \right\|_F \leq l_{\max} \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \|\hat{A}_l^* (\hat{A}_l^*)^\top\|_F \\ &= l_{\max} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \|\hat{A}_l \hat{A}_l^\top\|_F \stackrel{(6)}{\leq} l_{\max} \sum_{l=1}^{l_{\max}} \|\hat{\Sigma}_l\|_F \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_l\|_F^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l}) ((X_k)_{I_l} - \bar{X}_{I_l})^\top \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} (X_k)_{I_l} (X_k)_{I_l}^\top - \bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l} \right\|_F^2 \\ &\stackrel{\text{Cauchy-Schwarz}}{\leq} \frac{C}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} \mathbb{E}\|(X_k)_{I_l} (X_k)_{I_l}^\top\|_F^2 + C \mathbb{E}\|\bar{X}_{I_l} \bar{X}_{I_l}\|_F^2 \\ &= \frac{C}{n_l^*} \sum_{k \in J_l} \mathbb{E}\|(X_k)_{I_l}\|_2^4 + C \mathbb{E}\|\bar{X}_{I_l}\|_2^4 \stackrel{(63)}{\leq} Cp^2. \\ \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0\|_F^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0\|_F^2 + C \|\Sigma_0\|_F^2 \leq Cp^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0\|_F 1_{B_*^c} &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0\|_F^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}1_{B_*^c}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(67)}{\leq} (Cp^2 \cdot \gamma r/n^*)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to Steps 3 - 5 and based on Lemma 2, one can develop the upper bound for $\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_F$ on the ‘‘good event,’’

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_F \cdot 1_{\{B_* \text{ holds}\}} \leq C \sqrt{p^2 r \gamma / n^*}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_F = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_F 1_{\{B_* \text{ holds}\}} + \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma\|_F 1_{\{B_*^c \text{ holds}\}} \leq C \sqrt{p^2 r \gamma / n^*}.$$

Finally, since Σ_0 is a p -by- p linear interpolation for G , we finally have

$$\left\| \hat{G} - G \right\|_{HS} \leq \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0\|_F + O(p^{-1}) = O(\sqrt{\gamma r / n^*} + p^{-1}),$$

which has finished the proof of Proposition 1. \square

C Technical Lemmas

We collect all technical tools that were used in the main context of this paper in this section. We first provide the proof for Lemma 1, which provides an error bound for Wahba's problem (Wahba, 1965).

Proof of Lemma 1. Based on our assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| A_2 \hat{O} - A_1 \right\|_F \leq \left\| A_2 O_2^\top O_1 - A_1 \right\|_F = \left\| A_2 O_2^\top - A_1 O_1^\top \right\|_F \\ & \leq \left\| A_2 O_2^\top - A \right\|_F + \left\| A_1 O_1^\top - A \right\|_F = \|A_2 - AO_2\|_F + \|A_1 - AO_1\|_F \\ & \leq a_1 + a_2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| A_2 \hat{O} - A_1 \right\|_F \\ & \geq -\|A_1 - AO_1\|_F - \|A_2 \hat{O} - AO_2 \hat{O}\|_F + \|AO_1 - AO_2 \hat{O}\|_F \\ & \geq -a_1 - a_2 + \sigma_{\min}(A) \|O_1 - O_2 \hat{O}\|_F \\ & \geq -a_1 - a_2 + \lambda \|\hat{O} - O_2^\top O_1\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \hat{O} - O_2^\top O_1 \right\|_F \leq \frac{2(a_1 + a_2)}{\lambda}.$$

Finally,

$$\left\| O_2 \hat{O} - I \right\|_F \leq \left\| O_2 \hat{O} - O_1 \right\|_F + \|O_1 - I\|_F \leq \|O_1 - I\|_F + \frac{2(a_1 + a_2)}{\lambda}.$$

□

The following lemma characterizes the least and largest singular value of semi-positive symmetric definite matrix factorization.

Lemma 3. *Suppose a positive semidefinite matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ can be decomposed as $A = HDH^\top$. Here $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is a non-negative diagonal matrix and $H \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ is a general matrix that is not necessarily orthogonal. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\max_i D_{ii} \right) \sigma_r^2(H) \geq \sigma_r(A) \geq \left(\min_i D_{ii} \right) \sigma_r^2(H), \\ & \left(\max_i D_{ii} \right) \|H\|^2 \geq \|A\| \geq \left(\min_i D_{ii} \right) \|H\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3. Suppose the singular value decomposition of H is $H = U_H D_H V_H^\top$, where $U_H \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, $D_H \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is diagonal with non-increasing non-negative entries, $V_H \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\| &= \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} u^\top A u = \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} u^\top H D_H H^\top u \geq \left(U_{H,[:,1]}^\top H \right) D \left(H^\top U_{H,[:,1]} \right) \\ &\geq \sigma_r(D) \cdot \left\| H^\top U_{H,[:,1]} \right\|_2^2 = \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} D_{ii} \cdot \sigma_1^2(H), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\| &= \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} u^\top A u = \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} u^\top H D_H H^\top u \\ &\leq \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} \|u\|_2 \cdot \|H\| \cdot \|D\| \cdot \|H^\top\| \cdot \|u\|_2 = \left(\max_i D_{ii} \right) \|H\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, without loss of generality we assume $D_{rr} = \min_i D_{ii}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r(A) &= \sigma_r \left(U_H \left(D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H \right) U_H^\top \right) = \sigma_r \left(D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H \right) \\ &= \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^r: \|u\|_2=1} u^\top D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H u \leq e_r^\top D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H e_r \\ &\leq \|D\| \cdot \|e_r^\top D_H V_H^\top\|_2^2 = \left(\max_i D_{ii} \right) \sigma_r^2(H), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_r(A) &= \sigma_r \left(U_H \left(D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H \right) U_H^\top \right) = \sigma_r \left(D_H V_H^\top D V_H D_H \right) \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}^2(D_H V_H^\top) \sigma_{\min}(D) = \left(\min_i D_{ii} \right) \sigma_r^2(H). \end{aligned}$$

These have finished the proof for this lemma. \square

Lemma 4. Suppose $\Sigma = \Sigma_0 + \sigma^2 I \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times b}$. Here, Σ_0 is positive semi-definite, $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_0^{(r)} + \Sigma_0^{(-r)}$, $\Sigma_0^{(r)}$ is a rank- r matrix. Suppose $\hat{\Sigma}$ is another rank- r symmetric matrix satisfying $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_F \leq \lambda$. Suppose $\hat{U} \hat{D} \hat{U}^\top$ is the eigenvalue decomposition and

$$\hat{\Sigma}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{U}_{[:,i]} \left\{ (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \vee 0 \right\} (\hat{U}_{[:,i]})^\top, \quad \text{where } \hat{\sigma}^2 = \left(\frac{1}{b-r} \sum_{i=r+1}^b \hat{D}_{ii} \right) \vee 0, \quad (69)$$

then the following inequality holds,

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \leq C \sqrt{b/(b-r)} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right). \quad (70)$$

for uniform constant $C > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Since $\hat{\Sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^b \hat{U}_{[:,i]} \hat{D}_{ii} \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top$ is the eigenvalue decomposition of $\hat{\Sigma}$, we also have the following eigenvalue decomposition for $\hat{\Sigma} - \sigma^2 I_{b \times b}$,

$$\hat{\Sigma} - \sigma^2 I_{b \times b} = \Sigma^{(r)} + \Sigma_0^{(-r)} + (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^b \hat{U}_{[:,i]} (\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2) \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top.$$

Additionally, since $\Sigma_0^{(r)}$ is positive semi-definite, we can write down the eigenvalue decomposition $\Sigma_0^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^r U_{[:,i]} D_{ii} U_{[:,i]}^\top$, where $U \in \mathbb{O}_{b,r}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is non-negative diagonal. By Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2\}_{i=r+1}^b\|_2 &= \left(\sum_{i=r+1}^b (\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^r (\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2 - D_{ii})^2 + \sum_{i=r+1}^b (\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\hat{\Sigma} - \sigma^2 I_{b \times b} - \Sigma_0^{(r)}\|_F = \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)} + \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_F \leq \lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| &= \left| \left(\frac{1}{b-r} \sum_{i=r+1}^b \hat{D}_{ii} \right) \vee 0 - \sigma^2 \right| \leq \left| \left(\frac{1}{b-r} \sum_{i=r+1}^b \hat{D}_{ii} \right) - \sigma^2 \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{b-r} \sum_{i=r+1}^b |\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{b-r}} \left(\sum_{i=r+1}^b (\hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{b-r}} (\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\hat{\Sigma} - \hat{\sigma}^2 I_{b \times b}) - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F &\leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right\|_F + \|\hat{\sigma}^2 I_{b \times b} - \sigma^2 I_{b \times b}\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{b/(b-r)} (\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F) + \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

On the other hand, note that $\hat{\Sigma}_0 - \hat{\sigma}^2 I_{b \times b} = \sum_{i=1}^b \hat{U}_{[:,i]} (\hat{\Sigma}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top$ and $\hat{U}_{[:,1]}, \dots, \hat{U}_{[:,b]}$ are orthonormal, the following inequality holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F &\leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - (\hat{\Sigma} - \hat{\sigma}^2 I_{b \times b}) \right\|_F + \left\| \hat{\Sigma} - \hat{\sigma}^2 I_{b \times b} - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(73)}{\leq} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{U}_{[:,i]} \{(\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \vee 0\} \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top - \sum_{i=r+1}^b \hat{U}_{[:,i]} (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top \right\|_F \\ &\quad + \sqrt{b/(b-r)} (\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{i=1}^r \hat{U}_{[:,i]} \{(\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \vee 0\} \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top - \sum_{i=r+1}^b \hat{U}_{[:,i]} (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \hat{U}_{[:,i]}^\top \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \left\{ \{(\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \vee 0\} - (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \right\}^2 + \sum_{i=r+1}^b \left| \hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2 \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Here, we note that the i -th eigenvalue of Σ satisfies $\lambda_i(\Sigma) = D_{ii} + \sigma^2$, $D_{ii} \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^r \left\{ \left\{ (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \vee 0 \right\} - (\hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2) \right\}^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\{ \left(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \hat{D}_{ii} \right)_+ \right\}^2 \\
& \leq 3 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\{ \left(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2 \right)_+ \right\}^2 + 3 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\{ \left(\sigma^2 - (D_{ii} + \sigma^2) \right)_+ \right\}^2 \\
& \quad + 3 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\{ \left(\lambda_i(\Sigma) - \hat{D}_{ii} \right)_+ \right\}^2 \\
& \stackrel{(72)}{\leq} \frac{3r}{b-r} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right)^2 + 0 + 3 \sum_{i=1}^b \left\{ \lambda_i(\Sigma) - \hat{D}_{ii} \right\}^2 \\
& \stackrel{\text{Lemma 5}}{\leq} \frac{3b}{b-r} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right)^2 + 3 \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_F^2 \leq \frac{3b}{b-r} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right)^2 + 3\lambda^2; \\
& \quad \sum_{r+1 \leq i \leq b} \left| \hat{D}_{ii} - \hat{\sigma}^2 \right|^2 \leq \sum_{r+1 \leq i \leq b} \left\{ 2 \left| \hat{D}_{ii} - \sigma^2 \right|^2 + 2 \left| \sigma^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2 \right|^2 \right\} \\
& \stackrel{(71)(72)}{\leq} 2 \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right)^2 + \frac{2b}{b-r} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_0 - \Sigma_0 \right\|_F \leq C \sqrt{b/(b-r)} \left(\lambda + \|\Sigma_0^{(-r)}\|_F \right).$$

for some uniform constant $C > 0$. \square

Lemma 5. Suppose $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are two symmetric matrices. $\lambda_j(A)$ and $\lambda_j(B)$ represent the j -th eigenvalues of A and B , respectively. Then

$$\|A - B\|_F^2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^d (\lambda_j(A) - \lambda_j(B))^2. \tag{76}$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A - B\|_F^2 &= \text{tr} \left((A - B)^\top (A - B) \right) \\
&= \|A\|_F^2 + \|B\|_F^2 - 2 \text{tr}(A^\top B) = \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j^2(A) + \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j^2(B) - 2 \text{tr}(A^\top B),
\end{aligned}$$

we only need to show

$$\text{tr}(A^\top B) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j(A) \lambda_j(B). \tag{77}$$

Suppose the eigenvalue decomposition of B is $B = UDU^\top$, with $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(B), \dots, \lambda_d(B))$.

Let $U_{\{j\}} = U_{[:,1:j]}$, then

$$B = \sum_{j=1}^d U_{[:,j]} U_{[:,j]}^\top \cdot \lambda_j(B) = \sum_{j=1}^d U_{\{j\}} U_{\{j\}}^\top \cdot (\lambda_j(B) - \lambda_{j+1}(B)),$$

thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A^\top B) &= \sum_{j=1}^d \text{tr} \left(A^\top U_{\{j\}} U_{\{j\}}^\top \right) \cdot (\lambda_j(B) - \lambda_{j+1}(B)) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 6}}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^d \text{tr} \left(\sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i(A) \right) (\lambda_j(B) - \lambda_{j+1}(B)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j(A) \lambda_j(B), \end{aligned}$$

which has finished the proof of this lemma. \square

Lemma 6. *Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is symmetric, $U_{\{j\}} \in \mathbb{O}_{d,j}$, then*

$$\text{tr} \left(A^\top U_{\{j\}} U_{\{j\}}^\top \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i(A)$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Without loss of generality we can assume $A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_d(A))$.

Since $U_{\{j\}} \in \mathbb{O}_{d,j}$, we have

$$0 \leq (U_{\{j\}})_{ii} \leq 1, \quad \sum_{i=1}^d (U_{\{j\}})_{ii} = j,$$

then by rearrangement inequality,

$$\text{tr} \left(A^\top U_{\{j\}} U_{\{j\}}^\top \right) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(A) (U_{\{j\}} U_{\{j\}}^\top)_{ii} \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i(A).$$

\square

The following lemma characterizes the square-root factorization perturbation. The proof involves Abel's summation identity in Lemmas 8 and 9, which is highly non-trivial.

Lemma 7. *Suppose $\hat{M}, M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ are two matrices with the same dimension, then there exists an orthogonal matrix $O \in \mathbb{O}_r$ such that*

$$\left\| \hat{M} - MO \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\|\hat{M}\hat{M}^\top - MM^\top\|_F^2}{\sigma_r(M)\sigma_r(\hat{M})} \wedge \left(\|\hat{M}\|_F^2 + \|M\|_F^2 \right). \quad (78)$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Suppose $M^\top \hat{M}$ has singular value decomposition: $M^\top \hat{M} = U\Sigma V^\top$, where $U_M, V_M \in \mathbb{O}_r$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$. We will show that when $O = UV^\top$ (namely the solution to Wahba's problem), (78) holds.

Define $x_i = \sigma_i(\hat{M})$, $y_i = \sigma_i(M)$, $z_i = \sigma_i(\hat{M}^\top M)$, by Lemma 8, we know

$$x_1 \geq \cdots \geq x_r \geq 0, \quad y_1 \geq \cdots \geq y_r \geq 0, \quad z_1 \geq \cdots \geq z_r \geq 0,$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^s z_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^s x_i y_i$ for all $1 \leq s \leq r$. Then by both inequalities of Lemma 9,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^4 + y_i^4 - 2z_i^2) - \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 + y_i^2 - 2z_i) x_r y_r \\ & \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 y_i^2 - z_i^2) - 2 \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) x_r y_r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{M} - MO \right\|_F^2 = \text{tr} \left(\hat{M} \hat{M}^\top + MM^\top - \hat{M} O^\top M^\top - MO \hat{M}^\top \right) \\ & = \|\hat{M}\|_F^2 + \|M\|_F^2 - 2\text{tr}(O^\top M^\top \hat{M}) = \|\hat{M}\|_F^2 + \|M\|_F^2 - 2\text{tr}(VU^\top U\Sigma V) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\sigma_i^2(\hat{M}) + \sigma_i^2(M) - 2\sigma_i(M^\top \hat{M}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 + y_i^2 - 2z_i); \\ & \left\| \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top - MM^\top \right\|_F^2 \\ & = \text{tr} \left(\hat{M} \hat{M}^\top \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top + MM^\top MM^\top - \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top MM^\top - MM^\top \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top \right) \\ & = \|\hat{M} \hat{M}^\top\|_F^2 + \|MM^\top\|_F^2 - 2\|M^\top \hat{M}\|_F^2 \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\sigma_i^4(\hat{M}) + \sigma_i^4(M) - 2\sigma_i^2(M^\top \hat{M}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^4 + y_i^4 - 2z_i^2), \end{aligned}$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{M} - MO \right\|_F^2 \sigma_r(M) \sigma_r(\hat{M}) = x_r y_r \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 + y_i^2 - 2z_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^4 + y_i^4 - 2z_i^2) \\ & \leq \left\| \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top - MM^\top \right\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \left\| \hat{M} - MO \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\left\| \hat{M} \hat{M}^\top - MM^\top \right\|_F^2}{\sigma_r(M) \sigma_r(\hat{M})}.$$

In addition,

$$\min_O \left\| \hat{M} - MO \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\left\| \hat{M} - IM \right\|_F^2 + \left\| \hat{M} + IM \right\|_F^2 \right) = \|\hat{M}\|_F^2 + \|M\|_F^2.$$

Therefore, we have finished the proof of this lemma. \square

Lemma 8. Suppose $M, \hat{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ are two matrices of the same dimensions, we have the following inequality for Ky Fan s -norm of $M^\top \hat{M}$ (Fan, 1950) for any $s \geq 1$,

$$\|M^\top \hat{M}\|_{k_s} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i(M^\top \hat{M}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i(M) \sigma_i(\hat{M}).$$

Proof of Lemma 8. We first note the following property for Ky Fan norm (Fan, 1950),

$$\|X\|_{k_s} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i(X) = \max_{\substack{U \in \mathbb{O}_{p,s} \\ V \in \mathbb{O}_{r,s}}} \text{tr}(U^\top X V).$$

Let $\hat{M} = U_{\hat{M}} \Sigma_{\hat{M}} V_{\hat{M}}^\top$ be the singular value decomposition, then $(\Sigma_{\hat{M}})_{ii} = \sigma_i(\hat{M})$. Now for any $U, V \in \mathbb{O}_{r,s}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(U^\top M^\top \hat{M} V) &= \text{tr}(U^\top M^\top U_{\hat{M}} \Sigma_{\hat{M}} V_{\hat{M}}^\top V) = \text{tr}(V_{\hat{M}}^\top V U^\top M^\top U_{\hat{M}} \Sigma_{\hat{M}}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r (\Sigma_{\hat{M}})_{ii} (U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}})_{ii} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\hat{M}) (U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}})_{ii} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \left\{ (\sigma_i(\hat{M}) - \sigma_{i+1}(\hat{M})) \sum_{j=1}^i (U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}})_{jj} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the Abel's summation formula¹. Note that $U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}}$ is a s -by- s projection of M , so it has smaller Ky Fan norms than M . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{when } i \leq s, \quad \sum_{j=1}^i (U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}})_{jj} &= \sum_{j=1}^i e_j^\top U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}} e_j \\ &\leq \|U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}}\|_{k_i} \leq \sum_{j=1}^i \sigma_j(M); \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{when } i > s, \quad \sum_{j=1}^i (U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}})_{jj} \leq \|U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}}\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \sigma_j(M).$$

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Summation_by_parts

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} \left(U^\top M^\top \hat{M} V \right) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left\{ \left(\sigma_i(\hat{M}) - \sigma_{i+1}(\hat{M}) \right) \sum_{j=1}^i \left(U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}} \right)_{jj} \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{i=s+1}^r \left\{ \left(\sigma_i(\hat{M}) - \sigma_{i+1}(\hat{M}) \right) \sum_{j=1}^i \left(U_{\hat{M}}^\top M U V^\top V_{\hat{M}} \right)_{jj} \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left\{ \left(\sigma_i(\hat{M}) - \sigma_{i+1}(\hat{M}) \right) \sum_{j=1}^i \sigma_j(M) \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{i=s+1}^r \left\{ \left(\sigma_i(\hat{M}) - \sigma_{i+1}(\hat{M}) \right) \sum_{j=1}^s \sigma_j(M) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^s \sigma_i(\hat{M}) \sigma_i(M),
\end{aligned}$$

since U and V are arbitrarily chosen from $\mathbb{O}_{r,s}$, we have finished the proof for this lemma. \square

Lemma 9. Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^r, \{y_i\}_{i=1}^r, \{z_i\}_{i=1}^r$ are three sequences of non-negative values satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 \geq \cdots \geq x_r \geq 0, \quad y_1 \geq \cdots \geq y_r \geq 0, \quad z_1 \geq \cdots \geq z_r \geq 0; \\
\forall 1 \leq s \leq r, \quad \sum_{i=1}^s x_i y_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^s z_i.
\end{aligned}$$

This means $x_1 y_1 \geq z_1$, $x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 \geq z_1 + z_2$, but not necessarily $x_2 y_2 \geq z_2$. Then, we must have the following two inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 y_i^2 - z_i^2) - \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) x_r y_r \geq 0. \\
x_i^4 + y_i^4 - (x_i^2 + y_i^2) x_r y_r - 2x_i^2 y_i^2 + 2x_i y_i x_r y_r \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq r.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 9. The key to the first inequality is via Abel's summation formula. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 y_i^2 - z_i^2) + \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) x_r y_r - \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 y_i^2 - z_i^2) - \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) x_i y_i \right\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) (x_i y_i - x_r y_r) = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \left\{ (x_i y_i - x_{i+1} y_{i+1}) \sum_{j=1}^i (x_j y_j - z_j) \right\} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

If we let $x_{r+1} = y_{r+1} = z_{r+1} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i^2 y_i^2 - z_i^2) - \sum_{i=1}^r (x_i y_i - z_i) x_i y_i \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^r z_i (x_i y_i - z_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r (z_i - z_{i+1}) \sum_{j=1}^i (x_j y_j - z_j) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By combining the two inequalities above, we have finished the proof for the first part. In addition, by some algebraic calculation we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_i^4 + y_i^4 - (x_i^2 + y_i^2)x_r y_r - 2(x_i^2 y_i^2 - x_i y_i x_r y_r) \\
&= x_i^4 + y_i^4 - (x_i^2 + y_i^2)x_i y_i - 2(x_i^2 y_i^2 - x_i^2 y_i^2) + (x_i^2 + y_i^2 - 2x_i y_i)(x_i y_i - x_r y_r) \\
&= x_i^4 + y_i^4 - x_i^3 y_i - x_i y_i^3 + (x_i - y_i)^2(x_i y_i - x_r y_r) \\
&= (x_i - y_i)^2(x_i^2 + x_i y_i + y_i^2) + (x_i - y_i)^2(x_i y_i - x_r y_r) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have finished the proof for this lemma. \square