

Estimating tail probabilities of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of a Wishart matrix

Yinqiu He^a, Gongjun Xu^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Statistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Abstract

This paper develops an efficient Monte Carlo method to estimate the tail probabilities of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of the Wishart matrix, which plays an important role in multivariate data analysis. The estimator is constructed based on a change-of-measure technique and it is proved to be asymptotically efficient for both the real and complex Wishart matrices. Simulation studies further show the improved performance of the proposed method over existing approaches based on asymptotic approximations, especially when estimating probabilities of rare events.

Keywords: Ratio of largest eigenvalue to trace, Rare events, Wishart matrices, Tracy–Widom distribution

1. Introduction

Consider n independent and identically distributed (iid) p -dimensional observations $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ from a real or complex valued Gaussian distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I_p$. Here σ^2 is an unknown scaling factor and I_p is the $p \times p$ identity matrix. Define the $n \times p$ data matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^\top$, and assume $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$ are the ordered real eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma} = \mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X} / n$, where H denotes the conjugate transpose. Note that if $p > n$, the last $p - n$ of the λ s are zero. Let $U_{n,p}$ be the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace, viz.

$$U_{n,p} = \frac{\lambda_1}{(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p) / \min(n, p)}. \quad (1)$$

We are interested in estimating the rare-event tail probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x) = \Pr(U_{n,p} > x)$, where x is some constant such that $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ is small. Estimating rare-event tail probabilities is often of interest in multivariate data analysis. For instance, in multiple testing problems, it is often needed to evaluate very small p -values for individual test statistics to control the overall false-positive error rate.

The random variable $U_{n,p}$ plays an important role in multivariate statistics when testing the covariance structure. For instance, it has been used to test for equality of the population covariance to a scaled identity matrix, viz.

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \Sigma = \sigma^2 I_p \quad \text{vs.} \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \Sigma \neq \sigma^2 I_p$$

with σ^2 unknown, i.e., the so-called sphericity test; see, e.g., [22]. The test statistic $U_{n,p}$ does not depend on the unknown variance parameter σ^2 and has high detection power against alternative covariance matrices with a low-rank perturbation of the null $\sigma^2 I_p$. In particular, under the alternative of rank-1 perturbation with $\Sigma = hh^\top + \sigma^2 I_p$ for some unknown $h \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and σ^2 , the likelihood ratio test statistic $\mathcal{L}_n = \sup_{h, \sigma^2} f_1(X; h, \sigma^2) / \sup_{\sigma^2} f_0(X; \sigma^2)$ can be written as a monotone function of $U_{n,p}$ and therefore $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ corresponds to the p -value; see, e.g., [4, 22]. Please refer to [17, 22, 24] for more discussion and many other applications.

The exact distribution of $U_{n,p}$ is difficult to compute, especially when estimating rare-event tail probabilities. Note that $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X} / (n\sigma^2)$ follows a Wishart distribution $\mathcal{W}_{\beta,p}(n, I_p/n)$, with $\beta = 1$ for real Gaussian and $\beta = 2$ for

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: yqhe@umich.edu (Yinqiu He), gongjun@umich.edu (Gongjun Xu)

complex Gaussian. So the distribution of $U_{n,p}$ corresponds to that of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of a $\mathcal{W}_{\beta,p}(n, I_p/n)$. However, this distribution is nonstandard and exact formulas based on it typically involve high-dimensional integrals or inverses of Laplace transforms. Numerical evaluation has been studied in [6, 7, 16, 18, 25, 28]. But for high-dimensional data with large p , the computation becomes more challenging, which is notably the case when $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ is small, due to the additional computational cost to control the relative estimation error of $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$.

The asymptotic distribution of $U_{n,p}$ with p and n both going to infinity has also been studied in the literature. It is known that $U_{n,p}$ asymptotically behaves similarly to the largest eigenvalue λ_1 , whose limiting distribution has been studied in [13, 14], and $U_{n,p}$ also asymptotically follows the Tracy–Widom distribution; see, e.g., [4, 23]. That is,

$$\Pr\left(\frac{U_{n,p} - \mu_{n,p}}{\sigma_{n,p}} > x\right) \rightarrow 1 - \mathcal{T}\mathcal{W}_{\beta}(x), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{W}_{\beta}$ denotes the Tracy–Widom distribution of order β , with $\beta = 1$ or 2 for real and complex valued observations, respectively. In particular, for real-valued observations, the centering and scaling constants

$$\mu_{n,p} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{p - \frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 \text{ and } \sigma_{n,p} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sqrt{n - \frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{p - \frac{1}{2}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n - 1/2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p - 1/2}} \right)^{1/3} \quad (3)$$

lead to a convergence rate of the order $O(\min(n, p)^{-2/3})$; see [21]. For the complex case, similar expressions can be found in [15]. Nadler [23] studied the accuracy of the Tracy–Widom approximation for finite values of n and p . He found that the approximation may be inaccurate for small and even moderate values of p when n is large. Therefore, he proposed a correction term to improve the approximation result, which is derived using the Fredholm determinant representation, and he showed that the approximation rate is $o(\min(n, p)^{-2/3})$ when X follows a *complex* Gaussian distribution. In the *real* Gaussian case, which is of interest in many statistical applications, Nadler [23] conjectured that the result also holds. The calculation of the correction term in [23] depends on the second derivative of the non-standard Tracy–Widom distribution, which usually involves a numerical discretization scheme.

Another limitation of the existing methods is that they may become less efficient when estimating small tail probabilities of rare events. This paper aims to address this rare-event estimation problem. In particular, we propose an efficient Monte Carlo method to estimate the exact tail probability of $U_{n,p}$ by utilizing importance sampling. The latter is a commonly used tool to reduce Monte Carlo variance and it has been found helpful to estimate small tail probabilities, especially when the event is rare, in a wide variety of stochastic systems with both light-tailed and heavy-tailed distributions; see, e.g., [2, 3, 5, 11, 19, 20, 26, 29].

An importance sampling algorithm needs to construct an alternative sampling measure (a change of measure) under which the eigenvalues are sampled. Note that it is necessary to normalize the estimator with a Radon–Nikodym derivative to ensure an unbiased estimate. Ideally, one develops a sampling measure so that the event of interest is no longer rare under the sampling measure. The challenge is of course the construction of an appropriate sampling measure, and one common heuristic is to utilize a sampling measure that approximates the conditional distribution of $U_{n,p}$ given the event $\{U_{n,p} > x\}$. This paper proposes a change of measure Q that asymptotically approximates the conditional measure $\Pr(\cdot | U_{n,p} > x)$. We carry out a rigorous analysis of the proposed estimator for $U_{n,p}$ and show that it is asymptotically efficient. Simulation studies show that the proposed method outperforms existing approximation approaches, especially when estimating probabilities of rare events.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose our importance sampling estimator and establish its asymptotic efficiency in Theorem 1. Numerical results are presented in Section 3 to illustrate its performance. We discuss the possibility of generalizing the result to the ratio of the sum of the largest k eigenvalues to the trace of a Wishart matrix in Section 4. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 5.

2. Importance sampling estimation

For ease of discussion, we consider the setting $p \leq n$, $p \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$. When $p > n$, the algorithm and theory are essentially the same up to switching labels of p and n , which is explained in Remark 4. We use the notation β to denote the real Wishart Matrix ($\beta = 1$) and complex Wishart matrix ($\beta = 2$). Since $U_{n,p} = p\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p)$ is invariant to σ^2 , the analysis does not depend on the specific values of σ^2 , and we take σ^2 as follows in order to

simplify the notation and unify the real and complex cases under the same representation, as specified in Eq. (4) below:

- a) When $\beta = 1$, we assume that $\sigma^2 = 1$. That is, the entries of \mathbf{X} are iid $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ are the ordered eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}/n$.
- b) When $\beta = 2$, we assume $\sigma^2 = 2$. We consider the circularly symmetric Gaussian random variable [27], and we write $X = Y + iZ \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ when Y and Z are iid $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/2)$. In the following, we assume that the entries of \mathbf{X} are iid $\mathcal{CN}(0, 2)$, and that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ are the ordered eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$.

As mentioned, e.g., in [9], the p eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0$ are distributed with probability density function

$$f_{n,p,\beta}(\lambda) = C_{n,p,\beta} \prod_{i < j}^p |\lambda_i - \lambda_j|^\beta \prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} e^{-n(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_p)/2}, \quad (4)$$

when $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$, where $C_{n,p,\beta}$ is a normalizing constant given by

$$C_{n,p,\beta} = p! \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\beta np/2} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta/2)}{\Gamma(1 + \beta j/2) \Gamma\{\beta(n-p+j)/2\}}.$$

Then the target probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x) = \Pr(U_{n,p} > x)$ can be written as

$$\alpha_{n,p}(x) = \int_{\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0} \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) f_{n,p,\beta}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) d\lambda_1 \dots d\lambda_p,$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator function. As discussed in the Introduction, direct evaluation of the above p -dimensional integral is computationally challenging, especially when p is relatively large.

This work aims to design an efficient Monte Carlo method to estimate $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$. We first introduce some computational concepts from the rare-event analysis literature, which helps to evaluate the computation efficiency of a Monte Carlo estimator.

Consider an estimator $L_{n,p}(x)$ of a rare-event probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$, which goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We simulate N iid copies of $L_{n,p}(x)$, say $L_{n,p}^{(1)}(x), \dots, L_{n,p}^{(N)}(x)$, and obtain the average estimator $\bar{L}_{n,p}(x) = \{L_{n,p}^{(1)}(x) + \dots + L_{n,p}^{(N)}(x)\}/N$. We want to control the relative error $|\bar{L}_{n,p}(x) - \alpha_{n,p}(x)|/\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ such that for some prescribed $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\Pr\{|\bar{L}_{n,p}(x) - \alpha_{n,p}(x)|/\alpha_{n,p}(x) > \varepsilon\} < \delta.$$

Consider the direct Monte Carlo estimator as an example. The direct Monte Carlo directly generates samples from the density (4) and uses $L_{n,p}(x) = \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x)$. So in each simulation we have a Bernoulli variable with mean $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$. According to the Central Limit theorem, the direct Monte Carlo simulation requires $N = \Theta\{\varepsilon^{-2} \delta^{-1} \alpha_{n,p}(x)^{-1}\}$ iid replicates to achieve the above accuracy, where the notation Θ is defined as follows. For any a_n and b_n depending on n , $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ means that $0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n/b_n| \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n/b_n| < \infty$. This implies that the direct Monte Carlo method becomes inefficient and even infeasible as $\alpha_{n,p}(x) \rightarrow 0$.

A more efficient estimator is the asymptotically efficient estimator; see, e.g., [3, 26]. An unbiased estimator $L_{n,p}(x)$ of $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ is called asymptotically efficient if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln\{\text{var}\{L_{n,p}(x)\}\}/\ln\{\alpha_{n,p}(x)^2\} \geq 1. \quad (5)$$

Note that (5) is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}\{L_{n,p}(x)\}/\alpha_{n,p}(x)^{2-\eta} = 0, \quad (6)$$

for any $\eta > 0$. In addition, since $E(L_{n,p}^2) \geq \text{var}\{L_{n,p}(x)\}$ and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln\{E(L_{n,p}^2)\}/\ln\{\alpha_{n,p}(x)^2\} \leq 1$$

by Hölder's inequality, (5) is also equivalent to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln\{E(L_{n,p}^2)\}/\ln\{\alpha_{n,p}(x)^2\} = 1.$$

When $L_{n,p}(x)$ is asymptotically efficient, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\Pr\{|\bar{L}_{n,p}(x) - \alpha_{n,p}(x)|/\alpha_{n,p}(x) > \varepsilon\} \leq \text{var}\{L_{n,p}(x)\}/\{N\alpha_{n,p}(x)^2\varepsilon^2\},$$

and therefore (6) implies that we only need $N = O\{\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1}\alpha_{n,p}(x)^{-\eta}\}$, for any $\eta > 0$, iid replicates of $L_{n,p}(x)$. Compared with the direct Monte Carlo simulation, efficient estimation substantially reduces the computational cost, especially when $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ is small.

To construct an asymptotically efficient estimator, we use the importance sampling technique, which is an often used method for variance reduction of a Monte Carlo estimator. We use P to denote the probability measure of the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$. The importance sampling estimator is constructed based on the identity

$$\Pr(U_{n,p} > x) = E\{\mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x)\} = E_Q\{\mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) dP/dQ\},$$

where Q is a probability measure such that the Radon–Nikodym derivative dP/dQ is well defined on the set $\{U_{n,p} > x\}$, and we use E and E_Q to denote the expectations under the measures P and Q , respectively. Let $f_{n,p}^Q$ be the density function of the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ under the change of measure Q . Then, the random variable defined by

$$L_{n,p} = \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) f_{n,p}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) / f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$$

is an unbiased estimator of $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ under the measure Q . Therefore, to have $L_{n,p}$ asymptotically efficient, we only need to choose a change of measure Q such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)|} |\ln E_Q\{\mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) f_{n,p}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)^2 / f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)^2\}| \geq 1. \quad (7)$$

To gain insight into the requirement (7), we consider some examples. First consider the direct Monte Carlo with $f_{n,p}^Q = f_{n,p}$; the right-hand side of (7) then equals $1/2$ which is smaller than 1. On the other hand, consider Q to be the conditional probability measure given $U_{n,p} > x$, i.e., $f_{n,p}^Q(\cdot) = f_{n,p}(\cdot) \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) / \alpha_{n,p}(x)$; then the right-hand side of (7) is exactly 1. Note that this change of measure is of no practical use since $L_{n,p}$ depends on the unknown $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$. But if we can find a measure Q that is a good approximation of the conditional probability measure given $U_{n,p} > x$, we would expect (7) to hold and the corresponding estimator $L_{n,p}$ to be efficient. In other words, the asymptotic efficiency criterion requires the change of measure Q to be a good approximation of the conditional distribution of interest.

Following the above argument, we construct the change of measure Q as follows, which is motivated by a recent study of Jiang et al. [12]. These authors studied the tail probability of the largest eigenvalue, i.e., $\Pr(\lambda_1 > px)$ with $p > n$ and proposed a change of measure that approximates the conditional probability measure given $\lambda_1 > px$ in total variation when $p \gg n$. It is known that the asymptotic behaviors of λ_1 and $U_{n,p}$ are closely related. We therefore adapt the change of measure to the current problem of estimating $U_{n,p}$. However, we would like to clarify that the problem of estimating $U_{n,p}$ is different from that in [12] in terms of both theoretical justification and computational implementation, which is further discussed in Remark 3.

Specifically, we propose the following importance sampling estimator.

Algorithm 1. Every iteration in the algorithm contains three steps, as follows:

Step 1 We use the matrix representation of the β -Laguerre ensemble introduced in [9], and generate the matrix $\mathbf{L}_{n-1,p-1,\beta} =$

$\mathbf{B}_{n-1,p-1,\beta} \mathbf{B}_{n-1,p-1,\beta}^\top$, where $\mathbf{B}_{n-1,p-1,\beta}$ is a bidiagonal matrix defined by

$$\mathbf{B}_{n-1,p-1,\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{\beta(n-1)} & & & \\ \chi_{\beta(p-2)} & \chi_{\beta(n-2)} & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \chi_\beta & \chi_{\beta\{n-(p-1)\}} \end{pmatrix}_{(p-1) \times (p-1)}.$$

The notation χ_a denotes the square root of the chi-square distribution with a degrees of freedom, and the diagonal and sub-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{B}_{n-1,p-1,\beta}$ are generated independently. We then compute the corresponding ordered eigenvalues of $\mathbf{L}_{n-1,p-1,\beta}/n$, denoted by $\lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$.

Step 2 Conditional on $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p$, we sample λ_1 from an exponential distribution with density

$$f(\lambda_1) = nre^{-nr(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} \times \mathbf{1}(\lambda_1 > \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2), \quad (8)$$

where $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and r is a rate function such that

$$r = \frac{1}{2} - \beta\gamma \int \frac{1}{\beta x - y} d\sigma_\beta(y) - \frac{1 - \gamma}{2x} \quad (9)$$

with $\gamma = p/n$ and σ_β denotes the probability distribution function of the Marchenko–Pastur law such that

$$\sigma_\beta(ds) = (\beta \times 2\pi\gamma s)^{-1} \sqrt{(s - s_*)(s^* - s)} \mathbf{1}(s \in [s_*, s^*]) ds \quad (10)$$

with $s^* = \beta(\sqrt{\gamma} + 1)^2$ and $s_* = \beta(\sqrt{\gamma} - 1)^2$, and \tilde{x} is a constant depending on n, p, β and x such that

$$\tilde{x} = x \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{L}_{n-1,p-1,\beta}/n)/(p - x).$$

Step 3 Based on the collected values $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$, a corresponding importance sampling estimate can be computed as in (12) below and the value of the estimate is saved.

The three steps above are repeated at every iteration. After the last iteration, the saved sampling estimates from all iterations are averaged to give an unbiased estimate of $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$.

Now we detail how the importance sampling estimate (12) is computed at every iteration of the algorithm. Let Q be the measure induced by combining the above two-step sampling procedure. From [9], under the change of measure Q , the density of $(\lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_p^*) = n(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)/(n - 1)$ is

$$f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_p^*) = C_{n-1,p-1,\beta} \prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq p} |\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*|^\beta \times \prod_{i=2}^p (\lambda_i^*)^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-(n-1) \sum_{i=2}^p \lambda_i^*/2}.$$

This implies that the density function of $(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$ under Q is

$$f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p) = \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^{\beta(n-1)(p-1)/2} C_{n-1,p-1,\beta} \prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq p} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j|^\beta \times \prod_{i=2}^p \lambda_i^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-n \sum_{i=2}^p \lambda_i/2}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore dQ/dP takes the form

$$\frac{f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p) \times nre^{-nr(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} \times \mathbf{1}(\lambda_1 > \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)}{f_{n,p}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)} = \frac{\left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^{\beta(n-1)(p-1)/2} C_{n-1,p-1,\beta} nre^{-nr(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} \times \mathbf{1}(\lambda_1 > \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)}{C_{n,p,\beta} \prod_{i=2}^p (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i) \times \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-n\lambda_1/2}}.$$

The corresponding importance sampling estimate is given by

$$L_{n,p}(x) = \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) dP/dQ, \quad (12)$$

where $U_{n,p}$ is calculated with the sampled $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$ based on Eq. (1).

We claim that for the proposed Algorithm 1, with the choice of r specified in (9), the importance sampling estimator $L_{n,p}(x)$ is asymptotically efficient in estimating the target tail probability. This result is formally stated below and proved in Section 5.

Theorem 1. *When $p/n \rightarrow \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, the estimator $L_{n,p}(x)$ in (12) is an asymptotically efficient estimator of $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ for $x > (\sqrt{\gamma} + 1)^2$.*

Remark 1. Our discussion regarding asymptotic efficiency focuses on the case of estimating rare-event tail probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$, i.e., when $\{U_{n,p} > x\}$ corresponds to a rare event. When $x \leq (\sqrt{\gamma} + 1)^2$, $\{U_{n,p} > x\}$ is not rare, and we can still apply the importance sampling algorithm with a reasonable positive r value as the exponential distribution's rate. However, the theoretical properties of the importance sampling estimator must then be studied under a different framework; this issue is not pursued here.

Remark 2. We explain the Marchenko–Pastur form of (10). When the entries of \mathbf{X} have mean 0 and variance 1 ($\beta = 1$ and 2), the Marchenko–Pastur law for the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$ takes the standard form

$$f(d\bar{s}) = (2\pi\gamma\bar{s})^{-1} \sqrt{(\bar{s}_+ - \bar{s})(\bar{s} - \bar{s}_-)} \mathbf{1}(\bar{s} \in [\bar{s}_-, \bar{s}_+]) d\bar{s} \quad (13)$$

with $\bar{s}_- = (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})^2$ and $\bar{s}_+ = (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2$; see, e.g., Theorem 3.2 in [24]. For the setting considered of this paper, the real case ($\beta = 1$) has $\sigma^2 = 1$, so (10) and (13) are consistent. In contrast, the complex case ($\beta = 2$) has $\sigma^2 = 2$ and therefore (10) and (13) are different up to a factor of $\beta = 2$. Specifically, let $(\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_p)$ and $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ be eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$ when \mathbf{X} has iid entries of $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{CN}(0, 2)$, respectively. Then we know that $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) \sim 2(\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_p)$ and (13) implies the empirical distribution in (10).

Remark 3. We discuss the differences between the proposed method and the method in [12] on the largest eigenvalue, which also employs an importance sampling technique. First, the two methods have different targets, i.e., $\Pr(\lambda_1 > x)$ in [12] and $\Pr(U_{n,p} > x)$ here, and therefore use different changes of measure to construct efficient importance sampling estimators. As discussed in Section 2, in order to achieve asymptotic efficiency, the change of measures should approximate the target conditional distribution measures, i.e., $\Pr(\cdot \mid \lambda_1 > x)$ in [12] and $\Pr(\cdot \mid U_{n,p} > x)$ in this paper. Due to the difference between the two conditional distributions, different changes of measure are constructed in the two methods. Specifically, Jiang et al. [12] sample the largest eigenvalue λ_1 from a truncated exponential distribution depending on the second largest eigenvalue λ_2 , while the present work samples λ_1 from an exponential distribution depending on eigenvalues $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p$. Second, the proof techniques of the main asymptotic results in the two papers are also different. In particular, to show the asymptotic efficiency of the importance sampling estimators as defined in (5), we need to derive asymptotic approximations for both the rare-event probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ and the second moments of the importance sampling estimator $E_Q\{L_{n,p}^2(x)\}$. Even though the largest eigenvalue λ_1 and the ratio statistic $U_{n,p}$ have similar large deviation approximation results for their tail probabilities, the asymptotic approximations for the second moments of the importance sampling estimators are different due to the differences between the considered changes of measure as well as the effect of the trace term in $U_{n,p}$. Please refer to the proof for more details.

Remark 4. The method and the theoretical results can be easily extended from the case $p \leq n$ to the case $p \geq n$ by switching the labels of n and p and changing γ to $1/\gamma$ correspondingly. Note that when $p \geq n$, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$ and $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/p$ give the same test statistic $U_{n,p}$ as defined in (1), which is because $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H$ have the same set of nonzero eigenvalues and $U_{n,p}$ is scale invariant. By symmetry, when $p \geq n$, the joint density function of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/p$ have the same form as (4), except that the labels of n and p are switched. Therefore, the cases when $p \leq n$ and $p \geq n$ are equivalent up to the label switching. Note that after p/n is changed to n/p , γ becomes $1/\gamma$ correspondingly.

3. Numerical study

We conducted numerical studies to evaluate the performance of our algorithm. We first took combinations $(n, p) \in \{(100, 10), (100, 20), (500, 20), (1000, 50)\}$, and $\beta = 1$ and 2 , respectively. Then we compared our algorithm with other methods and present the results in Table 1 and 2.

For the proposed importance sampling estimator, we repeated $N_{IS} = 10^4$ times and show the estimated probabilities (“ EST_{IS} ” column) along with the estimated standard deviations of $L_{n,p}$, i.e., $\sqrt{\text{Var}^Q(L_{n,p})}$ (“ SD_{IS} ” column). The ratios between estimated standard deviations and estimates (“ SD_{IS}/EST_{IS} ” column) reflect the efficiency of the algorithms. Note that with $N_{IS} = 10^4$ replications, the standard error of the estimate is $SD_{IS}/\sqrt{N_{IS}} = SD_{IS}/100$.

In addition, three alternative methods were considered, namely the direct Monte Carlo, the Tracy–Widom distribution approximation, and the corrected Tracy–Widom approximation [23]. We computed direct Monte Carlo estimates (“ EST_{DMC} ” column) with $N_{DMC} = 10^6$ independent replications. We present the standard deviation of direct Monte Carlo estimates (“ SD_{DMC} ” column) and the ratios between estimated standard deviations and estimates (“ SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} ”). In addition, we used the approximation of Tracy–Widom distribution (“ TW ” column) specified in Eq. (2). The $TW(x)$ is computed from the RMTstat package in R. Furthermore, following [23], we computed the Tracy–Widom approximation with correction term (“ $c.TW$ ” column), viz.

$$\Pr\left(\frac{U - \mu_{n,p}}{\sigma_{n,p}} > x\right) \approx 1 - \mathcal{T}\mathcal{W}_\beta(x) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2}{np}\right)\left(\frac{\mu_{n,p}}{\sigma_{n,p}}\right)^2 \mathcal{T}\mathcal{W}_\beta''(x), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{W}''(x)$ is computed numerically via a standard central differencing scheme with $\Delta x = 10^{-3}$. When $\beta = 1$, μ and σ is chosen according to Eq. (3). When $\beta = 2$, μ and σ is chosen according to [15].

We can see from Tables 1 and 2 that the Tracy–Widom distribution (“ TW ” column) significantly overestimates the tail probabilities for all considered settings and the finding is consistent with that in [23]. Furthermore, the corrected Tracy–Widom approximation (“ $c.TW$ ” column) underestimates the tail probability $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ and goes to a negative number as $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ becomes small.

Since the proposed importance sampling and the direct Monte Carlo method are both unbiased estimators, next we compare their computational efficiency. As discussed in Section 2, for the average estimator $\bar{L}_{n,p}(x) = \{L_{n,p}^{(1)}(x) + \dots + L_{n,p}^{(N)}(x)\}/N$, “ SD_{IS}/EST_{IS} ” and “ SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} ” can be used as a measure of the computational efficiency in terms of iteration numbers. From the results in Tables 1 and 2, as $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ decreases, “ SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} ” grows quickly and even becomes not available. In contrast, “ SD_{IS}/EST_{IS} ” increases slowly and is generally smaller than “ SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} ”, showing that the proposed importance sampling is more efficient than the direct Monte Carlo method.

As a further illustration, we compared the iteration numbers N_{IS} and N_{DMC} that would be needed to achieve the same level of relative standard errors of the estimators. Specifically, in order to have the same ratios of the standard errors to the estimates, i.e., $SE_{IS}/EST_{IS} = (SD_{IS}/\sqrt{N_{IS}})/EST_{IS}$ and $SE_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} = (SD_{DMC}/\sqrt{N_{DMC}})/EST_{DMC}$, obtained under the importance sampling and direct Monte Carlo, respectively, we need

$$\frac{N_{DMC}}{N_{IS}} = \frac{(SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC})^2}{(SD_{IS}/EST_{IS})^2}. \quad (15)$$

Based on the above equation, the simulation results show that to have a similar standard error obtained under the importance sampling, the direct Monte Carlo method needs more iterations as $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ goes small. For example, from Table 1, when $n = 100$, $p = 10$ and $x = 2.1$, we need N_{DMC} to be approximately 4.3×10^2 times larger than N_{IS} ; when $n = 1000$, $p = 50$ and $x = 1.62$, we need N_{DMC} to be about 1.3×10^4 times larger.

Besides the iteration numbers, we compared the average time cost of each iteration under the importance sampling and the direct Monte Carlo method, respectively. For the direct Monte Carlo, two methods were considered in computing the eigenvalues. The first method directly computes the test statistic $U_{n,p}$ using the eigen-decomposition of a randomly sampled Wishart matrix. The second method computes the eigenvalues from the tridiagonal representation form as in Step 1 of Algorithm 1. We ran 10^4 iterations for all the methods and report the average time of one iteration in Table 3, where the first method of the direct Monte Carlo is denoted as $T_{DMC,1}$, the second method is denoted as $T_{DMC,2}$, and the importance sampling method is denoted as T_{IS} . The simulation results show that $T_{DMC,1}$ has the

Table 1: Estimation Results for $\beta = 1$.(a) $n = 100, p = 10$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1.80 | 2.44e-2 | 1.25e-1 | 5.14 | 2.46e-2 | 1.55e-1 | 6.30 | 2.58e-2 | 5.07e-2 |
| 1.95 | 1.02e-3 | 5.00e-3 | 4.89 | 1.08e-3 | 3.28e-2 | 30.46 | 3.90e-4 | 4.37e-3 |
| 1.98 | 5.32e-4 | 3.55e-3 | 6.66 | 5.57e-4 | 2.36e-2 | 42.36 | 4.96e-6 | 2.48e-3 |
| 2.10 | 2.43e-5 | 2.48e-4 | 10.22 | 2.20e-5 | 4.69e-3 | 213.20 | -7.46e-5 | 2.07e-4 |
| 2.30 | 5.25e-8 | 7.72e-7 | 14.71 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 0 | 0 |

(b) $n = 100, p = 20$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 2.10 | 9.14e-2 | 3.73e-1 | 4.09 | 8.99e-2 | 2.86e-1 | 3.18 | 9.29e-2 | 1.21e-1 |
| 2.30 | 2.86e-3 | 2.04e-2 | 7.13 | 2.71e-3 | 5.20e-2 | 19.19 | 2.31e-3 | 6.09e-3 |
| 2.40 | 3.44e-4 | 2.60e-3 | 7.54 | 3.11e-4 | 1.76e-2 | 56.70 | 1.54e-4 | 9.07e-4 |
| 2.50 | 2.89e-5 | 2.01e-4 | 6.95 | 2.60e-5 | 5.10e-3 | 196.11 | -6.13e-6 | 1.05e-4 |
| 2.70 | 1.50e-7 | 1.78e-6 | 11.85 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 0 | 0 |

(c) $n = 500, p = 20$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1.46 | 4.64e-2 | 2.21e-1 | 4.76 | 4.68e-2 | 2.11e-1 | 4.51 | 4.87e-2 | 6.51e-2 |
| 1.51 | 3.98e-3 | 2.16e-2 | 5.43 | 3.70e-3 | 6.07e-2 | 16.40 | 3.70e-3 | 7.03e-3 |
| 1.56 | 1.57e-4 | 7.13e-4 | 4.54 | 1.55e-4 | 1.24e-2 | 80.32 | 1.28e-4 | 4.40e-4 |
| 1.62 | 2.14e-6 | 1.49e-5 | 6.97 | 3.00e-6 | 1.73e-3 | 577.35 | -1.87e-6 | 6.71e-6 |
| 1.70 | 2.43e-9 | 2.72e-8 | 11.20 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 0 | 0 |

(d) $n = 1000, p = 50$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1.52 | 2.75e-2 | 1.29e-1 | 4.70 | 2.90e-2 | 1.68e-1 | 5.78 | 2.96e-2 | 3.59e-2 |
| 1.55 | 2.51e-3 | 1.16e-2 | 4.63 | 2.57e-3 | 5.06e-2 | 19.71 | 2.53e-3 | 7.98e-4 |
| 1.60 | 1.41e-5 | 5.25e-5 | 3.72 | 2.20e-5 | 4.69e-3 | 213.20 | 1.15e-5 | 3.25e-5 |
| 1.62 | 1.40e-6 | 8.70e-6 | 6.21 | 2.00e-6 | 1.41e-3 | 707.11 | -7.93e-7 | 6.71e-6 |
| 1.66 | 7.49e-9 | 3.69e-8 | 4.93 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 0 | 0 |

Table 2: Estimation Results for $\beta = 2$.(a) $n = 100, p = 10$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1.77 | 3.72e-3 | 3.34e-2 | 8.98 | 3.79e-3 | 6.15e-2 | 16.21 | 2.20e-3 | 1.26e-2 |
| 1.81 | 9.21e-4 | 1.32e-2 | 14.34 | 8.97e-4 | 2.99e-2 | 33.37 | -1.36e-4 | 4.42e-3 |
| 1.91 | 1.89e-5 | 3.28e-4 | 17.37 | 1.70e-5 | 4.12e-3 | 242.53 | -1.22e-4 | 2.11e-4 |
| 1.93 | 6.68e-6 | 8.44e-5 | 12.64 | 4.00e-6 | 2.00e-3 | 500 | -7.44e-5 | 1.07e-4 |
| 1.99 | 2.98e-7 | 4.25e-6 | 14.27 | 0 | 0 | NaN | -1.29e-5 | 1.24e-5 |

(b) $n = 100, p = 20$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 2.10 | 1.20e-2 | 7.99e-2 | 6.68 | 1.45e-2 | 1.20e-1 | 8.23 | 1.41e-2 | 2.70e-2 |
| 2.18 | 1.04e-3 | 7.59e-3 | 7.28 | 1.34e-3 | 3.66e-2 | 27.29 | 8.64e-4 | 3.65e-3 |
| 2.30 | 2.18e-5 | 3.47e-4 | 15.94 | 2.30e-5 | 4.80e-3 | 208.51 | -2.06e-5 | 8.86e-5 |
| 2.38 | 6.73e-7 | 1.94e-5 | 28.86 | 1.00e-6 | 1.00e-3 | 1000 | -2.70e-6 | 4.83e-6 |
| 2.46 | 1.63e-8 | 2.83e-7 | 17.36 | 0 | 0 | NaN | -1.73e-7 | 1.93e-7 |

(c) $n = 500, p = 20$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|-------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| 1.45 | 8.04e-3 | 5.49e-4 | 6.84 | 8.98e-3 | 9.43e-2 | 10.51 | 8.95e-3 | 1.58e-2 |
| 1.48 | 6.56e-4 | 8.02e-3 | 12.22 | 6.49e-4 | 2.55e-2 | 39.24 | 5.07e-4 | 1.59e-3 |
| 1.50 | 8.77e-5 | 1.16e-3 | 13.18 | 8.60e-5 | 9.27e-3 | 107.83 | 3.88e-5 | 2.70e-4 |
| 1.525 | 5.05e-6 | 5.37e-5 | 10.63 | 8.00e-6 | 2.83e-3 | 353.55 | -1.87e-6 | 2.28e-5 |
| 1.55 | 1.85e-7 | 1.71e-6 | 9.28 | 0 | 0 | NaN | -4.66e-7 | 1.49e-6 |

(d) $n = 1000, p = 50$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} | c.TW | TW |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1.51 | 5.85e-3 | 6.67e-2 | 11.39 | 5.20e-3 | 7.19e-2 | 13.83 | 5.31e-3 | 7.46e-3 |
| 1.53 | 2.65e-4 | 1.96e-3 | 7.39 | 3.04e-4 | 1.74e-2 | 57.35 | 2.98e-4 | 5.32e-4 |
| 1.56 | 1.72e-6 | 1.84e-5 | 10.72 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 1.33e-6 | 4.20e-6 |
| 1.58 | 3.15e-8 | 2.86e-7 | 9.10 | 0 | 0 | NaN | 1.46e-8 | 9.85e-8 |
| 1.60 | 4.24e-10 | 3.80e-9 | 8.97 | 0 | 0 | NaN | -6.21e-11 | 1.56e-9 |

highest time cost per iteration, while $T_{DMC,2}$ and T_{IS} are similar.

We further explain the simulation results from the perspective of algorithm complexity. For each iteration, the first direct Monte Carlo method samples a $p \times p$ Wishart matrix and performs its eigen-decomposition, whose cost is typically of the order of $O(p^3)$. The second direct Monte Carlo method and the importance sampling only need to sample $O(p)$ number of chi-square random variables and then decompose a symmetric tridiagonal matrix, at a cost of $O(p^2)$ per iteration [8]. Although the importance sampling also samples from an exponential distribution in Step 2, the distribution parameters can be calculated in advance and it does not affect the overall complexity much. Therefore, the time complexity of the algorithm $T_{DMC,1}$ is higher while $T_{DMC,2}$ and T_{IS} are similar per iteration. Together with the result in (15), we can see that the importance sampling is more efficient than the direct Monte Carlo method in terms of both the iteration number and the overall time cost.

To further check the influence of replication number N_{IS} of the importance sampling algorithm, we focus on the case $(n, p) = (100, 10)$ and compare the performance of different N_{IS} s. In order to obtain accurate reference values of the tail probabilities, we used direct Monte Carlo with repeating time $N_{DMC} = 10^8$ to estimate multiple tail probabilities $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ s ranging from 10^{-2} to 10^{-6} under $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = 2$, respectively. Then we estimated the corresponding $\alpha_{n,p}(x)$ s using our algorithm with $N_{IS} = 10^4, 10^5, 10^6$, respectively.

The results are presented in Figure 1, where the x -axis represents the reference values $\log_{10}(EST_{DMC})$. The line “DMC with error bar” represents the (approximated) pointwise 95% confidence intervals, viz.

$$[\log_{10}(EST_{DMC} - 2 \times SD_{DMC} / \sqrt{N_{DMC}}), \log_{10}(EST_{DMC} + 2 \times SD_{DMC} / \sqrt{N_{DMC}})].$$

Similarly, the line “Importance Sampling with error bar” represents the importance sampling estimates and pointwise 95% confidence intervals, viz.

$$[\log_{10}(EST_{IS} - 2 \times SD_{IS} / \sqrt{N_{IS}}), \log_{10}(EST_{IS} + 2 \times SD_{IS} / \sqrt{N_{IS}})].$$

One can surmise from the figures that the proposed algorithm gives reliable estimates of probabilities as small as 10^{-6} with $N_{IS} = 10^4$, which is more efficient than directed Monte Carlo and more accurate than Tracy–Widom approximations. Furthermore, Figure 1 shows that the algorithm improves as the number of iterations increases. We also plot the Tracy–Widom approximations in (2) and (14) in Figure 1 for comparison.

Figure 1 shows that without correction, the Tracy–Widom distribution in (2) is not accurate and overestimates the probabilities. The correction term in (14) improves the approximation when the probability is larger than the scale of about 10^{-2} , which is consistent with the result in [23]. But when the probability gets smaller, the corrected approximation has larger deviation from true values (on the \log_{10} scale) and even becomes negative. Note that since we cannot plot the \log_{10} of negative numbers in the figures, the lines of the corrected Tracy–Widom approximations appear to be shorter. These results validate the results in Table 1 and 2.

4. Conclusions and extensions

This paper proposes an asymptotically efficient Monte Carlo method to estimate the tail probabilities of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of the Wishart matrix. Theoretically, we prove that the importance sampling estimator is asymptotically efficient. Numerically, we conduct extensive studies to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm compared with other existing methods in terms of estimation accuracy and computational cost in estimating the tail probabilities.

The method can be adapted to estimate tail probabilities of the ratio of the sum of the first k largest eigenvalues to the trace of the Wishart matrix, which is defined as

$$U_{n,p}^k = \frac{\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k}{(\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_p) / \min(p, n)},$$

where k is a fixed positive integer. The algorithm is as follows. First sample $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p$ from $\mathbf{L}_{n-1, p-1, \beta}/n$ using the same method as in Algorithm 1. Second, conditioning on $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p$, sample λ_1 from a truncated exponential

Table 3: Estimation of Time.

(a) $\beta = 1$

| n | p | x | $T_{DMC.1}$ | $T_{DMC.2}$ | T_{IS} |
|------|-----|------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| 100 | 10 | 1.95 | 1.28e-03 | 7.26e-04 | 8.89e-05 |
| 100 | 10 | 1.98 | 1.15e-03 | 9.23e-05 | 8.51e-05 |
| 100 | 20 | 2.3 | 1.58e-03 | 7.35e-05 | 6.84e-05 |
| 100 | 20 | 2.4 | 1.65e-03 | 1.79e-04 | 6.33e-05 |
| 500 | 20 | 1.51 | 1.27e-03 | 9.87e-05 | 9.32e-05 |
| 500 | 20 | 1.56 | 1.67e-03 | 7.39e-05 | 8.82e-05 |
| 1000 | 50 | 1.55 | 3.19e-03 | 1.05e-04 | 1.56e-04 |
| 1000 | 50 | 1.6 | 3.12e-03 | 9.76e-05 | 1.34e-04 |

(b) $\beta = 2$

| n | p | x | $T_{DMC.1}$ | $T_{DMC.2}$ | T_{IS} |
|------|-----|------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| 100 | 10 | 1.77 | 1.87e-03 | 1.75e-04 | 6.08e-05 |
| 100 | 10 | 1.81 | 1.85e-03 | 5.47e-05 | 5.90e-05 |
| 100 | 20 | 2.18 | 2.86e-03 | 8.37e-05 | 1.20e-04 |
| 100 | 20 | 2.3 | 2.69e-03 | 1.11e-04 | 6.69e-05 |
| 500 | 20 | 1.45 | 2.79e-03 | 8.46e-05 | 7.01e-05 |
| 500 | 20 | 1.48 | 3.53e-03 | 7.24e-05 | 8.90e-05 |
| 1000 | 50 | 1.53 | 8.65e-03 | 9.03e-05 | 1.53e-04 |
| 1000 | 50 | 1.56 | 8.35e-03 | 9.61e-05 | 1.49e-04 |

Table 4: $U_{n,p}^k$ Results for $\beta = 1$.(a) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 2$


| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|-----|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 5.9 | 1.14e-03 | 6.70e-03 | 5.89 | 1.55e-03 | 3.93e-02 | 25.41 |
| 6.0 | 3.22e-04 | 3.80e-03 | 11.78 | 2.98e-04 | 1.73e-02 | 57.92 |
| 6.1 | 5.68e-05 | 9.37e-04 | 16.49 | 5.50e-05 | 7.42e-03 | 134.84 |
| 6.4 | 1.09e-07 | 3.21e-06 | 29.50 | 0 | 0 | NaN |

(b) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 3$


| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|-----|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 8.4 | 1.56e-03 | 1.77e-02 | 11.36 | 1.55e-03 | 3.93e-02 | 25.41 |
| 8.5 | 4.22e-04 | 5.48e-03 | 12.98 | 4.04e-04 | 2.01e-02 | 49.74 |
| 8.7 | 1.46e-05 | 2.99e-04 | 20.44 | 1.80e-05 | 4.24e-03 | 235.70 |
| 8.9 | 7.26e-07 | 2.53e-05 | 34.83 | 0 | 0 | NaN |

(c) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 4$


| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 10.6 | 7.60e-03 | 5.65e-02 | 7.43 | 8.01e-03 | 8.91e-02 | 11.13 |
| 10.8 | 6.58e-04 | 6.63e-03 | 10.08 | 8.44e-04 | 2.90e-02 | 34.41 |
| 11.0 | 5.49e-05 | 1.47e-03 | 26.73 | 6.40e-05 | 8.00e-03 | 125.00 |
| 11.3 | 1.70e-07 | 5.56e-06 | 32.77 | 0 | 0 | NaN |




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

Figure 1: Estimation results for $n = 100$ and $p = 10$.

Table 5: $U_{n,p}^k$ Results for $\beta = 2$.

(a) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 2$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|-----|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 5.6 | 4.67e-03 | 3.52e-02 | 7.54 | 5.03e-03 | 7.07e-02 | 14.07 |
| 5.7 | 5.08e-04 | 5.95e-03 | 11.72 | 4.98e-04 | 2.23e-02 | 44.80 |
| 5.8 | 4.75e-05 | 9.55e-04 | 20.12 | 3.80e-05 | 6.16e-03 | 162.23 |
| 6.0 | 7.71e-08 | 2.48e-06 | 32.18 | 0 | 0 | NaN |

(b) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 3$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|-----|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 8.1 | 1.78e-03 | 2.08e-02 | 11.67 | 2.16e-03 | 4.64e-02 | 21.50 |
| 8.2 | 3.67e-04 | 8.31e-03 | 22.67 | 2.90e-04 | 1.70e-02 | 58.71 |
| 8.3 | 1.87e-05 | 3.73e-04 | 19.96 | 2.50e-05 | 5.00e-03 | 200.00 |
| 8.5 | 1.50e-07 | 6.90e-06 | 45.95 | 0 | 0 | NaN |

(c) $n = 100, p = 50, k = 4$

| x | EST _{IS} | SD _{IS} | SD _{IS} /EST _{IS} | EST _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} | SD _{DMC} /EST _{DMC} |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 10.4 | 2.49e-03 | 4.78e-02 | 19.18 | 2.73e-03 | 5.22e-02 | 19.12 |
| 10.5 | 4.27e-04 | 6.15e-03 | 14.40 | 4.42e-04 | 2.10e-02 | 47.55 |
| 10.6 | 5.47e-05 | 1.86e-03 | 34.04 | 6.90e-05 | 8.31e-03 | 120.38 |
| 10.8 | 3.17e-07 | 1.23e-05 | 38.96 | 0 | 0 | NaN |

distribution of the same form as (8), but redefine

$$\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{p-x} \left(x \sum_{i=2}^p \lambda_i - p \sum_{i=2}^k \lambda_i \right)$$

and choose r to be a small constant that depends on the large deviation result of the largest k eigenvalues.

We conducted a numerical study to show the validity and efficiency of the proposed method in estimating the tail probabilities of $U_{n,p}^k$. Following the design in Section 3, the sampling was repeated 10^4 times for the importance sampling method and 10^6 times for the direct Monte Carlo method. The constant k was chosen to be 2, 3, 4, and we took $n = 100$, $p = 50$, and $r = 1/10$. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the results of $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = 2$, which show similar patterns as Tables 1 and 2. When the tail probability becomes smaller, SD_{IS}/EST_{IS} is smaller than SD_{DMC}/EST_{DMC} , which indicates that the importance sampling is more efficient than the direct Monte Carlo method in estimating the tail probabilities, as discussed in Section 3. It would be interesting to study the asymptotic property of this algorithm on estimating the tail probability of $U_{n,p}^k$. However, this would require the development of asymptotic theory on the tail probabilities of the first k largest eigenvalues, which is beyond the scope of this study. We leave it for future work.

5. Proof of Theorem 1

This section provides the proof of Theorem 1 on the estimator's asymptotic efficiency. We focus on the case when $p \leq n$ and $p/n \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, 1]$. For the case of $p \geq n$ and $p/n \rightarrow \gamma \in [1, \infty)$, the proof follows from the same argument by switching the labels of n and p , as shown in Remark 4.

Recall the definition of Q , $L_{n,p} = \mathbf{1}(U_{n,p} > x) dP/dQ$ and $\alpha_{n,p}(x) = \Pr(U_{n,p} > x)$. To prove the asymptotic efficiency defined in (5), we need only show that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)/\{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)\} \geq 1$ since $E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)/\{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)\} \leq \text{var}_Q(L_{n,p}^2)/\{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)\}$. We give an outline of the proof first.

Step 1. We give the asymptotic approximation of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x) = -\gamma I_\beta(\beta x)$, where $I_\beta(\beta x)$ is the large deviation rate function.

Step 2. By the result in Step 1, we only need to prove that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)}{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)}{-2\gamma I_\beta(\beta x)} \geq 1.$$

This is established using the upper bound $I_1 + I_2 + I_3$ of $E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)$ in (20) together with the limiting properties of I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 in (21), (22), and (23), respectively.

The details of Steps 1 and 2 are given below.

Step 1. We first obtain the large deviation rate function for $U_{n,p}$, which gives an approximation to $n^{-1} \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)$ as in [1]. From the argument in [4], the large deviation of $U_{n,p}$ has a similar rate function as λ_1 . The explicit form of the large deviation rate function of λ_1 can be obtained from Theorem 2.6.6 in [1]. In particular, denote $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_p)$ to be the unordered eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$; then from (4), $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_p)$ has joint density function

$$f_{n,p,\beta}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_p) = \frac{1}{p!} C_{n,p,\beta} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} |\tilde{\lambda}_i - \tilde{\lambda}_j|^\beta \times \prod_{i=1}^p \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-n \sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{\lambda}_i/2} = (Z_{V,\beta}^p)^{-1} |\Delta_p(\tilde{\lambda})|^\beta e^{-p \sum_{i=1}^p V(\tilde{\lambda}_i)},$$

where the last line follows the notation of (2.6.1) in [1] with $\Delta_p(\tilde{\lambda}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} (\tilde{\lambda}_i - \tilde{\lambda}_j)$, $Z_{V,\beta}^p = p! C_{n,p,\beta}^{-1}$ and

$$V(x) = \frac{n}{2p} x - \frac{\beta(n-p+1)-2}{2p} \ln x \sim \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{x}{\gamma} - \beta \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1 \right) \ln x \right\}.$$

The notation “ $a_n \sim b_n$ ” means $a_n = \{1 + o(1)\}b_n$. Following the definition in (2.6.3) of [1], we further define

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{pV/(p-1),\beta}^{p-1} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\Delta_{p-1}(\tilde{\lambda})|^\beta e^{-(p-1) \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \{pV(\tilde{\lambda}_i)/(p-1)\}} \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} d\tilde{\lambda}_i \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq (p-1)} |\tilde{\lambda}_i - \tilde{\lambda}_j|^\beta \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} \tilde{\lambda}_i^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-n \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \tilde{\lambda}_i/2} \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} d\tilde{\lambda}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the density function (11) implies that the normalization constant $Z_{pV/(p-1),\beta}^{p-1}$ equals

$$Z_{pV/(p-1),\beta}^{p-1} = \left\{ \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \left(\frac{n}{n-1} \right)^{\beta(n-1)(p-1)/2} C_{n-1,p-1,\beta} \right\}^{-1}.$$

With the above notation, Theorem 2.6.6 in [1] states that the large deviation approximation of $\lambda_1 = \max(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_p)$ has speed p and good rate function, viz.

$$I_\beta(s) = \begin{cases} -\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln |s-t| \sigma_\beta(dt) + V(s) + \alpha_{V,\beta} & \text{if } s \geq s^*, \\ \infty & \text{if } s < s^*, \end{cases}$$

where $s_* = \beta(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})^2$, $s^* = \beta(1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2$, $\sigma_\beta(\cdot)$ is the probability distribution function of the Marchenko–Pastur law specified in (10) and

$$\alpha_{V,\beta} = - \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \ln \frac{Z_{pV/(p-1),\beta}^{p-1}}{Z_{V,\beta}^p}.$$

A direct calculation gives that for $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{Z_{pV/(p-1)\beta}^{p-1}}{Z_{V\beta}^p} &\sim \frac{\beta(n+p)}{2} \ln n - \frac{\beta p}{2} \ln p - \frac{\beta n}{2} \ln n - \frac{\beta(p+n)}{2} \times (\ln \beta - 1) + O(\ln n) \\ &\sim \frac{\beta}{2} \{ \gamma \ln(1/\gamma) - (\gamma+1)(\ln \beta - 1) \} n + o(n). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Then, we obtain $\alpha_{V\beta} = (\beta/2) \times \{ \ln \gamma + (1/\gamma + 1)(\ln \beta - 1) \}$. Therefore, the large deviation approximation of $\lambda_1 = \max(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_p)$ has speed p and rate function

$$I_\beta(s) = \begin{cases} -\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln |s - t| \sigma_\beta(dt) + s/(2\gamma) - (\beta/2)(1/\gamma - 1) \ln s \\ \quad + (\beta/2) \{ \ln \gamma + (1/\gamma + 1)(\ln \beta - 1) \} & \text{if } s \geq s^*, \\ \infty & \text{if } s < s^*. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Recall the notation in Remark 2 and from result in [4], we know when \mathbf{X} has iid entries $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ or $C\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the largest eigenvalue $\bar{\lambda}_1$ and the ratio $U_{n,p}$ defined in (1) of $\mathbf{X}^H \mathbf{X}/n$ have the same large deviation approximation function (17). But now in the complex case, \mathbf{X} has iid entries $C\mathcal{N}(0, 2)$ with $\beta = 2$. Similar to the argument in Remark 2, since $U_{n,p}$ is invariant to this change, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \Pr(U_{n,p} > x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \Pr(\bar{\lambda}_1 > x) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p}{n} \times \frac{1}{p} \ln \Pr(\lambda_1 > \beta x) = -\gamma I_\beta(\beta x).$$

Therefore we have the large deviation result:

$$n^{-1} \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x) \sim -\gamma I_\beta(\beta x). \quad (18)$$

Step 2. We focus on $\ln \{E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)\}$ in this step. Recall that σ_β in (10) denotes the equilibrium measure for the large deviations of the empirical distribution of eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ under P ; see Lemma 2.6.2 from [1]. Define t_1 as a constant such that $t_1 > n/(n-1)$ but close to $n/(n-1)$. Let $B(\epsilon)$ be the ball of probability measures defined on $[0, t_1 M]$ with radius ϵ around σ_β under the following metric ρ that generates the weak convergence of probability measures on \mathbb{R} . For two probability measures μ and ν on \mathbb{R} ,

$$\rho(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\|h\|_L \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x) \mu(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x) \nu(dx) \right|, \quad (19)$$

where h is a bounded Lipschitz function defined on \mathbb{R} with

$$\|h\| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |h(x)|, \quad \|h\|_L = \|h\| + \sup_{x \neq y} |h(x) - h(y)|/|x - y|.$$

Let \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q be the empirical measure of $(\lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_p^*)$ with $(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p) = \{(n-1)/n\} \times (\lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_p^*)$ being constructed as in Step 1 of Algorithm 1 under the change of measure Q .

We know from the Marchenko–Pastur law that $\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \rightarrow \sigma_\beta$ a.s., as defined in (10). Then for a large constant M , we have the following upper bound for $E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} E_Q(L_{n,p}^2) &\leq E_Q \{ (dP/dQ)^2 : \lambda_1 > M \} \\ &\quad + E_Q \{ (dP/dQ)^2 : U_{n,p} > x, M > \lambda_1, \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon) \} + E_Q \{ (dP/dQ)^2 : U_{n,p} > x, M > \lambda_1, \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \in B(\epsilon) \} \\ &\equiv I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We will show that the first two terms of the above upper bound are ignorable, i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln I_1 = -\infty, \quad (21)$$

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln I_2 = -\infty, \quad (22)$$

and we will further show that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0, M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln I_3 = -2\gamma I_\beta(\beta x). \quad (23)$$

Combining (21), (22) and (23) together, we will then deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}_Q(L_{n,p}^2) \leq -2\gamma I_\beta(\beta x).$$

Then by the result in Step 1 of the proof, and the fact that $\ln \alpha_{n,p}(x) < 0$, we will conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \mathbb{E}_Q(L_{n,p}^2)}{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)} \geq 1.$$

Based on the argument above, in the following we need only prove (21)–(23).

Proof of (21). Let $B_{n,p,\beta} = Z_{pV/(p-1),\beta}^{p-1}/Z_{V,\beta}^p$. From the construction of the change of measure Q , we can rewrite the left-hand side display in (21) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\left\{ \frac{B_{n,p,\beta} \prod_{i=2}^p (\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)^\beta \times \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} \times e^{-n\lambda_1/2}}{n r e^{-nr(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} \times \mathbf{1}_{(\lambda_1 > \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)}} \right\}^2 : \lambda_1 > M \right] \\ & \leq \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \int_{\substack{\lambda_1 > M, \\ \lambda_1 > \lambda_2}} r^{-2} n^{-2} B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \lambda_1^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} e^{-n\lambda_1 + 2rn(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} \\ & \quad \times r n e^{-rn(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} f_{n,p}^Q(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_p \\ & \leq \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \int_{\lambda_1 > M} r^{-1} n^{-1} B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \lambda_1^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} \times e^{-n\lambda_1 + rn\lambda_1 - rn\tilde{x}} d\lambda_1. \end{aligned}$$

Next we change variable λ_1 to $\lambda_1 + M$ and since $(\lambda_1 + M)^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} \leq M^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} e^{\{\beta(p+n-1)-2\}\lambda_1/M}$, we obtain the following upper bound for the expectation in Eq. (21):

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \int_0^\infty r^{-1} n^{-1} B_{n,p,\beta}^2 M^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} e^{\{\beta(p+n-1)-2\}\lambda_1/M - (n-rn)(\lambda_1+M) - rn\tilde{x}} d\lambda_1 \\ & = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \{ B_{n,p,\beta}^2 M^{\beta(p+n-1)-2} e^{-(n-rn)M - rn\tilde{x}} \} + o(1) = -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the approximation of $B_{n,p,\beta}$ from (16). This proves Eq. (21). \square

Proof of (22). Consider the expectation term in Eq. (22). Since $\lambda_1 - \lambda_i < M$ and $\lambda_2 \vee \tilde{x} \geq \tilde{x}$, the following inequality holds for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln I_2 \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}_Q \left[\left\{ \frac{B_{n,p,\beta} M^{\beta(p-1)} \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} e^{-n\lambda_1/2}}{r n e^{-rn(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x})}} \right\}^2 : U_{n,p} > x, M > \lambda_1, \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon) \right]. \quad (24)$$

Under the assumption that $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$, $\lambda_1 < M$ and with the result from (16), we know that

$$\frac{B_{n,p,\beta} M^{\beta(p-1)} \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)/2-1} e^{-n\lambda_1/2}}{r n e^{-r n(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x})}} = e^{O(nM)}.$$

This implies that

$$(24) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \ln \left[e^{O(nM)} Q\{U_{n,p} > x, M > \lambda_1, \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon)\} \right] \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[O(M) + n^{-1} \ln \Pr\{\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon)\} \right].$$

The large deviation result for \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q [Theorem 2.6.1 in 1] then yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \ln \Pr\{\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon)\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(p-1)^2}{n^2} \times \frac{1}{(p-1)^2} \ln \Pr\{\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \notin B(\epsilon)\} < 0.$$

This proves (22). □

Proof of (23). Define $\Omega_n = \{U_{n,p} > x, M > \lambda_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \in B(\epsilon)\}$. We can write

$$I_3 = O(1) n^{-2} B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \mathbb{E}_Q \left\{ e^{2\beta \sum_{i=2}^p \ln(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i)} \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} e^{-n\lambda_1} e^{2nr(\lambda_1 - \tilde{x} \vee \lambda_2)} : \Omega_n \right\}.$$

Let $\Phi(z, \epsilon) = \sup_{\mu \in B(\epsilon)} \int \ln(|z - y|) \{\mu(dy) - \sigma_\beta(dy)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^p \ln(\lambda_1 - \lambda_i) &= (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln\left(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1} - y\right) \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q(dy) - (p-1) \ln \frac{n}{n-1} \\ &\leq (p-1) \Phi\left(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1}, \epsilon\right) + (p-1) \int \ln\left(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1} - y\right) \sigma_\beta(dy) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Under the condition that $\lambda_1 < M$, we know $n\lambda_1/(n-1) < 2M$ when n is large enough. Let $G = \max\{\beta(1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2, 2M\}$ and define

$$h(x) = x \mathbf{1}(x \in [0, G]). \quad (25)$$

Then h is a bounded Lipschitz function on $[0, G]$. Furthermore, given $\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \in B(\epsilon)$ and under measure Q , we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{n\lambda_i}{n-1} - \beta \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(y) \mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q(dy) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(y) \sigma_\beta(dy) \right| < O(\epsilon),$$

for $\beta \in \{1, 2\}$. This is because from Theorem 6.3.1 in [10], for a distribution with the same density as (13), the first moment is $\mu_{1,\gamma} = \int \bar{s} \times f(\bar{s}) d\bar{s} = 1$. For the density in (10), similar to Remark 2, the first moment is $\int s \times \sigma_\beta(ds) = \beta \int \bar{s} \times f(\bar{s}) d\bar{s} = \beta \times \mu_{1,\gamma} = \beta$. Considering our choice of G in (25), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(y) \sigma_\beta(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \sigma_\beta(dy) = \beta \times \mu_{1,\gamma} = \beta.$$

Therefore, $U_{n,p} > x$ and $\lambda_1 > \tilde{x}$ implies that $\lambda_1 > \beta x + O(\epsilon)$ and we can write

$$I_3 \leq O(1) n^{-1} B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \int_{\beta x + O(\epsilon)}^M e^{2\beta(p-1)\Phi(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1}, \epsilon) + 2\beta(p-1) \int \ln(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1} - y) \sigma_\beta(dy)} \times \lambda_1^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} e^{-n\lambda_1 + r n(\lambda_1 - \beta x + O(\epsilon))} d\lambda_1.$$

Since $\beta x + O(\epsilon) < \lambda_1 < M$, we have $\Phi[n\lambda_1/(n-1), \epsilon] \leq \sup_{z \in [n\beta x + O(\epsilon)/(n-1), nM/(n-1)]} \Phi(z, \epsilon)$ under the constraint $\mathcal{L}_{p-1}^Q \in B(\epsilon)$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \ln\left(\frac{n\lambda_1}{n-1} - y\right) \sigma_\beta(dy) &= \int \ln\left(\frac{n\beta x}{n-1} - y\right) \sigma_\beta(dy) + \int \ln\left\{1 + \frac{n\lambda_1 - n\beta x}{n\beta x - (n-1)y}\right\} \sigma_\beta(dy) \\ &\leq \int \ln\left(\frac{n\beta x}{n-1} - y\right) \sigma_\beta(dy) + \int \frac{n\lambda_1 - n\beta x}{n\beta x - (n-1)y} \sigma_\beta(dy). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq O(1)n^{-1}B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \times e^{2\beta(p-1) \sup_{z \in [\frac{n(\beta x + O(\epsilon))}{n-1}, \frac{nM}{n-1}]} \Phi(z, \epsilon) + 2\beta(p-1) \int \ln(\frac{n\beta x}{n-1} - y) \sigma_\beta(dy)} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\beta x + O(\epsilon)}^M e^{2\beta(p-1) \int \frac{n\lambda_1 - n\beta x}{n\beta x - (n-1)y} d\sigma_\beta(y)} \chi_1^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} e^{-n\lambda_1 + rn\{\lambda_1 - \beta x + O(\epsilon)\}} d\lambda_1. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side equals

$$\begin{aligned} O(1)n^{-1}B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \times e^{2\beta(p-1) \sup_{z \in [\frac{n(\beta x + O(\epsilon))}{n-1}, \frac{nM}{n-1}]} \Phi(z, \epsilon) + 2\beta(p-1) \int \ln(\frac{n\beta x}{n-1} - y) \sigma_\beta(dy)} \\ \times \int_{O(\epsilon)}^{M-\beta x} e^{2\beta(p-1) \int \frac{n\lambda_1}{n\beta x - (n-1)y} d\sigma_\beta(y)} \times (\lambda_1 + \beta x)^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} \times e^{-(1-r)n(\lambda_1 + \beta x) - rn\{\beta x + O(\epsilon)\}} d\lambda_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we change the variable λ_1 to $\lambda_1 + \beta x$ for the integral. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\leq O(1)n^{-1}B_{n,p,\beta}^2 \times e^{2\beta(p-1) \sup_{z \in [\frac{n(\beta x + O(\epsilon))}{n-1}, \frac{nM}{n-1}]} \Phi(z, \epsilon) + 2\beta(p-1) \int \ln(\frac{n\beta x}{n-1} - y) \sigma_\beta(dy)} \times (\beta x)^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} e^{-n\{\beta x + O(\epsilon)\}} \\ &\quad \times \int_{O(\epsilon)}^{M-\beta x} e^{2\beta(p-1) \int \frac{n\lambda_1}{n\beta x - (n-1)y} d\sigma_\beta(y) + \{\beta(n-p+1)-2\} \frac{\lambda_1}{\beta x} - (1-r)n\lambda_1} d\lambda_1, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

as we used the fact that $(\lambda_1 + \beta x)^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} \leq (\beta x)^{\beta(n-p+1)-2} e^{\{\beta(n-p+1)-2\}\lambda_1/(\beta x)}$.

Under $s^* < \beta x$, we can find a finite number t_0 such that $s^* < t_0 x \leq n\{\beta x + O(\epsilon)\}/(n-1)$, for small enough ϵ and large enough n . Recall that $t_1 M \geq nM/(n-1)$. Next we show that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \Phi(z, \epsilon) \leq 0. \quad (27)$$

For any $z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]$ and $\mu \in B(\epsilon)$, let $\mathcal{S}_1(z) = \{y \in \text{supp}(\sigma_\beta) \cup \text{supp}(\mu) : |z - y| > \eta\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(z) = \{y \in \text{supp}(\sigma_\beta) \cup \text{supp}(\mu) : |z - y| \leq \eta\}$, where $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is the support of measure μ and η is a small constant such that $\eta < \min\{t_0 x - s^*, 1\}$ with s^* defined in (10). Note that $\text{supp}(\sigma_\beta) \subset \mathcal{S}_1(z)$. Given $z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]$, set $f_z(y) = \ln(|z - y|)$ for $y \in \mathcal{S}_1(z)$. The Lipschitz norms of the set of functions $\{f_z(\cdot); z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]\}$ on $\mathcal{S}_1(z)$ are bounded by a constant $C < \infty$. By the definition of $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \ln(|z - y|) \{\mu(dy) - \sigma_\beta(dy)\} &\leq \sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} f_z(y) \{\mu(dy) - \sigma_\beta(dy)\} + \sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} f_z(y) \mu(dy) \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} f_z(y) \{\mu(dy) - \sigma_\beta(dy)\} \leq C\rho(\mu, \sigma_\beta) < C\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for any $\mu \in B_\epsilon$. This implies that $\sup_{z \in [t_0 x, t_1 M]} \Phi(z, \epsilon) < C\epsilon$. Then (27) follows. When $r < 1 - 2\beta\gamma \int \{1/(\beta x - y)\} d\sigma_\beta(y) - (1 - \gamma)/x$, we know that the integral term in (26) is $\sim e^{nO(\epsilon)}$. Therefore

$$\lim_{\substack{\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ M \rightarrow \infty}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln I_3 = 2\beta\gamma \int \ln(\beta x - y) \sigma_\beta(dy) - \beta x + \beta(1 - \gamma) \ln(\beta x) - \beta \{\gamma \ln \gamma + (1 + \gamma)(\ln \beta - 1)\} = -2\gamma I_\beta(\beta x),$$

where $I_\beta(x)$ is defined as in (17). Therefore, we conclude that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)/n \leq -2\gamma I_\beta(\beta x).$$

Hence, the above upper bound and the approximation in (18) imply that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ln E_Q(L_{n,p}^2)/\{2 \ln \alpha_{n,p}(x)\} \geq 1,$$

where note that $\ln \alpha_{n,p}(x) < 0$. This completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Prof. Boaz Nadler for suggesting this problem, as well as the Editor-in-Chief, an Associate Editor, and two reviewers for many helpful and constructive comments. This work was supported in part by National Security Agency grant H98230-17-1-0308 and National Science Foundation grant DMS-1712717.

References

References

- [1] G.W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, O. Zeitouni, *An Introduction to Random Matrices*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [2] S. Asmussen, P. Glynn, *Stochastic Simulation: Algorithms and Analysis*, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [3] S. Asmussen, D. Kroese, Improved algorithms for rare event simulation with heavy tails, *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 38 (2006) 545–558.
- [4] P. Bianchi, M. Debbah, M. Maïda, J. Najim, Performance of statistical tests for single-source detection using random matrix theory, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 57 (2011) 2400–2419.
- [5] J. Blanchet, P. Glynn, Efficient rare event simulation for the maximum of heavy-tailed random walks, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 18 (2008) 1351–1378.
- [6] M. Chiani, Distribution of the largest eigenvalue for real Wishart and Gaussian random matrices and a simple approximation for the Tracy–Widom distribution, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 129 (2014) 69–81.
- [7] A. Davis, On the ratios of the individual latent roots to the trace of a Wishart matrix, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 2 (1972) 440–443.
- [8] J.W. Demmel, *Applied Numerical Linear Algebra*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 1997.
- [9] I. Dumitriu, A. Edelman, Matrix models for beta ensembles, *J. Math. Phys.* 43 (2002) 5830–5847.
- [10] I. Dumitriu, A. Edelman, *Eigenvalue Statistics for Beta Ensembles*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, MA, 2003.
- [11] P. Dupuis, K. Leder, H. Wang, Importance sampling for sums of random variables with regularly varying tails, *ACM Trans. Model. Comput. Simul.* 17 (2007) 1–14.
- [12] T. Jiang, K. Leder, G. Xu, Rare-event analysis for extremal eigenvalues of white Wishart matrices, *Ann. Statist.* 45 (2017) 1609–1637.
- [13] K. Johansson, Shape fluctuations and random matrices, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 209 (2000) 437–476.
- [14] I.M. Johnstone, On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis, *Ann. Statist.* 29 (2001) 295–327.
- [15] N. Karoui, A rate of convergence result for the largest eigenvalue of complex white Wishart matrices, *Ann. Probab.* 34 (2006) 2077–2117.
- [16] A. Kortun, M. Sellathurai, T. Ratnarajah, C. Zhong, Distribution of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of complex Wishart matrices, *IEEE Trans. Signal Proc.* 60 (2012) 5527–5532.
- [17] W. Krzanowski, *Principles of Multivariate Analysis*, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [18] S. Kuriki, A. Takemura, Tail probabilities of the maxima of multilinear forms and their applications, *Ann. Statist.* 29 (2001) 328–371.
- [19] J. Liu, G. Xu, Efficient simulations for the exponential integrals of Hölder continuous Gaussian random fields, *ACM Trans. Model. Comput. Simul.* 24 (2014) 1–9.
- [20] J. Liu, G. Xu, On the conditional distributions and the efficient simulations of exponential integrals of Gaussian random fields, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 24 (2014) 1691–1738.
- [21] Z. Ma, Accuracy of the Tracy–Widom limits for the extreme eigenvalues in white Wishart matrices, *Bernoulli* 18 (2012) 322–359.
- [22] R.J. Muirhead, *Aspects of Multivariate Statistical Theory*, Wiley, New York, 2009.
- [23] B. Nadler, On the distribution of the ratio of the largest eigenvalue to the trace of a Wishart matrix, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 102 (2011) 363–371.
- [24] D. Paul, A. Aue, Random matrix theory in statistics: A review, *J. Stat. Plann. Inf.* 150 (2014) 1–29.
- [25] F. Schuurmann, P. Krishnaiah, A. Chattopadhyay, On the distributions of the ratios of the extreme roots to the trace of the Wishart matrix, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 3 (1973) 445–453.
- [26] D. Siegmund, Importance sampling in the Monte Carlo study of sequential tests, *Ann. Statist.* 4 (1976) 673–684.
- [27] D. Tse, P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [28] L. Wei, O. Tirkkonen, P. Dharmawansa, M. McKay, On the exact distribution of the scaled largest eigenvalue, In: 2012 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC), pp. 2422–2426, 2012.
- [29] G. Xu, G. Lin, J. Liu, Rare-event simulation for the stochastic Korteweg–de Vries equation, *SIAM/ASA J. Uncertainty Quantification* 2 (2014) 698–716.