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Abstract

This paper investigates limiting properties of eigenvalues of multivariate sample spatial-sign covariance matrices when both the number of variables and the sample size grow to infinity. The underlying $p$-variate populations are general enough to include the popular independent components model and the family of elliptical distributions. A first result of the paper establishes that the distribution of the eigenvalues converges to a deterministic limit that belongs to the family of generalized Marchenko-Pastur distributions. Furthermore, a new central limit theorem is established for a class of linear spectral statistics. We develop two applications of these results to robust statistics for a high-dimensional shape matrix. First, two statistics are proposed for testing the sphericity. Next, a spectrum-corrected estimator using the sample spatial-sign covariance matrix is proposed. Simulation experiments show that in high dimension, the sample spatial-sign covariance matrix provides a valid and robust tool for mitigating influence of outliers.

1 Introduction

When a multivariate data set is potentially contaminated by outliers, sample covariance matrix (SCM) becomes less reliable. Many robust alternatives have been proposed in the literature starting from the early M-estimators (Maronna, 1976; Huber, 1977), the minimum volume ellipsoid and minimum determinant estimators (Rousseeuw, 1985), the Stahel-Donoho estimators (Hampel et al., 1986; Donoho and Gasko, 1992) and Tyler’s scatter matrix (Tyler, 1987). Thorough reviews of these robust estimators for the population scatter can be found in Maronna et al. (2006), Oja (2010) and Magyar and Tyler (2014). However many of these estimators are implicitly defined only, and this lack of an analytically tractable form leads to certain difficulty for their theoretical analysis, especially when the number of variables is large. It is then interesting to find valid, tractable and robust estimator for the population scatter.

In this paper we study the spatial-sign covariance matrix (SSCM), introduced in Locantore et al. (1999) and Visuri et al. (2000) for the purpose of robust PCA. These papers demonstrate that the SSCM is able to mitigate the impact of influential outliers. A number of papers have followed and investigated various properties of the SSCM, see Gervini (2008), Sirkia et al. (2009), Taskinen et al. (2010, 2012), and Diürre et al. (2014, 2015, 2017). However, when the number of variables is large compared to the sample size, the sample SSCM, say $B_n$, will likely deviate from its population counterpart, say $\Sigma$, due to high-dimensional effect. In order to understand such high-dimensional distortion, it is necessary to investigate limiting
properties of the SSCM when both the number of variables and the sample size grow to infinity. To this end, we consider a general $p$-variate population $\mathbf{x}$ that encompasses the popular independent components model and the family of elliptical distributions. The first main result of the paper is an analogue of Marčenko-Pastur law for the limiting distribution of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_n$. It is worth noticing that in the same asymptotic regime, it has been established that the eigenvalue distributions of both the Maronna’s M-estimator and Tyler’s M-estimator for multivariate scatter converge to scaled Marčenko-Pastur laws (Couillet et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2016). The findings of this paper confirm that up to a proper scaling, the high-dimensional limits for the eigenvalue distributions of the three robust estimators of the scatter (Maronna’s M-estimator, Tyler’s M-estimator and the SSCM $\mathbf{B}_n$) are all Marčenko-Pastur laws. Note however that for the Maronna’s and Tyler’s M-estimators, the limits are only established for elliptical distributions while here for the SSCM $\mathbf{B}_n$, our results cover a substantially wider family of distributions that include the elliptical ones as a special case (Section 2.1).

To move a step further, our second main contribution in this paper is to investigate the second order asymptotic behaviors of the global spectrum of $\mathbf{B}_n$, that is, to establish a universal central limit theorem (CLT) for its linear spectral statistics (LSSs). CLTs for linear spectral statistics of large random matrices have been actively studied in recent decades, especially for large SCMs. The earliest work dates back to Jonsson (1982) where the population is assumed to be standard multivariate normal. Further, Bai and Silverstein (2004) established the CLT under the independent components model, which was later extended by Pan and Zhou (2008) and Zheng et al. (2015). Parallel to the independent components model, recently, Hu et al. (2019) and Hu et al. (2019a) considered a class of elliptical distributions and established the CLTs for LSSs. However, the latter CLTs for the SCM are characterized by both the random directions and random lengths through a system of implicit equations, to be specific, the involvement of random length will seriously interfere with our understanding of the shape matrix. This again motivates us to shift our attention to the study of SSCM $\mathbf{B}_n$ which does not depend on random lengths anymore. For more references, one is referred to El Karoui (2009); Bai and Silverstein (2010); Bai et al. (2015) and Li and Yao (2018).

Recent works related to the high-dimensional SSCM $\mathbf{B}_n$ (or its variants) include Zou et al. (2014), Feng and Sun (2016), Li et al. (2016) and Chakraborty and Chaudhuri (2017). A common feature in these papers is that given a specific null hypothesis on the population location or scatter, under elliptical distributions, in a one-sample or two-sample design, the authors have in their disposal a specific test statistic which is an explicit function of $\mathbf{B}_n$ (or its variants). They thus directly study the statistic using traditional asymptotic methods such as projections (as in a U-statistic) or a martingale decomposition (some of these test statistics are indeed linear spectral statistics of $\mathbf{B}_n$ studied in the current paper). No general results exist however on the limiting distributions of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_n$, and a fortiori, on the asymptotic normality of linear spectral statistics.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2.1 introduces our model settings. Section 2.2 reviews the sample SSCM $\mathbf{B}_n$ and exhibits our main theoretical re-
results including both the limiting spectral distribution and the fluctuation of linear spectral statistics of $B_n$. In Section 3, we develop two applications of our general theory to robust statistics in the high-dimensional context. Technical proof of the main theorem (Theorem 2.2) is gathered in Section 4.

2 High-dimensional theory for eigenvalues of sample SSCM

2.1 Model assumptions

Let $M_p$ be a $p \times p$ symmetric or Hermitian matrix with eigenvalues $(\lambda_j)_{1 \leq j \leq p}$. Its empirical spectral distribution (ESD) is by definition the probability measure

$$F^{M_p} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \delta_{\lambda_j},$$

where $\delta_b$ denotes the Dirac mass at $b$. If the ESD sequence has a limit when $p \to \infty$, the limit is referred as the limiting spectral distribution (LSD) of the sequence. The Stieltjes transform of a probability measure $G$ is defined as

$$m_G(z) = \int \frac{1}{x-z} dG(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,\)$$

where $\mathbb{C}^+ \equiv \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im(z) > 0\}$. This definition can be easily extended to the whole complex plan except the support set of $G$.

Let $s(x) = I_{\{x \neq 0\}} x/||x||$ be the spatial-sign function, $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Our main assumptions are as follows.

Assumption (a). Both the sample size $n$ and population dimension $p$ tend to infinity in such a way that $p = \alpha(n)$ and $c_n = p/n \to c \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumption (b). The $p$-variate population $x$ admits the following stochastic representation:

$$x = \mu + wAz,$$

(2.1)

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the unknown location vector, $A$ a $p \times p$ deterministic matrix, the matrix $T = AA'$ is called the shape matrix of the population with normalization $\text{tr}(T) = p$, $w \geq 0$ a scalar random variable, $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ a vector whose coordinates $z_j$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), and they satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}(w^2) < +\infty, \quad \mathbb{E}(w^{-4}) < +\infty, \quad \mathbb{E}(z_1) = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(z_1^2) = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}(z_1^4) = \tau < \infty.$$

Assumption (c). The spectral distribution $H_p$ of $\Sigma = n^{-1} \mathbb{E}s(x-\mu)s(x-\mu)'$ converges weakly to a probability distribution $H$ on $[0, \infty)$, called population spectral distribution (PSD).
Assumption (d). The spectral norm of $\Sigma$ is bounded.

Assumption (e). In the model (2.1), $w$ and $s(z)$ are independent.

Remark 2.1. Recall that in the literature on high-dimensional covariance matrices, the following independent components model is routinely considered (Paul and Aue, 2014; Yao et al., 2015):

$$y = \mu + \sigma Az,$$

where $\sigma$ is a positive constant, $A$ and $z$ are as in (2.1). Clearly this model is a particular case of the model (2.1) with $w \equiv \sigma$.

Remark 2.2. The model (2.1) contains also the family of elliptical distributions. Indeed, an elliptically distributed variable has the form

$$\zeta = \mu + vAu,$$

where $\mu$ and $A$ are as in (2.1), in particular, $u$ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^p$ and is independent of $v \geq 0$. To see this, let $u = \xi/\|\xi\|$ where $\xi \sim N(0, I_p)$ is a standard $p$-dimensional Gaussian vector, independent of $v$. We thus have

$$\zeta = \mu + vAu = \mu + \frac{v}{\|\xi\|}A\xi.$$

Because $v$, $\xi/\|\xi\|$ and $\|\xi\|$ are mutually independent, $v/\|\xi\|$ is independent of $s(\xi) = \xi/\|\xi\|$: the elliptical model (2.3) is a special case of the model (2.1) with $w = v/\|\xi\|$ and $z = \xi$.

2.2 Sample SSCM and its limiting spectral distribution

Given a sample $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, the sample spatial median $\hat{\mu}$ is the solution to the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} s(x_j - \hat{\mu}) = 0.$$

Accordingly, the sample SSCM is the matrix

$$B_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} s(x_j - \hat{\mu})s(x_j - \hat{\mu})'.$$

The following theorem describes the convergence of the ESD $F^{B_n}$ when the sample observations are from the population $x$ in (2.1).

Theorem 2.1. Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(b)-(c)-(d) hold. Then, almost surely, the empirical spectral distribution $F^{B_n}$ converges weakly to a probability distribution $F^{c,H}$, whose Stieltjes transform $m = m(z)$ is the unique solution to the equation

$$m = \int \frac{1}{t(1 - c - czm) - z} dH(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

in the set $\{m \in \mathbb{C} : -(1 - c)/z + cm \in \mathbb{C}^+\}$. 
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The proof of this Theorem is given in the supplementary file.

**Remark 2.3.** Note that the spectral distributions of $\Sigma$ and $T = \Lambda\Lambda'$ are asymptotically identical (Lemma S1.4). So replacing $\Sigma$ with $T$ in Assumption (c) does not affect the LSD of $F^{B_n}$. However we still keep $\Sigma$ because its spectral distribution $H_p$ (depending on $p$) will be used in the statement of our CLT for LSSs.

**Remark 2.4.** The LSD $F^{c,H}$ defined in (2.5) is a generalized MP law already appeared in the seminal paper Marčenko and Pastur (1967). Let $m = m(z)$ denote the Stieltjes transform of $F^{c,H} = cF^{c,H} + (1 - c)\delta_0$. Then (2.5) can also be rewritten as (Silverstein, 1995)

$$z = \frac{1}{m} + c \int \frac{t}{1 + tm}dH(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \quad (2.6)$$

For procedures on finding the density function and the support of $F^{c,H}$ from (2.5) or (2.6), one is referred to Bai and Silverstein (2010).

**Remark 2.5.** When the mean vector $\mu$ is known, a simpler sample SSCM is available, i.e.

$$B_0^n = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} s(x_j - \mu)(x_j - \mu)' \quad (2.7)$$

The LSD of this matrix remains the same as the generalized MP law given in Theorem 2.1.

### 2.3 CLT for linear spectral statistics of $B_n$

Let $m_0(z)$ be the Stieltjes transform in (2.6) with the parameters $(c, H)$ replaced by $(c_n, H_p)$. This Stieltjes transform uniquely defines an LSD, denoted as $F^{c_n,H_p}$, through

$$m_0(z) = \frac{1}{z} - \frac{c_n}{z} + c_n \int \frac{1}{x - z}dF^{c_n,H_p}(x). \quad (2.8)$$

Let $G_n = F^{B_n} - F^{c_n,H_p}$. We now study the fluctuation of so-called LSS of the form

$$G_n(f) := \int f(x)dG_n(x) = \int f(x)d[F^{B_n}(x) - F^{c_n,H_p}(x)],$$

where $f$ is some given measurable function.

Let $r_w = \mathbb{E}(w^{-2})/\mathbb{E}^2(w^{-1})$ and define three auxiliary quantities

$$\zeta_p = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}[(A'A) \circ (A'A)],$$

$$h_p(z) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}[(A'\Sigma - zI)^{-1}A] \circ (A'A)],$$

$$g_p(z, \tilde{z}) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} [(A'\Sigma - zI)^{-1}A] \circ (A'(\Sigma - \tilde{z}I)^{-1}A)],$$

where $\Sigma$ is a $d \times d$ symmetric positive definite matrix.
where \( z, \bar{z} \in \mathbb{C}^+ \) and “\( \circ \)” denotes the Hadamard product of two matrices. These quantities depend not only on singular values of \( A \), but also on its singular vectors, which will contribute when the fourth moment \( \tau \neq 3 \).

We need the following concept of asymptotic equality in distribution. Two sequences of \( \mathbb{R}^k \)-valued random vectors \( (\xi_n) \) and \( (\zeta_n) \) are asymptotically equal in distribution, denoted as \( \xi_n \overset{d}{\to} \zeta_n \), if for any Borel set \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^k \),

\[
\mathbb{P}(\xi_n \in C) - \mathbb{P}(\zeta_n \in C) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.
\]

**Theorem 2.2.** Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(b)-(d)-(e) hold. Let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k \) be functions analytic on an open set that include the interval \( I_c = \left[ \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\min}^\Sigma(\delta(0,1))(1 - \sqrt{c})^2, \limsup_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\max}^\Sigma(1 + \sqrt{c})^2 \right]. \)

Also let

\[
Y_n = \rho\{G_n(f_1), \ldots, G_n(f_k)\}
\]

be the vector of the \( k \) normalized LSSs with respect to \( f_1, \ldots, f_k \). Then \( Y_n \) is asymptotically equal in distribution to a \( k \)-dimensional Gaussian random vector \( \xi_n = \xi_n(f_1, \ldots, f_k) = (\xi_{n1}, \ldots, \xi_{nk}) \) with mean function

\[
\mathbb{E}(\xi_n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{C_1} f_j(z) [\kappa(z) + \mu_1(z) + (\tau - 3)\mu_2(z)] \, dz,
\]

where

\[
\kappa(z) = \frac{m_2(z) + zm_2'(z)}{z^2m_0(z)(r_w + zm_0(z)(r_w - 1))},
\]

\[
\mu_1(z) = \int \frac{c_n(m_0'(z)t)^2 dH_p(t)}{m_0(z)(1 + m_0(z)t)^2} - \int \frac{2zm_0(z)(1 + zm_0(z))dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2}
\]

\[
+ \int \frac{(\text{tr}(\Sigma^2/p)t - t^2)dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2} \int \frac{2c_nm_0(z)m_0'(z)dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2}.
\]

\[
\mu_2(z) = \frac{c_p m_0'(z)}{m_0^2(z)} g_{p,z} \left( \frac{-1}{m_0(z)} \frac{c_p m_0'(z)}{m_0^2(z)} \right) + c_p \int \frac{[1 + zm_0(z))tm_0'(z)dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2} \int \frac{c_p m_0'(z)tdH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2} h_p \left( \frac{-1}{m_0(z)} \right),
\]

and covariance function

\[
\text{Cov}(\xi_{nj}, \xi_{nl}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{C_1} \int_{C_2} f_j(z)f_l(\bar{z}) [\sigma_1(z, \bar{z}) + (\tau - 3)\sigma_2(z, \bar{z})] \, dzd\bar{z},
\]
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where

\[
\sigma_1(z, \tilde{z}) = \frac{2\partial^2}{\partial z \partial \tilde{z}} \left[ \log \frac{m_0(z) - m_0(\tilde{z})}{m_0(z)m_0(\tilde{z})} + \left( \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma^2)}{pc_n} + \frac{1}{c_n m_0(z)} + \frac{1}{c_n m_0(\tilde{z})} \right) \times (1 + zm_0(z))(1 + \tilde{z}m_0(\tilde{z})) - zm_0(z) - \tilde{z}m_0(\tilde{z}) - 2 \right],
\]

\[
\sigma_2(z, \tilde{z}) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z \partial \tilde{z}} \left[ c_n g_p \left( \frac{-1}{m_0(z)}, \frac{-1}{m_0(\tilde{z})} \right) + \frac{\xi}{c_n} (1 + zm_0(z))(1 + \tilde{z}m_0(\tilde{z})) \right. \\
- \left. (1 + zm_0(z))h_p \left( \frac{-1}{m_0(z)} \right) - (1 + \tilde{z}m_0(\tilde{z}))h_p \left( \frac{-1}{m_0(\tilde{z})} \right) \right].
\]

The contours \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are non-overlapping, closed, counter-clockwise oriented in the complex plane and enclosing the interval \( I_c \).

**Remark 2.6.** Theorem 2.2 approximates the distribution of \( Y_n \) by that of a Gaussian vector \( \xi_n \). This approximating vector \( \xi_n \) may not converge in distribution, that is, the parameters \((H_p, \xi, h_p(z), g_p(z, \tilde{z}))\) which determine its mean and covariance functions may not have a limit as \((p, n) \to \infty\). In contrast, such limits for the parameters are assumed in the CLTs for linear spectral statistics of large sample covariance matrices developed in Pan and Zhou (2008) and in Zheng et al. (2015). In addition, the convergence of \( c_n \) in Assumption (a) can be weaken to \( 0 < \lim \inf c_n \leq \lim \sup c_n < \infty \).

**Remark 2.7.** The mean drift \( \kappa(z) \) comes from the substitution of the sample spatial median \( \hat{\mu} \) for the location vector \( \mu \) in (2.1), that is, the difference between \( B_n \) and \( B_n^0 \) in (2.7). Precisely, as will be shown in the first step of the proof (in Section 4.1),

\[
\text{tr}(B_n - zI)^{-1} - \text{tr}(B_n^0 - zI)^{-1} = \kappa(z) + o_p(1).
\]

This is also the only place where the substitution plays a role. Hence, when \( \mu \) is known and \( B_n^0 \) is applied, results in Theorem 2.2 still hold by setting \( \kappa(z) = 0 \). On the other hand, under the independent components model (2.2) \((r_w = 1)\), the sample spatial median is asymptotically equivalent to the sample mean \( \hat{x} = \sum_{j=1}^nx_j/n \) in the sense that \( ||\mu - \hat{x}|| = o_{as}(1) \). Beyond this, by setting \( r_w = 1 \), one may also have

\[
\kappa(z) = \frac{(1 + zm_0(z))(m_0(z) + zm_0(\tilde{z}))}{zm_0(z)},
\]

which can be further reduced to

\[
p \int \frac{1}{x - z} dF_{c_n,H_p}(x) - p \int \frac{1}{x - z} dF_{c_n-1,H_p}(x) + o(1)
\]

with \( c_{n-1} = p/(n - 1) \) and the “\( o(1) \)” is uniform on \( \{ z : z \in C \} \). Curiously enough, this mean drift coincides with the results in Zheng et al. (2015) on SCM, while here we consider the SSCM.
2.4 Examples and numerical results

As an illustration, we consider two LSSs

\[ \hat{\beta}_2 = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(B_n^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_3 = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(B_n^3), \]

which are moments of sample eigenvalues of \( B_n \). The approximating distributions for the two statistics are presented in the supplementary file. A small simulation experiment is carried out to examine the finite-sample fluctuations of \( \hat{\beta}_2 \) and \( \hat{\beta}_3 \) under three models.

Model 1: \( T = I_p, \quad z_{11} \sim \frac{1}{2} \chi^2 - 1, \quad w = 1, \quad (p, n) = (400, 200). \)

Model 2: \( T = (I_p + vv')/(1 + 1/p), \quad z_{11} \sim N(0, 1), \quad (p, n) = (400, 800), \quad P(w = 1) = P(w = 1/5) = 0.5. \)

Model 3: \( T = \text{diag}(0.5I_{p/2}, 1.5I_{p/2}), \quad z_{11} \sim \frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}(\text{Gamma}(5, 2) - 5/2), \quad w \sim \text{Beta}(4, 2), \quad (p, n) = (400, 400). \)

The first model has \( T = I_p \) so that \( \mu_2(z) = \sigma_2(z, \tilde{z}) = 0 \). Thus for any LSS, its Gaussian approximation \( \xi_n \) does not depend on the forth moment \( \tau \). In the second model, \( T \) is a rank-one spiked matrix where \( v \) is an arbitrary unit vector in \( \mathbb{R}^p \). In our experiment, \( v \) is chosen randomly and fixed once generated. The length variable \( w \) follows a two-point distribution with \( r_w = 13/9 \), so the population \( x \) can be viewed as a Gaussian mixture. In the last model, we choose the shape matrix \( T \) to be a diagonal one. The variable \( z_{11} \) follows a standardized Gamma distribution with its fourth moment being \( \tau = 4.2 \). For the Beta-distributed variable \( w \), we have \( r_w = 1.2. \)

Normal QQ-plots for normalized \( \hat{\beta}_2 \) and \( \hat{\beta}_3 \) are displayed in Figure 1 using 5000 independent replications. It shows that all predicted distributions match well the empirical ones.

3 Applications to robust statistics

In this section we develop two applications of our general theory in Section 2.2 to robust statistics using sample SSCM.

3.1 Robust sphericity test

We revisit the sphericity test for covariance matrices in high-dimensional framework, that is, testing

\[ H_0 : \text{Cov}(x) = \sigma^2 I_p \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \text{Cov}(x) \neq \sigma^2 I_p, \]

where \( \sigma^2 \) is an unknown scalar parameter. This testing problem has been extensively studied, for example, Ledoit and Wolf (2002) and Wang and Yao (2013) for the independent
components model in (2.2), which are based on the eigenvalues of SCM. However, such procedures will create bias if the samples are contaminated by outliers. Recently, by assuming the populations are elliptical, Zou et al. (2014) and Paindaveine and Verdebout (2016) proposed similar test statistics, both are equivalent to \( \text{tr}(B_n^2) \). Here we develop two robust tests under our model (2.1).

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that Assumptions (a)-(b)-(d)-(e) hold. Under the null hypothesis,

\[
(1) \quad \frac{\text{tr}(B_n^2) - p(1 + c_n) - c_n(\kappa_1 - 1)}{2c_n} \overset{d}{\sim} N(0, 1),
\]
\[
\text{tr}(B_n) - \log |B_n| - 2p + (p - n + 1/2) \log(1 - c_n) - \kappa_1 + c_n \sim N(0, 1),
\]
where \( \kappa_1 = c_n(r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2) \) and \( \kappa_2 = c_n(r_w - 2) - \log(1 - c_n) - \log(1 + c_n(r_w - 1)) \).

**Remark 3.1.** Note that the first test statistic measures the Frobenius distance \( \text{tr}(B_n - I_p)^2 \), which is applicable for all combinations of large \((p, n)\) while the second test, which is motivated by the Kullback-Leibler (KL) distance between \( B_n \) and \( I_p \), valid when \( p < n \) only.

### 3.2 Robust estimation of the shape matrix \( T = AA' \)

In this section, we examine the robustness of several estimators for the shape matrix \( T \) when sample data include outliers. The population mean here is assumed known to simplify discussions. Six estimators are taken into consideration. They are derived from the SCM, denoted by \( S_n^0 \), the SSCM \( B_n^0 \), and the Tyler’s M-estimator, denoted by \( M_n^0 \), which is the solution to

\[
M = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j x_j' M^{-1} x_j,
\]

for \( p < n \). Consider the spectral decomposition of \( S_n^0, B_n^0 \) and \( M_n^0 \)

\[
S_n^0 = U_s \Lambda_s U_s', \quad B_n^0 = U_b \Lambda_b U_b' \quad \text{and} \quad M_n^0 = U_m \Lambda_m U_m',
\]

where the \( \Lambda \)'s are diagonal matrices of eigenvalues, sorted in ascending order, and the \( U \)'s are matrices of corresponding eigenvectors, respectively. In addition, we define a regularization function \( \psi(\cdot) \) as

\[
\psi(C) = p \frac{C}{\text{tr}(C)},
\]

for any \( p \times p \) matrix \( C \) with non-zero trace. Obviously, this function normalizes \( C \) such that \( \text{tr}(C) = p \). With the above notations, the six estimators of \( T \) are as follows:

(i) Regularized SCM \( \hat{T}_1: \hat{T}_1 = \psi(S_n^0) \);

(ii) Spectrum-corrected SCM \( \hat{T}_2: \hat{T}_2 = \psi(U_s \Lambda_2 U_s') \), where \( \Lambda_2 = \text{diag}(\lambda_{21}, \ldots, \lambda_{2p}) \) is a collection of ascendingly sorted estimators of population eigenvalues using a moment method developed in Li and Yao (2014);

(iii) Robust sample SSCM \( \hat{T}_3 \) (Visuri et al., 2000): \( \hat{T}_3 = \psi(U_b \Lambda_3 U_b') \), where \( \Lambda_3 = \text{diag}(\lambda_{31}, \ldots, \lambda_{3p}) \) with \( \lambda_{3k} \) being the square of the MAD of the \( k \)th row of \( (U_b' x_1, \ldots, U_b' x_n) \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, p \).

(iv) Spectrum-corrected sample SSCM \( \hat{T}_4: \hat{T}_4 = \psi(U_b \Lambda_4 U_b') \), where the correction \( \Lambda_4 = \text{diag}(\lambda_{41}, \ldots, \lambda_{4p}) \) is obtained following three steps:
Figure 2: Averaged Frobenius distance between $\hat{T}$ and $T$ from 1000 independent replications.

- Step 1: Estimate the PSD $H_p$ of $\Sigma$ from the ESD $F^B_n$ through the moment method in Li and Yao (2014) to get, say, $\hat{H}_p$;
- Step 2: Estimate the eigenvalues of $T$ from $\hat{H}_p$ using the correspondence between the eigenvalues of $\Sigma$ and $T$ as given in Lemma S1.4 in the supplementary file;
- Step 3: Sort the obtained estimates of the eigenvalues in ascending order to obtain $\Lambda_4$.

(v) Regularized Tyler’s M-estimator $\hat{T}_5$: $\hat{T}_5 = \psi(M^0_n)$;
(vi) Spectrum-corrected Tyler’s M-estimator $\hat{T}_6$: $\hat{T}_6 = \psi(U_m\Lambda_6 U_m')$, where $\Lambda_6$ is obtained similar to $\Lambda_2$.

Note that $\hat{T}_5$ and $\hat{T}_6$ are available only for cases $p < n$. The performance of the six estimators $\{\hat{T}_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 6}$ are tested under two models below.

**Model 4:** Contaminated normal distribution of elliptical form:

$$(1 - \varepsilon)N(0, T) + \varepsilon N(0, 16T),$$

where the population shape matrix $T$ is the diagonal matrix in Model 3. Thus there are about $100\varepsilon\%$ outlying observations with large amplitude. The mixing parameter $\varepsilon$ takes two values 0 (uncontaminated) and 0.01 (contaminated by 1% outliers).

**Model 5:** Contaminated normal distribution of non-elliptical form:

$$(1 - \varepsilon)N(0, T) + \varepsilon N(0, 16T)$$

where the population shape matrix $T$ is the same as in Model 3 and the mixing parameter $\varepsilon$ takes values 0.01 and 0.05. For outliers, their shape matrix is $T = \text{Diag}(1.5I_{p/2}, 0.5I_{p/2})$.

The population dimensions are $p = 2, 40, 80, 120, 160, 200$ and the sample size is $n = 100$. All statistics are averaged from 1000 independent replications. The number of outliers is fixed at $[100\varepsilon]$ for a given $\varepsilon$.

For each estimator $\hat{T} \in \{\hat{T}_1, \hat{T}_2, \hat{T}_3, \hat{T}_4, \hat{T}_5, \hat{T}_6\}$, we calculate the Frobenius distance from $\hat{T}$ to its target matrix $T$. Figure 2 summarizes the results. It shows that, when there is no outlier ($\varepsilon = 0$, top-left plot), $\{\hat{T}_i, i = 1, 3, 5\}$ are comparable and all suffers from large bias caused by the high-dimensional effect. Such bias can be much alleviated by means of spectral correction implemented in $\{\hat{T}_i, i = 2, 4, 6\}$. Besides, these three estimators are close to each other. Note that the remaining bias is obvious, coming from the inconsistency of eigenvectors, which can not be removed entirely at present. Therefore, these outlier-free performances can serve as a benchmark for the six estimators when comparing their robustness against outliers. In the presence of outliers, the other three plots in Figure 2 clearly show that the estimators $\hat{T}_4$ and $\hat{T}_6$, namely the spectrum-corrected versions of the SSCM and Tyler’s M-estimator, respectively, outperform all other competitors in the studied cases and their performance are both close to the benchmark case ($\varepsilon = 0$, without outliers). Moreover, the SSCM-based estimator $\hat{T}_4$ is the only reasonable and available robust estimator when $p > n$. 
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4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

4.1 Sketch of the proof

We begin with defining a rectangular contour enclosing an interval \([s_l, s_r]\) with

\[
s_l = \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\min}^\Sigma(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 I_{(0,1)}(c) \quad \text{and} \quad s_r = \limsup_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\max}^\Sigma(1 + \sqrt{c})^2,
\]

(4.1)

and thus enclosing all supports of the LSDs \(F_{c_n}^{H_p}\). Choosing two numbers \(x_l < x_r\) such that \([s_l, s_r] \subset (x_l, x_r)\) and letting \(v_0 > 0\) be arbitrary, then the contour can be described as

\[
\mathcal{C} = \{x + iv_0 : x \in [x_l, x_r]\} \cup \{x + iv : x \in \{x_l, x_r\}, v \in [-v_0, v_0]\}.
\]

Let \(m_0(z)\) be the Stieltjes transforms of \(F_{c_n}^{H_p}\) and recall \(m_0(z)\) defined in (2.8), we then define a random process on \(\mathcal{C}\) as

\[
M_n(z) = p[m_n(z) - m_0(z)] = n[m_n(z) - m_0(z)], \quad z \in \mathcal{C},
\]

where \(m_n(z)\) is the Stieltjes transform of the ESD \(F^{\mathcal{B}_n}\) and \(m_0(z) = -(1 - c_n)/z + c_n m_n(z)\).

From Cauchy’s integral formula, for any \(k\) analytic functions \((f_\ell)\) and complex numbers \((a_\ell)\), we have

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^k p a_\ell \int f_\ell(x) dG_n(x) = -\sum_{\ell=1}^k \frac{a_\ell}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f_\ell(z) M_n(z) dz
\]

when all sample eigenvalues fall in the interval \((x_l, x_r)\), which holds asymptotically with probability one. In order to deal with the small probability event where some eigenvalues are outside the interval in finite dimensional situations, Bai and Silverstein (2004) suggested truncating \(M_n(z)\) as, for \(z = x + iv \in \mathcal{C}\),

\[
\hat{M}_n(z) = \begin{cases} 
M_n(z) & z \in \mathcal{C}_n, \\
M_n(x + in^{-1} \varepsilon_n) & x \in \{x_l, x_r\} \quad \text{and} \quad v \in [0, n^{-1} \varepsilon_n], \\
M_n(x - in^{-1} \varepsilon_n) & x \in \{x_l, x_r\} \quad \text{and} \quad v \in [-n^{-1} \varepsilon_n, 0],
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\mathcal{C}_n = \{x + iv_0 : x \in [x_l, x_r]\} \cup \{x \pm iv : x \in \{x_l, x_r\}, v \in [n^{-1} \varepsilon_n, v_0]\}\), a regularized version of \(\mathcal{C}\) excluding a small segment near the real line, and the positive sequence \((\varepsilon_n)\) decreases to zero satisfying \(\varepsilon_n > n^{-s}\) for some \(s \in (0,1)\). From similar arguments on Page 563 in Bai and Silverstein (2004), for any \(\ell \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\), one may get that

\[
\oint_{\mathcal{C}} f_\ell(z) M_n(z) dz = \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f_\ell(z) \hat{M}_n(z) dz + o_p(1).
\]

Hence, the proof of Theorem 2.2 can be completed by the convergence of \(\hat{M}_n(z)\) on \(\mathcal{C}\) as stated in the following lemma.
Lemma 4.1. Under Assumptions (a)-(b)-(d)-(e), we have
\[ \hat{M}_n(z) \overset{D}{=} M_0(z) + o_p(1), \quad z \in C, \]
where the random process \( M_0(z) \) is a two-dimensional Gaussian process. The mean function is
\[ E M_0(z) = \kappa(z) + \mu_1(z) + (\tau - 3)\mu_2(z), \tag{4.2} \]
and the covariance function is
\[ \text{Cov}(M_0(z), M_0(\tilde{z})) = \sigma_1(z, \tilde{z}) + (\tau - 3)\sigma_2(z, \tilde{z}), \]
where \( \kappa(z), \mu_1(z), \mu_2(z), \sigma_1(z, \tilde{z}), \sigma_2(z, \tilde{z}) \) are given in Theorem 2.2.

4.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1
Now we split \( \hat{M}_n(z) \) into three parts as
\[ \hat{M}_n(z) = \hat{m}_n(z) + m_0^0(z) + \hat{E} m_0^0(z) - m_0(z) \]
where \( m_0^0(z) \) is the Stieltjes transform of the ESD \( F_{B_n^0} \). Hence, the convergence of \( \hat{M}_n(z) \)
can be obtained through the following four steps.

Step 1: Convergence of \( M_1^{(1)}(z) \) in probability. This step finds the limit of the difference between the resolvent matrices of \( B_n \) and \( B_0^0 \). We will show that
\[ M_1^{(1)}(z) = \text{tr}(B_n(z) - zI)^{-1} - \text{tr}(B_0^0(z) - zI)^{-1} = \kappa(z) + o_p(1), \quad \forall z \in C. \]
The main challenge here lies in the implicit expression of the SSCM \( B_n \), which involves the sample spatial median \( \hat{\mu} \). By establishing an asymptotic expansion of the sample spatial median \( \hat{\mu} \) (Lemma S1.1), we arrive at an explicit expression for the leading terms of \( M_1^{(1)}(z) \), which only relate to the resolvent of \( B_1^0(z) \) and some model parameters (Lemma S1.3). Finally, the convergence of each main terms are established in Lemmas 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.

Step 2: Finite dimensional convergence of \( M_1^{(2)}(z) \). Let \( z_1, \ldots, z_q \) be any \( q \) complex numbers on \( C_n \), this step approximates joint distribution of \( [M_1^0(z_1), \ldots, M_1^0(z_q)] \) through the martingale CLT in Lemma S1.7. Beyond the techniques used in Bai and Silverstein (2004), a particularly important problem is to find new approaches to deal with the non-linear correlation structure among the entries of \( \hat{s}(x_j - \mu) \). And such non-linear correlation is actually introduced by the spatial-sign transform of the data, to be precise, the sign function \( \|x_j - \mu\| \) that appears in the denominator of \( \hat{s}(x_j - \mu) \). To this end, by giving an asymptotic expansion of \( \hat{s}(x_j - \mu) \), we develop a new Lemma S1.2 concerning the covariance of certain quadratic forms, which turns out to be one of the cornerstones for establishing our new CLT.
Step 3: Tightness of $M_n^{(1)}(z)$ and $M_n^{(2)}(z)$ on $C_n$. We illustrate in this step the basic idea for proving the tightness. A key element is controlling the probability of extreme eigenvalues falling outside of the contour $C$, which is detailed in Lemma S1.6. By virtue of this and Lemmas S1.5, the tightness can be obtained following similar arguments in Bai and Silverstein (2004) and Zheng et al. (2015).

Step 4: Convergence of $M_n^{(3)}(z)$. In this final step, we approximate the quantity $M_n^{(3)}(z)$. In parallel with Step 2, dealing with the nonlinear effects as shown in Lemma S1.2 is the central work in this part, which results in several new terms in the mean functions $\mu_1(z)$ and $\mu_2(z)$.

Through similar steps of truncation, centralization and renormalization as in Bai and Silverstein (2004), by the moment conditions in Assumption (b), one may assume that

$$w_1 < n^{1/2}, \ z_{11} < \eta_n \sqrt{n}, \ E(z_{11}) = 0, \ E(z_{11}^2) = 1, \ E(z_{11}^4) = \tau + o(1), \quad (4.3)$$

where $\eta_n \downarrow 0$ and $\eta_n n^{1/4} \to \infty$. In addition, we assume $||\Sigma|| \leq 1$ for all $p$ and denote by $K$ some constant that can vary from place to place. Some quantities are listed below which will be used frequently throughout the proof.

$$s_j = s(x_j - \mu), \quad r_j = \sqrt{p/n} s_j, \quad e = \mathbb{E}r_j$$

$$\xi_i = w^{-2} - \mathbb{E}w^{-2}, \quad \eta_{ij} = \frac{\mathbb{E}w^{-2}}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}} - \frac{1}{w_i} - \frac{1}{w_j}, \quad \theta = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}}$$

$$D(z) = B_n^0 - z I, \quad D_j(z) = D(z) - r_j r_j', \quad D_{ij}(z) = D(z) - r_i r'_i - r_j r'_j, \quad (i \neq j)$$

$$\varepsilon_j(z) = r_j D_{j^{-1}}(z) r_j - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \Sigma D_{j^{-1}}(z)$$

$$\gamma_j(z) = r_j D_{j^{-1}}(z) r_j - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \Sigma D_{j^{-1}}(z)$$

$$\delta_j(z) = r_j D_{j^{-2}}(z) r_j - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \Sigma D_{j^{-2}}(z)$$

$$\beta_j(z) = \frac{1}{1 + r_j D_{j^{-1}}(z) r_j}, \quad \beta_j(z) = \frac{1}{1 + r_j D_{j^{-1}}(z) r_j}$$

$$\bar{\beta}_j(z) = \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D_{j^{-1}}(z)}$$

$$b_n(z) = \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D_{j^{-1}}(z)}$$

Note that the last six quantities are bounded in absolute value by $|z|/v$ for any $z = u + iv \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Now we split $\tilde{M}_n(z)$ into three parts as

$$\tilde{M}_n(z) = p[m_n(z) - m^0_n(z)] + p[m_n(z) - \mathbb{E}m^0_n(z)] + p[\mathbb{E}m^0_n(z) - m_0(z)]$$
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where \( m_n^0(z) \) is the Stieltjes transform of the ESD \( F_{\mathcal{B}_n} \). We will deal with the convergence of the three processes separately.

**Step 1: Finite dimensional convergence of \( M^{(1)}_n(z) \) in probability.** Using Lemma 2.1.3, we will show that in the expansion of \( M^{(1)}_n(z) \), the contribution of the first term can be negligible while the second and third terms will converge to some deterministic limits, which is summarized in the following three lemmas (Lemmas 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4). From this, we have

\[
M^{(1)}_n(z) = \left(1 + zm_n(z)\right) \frac{zm_n(z)(r_w - 2)(r_w - 1) - r_w}{zm_n(z)(r_w + zm_n(z)(r_w - 1)) / (zm_n(z) + zm_n'(z))} + o_p(1),
\]

where the dominant term is given by \( \kappa(z) \) in Theorem 2.2.

**Lemma 4.2.** We have for any \( z \in \mathcal{C}_n \), \( \text{tr} \ D^{-2}(z) \Delta = o_p(1) \).

Proof. Since \( \text{tr} \ D^{-2}(z) \Delta = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) \Delta \), we only have to show that \( E \| \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) \Delta \|^2 \leq Kn^{-1} \). First,

\[
E \| \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) \Delta_1 \|^2 = \frac{E \frac{\partial^4}{\partial z^4} \sum_{i,j} \xi_i \xi_j \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i r_j D^{-1}(z) r_j}{\Delta_1} \leq \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_i E \left[ (\xi_i^2 \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i) \right]^2 \leq Kn^{-1},
\]

where the last inequality uses \( r_i \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i = O(1) \). Second, by applying the same trick as in Zheng et al. (2015) (their Lemma 5.3), we have

\[
E \| \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) \Delta_2 \|^2 = \frac{E \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\ell \neq m} \eta_{i\ell} \eta_{j\ell} \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i r_j D^{-1}(z) r_m r_m}{\Delta_2} \leq \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\ell \neq m} \eta_{i\ell} \eta_{j\ell} \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i r_j D^{-1}(z) r_m \leq Kn^{-1}.
\]

Finally for the term involving \( \Delta_3 \), we have

\[
E \| \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) \Delta_3 \|^2 \leq \frac{E \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i,j,k} \sum_{\ell \neq k} \frac{r_i r_j}{w_i} \beta_i(z) \beta_k(z) \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i r_j D^{-1}(z) r_k D^{-1}(z) r_k}{\Delta_3} \leq Kn^{-1}.
\]

(4.4)

For those terms that involve two distinct indexes in the summation in (4.4), we have the contribution to (4.4) is bounded by \( Kn^{-1} \), say the case \( i = \ell \neq j = k \),

\[
E \left( \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \left( \frac{r_i r_j}{w_i} \right)^2 \beta_i(z) \text{tr} \ D^{-1}(z) r_i \right)^2 \leq K \frac{n}{n^2} \left( \frac{r_i r_j}{w_i} \right)^2 \leq Kn^{-1}.
\]
For those terms that involve three distinct indexes in the summation in (4.4), we have the contribution to (4.4) also bounded by $Kn^{-1}$. For example, consider the case $i = l \neq j \neq k$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l \beta_i(z) r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \beta_i(z) r_i^l D_{il}^{-1}(z) r_i \right] \\
= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l - \beta_{kl}(z) \left( r_i^k D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i \right)^2 \right|^2 \\
\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left( \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 + \left| \beta_{kl}(z)^2 \right| \left| r_i^k D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i \right|^4 \right) \right] \\
\end{align*}
$$

(4.5)

For the first part in (4.5),

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 \right] \\
= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left( \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 \right) \right] \\
\end{align*}
$$

(4.6)

where the term

$$
\begin{align*}
&\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left( \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 \right) \right] \\
\leq& \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \beta_i(z)^2 \left( \left| \beta_{ik}(z) \right| + \left| \beta_{kl}(z) \right| \left| \beta_{lk}(z) - \beta_{ik}(z) \right| \right) \right] \\
= &\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \left| r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \right| \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 \right] \\
\leq &\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right)^4 \right)^{1/2} \right] \leq Kn^{-1},
\end{align*}
$$

where the last inequality uses the bound such that $\mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j r_i^l r_i^k \right)^2 \leq Kn^{-2}$ and $\mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right)^4 \leq Kn^{-2}$, which can be derived directly by Lemma S1.2. And for the remaining term in (4.6), since $r_k$ is independent of $r_i$, $r_j$, $D_{ik}^{-1}(z)$ and $\beta_{ik}(z)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
&\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \left| \beta_{ik}(z) \right|^2 \left| r_i^j D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i^l \right|^2 \right] \\
\leq &\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{K}{n} \sum_{i \neq j} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j r_j \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{K}{n},
\end{align*}
$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that $\mathbb{E} \left( r_i^j r_j \right)^2 \leq Kn^{-1}$ and Lemma S1.4. We thus have proved (4.6) can be bounded by $Kn^{-1}$. For the second part in (4.5), similarly,
we have
\[
\left| \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \frac{r_i' r_j' r_k'}{w_i} |\beta_i(z)|^2 |\beta_k(z)|^2 r_i' D_{ik}^{-1}(z) r_i| \right| \leq Kn^{-1}.
\]

Therefore, we have proved that (4.5) can be bounded by $Kn^{-1}$. The other cases involving three distinct indexes can also be similarly bounded and thus omitted.

For those terms that involve four distinct indexes in the summation in (4.4), i.e.
\[
\frac{K}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell} \frac{r_i' r_j' r_k'}{w_i} \frac{r_i' r_j' r_k'}{w_j} \frac{r_i' r_j' r_k'}{w_k} \frac{r_i' r_j' r_k'}{w_\ell} D_{i\ell}^{-1}(z)
\]
similar technique as before can also be applied by replacing all the $D^{-1}(z)$ with $D_{ij\ell}^{-1}(z)$, and then since $r_k$ and $r_j$ are independent of all the others, we can replace the two by $\epsilon$ and using Lemma S1.4 again will lead to the designed bound $Kn^{-1}$. Therefore, the proof of this lemma is complete. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 4.3.** We have for any $z \in \mathbb{C}_n$,
\[
\text{tr} D^{-2}(z) \Delta D^{-1}(z) \Delta = (r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2) (m_0(z) + zm_0(z)) (1 + zm_0(z)) + o_n(1).
\]

**Proof.** Define $T_{ij}(z_1, z_2) = \text{tr} D^{-1}(z_1) \Delta_1 D^{-1}(z_2) \Delta_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. For those $i \neq j$, we have
\[
|T_{ij}(z_1, z_2)| \leq \left\{ \text{tr} D^{-1}(z_1) \Delta_1 D^{-1}(z_2) \Delta_j \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \text{tr} D^{-1}(z_2) \Delta_2 D^{-1}(z_2) \Delta_j \right\}^{1/2}
= \left\{ T_{ii}(z_1, z_1) T_{jj}(z_2, z_2) \right\}^{1/2}.
\]
Therefore, we only need to verify the following:
\[
E|T_{11}(z_1, z_2)|^2 \to 0, \quad E|T_{33}(z_1, z_2)|^2 \to 0 \quad (4.7)
\]
and $T_{22}(z_1, z_2)$ converges in probability to
\[
(r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2) (1 + z_1 m_0(z_1)) (1 + z_2 m_0(z_2)). \quad (4.8)
\]
For $T_{11}$, we have
\[
E|T_{11}|^2 \leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i, j, k, \ell} \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \xi_\ell r_i' D^{-1}(z_1) r_i r_j' D^{-1}(z_2) r_j r_k' D^{-1}(z_1) r_k r_\ell'.
\]
Since $\xi_i$ is centered, then the non-zero terms above appear only in $\Sigma(1)$ and $\Sigma(2)$, i.e. with one and two distinct indexes such that
\[
\left| \Sigma(1) \right| = \frac{K}{n^2} \sum_i \mathbb{E}|r_i' D^{-1}(z_1) r_i' D^{-1}(z_2)|^2 \leq Kn^{-2}
\]
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and using the trivial $O(1)$ bound for the absolute values for each quadratic forms leads to $|\Sigma(z)| \leq Kn^{-2}$. We have achieved that $E|T_{13}(z_1, z_2)|^2 \to 0$. For $T_{33}$, define $u_i = \sum_{j \neq i} r_j r_i / \omega_i$, we have

$$E|T_{33}|^2 \leq \frac{K}{n^4} \sum_{i, \ell, s, t} u_i u_s u_t r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_1) r_i r_s^2 r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_2) r_t = \frac{K}{n^4} \left( \sum_{i, \ell} u_i^2 (T_{i \ell} D^{-1}(z_1) r_i)^2 \right) \leq \frac{K}{n^4} \left( \sum_{i, \ell} u_i^2 (T_{i \ell} D^{-1}(z_1) r_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq Kn^2.$$  \hfill (4.9)

Using Lemma S1.4, we have

$$E \left[ \sum_{i, \ell} u_i^2 (T_{i \ell} D^{-1}(z_1) r_i)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{E} \sum_{i, \ell, s, t} u_i^2 u_s^2 (T_{i \ell} D^{-1}(z_1) r_i)^2 (T_{i \ell} D^{-1}(z_1) r_s)^2 \leq \sum_{i, \ell, s, t} (E(u_i^4 u_s^4))^{1/2} \left( E(r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_1) r_i)^4 (r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_1) r_s)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq Kn^2,$$  \hfill (4.10)

where in the last inequality, we replace the two $D^{-1}$ with $D^{-1}_{i \ell}$, thus the two quadratic forms are independent, each with expectation the order of $O(n^{-2})$ due to Lemma S1.4. Combining (4.9) and (4.10) leads to $E|T_{33}|^2 \to 0$.

For $T_{22}$, similar to the steps in Zheng et al. (2015), we have

$$T_{22}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\theta^2}{n^2} \sum_{i, j \neq k} \eta_{ij} \eta_{ik} r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_1) r_i r_j^2 D^{-1}(z_2) r_k = \frac{\theta^2}{n^2} \sum_{i, j \neq k} \eta_{ij} \eta_{ik} r_i^4 D^{-1}(z_1) r_i r_j^2 D^{-1}(z_2) r_j + o_p(1).$$

Using Lemma S1.4 again together with the definition of $\theta$ and $\eta_{ij}$, we have

$$E \left[ T_{22} - (r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2) (1 + z_1 m_0(z_1)) (1 + z_2 m_0(z_2)) \right]^2 \to 0.$$

Finally, combining (4.7), (4.8), taking derivative with respect to $z_1$ and setting $z_1 = z_2$ gives the desired result. The proof of the lemma is then complete.  \hfill \square

**Lemma 4.4.** We have for any $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$,

$$tr (D^{-1}(z) \Delta)^3 (D(z) + \Delta)^{-1} \frac{r_w/(z m_0) - (1 - r_w)(r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2)}{[1 - (1 - r_w)(1 + z m_0)]/ \left( m_0(z) + zm_0'(z) \right) (1 + z m_0(z))^2} + o_p(1).$$
Proof. Define $T_{ijk} = \text{tr} D^{-1}(z) \Delta_i D^{-1}(z) \Delta_j D^{-1}(z) \Delta_k (D(z) + \Delta)^{-1}$, for $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We will prove that all the terms are $o_p(1)$ except for $T_{222}$, which will further be shown to converge to our desired value in probability. For $T_{111}$, $T_{333}$, $T_{113}$, $T_{122}$, $T_{123}$ and $T_{233}$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{111}| \leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k r'_i D^{-1}(z) r_j r'_k (D(z) + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1}(z) r_i \right|
$$

$$
\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \right| \left\{ \mathbb{E} |r'_i D^{-1}(z) r_j|^2 \mathbb{E} |r'_j D^{-1}(z) r_k|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \rightarrow 0,
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{333}| = \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,k,s} u_i u_k u_s r'_i r'_k r'_s (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i
$$

$$
\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,k,s} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |u_i u_k u_s|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |r'_i D^{-1} r_k|^4 \mathbb{E} |r'_k D^{-1} r_s|^4 \right\}^{1/4} \rightarrow 0,
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{113}| = \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k r'_i r'_j r'_k (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right|
$$

$$
\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |\xi_i \xi_j \xi_k|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |r'_i D^{-1} r_j|^4 \mathbb{E} |r'_j D^{-1} r_k|^4 \right\}^{1/4} \rightarrow 0,
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{112}| = \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E} \left| \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k r'_i \left( \sum_{k \neq \ell} \eta_k r'_j D^{-1} r_k \right) r'_k (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right|
$$

$$
\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |r'_i D^{-1} r_j|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k \neq \ell} r'_j D^{-1} r_k \right|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \rightarrow 0,
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{123}| = \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{k \neq \ell} \eta_k r'_i D^{-1} r_k \right) r'_j D^{-1} r_s r'_s (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i
$$

$$
\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |r'_i D^{-1} r_j|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k \neq \ell} \eta_k r'_i D^{-1} r_k \right|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \rightarrow 0.
$$

and

$$
\mathbb{E}|T_{233}| = \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,k,s} u_k u_s \left( \sum_{j} \eta_j r'_i D^{-1} r_k \right) r'_k D^{-1} r_s r'_s (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i
$$
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For the remaining two terms $T_{122}$ and $T_{223}$, we have the following bounds.

$$E|T_{122}| \leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{s,k,t} \left( \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right) | \eta_{kt} r'_t D^{-1} r_s |$$

$$\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{s,k,t} \left( \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right)^2 E|\eta_{kt} r'_t D^{-1} r_s |^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

For the first term, since $\| (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} \|$ and $\| B_n \|$ are bounded, we have

$$E \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right)^2$$

$$\leq KE \| B_n \|^2 \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right)^2 \leq KE \sum_{i,t} \xi_i r'_i D^{-1} r'_t \right)^2 = O(1) \quad (4.11)$$

and for the second term, $E|\eta_{kt} r'_t D^{-1} r_s |^2 \to 0$. We thus have $E|T_{122}| \to 0$. Also,

$$E|T_{223}| \leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j} \left( \sum_{s} \eta_{st} r'_s r_s \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{K}{n^3} \sum_{i,j} \left( \sum_{s} \eta_{st} r'_s r_s \right)^2 E \sum_{i,t} \xi_i \eta_{st} r'_i D^{-1} r'_t (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$
Finally, for the term $T_{222}$, denote $C = \mathbb{E}w^{-1} - \mathbb{E}w^{-2}/\mathbb{E}w^{-1}$. Following similar routine as Zheng et al. (2015), we have

$$T_{222} = \frac{\theta^3}{n^3} \sum_{i \neq j, k \neq \ell} \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{ij} \eta_{kt} \eta_{ts} r'_j D^{-1} r_k r'_\ell D^{-1} r_i (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i$$

$$= \frac{\theta^3}{n^3} \sum_{i \neq j, k \neq \ell} \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{ij} \eta_{kt} \eta_{ts} r'_j D^{-1} r_k r'_\ell D^{-1} r_i (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i + o_p(1)$$

$$= \frac{\theta^2}{n} \sum_{k \neq i, k \neq \ell} \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{ij} \eta_{kt} \eta_{ts} r'_j D^{-1} D^{-1} r_k r'_\ell \eta_{kt} + o_p(1)$$

$$= \frac{\theta^2}{n} \sum_{i \neq \ell} \eta_{ij} \eta_{k\ell} \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st} - (1 + zm_0) \prod_{i \neq \ell} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{i \neq \ell} (D + \Delta)^{-1} + o_p(1)$$

Consider the first term in (4.12), we have

$$\sum_{i \neq \ell} \eta_{ij} \eta_{k\ell} \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st}$$

$$= \prod_{i \neq \ell} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st}$$

$$= \prod_{i \neq \ell} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st}$$

On the other hand, using the definition of $\Delta_2$ and repeating the steps in (4.12) leads to

$$\prod_{i \neq \ell} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_i r'_\ell \prod_{s \neq t} \eta_{st}$$
\begin{equation*}
= \left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right) \frac{\theta^2}{n^2} \sum_{i, t} \sum_{s \neq t} \frac{\eta_{ij}}{w_i} \left(\sum_{s \neq t} \frac{\eta_{st}}{w_s}\right) r_i' (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} r_j' D^{-1} r_i + o_p (1)
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
= - \left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right) \sum_{i \neq t} \frac{\theta E w^{-1}}{w_i w_t} r_i' (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} \Delta_2 D^{-1} r_i + o_p (1)
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
= - \left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right) \theta E w^{-1} \text{tr} D^{-1} \sum_{i \neq t} \frac{r_i r_i'}{w_i w_t} (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} \Delta_2 + o_p (1). \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}

Combining (4.13) and (4.14) gives

\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i \neq t} \text{tr} D^{-1} \Delta_2 (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} \frac{r_i r_i'}{w_i w_t} = \frac{\text{tr} D^{-1} \Delta_2 D^{-2} \sum_{i \neq t} r_i r_i'/w_i w_t}{1 - \left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right) \theta E w^{-1}}. \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}

For the denominator in (4.15), we have since

\begin{equation*}
\text{tr} D^{-1} (z_1) \Delta_2 D^{-1} (z_2) \sum_{i \neq t} \frac{r_i r_i'}{w_i w_t} = \frac{\theta}{n} \sum_{s \neq t, i \neq t} \frac{\eta_{st}}{w_i w_t} r_i' D^{-1} (z_2) r_i D^{-1} (z_1) r_s + o_p (1)
\end{equation*}

\begin{equation*}
= -n E w^{-2} \left(1 + z_1 m_0 (z_1)\right) \left(1 + z_2 m_0 (z_2)\right) + o_p (1),
\end{equation*}

then

\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i \neq t} \text{tr} D^{-1} \Delta_2 (D + \Delta)^{-1} D^{-1} \frac{r_i r_i'}{w_i w_t} = \frac{n E w^{-2} \left(z m_0 (z) + z m_0'(z)\right) \left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right)}{z m_0 (z)}. \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}

Combining (4.12) with (4.16) leads to

\begin{equation*}
T_{222} = \frac{\left(1 + z m_0 (z)\right)^2 \left(r_w / (z m_0) - (1 - r_w) (r_w^2 - 2 r_w + 2)\right)}{\left[1 - (1 - r_w) (1 + z m_0)\right] / \left[z m_0 (z) + z m_0'(z)\right]} + o_p (1).
\end{equation*}

The proof of this lemma is then complete.

\[\square\]

**Step 2: Finite dimensional convergence of \(M_n^{(2)} (z)\) in distribution.** For any \(q\) complex numbers \(z_1, \ldots, z_q \in C_n\), this step approximates joint distribution of

\begin{equation*}
\left[ M_n^{(2)} (z_1), \ldots, M_n^{(2)} (z_q) \right] \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}

by the martingale CLT in Lemma S1.7. To this end, we extend the identity (1.15) and Lemma 2.2 in *Bai and Silverstein (2004)* to Lemmas S1.2 and S1.5, respectively. These
two lemmas are used to calculate the limiting covariance function and verify Lindeberg’s condition when applying the martingale CLT.

Let \( E(\cdot) \) denote expectation and \( E_j(\cdot) \) denote conditional expectation with respect to the \( \sigma \)-field generated by \( r_1, \ldots, r_j, j = 1, \ldots, n \). From the martingale decomposition and the identity

\[
D^{-1}(z) - D_j^{-1}(z) = -D_j^{-1}(z)r_j r_j' D_j^{-1}(z) \beta_j(z),
\]

we get

\[
M_n^{(2)}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n (E_j - E_{j-1}) \text{tr} [D^{-1}(z) - D_j^{-1}(z)]
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=1}^n (E_j - E_{j-1}) \frac{d \log(\beta_j(z)/\bar{\beta}_j(z))}{dz},
\]

\[
= \frac{d}{dz} \sum_{j=1}^n (E_j - E_{j-1}) \log[1 - \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z)],
\]

where the last equality is from the identity \( \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) = \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \).

By Lemma S1.5 and Lemma 2.1 in Bai and Silverstein (2004), we have \( E \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (E_j - E_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \right|^2 \rightarrow 0 \). Thus applying the Taylor expansion to the log function in (4.19), one may conclude

\[
M_n^{(2)}(z) = -\frac{d}{dz} \sum_{j=1}^n (E_j - E_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + o_p(1)
\]

\[
= -\frac{d}{dz} \sum_{j=1}^n E_j \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + o_p(1).
\]

Therefore, we turn to consider the martingale difference sequence

\[
Y_{nj}(z) := \frac{d}{dz} E_j \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

The Lyapunov condition for this sequence is guaranteed by the fact that

\[
\sum_{j=1}^n E \left| Y_{nj}(z) \right|^4 = \sum_{j=1}^n E \left| E_j \left( \delta_j(z) \bar{\beta}_j(z) - \varepsilon_j(z) \beta_j^2(z) \right) \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \Sigma D_j^{-2}(z) \right|^4
\]

\[
\leq K \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{|z|^4 E|\delta_j(z)|^4}{v^4} + \frac{|z|^8 p^4 E|\varepsilon_j(z)|^4}{v^{16} n^4} \right) \rightarrow 0,
\]
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where the convergence is from Lemma S1.5. Moreover, from the lemma, we have \( E|Y_{nj}(z)|^2 = O(n^{-1}) \), and hence the random vector in (4.17) forms a tight sequence.

We next consider the sum \( \sigma_n(z, \hat{z}) := \sum_{j=1}^{n} E_{j-1} [Y_{nj}(z) Y_{nj}(\hat{z})] \), for \( z \neq \hat{z} \in \{z_1, \ldots, z_w\} \).

From similar arguments on Pages 571 and 576 of Bai and Silverstein (2004), we have

\[
E[\tilde{\beta}_j(z) - b_n(z)] \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_n(z) + zm_0(z) \to 0, \quad (4.20)
\]

which implies

\[
\sigma_n(z, \hat{z}) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z \partial \hat{z}} z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z}) \sum_{j=1}^{n} E_{j-1} (E_j \epsilon_j(z) E_j \epsilon_j(\hat{z})) + o_p(1).
\]

From (4.3) and Lemma S1.2, one may get

\[
z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z}) \sum_{j=1}^{n} E_{j-1} (E_j \epsilon_j(z) E_j \epsilon_j(\hat{z})) = 2(T_1 + \alpha_2 T_2 - T_3 - T_4) + (\tau - 3)(T_5 + T_6 - T_7 - T_8) + o(1),
\]

where

\[
T_1 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right],
\]

\[
T_2 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) \right] tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right],
\]

\[
T_3 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) \right] tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right],
\]

\[
T_4 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) \right] tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right],
\]

\[
T_5 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j (A' D_j^{-1}(z) A) \circ E_j (A' D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) A) \right],
\]

\[
T_6 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) \right] tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right] tr \left[(A' A) \circ (A' A)\right],
\]

\[
T_7 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(z) \right] tr \left[ E_j (A' D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) A) \circ (A' A)\right],
\]

\[
T_8 = \frac{z \hat{z} m_0(z) m_0(\hat{z})}{pn^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} tr \left[ E_j (A' D_j^{-1}(z) A) \circ (A' A)\right] tr \left[ E_j \Sigma D_j^{-1}(\hat{z}) \right].
\]
The quantities $T_1$ and $T_2$ have been respectively studied in Bai and Silverstein (2004) and Hu et al. (2019) under their models. Following their steps and applying Lemma S1.5, one may obtain

$$T_1 = \log \frac{m_p(z) - m_0(\tilde{z})}{m_0(z) m_0(\tilde{z}) (z - \tilde{z})} + o_p(1),$$

$$T_2 = \frac{T_6}{c_n} = c_n \int \frac{tm_0(z) dH_p(t)}{1 + tm_0(z)} \int \frac{tm_0(\tilde{z}) dH_p(t)}{1 + tm_0(\tilde{z})}$$

$$= \frac{[1 + z m_0(z)][1 + \tilde{z} m_0(\tilde{z})]}{c_n} + o_p(1).$$

Notice that statistics $T_3$ and $T_4$ will reduce to $T_2$ if $\Sigma^2$ is replaced with $\Sigma$. Therefore, similar to the derivation of the limit of $T_2$, it’s straightforward to get

$$T_3 = c_n \int t^2 m_p(z) dH_p(t) \int \frac{tm_0(\tilde{z}) dH_p(t)}{1 + tm_0(\tilde{z})} + o_p(1)$$

$$= \left[ 1 - \frac{1 + z m_0(z)}{c_n m_p(z)} \right] [1 + \tilde{z} m_0(\tilde{z})] + o_p(1),$$

$$T_4 = c_n \int \frac{tm_0(z) dH_p(t)}{1 + tm_0(z)} \int t^2 m_p(\tilde{z}) dH_p(t) \int \frac{tm_0(\tilde{z}) dH_p(t)}{1 + tm_0(\tilde{z})} + o_p(1)$$

$$= \left[ 1 - \frac{1 + \tilde{z} m_0(\tilde{z})}{c_n m_p(\tilde{z})} \right] [1 + z m_0(z)] + o_p(1).$$

Following the proof of Theorem 1.4 of Pan and Zhou (2008) and using Lemma S1.5, one may get

$$T_5 = \frac{1}{n} \tr [(A^t (\Sigma_0^{-1}) I + \Sigma_0^{-1}) A] o_p(1)$$

$$= c_n g_p \left( -\frac{1}{m_0(z)}, -\frac{1}{m_0(\tilde{z})} \right) + o_p(1),$$

$$T_7 = \frac{1}{mn} \tr [\Sigma (m_0^{-1}(z) I + \Sigma)^{-1}] \tr [(A^t (\Sigma_0^{-1}) I + \Sigma_0^{-1}) A] o_p(1)$$

$$= h_p \left( -\frac{1}{m_0(z)} \right) [1 + z m_0(z)] + o_p(1),$$

$$T_8 = \frac{1}{mn} \tr [(A^t (\Sigma_0^{-1}) I + \Sigma)^{-1}] \tr [(A^t A)] tr [\Sigma (m_0^{-1}(z) I + \Sigma)^{-1}] + o_p(1)$$

$$= h_p \left( -\frac{1}{m_0(z)} \right) [1 + \tilde{z} m_0(\tilde{z})] + o_p(1).$$

Collecting the above results and applying Lemma S1.7, we get

$$(4.17) \equiv \mathcal{D} \left[ M_0^{(2)}(z_1), \ldots, M_0^{(2)}(z_q) \right] + o_p(1),$$
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where \( \{M_0^{(2)}(z)\} \) is a \( q \)-dim zero-mean normal random vector with covariance function

\[
\text{Cov}[M_0^{(2)}(z), M_0^{(2)}(\tilde{z})] = \sigma_1(z, \tilde{z}) + (\tau - 3)\sigma_2(z, \tilde{z}).
\]

**Step 3: Tightness of** \( M_n^{(1)}(z) \) **and** \( M_n^{(2)}(z) \). The tightness can be established by verifying the moment condition (12.51) of Billingsley (1968):

\[
\sup_{n,z_1,z_2\in C_n} \frac{E|M_n^{(k)}(z_1) - M_n^{(k)}(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} < \infty, \ k = 1, 2. \tag{4.21}
\]

Proof for \( M_n^{(1)}(z) \) is similar to Zheng et al. (2015) and that for \( M_n^{(2)}(z) \) is similar to Bai and Silverstein (2004). Since the latter is more involved, as an illustration, we sketch main ideas for \( M_n^{(2)}(z) \) only.

The first task here is to control the probability of the event that extreme eigenvalues of \( \mathbf{B}_n^0 \) falling outside of the interval \([s_l, s_r]\) defined by (4.1). This is done in Lemma S1.6. By virtue of this lemma and arguments on Page 579 in Bai and Silverstein (2004), one may assume that moments of \( \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \), \( \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \) and \( \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z) \) are all bounded in \( n \) and \( z \in C_n \), that is, for any positive \( q \),

\[
\max\{E||\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)||^q, E||\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)||^q, E||\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z)||^q\} \leq K_q. \tag{4.22}
\]

Then using such boundedness, the inequality in Lemma S1.5 can be extended as

\[
\left| E\left[ a(v) \prod_{l=1}^q (y' \mathbf{B}_l(v)y - \text{tr } \Sigma \mathbf{B}_l(v)) \right] \right| \leq K q^{q-1} \eta_n^{2q-4}, \ q \geq 2, \tag{4.23}
\]

where the matrices \( \mathbf{B}_l(v) \) are independent of \( y = \sqrt{\eta s}(x - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \) and

\[
\max\{|a(v)|, ||\mathbf{B}_l(v)||\} \leq K \left[ 1 + p^* I \left( ||\mathbf{B}_n^0|| \geq x_r \text{ or } \lambda_{\text{min}}^B \leq x_l \right) \right]
\]

for some positive \( s \), where \( \mathbf{B} \) is \( \mathbf{B}_n^0 \) or \( \mathbf{B}_0^0 \) with some \( r_j \)'s removed. Note that the inequality (4.23) is parallel to the inequality (3.2) in Bai and Silverstein (2004) for the independent components model.

Finally, following closely the procedure in Section 3 of Bai and Silverstein (2004), and applying Lemmas S1.5 and S1.6 together with (4.22) and (4.23), one may verify (4.21) for \( M_n^{(2)}(z) \). The details are thus omitted.

**Step 4: Convergence of** \( M_n^{(3)}(z) \). To finish the proof, it is enough to show that the sequence of \( M_n^{(3)}(z) \) is bounded and equicontinuous, and converges to the mean function (4.2). The boundedness and equicontinuity can be verified following the arguments on Pages 592-593 of Bai and Silverstein (2004), and we only focus on the convergence of \( M_n^{(3)}(z) \) in this step.
A novel method for the convergence is proposed, which is quite different from the idea in Bai and Silverstein (2004). This new procedure is more straightforward and easier to follow.

We first list some results that will be used in this part:

\[
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_j(z)|^q \leq K_q \mu^{-1} n^{-2q-4},
\]

\[
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}|\gamma_j(z)|^q \leq K_q \mu^{-1} n^{-2q-4},
\]

\[
\sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |b_n(z) + zm_0(z)| \to 0,
\]

\[
\sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \|zI - b_n(z)\Sigma\|^{-1} < \infty,
\]

\[
\sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}\left|\text{tr} D^{-1}(z)M - \mathbb{E}\text{tr} D^{-1}(z)M\right|^2 \leq K\|M\|^2,
\]

where \( q \geq 2 \) and \( M \) is any nonrandom \( p \times p \) matrix. These results can be verified step by step following the discussions in Bai and Silverstein (2004) and we omit the details.

Writing \( V(z) = zI - b_n(z)\Sigma \), we decompose \( M_n^{(3)}(z) \) in two ways:

\[
M_n^{(3)}(z) = [p\mathbb{E}m_n^0(z) + \text{tr} V^{-1}(z)] - [\text{tr} V^{-1}(z) + pm_0(z)] := S_n(z) - T_n(z),
\]

\[
M_n^{(3)}(z) = [n\mathbb{E}m_n^0(z) + nb_n(z)/z] - [nb_n(z)/z + nm_0(z)] := S_n(z) - T_n(z).
\]

Notice that

\[
T_n(z) = p \int \frac{dH_p(t)}{z - b_n(z)t} - p \int \frac{dH_p(t)}{z + zm_0(z)t} \\
= p \left[b_n(z) + zm_0(z)\right] \int \frac{tdH_p(t)}{(z - b_n(z)t)(z + zm_0(z)t)} \\
= c_n T_n(z) \int \frac{tdH_p(t)}{(z - b_n(z)t)(1 + m_0(z)t)}.
\]

We have

\[
\frac{M_n^{(3)}(z) - S_n(z)}{M_n^{(3)}(z) - T_n(z)} = \frac{T_n(z)}{T_n(z)} = \frac{c_n}{z} \int \frac{tdH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0(z)t)^2} + o(1),
\]

where the second identity uses the convergence in (4.25).

Our next task is to study the convergence of \( S_n(z) \) and \( S_n(z) \). For simplicity, we suppress the expression \( z \) in the sequel when it is served as independent variables of some functions. All expressions and convergence statements hold uniformly for \( z \in \mathcal{C}_n \).

We first simplify the expression of \( S_n \). Using the identity \( r'_j D^{-1} = r'_j D_j^{-1} \beta_j \), we have

\[
S_n = \mathbb{E}\text{tr}(D^{-1} + V^{-1}) = \mathbb{E}\text{tr} \left[ V^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_j r'_j - b_n\Sigma \right) D^{-1} \right] \\
= n\mathbb{E}\beta_1 r'_1 D_1^{-1} V^{-1} r_1 - b_n\mathbb{E}\text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1}.
\]
From (4.18) and \( \beta_1 = b_n - b_n \beta_1 \gamma_1 \),
\[
\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{D}^{-1}) = \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \beta_1 \\
= b_n \mathbb{E}(1 - \beta_1 \gamma_1) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1,
\]
where \( |\mathbb{E} \beta_1 \gamma_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1| \leq Kn^{-1/2} \). From this and (4.28), we get
\[
S_n = n \mathbb{E} \beta_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - b_n \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} + \frac{1}{n} b_n^2 \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma + o(1).
\]
Plugging \( \beta_1 = b_n - b_n^2 \gamma_1 + b_n^3 \gamma_2 - b_1 b_n^3 \gamma_3 \) into the first term in the above equation, we obtain
\[
n \mathbb{E} \beta_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 = b_n \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma - nb_n^2 E \gamma_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 \\
+ nb_n^3 E \gamma^2 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - nb_n^3 E \beta_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1.
\]
Note that, from (4.23), (4.24), and (4.26),
\[
E \gamma_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 = E \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma \right] \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 \\
- \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \right] + \frac{1}{n^2} \operatorname{Cov}(\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma, \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma) \\
= E \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma \right] \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 \\
- \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \right] + o \left( \frac{1}{n} \right),
\]
\[
E \gamma_1^2 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 = E \gamma_1^2 \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \right] \\
+ \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Cov}(\gamma_1^2, \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma) + \frac{1}{n} E \gamma_1^2 \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \\
= \frac{1}{n} E \gamma_1^2 \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma + o \left( \frac{1}{n} \right),
\]
\[
E \beta_1 \gamma_1 \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 = o \left( \frac{1}{n} \right).
\]
We thus arrive at
\[
S_n = -nb_n^2 E \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma \right] \left[ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \right] \\
+ b_n^2 E \gamma_1^2 \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma + \frac{1}{n} b_n^2 \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1} \Sigma + o(1).
\]
On the other hand, by the identity \( r'_j D^{-1} = r'_j D^{-1}_j \beta_j \), we have

\[
p + z \text{tr} D^{-1} = \text{tr}(B_n D^{-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j r'_j D^{-1}_j = n - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j,
\]

which implies \( n z n^0 = - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j \). From this, together with \( \beta_1 = b_n - b_n^2 \gamma_1 + b_n^2 \gamma_1^2 - \beta_1 b_n^3 \gamma_1^3 \), (4.23), we get

\[
S_n = - \frac{n}{z} E (\beta_1 - b_n) = - \frac{n}{z} b_n^3 E \gamma_1^2 + o(1).
\]

Applying Lemma S1.2 to the simplified \( S_n \) and \( \tilde{S}_n \), and then replacing \( D_j \) with \( D \) in the derived results yield

\[
S_n = - \frac{b_n^2}{n} \left[ E \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma + \frac{2}{p} \left( \alpha_2 \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} \right) \right.
\]

\[
- E \text{tr} \Sigma^2 D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} - E \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma^2 D^{-1} V^{-1} \right] 
\]

\[
+ \frac{2 k_3^2}{n^2} \left[ E \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma + \frac{1}{p} \left( \alpha_3 \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} - 2 E \text{tr} \Sigma^2 D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} \right) \right]
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr}(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}(D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' D^{-1} V^{-1} A)]
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} V^{-1} A) \circ (A' A)] - \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' A)]
\]

\[
+ \frac{(r - 3) b_n^3}{n^2} \left[ E \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' D^{-1} A)] + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr}^2(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' A) \circ (A' A)] \right]
\]

\[
- \frac{2}{p} \text{tr}(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' A)] ED^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma + o(1),
\]

\[
\tilde{S}_n = \frac{-2 k_3^3}{zn} \left[ E \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} D^{-2} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} - 2 E \text{tr} \Sigma^2 D^{-1} \text{tr} \Sigma D^{-1} \right] 
\]

\[
- \frac{(r - 3) b_n^3}{zn} \left[ E \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' D^{-1} A)] + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr}^2(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' A) \circ (A' A)] \right]
\]

\[
- \frac{2}{p} \text{tr}(D^{-1} \Sigma) \text{tr}[(A' D^{-1} A) \circ (A' A)] + o(1).
\]

To study the convergence of \( S_n \) and \( \tilde{S}_n \), we need to figure out the difference between \( D^{-1} \) and \( V^{-1} \). Write

\[
D^{-1} + V^{-1} = b_n \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 + \tilde{R}_3,
\]

(4.29)
where
\[ \hat{R}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} V^{-1}(r_j r_j^T - n^{-1} \Sigma)D_j^{-1}, \quad \hat{R}_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} V^{-1}r_j r_j^T D_j^{-1}(\beta_j - b_n), \]
\[ \hat{R}_3 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_n V^{-1} \Sigma(D_j^{-1} - D^{-1}). \]

Similar to the arguments on page 590 in Bai and Silverstein (2004) we have, for any \( p \times p \) matrix \( M \),
\[ |E \text{ tr } \hat{R}_2 M| \leq n^{1/2} K(\|M\|^4)^{1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{ tr } \hat{R}_3 M| \leq K(\|M\|^2)^{1/2} \]  (4.30)
and, for nonrandom matrix \( M \),
\[ |E \text{ tr } \hat{R}_1 M| \leq n^{1/2} K \|M\|. \]  (4.31)

Taking a step further, for \( M \) nonrandom, we write
\[ \text{ tr } \hat{R}_1 \Sigma D^{-1} M = \hat{R}_{11} + \hat{R}_{12} + \hat{R}_{13}, \]  (4.32)
where
\[ \hat{R}_{11} = \text{ tr } \sum_{j=1}^{n} V^{-1}r_j r_j^T D_j^{-1} \Sigma(D^{-1} - D_j^{-1})M, \]
\[ \hat{R}_{12} = \text{ tr } \sum_{j=1}^{n} V^{-1}(r_j r_j^T - n^{-1} \Sigma)D_j^{-1} \Sigma D_j^{-1} M, \]
\[ \hat{R}_{13} = -\frac{1}{n} \text{ tr } \sum_{j=1}^{n} V^{-1} \Sigma D_j^{-1} \Sigma(D^{-1} - D_j^{-1})M. \]

It’s clear that \( E \hat{R}_{12} = 0 \) and moreover, using (4.22), (4.23) and (4.26), we get
\[ |E \hat{R}_{13}| \leq K \|M\|, \]  (4.33)
\[ E \hat{R}_{11} = -n \beta_1 r_1 D_1^{-1} \Sigma D_1^{-1} \Sigma D_1^{-1} M V^{-1} r_1 \]
\[ = -b_n n^{-1} \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} \Sigma D_1^{-1} \Sigma \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} M V^{-1} \Sigma + o(1) \]
\[ = -b_n n^{-1} \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} \Sigma D_1^{-1} \Sigma \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} M V^{-1} \Sigma + o(1) \]
\[ = -b_n n^{-1} \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} \Sigma D_1^{-1} \Sigma \text{ tr } D_1^{-1} M V^{-1} \Sigma + o(1). \]  (4.34)

Applying (4.20), (4.29)-(4.34) and (2.6), one may calculate the limit of each component of \( S_n \) and \( S_n \). Specifically, we have
\[ \frac{1}{n} E \text{ tr } D^{-1} \Sigma^k = -\int c_n t^k dH_p(t) z(1 + w_0(t)) + o(1), \]
31
\[
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma_k = - \int \frac{c_n t^k dH_p(t)}{z^2(1 + m_0 t)^2} + o(1),
\]
\[
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma
\]
\[
= - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma = \frac{b^2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma + o(1)
\]
\[
= - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma \left[ 1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma \right]^{-1} + o(1),
\]
\[
= \int \frac{c_n t^2 dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} \left[ 1 - \int \frac{c_n m_0^2 t^2 dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right]^{-1} + o(1),
\]
\[
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} D^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma
\]
\[
= - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma \left[ 1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma \right] + o(1)
\]
\[
= - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} V^{-1} \Sigma \left[ 1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} V^{-1} \Sigma D^{-1} \Sigma \right]^{-1} + o(1),
\]
\[
= \int \frac{c_n t^2 dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} \left[ 1 - \int \frac{c_n m_0^2 t^2 dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right]^{-1} + o(1).
\]

Combining the above results, we obtain
\[
T_n / T_n = \int \frac{c_n t dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} + o(1),
\]
\[
S_n = - \mathbb{E} T_n / T_n
\]
\[
= - \int \frac{c_n m_0^2 t^2 dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} \left[ 1 - \int \frac{c_n m_0^2 t^2 dH_p(t)}{(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right]^{-1} + o(1),
\]
\[
- \frac{2c_n m_0^2}{z} \left[ \int (\alpha t - t^2) dH_p(t) \int \frac{tdH_p(t)}{1 + m_0 t} - \int \frac{tdH_p(t)}{1 + m_0 t} \int \frac{t^2 dH_p(t)}{1 + m_0 t} \right]
\]
\[
- c_n (\tau - 3) \left\{ \frac{1}{z m_0} b_{p,z} \left( \frac{1}{m_0} \right) + c_p \int \frac{t m_0 dH_p(t)}{1 + m_0 t} \int \frac{t m_0 dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right\} + o(1).
\]

Therefore, from (4.27) and the identities
\[
\left[ 1 - \int \frac{c_n t dH_p(t)}{z(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right]^{-1} = -z m_0 \left[ 1 - \int \frac{c_n m_0^2 t^2 dH(t)}{(1 + m_0 t)^2} \right]^{-1} = -z m_0^4 m_0.
\]
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we obtain

\[ M_n^{(3)}(z) = \frac{S_n - \frac{S_n T_n}{T_n}}{1 - \frac{T_n}{T_n}} = \mu_1(z) + (\tau - 3)\mu_2(z) + o(1). \]

The proof is complete.

**S1 Lemmas**

**Lemma S1.1.** Under Assumptions (a)-(b)-(d), the sample spatial median \( \hat{\mu} \) satisfies

\[ ||\hat{\mu} - \mu|| = O_{a.s.}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \left| \hat{\mu} - \mu - \frac{\sum s_j}{\sum |x_j - \mu|} \right| \right| = o_{a.s.}(1), \]

where \( s_j = s(x_j - \mu) \), \( j = 1, \ldots, n \).

**Lemma S1.2.** In addition to Assumptions (a)-(b)-(d), suppose that the conditions in (4.3) hold. Let \( y = \sqrt{p}s(x - \mu) \), then for any \( p \times p \) complex matrices \( C \) and \( \tilde{C} \) with bounded spectral norms,

\[ E(y'Cy - \text{tr} \Sigma C)(y'\tilde{C}y - \text{tr} \Sigma \tilde{C}) = \text{tr} \Sigma C \Sigma \tilde{C} + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \Sigma^2 C \text{tr} \Sigma \tilde{C} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} \Sigma^2 C \text{tr} \Sigma \tilde{C} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} \Sigma C \text{tr} \Sigma^2 \tilde{C} + (\tau - 3) \left\{ \text{tr}[(A'CA) \circ (A'\tilde{C}A)] + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} C \Sigma \tilde{C} \Sigma \text{tr}[(A'CA) \circ (A'CA)] \right\} + o(p). \]

**Lemma S1.3.** Under the assumptions of Lemma S1.2,

\[ \text{tr}(B_n - zI)^{-1} - \text{tr}(B_0^n - zI)^{-1} = -\text{tr} D^{-2}(z)\Delta + \text{tr} D^{-2}(z)\Delta D^{-1}(z)\Delta - \text{tr} (D^{-1}(z)\Delta)^3(D(z) + \Delta)^{-1} + o_p(1). \]

The matrix \( \Delta \) is \( \Delta = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 \) with

\[ \Delta_1 = -\frac{\theta^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i r_i r'_i, \quad \Delta_2 = \frac{\theta}{n} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{ij} r_i r'_j, \quad \Delta_3 = \frac{2\theta}{p} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{r'_i r_i}{w_i} r_j r'_j, \]

where \( \theta = 1/E(w^{-1}) \), \( \xi_i = w_i^{-2} - Ew^{-2} \) and \( \eta_{ij} = Ew^{-2}/Ew^{-1} - 1/w_i - 1/w_j \).

**Lemma S1.4.** Under the assumptions of Lemma S1.2, let \( u_j = \sum_{i \neq j} r'_i r_j / w_j \). We have

1.) \( E(r'_i e)^2 \leq Kn^{-3}; \)
2.) \( E|\mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 - (1 + z \mathbf{m}_0(z))|^2 \leq Kn^{-1}; \)
3.) \( E|\mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_2|^4 \leq Kn^{-2}; \)
4.) \( E|u_1^4 u_2^4| \leq K; \)
5.) The population spatial sign covariance matrix \( \Sigma \) has the following expansion
\[
\Sigma = \mathbf{T} - \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{diag}(\mathbf{T}) \mathbf{A}' - \frac{2}{p} \mathbf{T}^2 + \left( \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{T} \circ \mathbf{T}) + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \mathbf{T}^2 \right) \mathbf{T} + o(p^{-1}),
\]
where \( \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{A} \) and \( \text{diag}(\mathbf{T}) \) is the matrix of \( \mathbf{T} \) with off diagonal entries removed.

**Lemma S1.5.** Under the assumptions of Lemma S1.2, for any \( p \times p \) complex matrix \( \mathbf{M} \),
\[
E |\mathbf{y}' \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y} - \text{tr} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{M}|^q \leq K_q ||\mathbf{M}||^q p q^{-1} \delta_n^{q-4}, \quad q \geq 2, \tag{S.1}
\]
where \( K_q \) is a positive constant depending only on \( q \).

This lemma follows from Lemma 2.2 in Bai and Silverstein (2004) and similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 5 in Gao et al. (2016).

**Lemma S1.6.** Under the assumptions of Lemma S1.2, for any \( s > 0 \), \( x_r = \limsup_{p \to \infty} ||\mathbf{\Sigma}||(1 + \sqrt{c})^2 \) and \( x_l = \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\min} \mathbf{\Sigma} \),
\[
P(||\mathbf{B}_n^0|| > x_r) = o(n^{-s}) \quad \text{and} \quad P(\lambda_{\min} \mathbf{B}_n^0 < x_l) = o(n^{-s}).
\]

**Lemma S1.7** (Theorem 35.12 of Billingsley (1995)). Suppose for each \( n, Y_{n1}, Y_{n2}, \ldots, Y_{nk_n} \) is a real martingale difference sequence with respect to the increasing \( \sigma \)-field \( \mathcal{F}_{nj} \) having second moments. If for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \),
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E(Y_{nj}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{nj,j-\varepsilon}) \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E(Y_{nj}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{nj,j-1}) \overset{L_{\sigma}}{\to} \sigma^2,
\]
as \( n \to \infty \), where \( \sigma^2 \) is a positive constant, then
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{nj} \overset{D}{\to} N(0,\sigma^2).
\]

**S2  Proofs**

**S2.1  Proof of Lemma S1.1**
By definition, the sample spatial median \( \hat{\mu} \) is the unique solution to
\[
\hat{\mu} = \mu + \frac{1}{\sum \frac{s_j}{||x_j - \hat{\mu}||^{-1}}}.
\]
We have thus
\[ ||x_j - \hat{\mu}|| \leq ||x_j - \mu|| + ||\mu - \hat{\mu}|| = ||x_j - \mu|| + \frac{||\sum_s (x_j - \mu)||}{\sum ||x_j - \hat{\mu}|| - 1}. \] (S.2)

Taking the sum on both side of (S.2) yields
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \hat{\mu}|| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \mu|| + \frac{n||\sum_s || s_j ||}{\sum ||x_j - \hat{\mu}|| - 1}. \] (S.3)

From (S.1), (S.3), and the inequality
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \hat{\mu}|| - 1 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \mu||, \] (S.4)
we get
\[ ||\mu - \hat{\mu}|| = \frac{||\sum s_j||}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| - 1} \leq \frac{||\sum s_j|| \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \mu||}{n^2 - n \sum ||s_j||}. \]

Then by the facts
\[ \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \right\| = O_{a.s.}(\sqrt{n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \mu|| = O_{a.s.}(n^{3/2}), \] (S.5)
we conclude that \( ||\hat{\mu} - \mu|| = O_{a.s.}(1). \)

For the second conclusion, from (S.1), (S.4), (S.5), and the fact \( ||\mu - \hat{\mu}|| = O_{a.s.}(1), \) it holds almost surely that
\[
\left\| \hat{\mu} - \mu - \frac{\sum s_j}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| - 1} \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{s_j}{||x_j - \mu|| - 1} - \frac{\sum s_j}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| - 1} \right\| \\
\leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \right\| \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| - 1} - \frac{1}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| + ||\mu - \hat{\mu}|| - 1}, \right. \\
\left. \frac{1}{\sum ||x_j - \mu|| - 1} - \frac{1}{\sum (||x_j - \mu|| + ||\mu - \hat{\mu}|| - 1)} \right\} \\
\leq K \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left| \frac{\sum s_j}{||x_j - \mu||^2} \right|^2 \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} ||x_j - \mu|| \right)^2 = o_{a.s.}(1),
\]
where \( K \) is some constant.
Denote $W = A'CA$, $U = A'CA$, $\tilde{T} = A'A$. Consider the product of the quadratic form $y'Cyy'C_y$, which is equivalent to $z'Wzz'Uz/(z'Tz/p)^2$. Further, denote $s = z'Tz/p$ and recall $\text{tr} \tilde{T} = p$, it is trivial to have $s - 1 = O_p(p^{-1/2})$. Using the equation that

$$\frac{1}{s^2} = 2 - s^2 + (1 - s^2)^2 + s^{-2}(1 - s^2)^3,$$

we have

$$Ey'Cyy'C_y = E(z'Wzz'Uz)\left(2 - s^2 + 4(1 - s)^2 + O_p(p^{-3/2})\right) = E(z'Wzz'Uz)\left(6 - 8s + 3s^2\right) + O(\sqrt{p}). \quad (S.6)$$

Therefore, the main task in the following is to derive the limit for the three terms $Ez'Wzz'Uz$, $Ez'Wzz'Uzs$ and $Ez'Wzz'Uzs^2$ up to the order $O(p)$.

For the first term $Ez'Wzz'Uz$, we have

$$Ez'Wzz'Uz = E \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} z_iz_\ell z_k z_\ell W_{ij}U_{k\ell}. \quad (S.7)$$

Since all the $p$ components $z_i$ are independent and standardized, with mean zero, variance one and finite fourth moment, the terms that will contribute are the ones with their indexes either can be glued together or derived into two groups, i.e. $i = j = k = \ell$, or $i = j \neq k = \ell$, or $i = k \neq j = \ell$ or $i = \ell \neq j = k$. All the four cases together gives

$$Ez'Wzz'Uz = \text{tr} W \text{tr} U + \text{tr} WU + \text{tr} W'U + (\tau - 3) \sum_i W_{ii}U_{ii}. \quad (S.7)$$

For the second term $Ez'Wzz'Uzs$, we have

$$Ez'Wzz'Uzs = \frac{1}{p} E \sum_{i,j,k,\ell,s,u} z_iz_\ell z_k z_\ell z_s z_u W_{ij}U_{k\ell} \tilde{T}_{su}. \quad (S.7)$$

The terms that will contribute up to order $O(p)$ are in $\sum_{(2)}$ and $\sum_{(3)}$, where the index ($\cdot$) denotes the number of distinct integers in the set $\{i, j, k, \ell, s, u\}$. It can be checked that the following three cases should be counted in $\sum_{(2)}$ (all have the form of the product of two traces)

case 1: $i = j \neq k = \ell = s = u,$

case 2: $k = \ell \neq i = j = s = u,$

case 3: $s = u \neq i = j = k = \ell,$

while in $\sum_{(3)}$ the following four cases should be taken into account,

case 1: $k = s \neq \ell = u \neq i = j$ and $k = u \neq \ell = s \neq i = j,$

case 2: $i = j \neq k = \ell = s = u,$

case 3: $k = \ell \neq i = j = s = u,$

case 4: $s = u \neq i = j = k = \ell.$
case 2: $i = s \neq j = u \neq k = \ell$, and $i = u \neq j = s \neq k = \ell$,
case 3: $i = \ell \neq j = k \neq s = u$, and $i = k \neq j = \ell \neq s = u$,
case 4: $i = j \neq k = \ell \neq s = u$.

Combining the contribution of each case in $\sum(2)$ and $\sum(3)$, we have

\[
\text{case 1} = \frac{\tau}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{kk} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq k \neq \ell} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{\ell k}
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{kk} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} W_{ii} (U \tilde{T})_{kk} + O(1)
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} W \sum_{k} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{kk} + \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} W \text{tr}(U \tilde{T}) + O(1),
\]

\[
\text{case 2} = \frac{\tau}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ii} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} W_{ij} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ji}
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} W_{ii} \tilde{T}_{ii} U_{kk} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{i \neq k} U_{kk} (W \tilde{T})_{ii} + O(1)
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} U \sum_{i} W_{ii} \tilde{T}_{ii} + \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} U \text{tr}(W \tilde{T}) + O(1),
\]

\[
\text{case 3} = \frac{\tau}{p} \sum_{s \neq i} W_{ii} U_{is} \tilde{T}_{ss} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \neq j \neq s} W_{ij} U_{ji} \tilde{T}_{ss} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \neq j \neq s} W_{ij} U_{ji} \tilde{T}_{ss}
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \sum_{s \neq i} W_{ii} U_{is} \tilde{T}_{ss} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \neq s} \tilde{T}_{ss} (WU)_{ii} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \neq s} \tilde{T}_{ss} (WU^*)_{ii} + O(1)
= \frac{\tau}{p} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \sum_{i} W_{ii} U_{ii} + \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \text{tr}(WU) + \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \text{tr}(WU^*) + O(1),
\]

\[
\text{case 4} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \neq k \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ss}
= \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} W \text{tr} U \text{tr} \tilde{T} - \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \sum_{i} W_{ii} U_{ii} - \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} U \sum_{i} W_{ii} \tilde{T}_{ii}
- \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} W \sum_{i} \tilde{T}_{ii} U_{ii} + O(1),
\]

which further gives

\[
Ez'Wzz'Uzs = \text{case 1} + \text{case 2} + \text{case 3} + \text{case 4} + o(p)
= \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} W \text{tr} U \text{tr} \tilde{T} + \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} W \text{tr}(U \tilde{T}) + \frac{2}{p} \text{tr} U \text{tr}(W \tilde{T})
\]
\[ \begin{align*}
  &+ \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \text{tr}(WU) + \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \text{tr}(WU^*) + \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{tr} W \sum_k U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{kk} \\
  &+ \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{tr} U \sum_i W_{ii} \tilde{T}_{ii} + \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{tr} \tilde{T} \sum_i W_{ii} U_{ii} + o(p). \quad (S.8)
\end{align*} \]

Finally, for the third term \( \mathbb{E}z'W_{zz'}Uzs^2 \), we have

\[ \mathbb{E}z'W_{zz'}Uzs^2 = \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i,j,k,l,s,u,m,b} z_i z_j z_k z_\ell z_u z_m z_b W_{ij} U_{k\ell} \tilde{T}_{su} \tilde{T}_{mb}. \]

The terms that will make the main contribution up to order \( O(p) \) are in \( \sum_{(3)} \) and \( \sum_{(4)} \).

For example, when considering \( \sum_{(1)} \), we have

\[ \sum_{(1)} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i} \frac{1}{p^2} z_i^2 W_{ii} U_{ii} \tilde{T}_{ii}^2 = O(p^{1-4\eta}) = o(p) \]

by using the assumptions in (4.3). Similar technique can be applied for dealing with the terms in \( \sum_{(2)} \) and get the \( o(p) \) bound, thus can be neglected. For terms in \( \sum_{(3)} \) and \( \sum_{(4)} \), we list in the following all the cases that should be counted, which are all up to order \( O(p) \).

For \( \sum_{(3)} \), we have six cases

case 1: \( i = j \neq k = \ell \neq s = u = m = b \),
case 2: \( i = j = s = u \neq k = \ell \neq m = b \),
case 3: \( i = j = m = b \neq k = \ell \neq s = u \),
case 4: \( k = \ell = m = b \neq i = j \neq s = u \),
case 5: \( i = j = k = \ell \neq s = u \neq m = b \),
case 6: \( k = \ell = s = u \neq i = j \neq m = b \),

while in \( \sum_{(4)} \), we have seven cases

case 1: \( i = j \neq k = \ell \neq u = m \neq s = b \) and \( i = j \neq k = \ell \neq s = m \neq u = b \),
case 2: \( i = s = u \neq j = k \neq \ell \neq m = b \) and \( i = u \neq j = s \neq k = \ell \neq m = b \),
case 3: \( i = m \neq j = b \neq u = s \neq k = \ell \) and \( i = u \neq j = m \neq k = \ell \neq s = u \),
case 4: \( k = m \neq \ell \neq b \neq i = j \neq s = u \) and \( k = b \neq \ell \neq m \neq i = j \neq s = u \),
case 5: \( i = k \neq j = \ell \neq s = u \neq m = b \) and \( i = \ell \neq j = k \neq s = u \neq m = b \),
case 6: \( k = s \neq \ell \neq u \neq i = j \neq m = b \) and \( k = u \neq \ell \neq s \neq i = j \neq m = b \),
case 7: \( i = j \neq k = \ell \neq s = u \neq m = b \).

Combining the above, we have

\[ \begin{align*}
  \text{case } 1 &= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq m \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ms} \tilde{T}_{ms} + \frac{\tau}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ss}^2 \\
  &= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} (\tilde{T} \tilde{T})_{ss} + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \tilde{T}_{ss}^2 + O(1)
\end{align*} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{case 3} &= \text{case 2} \\
\text{case 7} &= 1 \\
\text{case 6} &= \text{case 4} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, \bar{T}^2 \, \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, U + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, U \sum_s \bar{T}_{ss}^2 + O(1),
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{case 2} &= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq k \neq m} W_{ij} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ij} \bar{T}_{mm} + \frac{\tau}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq m} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ii} \bar{T}_{mm} \\
&= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq m} (W \bar{T})_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{mm} + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq m} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ii} \bar{T}_{mm} + O(1) \\
&= \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} (W \bar{T}) \, \text{tr} \, U \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, U \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} \sum_i W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ii} + O(1),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{case 3} = \text{case 2},
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{case 4} &= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{k \neq \ell \neq i \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{kk} + \frac{\tau}{p^2} \sum_{k \neq i \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{kk} \bar{T}_{ss} \\
&= \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{k \neq i \neq s} (U \bar{T})_{kk} W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ss} + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \sum_{k \neq i \neq s} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{kk} + O(1) \\
&= \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} (U \bar{T}) \, \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} \sum_k U_{kk} \bar{T}_{kk} + O(1),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{case 5} &= \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq s \neq m} W_{ij} U_{ij} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} + \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq j \neq s \neq m} W_{ij} U_{ji} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq s \neq m} W_{ii} U_{ii} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} \\
&= \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq s \neq m} (WU)_{ii} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} + \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq s \neq m} (WU^*)_{ii} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} \\
&\quad + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq s \neq m} W_{ii} U_{ii} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} (WU) (\text{tr} \, \bar{T})^2 + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} (WU^*) (\text{tr} \, \bar{T})^2 + \frac{\tau - 2}{p^2} (\text{tr} \, \bar{T})^2 \sum_i W_{ii} U_{ii} + O(1),
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{case 6} = \text{case 4},
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{case 7} &= \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i \neq k \neq s \neq m} W_{ii} U_{kk} \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{T}_{mm} \\
&= \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, U (\text{tr} \, \bar{T})^2 - \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, U \sum_s \bar{T}_{ss}^2 - \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, W \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} \sum_s \bar{T}_{ss} \bar{U}_{ss} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{p^2} (\text{tr} \, \bar{T})^2 \sum_i W_{ii} U_{ii} - \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \, U \, \text{tr} \, \bar{T} \sum_i W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ii} + O(1),
\end{align*}
\]
which finally leads to

\[
\mathbb{E}(z'Wz'Uz)s^2
= \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr} W \text{tr} U (\text{tr} \bar{T})^2 + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr} \bar{T}^2 \text{tr} W \text{tr} U + \frac{4}{p^2} \text{tr}(W \bar{T}) \text{tr} U \text{tr} \bar{T}
+ \frac{4}{p^2} \text{tr}(U \bar{T}) \text{tr} W \text{tr} \bar{T} + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr}(WU)(\text{tr} \bar{T})^2 + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr}(WU^*)(\text{tr} \bar{T})^2
+ \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr} W \text{tr} U \sum_s \bar{T}_{ss}^2 + \frac{2\tau - 6}{p^2} \text{tr} U \text{tr} \bar{T} \sum_i W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ii}
+ \frac{2\tau - 6}{p^2} \text{tr} W \text{tr} \bar{T} \sum_k U_{kk} \bar{T}_{kk} + \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} (\text{tr} \bar{T})^2 \sum_i W_{ii} U_{ii} + o(p).
\]  

(S.9)

Collecting (S.6), (S.7), (S.8), (S.9), we have

\[
\mathbb{E}y'Cyy'Cy
= (\tau - 3) \sum_i W_{ii} U_{ii} + \text{tr} W \text{tr} U + \text{tr}(WU) + \text{tr}(W'U)
+ \frac{6}{p^2} \text{tr} \bar{T}^2 \text{tr} W \text{tr} U - \frac{4}{p} \text{tr}(W \bar{T}) \text{tr} U - \frac{4}{p} \text{tr}(U \bar{T}) \text{tr} W
+ \frac{3(\tau - 3)}{p^2} \text{tr} W \text{tr} U \sum_s \bar{T}_{ss}^2 - \frac{2(\tau - 3)}{p} \text{tr} W \sum_k U_{kk} \bar{T}_{kk}
- \frac{2(\tau - 3)}{p} \text{tr} U \sum_i W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ii} + o(p).
\]  

(S.10)

On the other hand, using the equality

\[
\frac{1}{s} = 2 - s + (1 - s)^2 + O(p^{-3/2})
\]

we can derive

\[
\mathbb{E}y'Cy = \mathbb{E}z'Wy = \mathbb{E}z'Wy \left(3 - 3s + s^2\right) + O(p^{-1/2}).
\]  

(S.11)

It is trivial to have

\[
\mathbb{E}z'Wy = \text{tr} W
\]  

(S.12)

and by applying (S.7) and (S.8) again,

\[
\mathbb{E}z'Wzs = \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \sum_i W_{ii} \bar{T}_{ii} + r \text{tr} W + \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(W \bar{T}) + \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(W^* \bar{T}),
\]  
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\[ E\v'Wz^2 = \text{tr } W + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr } W \text{tr}(T^2) + \frac{4}{p} \text{tr}(W\tilde{T}) + \frac{2(\tau - 3)}{p} \sum_i W_{ii}\tilde{T}_{ii} + \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr } W \sum_i \tilde{T}_{ii}^2 + o(1). \]  

(S.13)

Collecting (S.11), (S.12) and (S.13) leads to

\[ Ey'C_y = \text{tr } W + \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr } W \sum_i \tilde{T}_{ii}^2 + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr } W \text{tr}(\tilde{T}^2) - \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \sum_i W_{ii}\tilde{T}_{ii} + \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr } W \sum_i \tilde{T}_{ii}^2 - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr}(W\tilde{T}) + o(1). \]  

(S.14)

Therefore, combining (S.10)-(S.14) and facts that for any \( p \times p \) matrix \( M \),

\[ \text{tr } \tilde{T}^k = \text{tr } T^k \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr } T^k M = \text{tr } \Sigma^k M + o(p||M||), \quad k = 1, 2, \]

we have got

\[ E(y'C_y - \Sigma C)(y'\tilde{C}_y - \Sigma \tilde{C}) = E\gamma y'\tilde{C}_y - E\gamma y'E\gamma'\tilde{C}_y 
= \text{tr }[(W' + W)U] + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr } \tilde{T}^2 \text{tr } W \text{tr } U - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr}(W\tilde{T}) \text{tr } U 
- \frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr } W \text{tr } (U \circ \tilde{T}) - \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{tr } U \text{tr } (U \circ \tilde{T}) 
= \text{tr } \Sigma C \Sigma \tilde{C} + \text{tr } \Sigma C \Sigma \tilde{C} + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr } (\Sigma^2) \text{tr } \Sigma C \text{tr } \Sigma \tilde{C} 
- \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{tr } \Sigma^2 C \text{tr } \Sigma \tilde{C} - \frac{2}{p} \text{tr } \Sigma C \text{tr } \Sigma^2 \tilde{C} 
+ (\tau - 3)
\left[ \text{tr } (A'C_\Sigma A' \tilde{C} A) + \frac{1}{p^2} \text{tr } (C\Sigma) \text{tr } (\tilde{C}\Sigma) \text{tr } (A'\Sigma A \circ A'A) 
- \frac{1}{p} \text{tr } (C\Sigma) \text{tr } (A'C_\Sigma A' \tilde{C} A) \right] + o(p). \]

The proof of this lemma is then complete.

**S2.3 Proof of Lemma S1.3**

Let for \( j = 1, \ldots, n \),
\[ s_j = s(x_j - \mu), \quad \tilde{s}_j = s(x_j - \tilde{\mu}), \quad \text{and} \quad R_j = ||x_j - \mu||. \]
Notice that
\[
\frac{||x_j - \mu||}{||x_j - \hat{\mu}||} = 1 - \frac{(x_j - \mu)'(\mu - \hat{\mu})}{||x_j - \mu||^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \|\mu_j - \hat{\mu}\|_2^2 + o_p(n^{-1})
\]
which leads to
\[
\hat{s}_j = s_j + R_j^{-1}(I_p - s_js_j')(\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_js_j') - \frac{1}{2} R_j^{-2}||\mu - \hat{\mu}||^2 s_j + o_p(n^{-1}).
\]
We have then
\[
B_n = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{s}_j \hat{s}_j' = B_n^0 + \Xi + o_p(n^{-1}),
\]
where \(\Xi = \Xi_1 + \Xi_2 + \Xi_3 + \Xi_4 + \Xi_5\) and
\[
\Xi_1 = \frac{n}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} R_i^{-2} (I_p - s_i s_i') (\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s_i')
\]
\[
\Xi_2 = -\frac{p}{n} \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} s_i s_i',
\]
\[
\Xi_3 = \frac{n}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-1} s_i (\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s_i'),
\]
\[
\Xi_4 = -\frac{p}{n} \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-3} s_i (\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s_i').
\]
Denote
\[
\Xi_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} (\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s_i') - \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} (\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s_i')
\]
\[
- \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} s_i s_i' (\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' s_i s_i' + \frac{n}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} s_i s_i' (\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' s_i s_i'
\]
\[= \Xi_{11} - \Xi_{12} - \Xi_{13} + \Xi_{14}.
\]
We have \(\Xi_{12}\) and \(\Xi_{13}\) being rank one with their operator norm bounded by \(O_p(n^{-1})\) and \(\|\Xi_{14}\| = o_p(n^{-1})\). Similarly,
\[
\Xi_4 = -\frac{p}{n} \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-3} s_i (\mu - \hat{\mu})' + \frac{p}{n} \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-3} s_i (\mu - \hat{\mu})' s_i s_i'
\]
\[= \Xi_{41} + \Xi_{42}.
\]
For its first term, $\Xi_{41}$ is rank one and $\|\Xi_{41}\| = o_p(1)$ while for its second term, we have $\|\Xi_{42}\| = o(n^{-1})$. Therefore, when considering the difference $\text{tr}(B_n - z\mathbf{I})^{-1} - \text{tr}(B_0 - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}$, the terms $\Xi_{12}, \Xi_{13}, \Xi_{14}, \Xi_{4}$, and $\Xi'_4$ can be negligible. Meanwhile, the terms that will contribute are $\Xi_{11}, \Xi_{2}, \Xi_{3}$ and $\Xi_{3}$. By applying Lemma S1.1, we have for the rank one part $\Xi_{11}$,

$$
\Xi_{11} = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2}(\mu - \hat{\mu})(\mu - \hat{\mu})' = \frac{\mathbb{E}w^{-2}}{(\mathbb{E}w^{-1})^2} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i} s_i s'_i + o_p(1)
$$

(S.15)

For $\Xi_{2}$ and $\Xi_{3}$, we have

$$
\Xi_{2} = -\frac{p}{n} \|\mu - \hat{\mu}\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-2} s_i s'_i = -\frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}w^{-1})^2} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i} w'_s w^2_i + o_p(n^{-1}),
$$

(S.16)

$\Xi_{3} = \frac{p}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{-1} s_i (\mu - \hat{\mu})' (I_p - s_i s'_i)$

$$
= -\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i} s_i s'_i w'_i + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i} s_i s'_i s_j + o_p(n^{-1})
$$

$$
= -\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} s_i s'_i w'_i + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}w^{-1}} \frac{p}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} s'_i s_j s_i + o_p(n^{-1}).
$$

(S.17)

Collecting (S.15), (S.16) and (S.17), we have

$$
B_n = B_0 + \Delta + \Delta_0,
$$

where $\Delta_0$ is a sum of matrices which are either full rank with spectral norm $o_p(1/n)$ or finite rank with spectral norm $o_p(1)$. By simple algebra calculations, one gets the conclusion of the lemma.

**S2.4 Proof of Lemma S1.4**

1.) Denote for short $v_i = \|Az_i\|$ and $r = \sqrt{\text{tr} A' A} = \sqrt{p}$ and apparently, we have $v_i - r = O_p(1)$. Using the identity

$$
\frac{1}{v_i} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{r - v_i}{r^2} + \frac{(r - v_i)^2}{v_i r^2},
$$
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we have
\[ \mathbb{E} \frac{\|Az_i\|}{\|Az_i\|} = \mathbb{E} \left( Az_i \cdot \left( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{r - v_i}{r^2} + \frac{(r - v_i)^2}{v_i r^2} \right) \right) = \mathbb{E} \left( Az_i \frac{r - v_i}{r^2} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left( Az_i \frac{(r - v_i)^2}{v_i r^2} \right), \]
which leads to
\[ \epsilon' \Sigma \epsilon = K \left( \mathbb{E} \frac{Az_i}{\|Az_i\|} \right) \Sigma \left( \mathbb{E} \frac{Az_j}{\|Az_j\|} \right) = \frac{K}{r^4} \mathbb{E} \left( (r - v_i)(r - v_j)z'_i A' \Sigma A z_j \right) \cdot (1 + O(1/\sqrt{p})) \]
In the remaining, we will show that
\[ \mathbb{E} \left( (r - v_i)(r - v_j)z'_i A' \Sigma A z_j \right) \leq K, \]
which then gives \( \epsilon' \Sigma \epsilon \leq Kp^{-2} \). Further, it holds
\[ \mathbb{E}(r'_i \epsilon)^2 = \epsilon' \mathbb{E}(r'_1 \epsilon) \epsilon = \frac{1}{n} \epsilon' \Sigma \epsilon \leq Kn^{-3}. \]
Since
\[ \mathbb{E} \left( (r - v_i)(r - v_j)z'_i A' \Sigma A z_j \right) = \sum_{lt} (A' \Sigma A)_{lt} \mathbb{E}(r - v_i)z_{lt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(r - v_j)z_{jt}, \quad (S.18) \]
we will focus on the term \( \mathbb{E}(r - v_i)z_{jt} \), which is denoted as \( \mathbb{E}(r - v)z_t \) for short. Also, define \( \|Az\|_{(\cdot)} \) as the quantity that removes all the terms that involve \( z_t \) in the expansion of \( \|Az\| \), i.e.
\[ \|Az\|^2 = \sum_{k,j \neq t} z_k (A' A)_{kj} z_j + \sum_{j \neq t} z_t (A' A)_{tj} z_j + \sum_{k \neq t} z_k (A' A)_{kt} z_t + z_t (A' A)_{tt} z_t \]
\[ = \|Az\|_{(\cdot)}^2 + \sum_{j \neq t} z_t (A' A)_{tj} z_j + \sum_{k \neq t} z_k (A' A)_{kt} z_t + z_t (A' A)_{tt} z_t. \]
Obviously, we have \( \mathbb{E}\|Az\|_{(\cdot)} z_t = 0 \) since the two are independent, therefore, we arrive
\[ \mathbb{E}(r - v)z_t = -\mathbb{E} \left( \|Az\| - \|Az\|_{(\cdot)} + \|Az\|_{(\cdot)} \right) z_t \]
\[ = -\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\|Az\|^2 - \|Az\|_{(\cdot)}^2}{\|Az\| + \|Az\|_{(\cdot)}} \right) z_t \]
\[ = \frac{K}{\sqrt{p}} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\|Az\|^2 - \|Az\|_{(\cdot)}^2}{\|Az\| + \|Az\|_{(\cdot)}} \right) z_t \cdot (1 + O(1/\sqrt{p})) \]
\[ = \frac{K}{\sqrt{p}} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{j \neq t} z_t (A' A)_{tj} z_j + \sum_{k \neq t} z_k (A' A)_{kt} z_t + z_t (A' A)_{tt} z_t \right) z_t \cdot (1 + O(1/\sqrt{p})) \]
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Finally, by (S.18) and (S.19), we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left( (r - v_i)(r - v_j) z_i^T A' \Sigma A z_j \right) = \frac{K}{p} \text{tr} \left( A' A \circ (A' \Sigma A) \circ A' A \right) + o(1) \leq K.
\]

2.) This follows directly from Bai and Silverstein (2004).

3.) Following Lemma S1.2, let \( y_j = \sqrt{p} s(x_j - \mu) \) for \( j = 1, 2 \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left| r_1^T D^{-1}(z) r_2 \right|^4 \leq \frac{K}{n^4} \mathbb{E}\left| y_1^T D^{-1}_{12}(z) y_2 \right|^4
\]
\[
= \frac{K}{n^4} \mathbb{E}\left( \text{tr}^2 D^{-1}_{12}(z) y_2 y_2^T D^{-1}_{12}(z) \Sigma + O(n^{-2}) \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{K}{n^4} \mathbb{E}\left( y_2^T D^{-1}_{12}(z) \Sigma D^{-1}_{12}(z) y_2 + O(n^{-2}) \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{K}{n^4} \mathbb{E}\left( \text{tr}^2 D^{-1}_{12}(z) \Sigma D^{-1}_{12}(z) \Sigma + O(n^{-2}) \right) = O(n^{-2}).
\]

4.) Let \( r_0 = \sum_{j=3}^n r_j \). From the fact \( |r_1^T C r_j| \leq K \) for any matrix \( C \) with bounded spectral norm, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}(u_1^T u_2^T) = \mathbb{E}(r_1^T r_2 + r_1^T r_0 + r_0^T r_2 + r_0^T r_0)^4
\]
\[
\leq K \mathbb{E}|r_1^T r_2|^4 + 2(r_1^T r_2)^4(r_0^T r_0)^4 + (r_1^T r_0 r_0^T r_2)^4 \leq K \mathbb{E}|r_1^T r_0 r_0^T r_2|^4 + O(1),
\]
Using Lemma S1.2, one may get
\[
\mathbb{E}(u_1^T u_2^T) \leq K \mathbb{E}|r_1^T r_0 r_0^T r_2 r_0^T r_0^T r_1|^2 + O(1)
\]
\[
\leq K \mathbb{E}|y_1^T r_0 y_2 y_2^T r_0^T r_1|^2 + O(1)
\]
\[
\leq K \mathbb{E}\left( \text{tr}^2 r_0 y_2 y_2^T r_0 r_0^T \Sigma + O(1) \right)
\]
\[
\leq K \mathbb{E}\left( \text{tr}^2 \Sigma r_0 y_2 y_2^T r_0^T \Sigma + O(1) \right) = O(1).
\]

5.) Denote \( s = z^T \bar{T} z / p \) and recall \( \text{tr} \bar{T} = p \). Obviously, \( s - 1 = O_p(p^{-1/2}) \). From the expansion
\[
\frac{1}{s} = 1 + 1 - s + (1 - s)^2 + s^{-2}(1 - s)^3 = 3 - 3s + s^2 + o_p(p^{-1}),
\]
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we get

$$\Sigma = 3T - \frac{3}{p} \mathbb{E}zz'Az'Az + \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E}zz'Az'(z'Az) + o(p^{-1}).$$

Elementary calculations reveal that

$$\frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E}zz'Az'Az = \frac{\tau - 3}{p} \text{diag}(T) + I_p + \frac{2}{p} T,$$

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E}zz'Az'Az(I) = \left(\frac{\tau - 3}{p^2} \text{tr}(T o T) + \frac{2}{p^2} \text{tr}(T^2) + 1\right) I_p + \frac{2\tau - 6}{p} \text{diag}(T) + \frac{4}{p} T + o(p^{-1}).$$

Collecting these results, we obtain the fifth conclusion.

**S2.5 Proof of Lemma S1.6**

Let $\tilde{B}_n = AZ_n, Z_n' Az/n$ with $AA' = T$ and $\text{tr}(T) = p$, where $Z_n = (z_{ij})$ satisfies (4.3). From Bai and Silverstein (2004), the conclusions of this lemma hold when $(B^0_n, \Sigma)$ are replaced with $(\tilde{B}_n, T)$. Choose $\eta_r^{(0)}$ and $\eta_l^{(0)}$ (when $s_l > 0$) satisfying

$$\limsup_{p \to \infty} \frac{||\Sigma||}{(1 + \sqrt{c})^2} < \eta_r^{(0)} < \eta_r,$$

$$\eta_l < \eta_l^{(0)} < \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\min} I(0,1)(c(1 - \sqrt{c})^2).$$

It follows that

$$\eta_l^{(0)} < \liminf_{p \to \infty} \lambda_{\min} I(0,1)(c(1 - \sqrt{c})^2)$$

and

$$\limsup_{p \to \infty} \frac{||T||}{(1 + \sqrt{c})^2} < \eta_r^{(0)}.$$

Using inequalities

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{p}{||Az_j||^2} \lambda_{\min} \frac{B^0_n}{||Az_j||^2} \leq \lambda_{\min} \frac{||B^0_n||}{||B_n||} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{p}{||Az_j||^2} \frac{||B^0_n||}{||B_n||},$$

one gets

$$P(||B^0_n|| > \eta_r)$$

$$\leq P \left( \left| \frac{||B_n||}{||Az_j||^2} \right| > \frac{\eta_r}{\eta_r^{(0)}} \right) + P \left( \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{p}{||Az_j||^2} \frac{||B_n||}{||B_n||} > \eta_r, ||B_n|| > \eta_r^{(0)} \right)$$

$$\leq P \left( \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{p}{||Az_j||^2} > \frac{\eta_r}{\eta_r^{(0)}} \right) + o(n^{-s})$$

$$\leq P \left( \left| \frac{z' Az}{p} - 1 \right| > \frac{\eta_r}{\eta_r^{(0)}} - 1 \right) + o(n^{-s})$$
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\[
\left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[|z'_1 Tz_1 - \mu|^2]}{p^2(\eta/\eta_0^{(0)} - 1)^2} \right)^n + o(n^{-s}),
\]
\[
= o(n^{-s}),
\]
where the fourth inequality is from the Markov inequality. Similarly, \( P(\lambda_{\min}^{B_0} < \eta) = o(n^{-s}) \).

**S2.6 Proof of Theorem 2.1**

Let
\[
B_{n1} = \frac{1}{n} AZC_1 Z'A', \quad B_{n2} = \frac{1}{n} AZC_2 Z'A',
\]
\[
B_{n3} = \frac{1}{n} AZC_3 Z'A', \quad B_{n4} = \frac{1}{n} AZZ'A',
\]
where \( C_1 = \text{diag}(d_j) \), \( C_2 = \text{diag}(d_j I_{A_j}) \), and \( C_3 = \text{diag}(I_{A_j}) \) with
\[
d_j = \frac{p w_j^2}{||x_j - \hat{\mu}||^2}
\]
and \( A_j = \{w_j^{-1} < n^{1/3}, \max_k |z_{jk}| < n^{1/3}\} \),
\[
j = 1, \ldots, n. \] Here \( I_A \) denotes the indicator function on the set \( A \). Then from Theorem A.43 in Bai and Silverstein (2010), we have
\[
||F_{B_n} - F_{B_{n1}}|| \leq \frac{1}{p} \text{rank}(B_n - B_{n1}) \leq \frac{2}{p} \to 0,
\]
\[
||F_{B_{n1}} - F_{B_{n2}}|| \leq \frac{1}{p} \text{rank}(D_1 - D_2) \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^n I_{A_j},
\]
\[
||F_{B_{n3}} - F_{B_{n4}}|| \leq \frac{1}{p} \text{rank}(D_3 - D_4) \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^n I_{A_j},
\]
where \( ||f|| = \sup_x |f(x)| \). Applying Bernsteins inequality,
\[
\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^n I_{A_j} \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^n I_{(w_j^{-1} > n^{1/3})} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j,k} I_{(|z_{jk}| > n^{1/3})} \to 0, \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
Moreover, the spectral norm of the difference between \( B_{n2} \) and \( B_{n3} \) is
\[
||B_{n2} - B_{n3}|| \leq \frac{1}{n} ||AA'|| ||ZZ'|| \max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} |d_j - 1| \right\}.
\]
From Bai and Silverstein (1998), the spectral norm \( ||ZZ'||/n \) is bounded almost surely for all large \( n \). Next we show that \( \max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} |d_j - 1| \right\} = o_{a.s.}(1) \) which is equivalent to \( \max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} |1/d_j - 1| \right\} = o_{a.s.}(1) \). Notice that
\[
\max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} |1/d_j - 1| \right\} \leq ||\mu - \hat{\mu}||^2 \max_j \left\{ \frac{I_{A_j}}{pw_j^2} \right\} + \max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} \left| \frac{z'_i Tz_j}{p} - 1 \right| \right\},
\]
\[
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\]
where the first term is $O_{a.s.}(1)$ from Lemma S1.1. Applying Markov’s inequality and Lemma 2.7 in Bai and Silverstein (1998), for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$
P \left( \max_j \left\{ I_{A_j} \left| \frac{z'_j T z_j}{p} - 1 \right| \right\} > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left| z'_j T z_j - p \right|^8 I_{A_1}}{n^2 \varepsilon^8} = O(n^{-2})
$$

which implies $\|B_{n2} - B_{n3}\| = o_{a.s.}(1)$. We therefore conclude that the matrices $B_n$ and $B_{n4}$ have the same LSD. Following Theorem 1.1 in Silverstein (1995), we get the conclusion of Theorem 2.1.

### S3 Approximating distribution of $(\hat{\beta}_2, \hat{\beta}_3)$

Let $\alpha_k = \text{tr}(\Sigma_k^k)/p$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, and recall that $\alpha_1 = 1$. Then the centralization terms for the two statistics are

$$\beta_2 = \alpha_2 + c_n \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_3 = \alpha_3 + 3c_n\alpha_2 + c_n^2,$$

respectively. Following Theorem 2.2, the vector $p(\beta_2 - \hat{\beta}_2, \beta_3 - \hat{\beta}_3)$ has the following normal approximation

$$N \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mu_2 \\ \mu_3 \end{pmatrix} + (\tau - 3) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_2 \\ \hat{\beta}_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{22} & \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{23} & \sigma_{33} \end{pmatrix} + (\tau - 3) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{22} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{23} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{33} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

The mean and covariance parameters possess explicit expressions as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu_2 &= c_n^2(r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2) - c_n\alpha_2, \\
\mu_3 &= 3c_n^2(r_w^2 - 2r_w + 2)\alpha_2 + c_n^3(r_w^3 - 3r_w + 4) - 3c_n(\alpha_3 + c_n\alpha_2), \\
\sigma_{22} &= 8c_n(\alpha_3^2 - 2\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4) + 4c_n^2\alpha_2^2, \\
\sigma_{23} &= 12c_n(\alpha_2\alpha_3 - \alpha_3^2 - \alpha_2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5) + 12c_n^2(2\alpha_3^3 - 3\alpha_2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4) + 12c_n^3\alpha_2, \\
\sigma_{33} &= 18c_n(\alpha_2^2\alpha_3^2 - 2\alpha_3\alpha_4 + \alpha_6) + 18c_n^2(4\alpha_2\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_3^2 - 3\alpha_2\alpha_4 + 4\alpha_5) + 6c_n^3(13\alpha_2^2 - 12\alpha_2\alpha_3 + 12\alpha_4) + 36c_n^4\alpha_2^2.
\end{align*}
$$

When the matrix $A$ is diagonal, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{\mu}_2 &= \hat{\mu}_3 = 0, \\
\hat{\sigma}_{22} &= 4c_n(\alpha_3^2 - 2\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4), \\
\hat{\sigma}_{23} &= 6c_n(\alpha_2\alpha_3 - \alpha_3^2 - \alpha_2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5) + 12c_n^2(\alpha_2^2 - 2\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4), \\
\hat{\sigma}_{33} &= 9c_n(\alpha_2^2\alpha_3 - 2\alpha_3\alpha_4 + \alpha_6) + 36c_n^2(\alpha_2\alpha_3 - \alpha_3^2 - \alpha_2\alpha_4 + \alpha_5) + 36c_n^3(\alpha_2^3 - 2\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4).
\end{align*}
$$

These explicit formulas are obtained through residue theorem, see Qin and Li (2017) for details.
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