OPTIMAL CHOICE OF $K$ FOR $K$-NEAREST NEIGHBOR REGRESSION

BY MONA AZADKIA∗†

The $k$-nearest neighbor algorithm ($k$-NN) is a widely used non-parametric method for classification and regression. We study the mean squared error of the $k$-NN estimator when $k$ is chosen by leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV). Although it was known that this choice of $k$ is asymptotically consistent, it was not known previously that it is an optimal $k$. We show, with high probability, the mean squared error of this estimator is close to the minimum mean squared error using the $k$-NN estimate, where the minimum is over all choices of $k$.

1. Introduction.

1.1. $k$-NN Algorithm. The $k$-nearest neighbor algorithm ($k$-NN) is a non-parametric method used for classification and regression. For a given sample of $n$ pairs $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the $k$-NN algorithm outputs

$$
\hat{y} = \hat{m}_{k,n}(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(x)} y_j,
$$

as an estimate of $m(x) := \mathbb{E}[y \mid x]$, where $N_k(x)$ is the set of indices of the $k$ nearest neighbors of $x$ among $x_i$’s.

The choice of $k$ is very important. For small values of $k$, the $k$-NN estimator would have high variance and may overfit to the noise. As $k$ grows, the estimator becomes less flexible and therefore more biased.

1.2. Related Literature. The consistency and asymptotic behaviour of $k$-NN regression and classification has been studied by many researchers. In [1, 2], the authors provide the necessary and sufficient conditions on $k$ for $k$-NN estimator to be consistent. In [12], the author has shown asymptotic normality of the $k$-NN estimator. The rate of convergence of this estimator has also been studied under assumptions on the density of $x_i$’s [3, 5, 7] or the Lipschitz property of the unknown function $m(\cdot)$ [9].
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In applications, an optimal choice of $k$ depends on the sample. Assuming that the variance of noise, $\text{var}(y \mid x) = \sigma^2$, is known and $m(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz with known constant $L$, Guerre [4] suggested a choice of $k$ as a function of the sample and provided a non-asymptotic bound on the mean squared error of the proposed $k$-NN estimator conditional on the $x_i$’s. Although he did not assume independence of the $x_i$’s, the assumptions on $m(\cdot)$ and $\sigma^2$ seem to be very strong for many real data applications.

In application, a common approach for choosing the value of $k$ is by cross-validation [8]. In [10], Li showed that the $k$-NN estimator using the $k$ chosen by LOOCV is asymptotically consistent. This result is under the assumption that the distribution of $x_i$’s fulfills two regularity conditions that together imply that $x_i$’s are dense in their support in a uniform way. Although this result is stronger than the results on the consistency of the $k$-NN estimator for non-random choice of $k$, it does not show why the LOOCV choice of $k$ is a competitive choice. More precisely, given other values of $k$ that give a consistent $k$-NN estimate, [10] does not show why one should use the value of $k$ by LOOCV.

1.3. Our Work. In this work, we study the LOOCV $k$-NN estimator. Although it has been shown previously that this $k$ gives us a consistent estimator, it was not shown that this choice of $k$ is optimal. In this paper we compare the mean squared error of the proposed $k$-NN estimator with the minimum mean squared error using the $k$-NN algorithm, where the minimum is taken over all choices of $k$, and we show that with high probability they are very close. In section 2 we discuss the setting and provide the main result. In section 3 we discuss a simulated example. Finally we provide all the proofs in section 4.

1.4. Notation. We use boldface for vectors and matrices, e.g. $X$ for a matrix and $x$ for a vector. For simplicity, we use $[n]$ for $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, the set of natural numbers less than or equal to $n$. For given points $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ and $x$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ where $k \leq t$ we define $N_k(x)$ to be the set of indices of the $k$ nearest neighbors of $x$ among $x_i$’s. Ties are broken uniformly at random. For matrix $A$, the 2-norm $\|A\|_2$ and the Frobenius norm $\|A\|_F$ are defined as

$$\|A\|_2 = \sup_{\|x\|_2 = 1} \|Ax\|_2, \quad \|A\|_F = (\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2)^{1/2}.$$ 

Throughout the paper, $c$, $C$ and $K$ denote positive absolute constants.
2. Main result. Let \( \{(x_i, y_i)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \) be a set of pairs of observations for \( i \in [n] \). For each \( i \), we assume that \( y_i = m(x_i) + \epsilon_i \), where \( m : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) is an unknown continuous function and \( x_i \) are drawn independently from an unknown distribution. For simplicity let \( \mu_i = m(x_i) \). We assume that \( \mu_i = m(x_i) \) are sub-Gaussian with sub-Gaussian norm bounded by \( C \)

\[
\mathbb{E} \exp(\mu_i/C)^2 \leq 2.
\]

and \( \mathbb{E} \mu_i^2 \leq M \).

Noise variables \( \epsilon_i \)'s are independent sub-Gaussian mean zero random variables with sub-Gaussian norm \( \|\epsilon_i\|_{\psi^2} \) upper bounded by \( K \),

\[
\mathbb{E} \exp(\epsilon_i/K)^2 \leq 2.
\]

For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), the \( k \)-NN estimate of \( m(x) \) given sample \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n]} \) is

\[
\hat{m}_{k,n}(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(x)} y_j.
\]

The mean squared error of this estimate is

\[
\text{MSE}(k) = \mathbb{E}[(m(x) - \hat{m}_{k,n}(x))^2],
\]

where the expectation is with respect to the joint distribution of \( x \) and \( \epsilon \).

In practice, we do not know the probability distribution function of the \( x_i \)'s. Therefore we can not compute the \( \text{MSE}(k) \). Instead, we can use the given data to estimate the \( \text{MSE}(k) \).

For each \( i \in [n] \), let \( N_k(i) := N_k(x_i) \) be the set of the \( k \) nearest neighbors of \( x_i \) among \( \{x_j\}_{j \neq i} \). Note that in defining \( N_k(i) \) we are excluding \( x_i \) from the set of query points.

Define

\[
k^* := \arg\min_{k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}} \text{MSE}(k).
\]

One may find \( k^* \) the best value of \( k \) for the \( k \)-NN estimate. But since the distributions of \( x \) and \( \epsilon \) and function \( m(\cdot) \) are all unknown, in practice we can not find \( k^* \). Instead, for each \( k \in [n-1] \) we define

\[
f(k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} y_j)^2,
\]

and

\[
\tilde{k} := \arg\min_{k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}} f(k).
\]
In the Statistics and Machine Learning literature \( f(k) \) is known as the leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV) estimate of the mean squared error. Note that \( f : [n-1] \to \mathbb{R} \) is a random function (randomness comes from the dependence of \( f(k) \) on \( \epsilon_i \)'s) and therefore \( \tilde{k} \) is a random variable. For each given sample \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n]} \), we can compute \( \tilde{k} \). Therefore a simple idea is to use \( \tilde{k} \) in the \( k \)-NN algorithm. Note that in practice the distance between \( \tilde{k} \) and \( k^* \) is not of the main importance for us. The main question is how far \( \text{MSE}(\tilde{k}) \) is from \( \text{MSE}(k^*) \)? Theorem 2.1 gives a probability tail bound on \( |\text{MSE}(k^*) - \text{MSE}(\tilde{k})| \) to answer this question.

**Theorem 2.1.** With \( k^* \) and \( \tilde{k} \) defined in 2.3 and 2.5,

\[
P(|\text{MSE}(k^*) - \text{MSE}(\tilde{k})| \geq t) \\
\leq 2(n+1) \exp \left[-n \min \left( \frac{t^2}{32K^4(1+4\gamma_d)}, \frac{t}{16K^2(1+\gamma_d)^2} \right) \right] \\
+2(n+1) \exp \left(-\frac{nt^2}{2048(1+\gamma_d)^4(M+t)} \right) \\
+(n+1) \exp(-\frac{2nt^2}{C}),
\]

where \( \gamma_d \) is a constant that only depends on \( d \). Constants \( K \), and \( C \) are upper bounds on the sub-Gaussian norms of \( \epsilon_i \) and \( \mu_i \) respectively, and \( \mathbb{E}[\mu_i^2] \leq M \).

For the set of observations \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in [n]} \) from an unknown joint distribution, the choice of \( k^* \) for the \( k \)-NN estimate gives us the minimum mean squared error over all possible choices of \( k \), which is typically not computable. Instead, Theorem 2.1 guarantees that using \( \tilde{k} \), with high probability, gives \( \text{MSE}(\tilde{k}) \) that is very close to \( \text{MSE}(k^*) \). This shows that not only does \( \tilde{k} \) give us a consistent estimator but it is an optimal choice as well.

**3. Discussion and Simulations.** We should emphasize that in computing \( \tilde{k} \) we exclude each \( x_i \) from the whole set and we do not consider \( x_i \) as one of its nearest neighbors. This is in fact very important and prevents us from choosing a value of \( k \) that suffers from overfitting. The following example helps to see this better.

**Example 3.1.** For \( n = 1000 \) we have generated \( x_i \)'s i.i.d from Unif\([0,1]\) and \( \epsilon_i \)'s i.i.d from \( N(0, 1) \). Let \( m(x) = \cos(20x) + x/2 \) and \( y_i = m(x_i) + \epsilon_i \). For this sample we have \( k^* = 58 \) and \( \tilde{k} = 48 \). Now let \( N_k^\perp(x_i) \) be the set of
$k$ nearest neighbors of $x_i$ among all $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and define

$$
(3.1) \quad k^\dagger := \arg\min_{k \in \{2, \ldots, n\}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left( y_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k^i(x_i)} y_j \right)^2.
$$

Note that we are taking the minimum over $k \geq 2$, since clearly for $k = 1$ the sum in the right hand side of 3.1 is equal to zero. For our sample $\hat{\MSE}(k^*) = 0.010$, $\MSE(\hat{k}) = 0.013$ and $\hat{\MSE}(k^\dagger) = 0.500$, where $\hat{\MSE}$ is the empirical estimate of $\MSE$.

$$
\hat{\MSE}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( m(x_i) - \hat{m}_{k,n}(x_i) \right)^2.
$$

It is clear that by choosing $k^\dagger = 2$, we will overfit to the noise and therefore the estimated mean squared error is much higher than that of two other values of $k$.

In Figure 1 we have plotted the $f(k)$ (solid line) and $\hat{\MSE}(k)$ (dashed line) for $k \in [n-1]$. It can be seen that the behaviour of these two is very similar. In fact, as we expect from equality 4.1 in Section 4,

$$
\E[f(k)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \E[k_i^2] + \MSE(k),
$$
they differ slightly only by a constant. Therefore the point-wise difference of these two curves, when \( \epsilon_i \)'s have the same variance \( \sigma^2 \) is approximately equal to \( \sigma^2 \). This shows that looking at the curve of \( f(k) \) gives us almost the same information as looking at the curve \( \text{MSE}(k) \). Therefore computing \( f(k) \) is enough for finding the optimal choice of \( k \).

From Figure 2a and 2b it can be seen that k-NN has almost recovered the signal in the presence of the strong noise.

4. proofs.

**Proof. Theorem 2.1.**

By writing \( y_i = \mu_i + \epsilon_i \), we have

\[
    f(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} y_j)^2
\]

\[
    = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mu_i + \epsilon_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} y_j)^2
\]

\[
    = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mu_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} y_j)^2 + \epsilon_i^2 + 2\epsilon_i (\mu_i - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} y_j).
\]

Since \( \epsilon_i \)'s are independent with mean zero, taking expectation of the above equality gives us

\[
    \mathbb{E}[f(k)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] + \text{MSE}(k).
\]
Define \( g(k) := \mathbb{E}[f(k)] \), for \( k \in [n-1] \). For each \( n, g : [n-1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is a deterministic function and does not depend on a given sample. Remember that \( \tilde{k} \) is a function of the given sample and therefore is random. So \( g(\tilde{k}) \) depends on the given sample as well and therefore is random. By definition of \( k^* \), for all \( k \in [n-1], \text{MSE}(k^*) \leq \text{MSE}(k) \) and therefore \( \text{MSE}(k^*) \leq \text{MSE}(\tilde{k}) \). This gives us \( g(k^*) \leq g(\tilde{k}) \). Also by definition of \( \tilde{k} \), we have \( f(\tilde{k}) \leq f(k^*) \).

Putting these two together gives us,

\[
\mathbb{P}(|\text{MSE}(k^*) - \text{MSE}(\tilde{k})| \geq t) \\
= \mathbb{P}(|g(k^*) - g(\tilde{k})| \geq t) \\
\leq \mathbb{P}(|g(k^*) - f(k^*)| \geq t/2) + \mathbb{P}(|g(\tilde{k}) - f(\tilde{k})| \geq t/2) \\
= \mathbb{P}(|\mathbb{E}[f(k^*)] - f(k^*)| \geq t/2) + \mathbb{P}(|\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{k})] - f(\tilde{k})| \geq t/2). 
\]

(4.2)

Therefore to find an upper bound on \( \mathbb{P}(|\text{MSE}(k^*) - \text{MSE}(\tilde{k})| \geq t) \), it’s enough to find an upper bound on \( \mathbb{P}(|\mathbb{E}[f(k)] - f(k)| \geq t) \) for any arbitrary \( k \in [n-1] \).

**Lemma 4.1.** For any \( k \in [n-1] \) and any \( \lambda > 0 \)

\[
\mathbb{P}(|f(k) - \mathbb{E}[f(k)]| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp \left[-nc \min \left( \frac{t^2}{8K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)}, \frac{t}{8K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2} \right) \right] \\
+ \frac{nt^2}{512(1 + \gamma_d)^4(M + \lambda)} \\
+ \exp \left(- \frac{2n\lambda^2}{C} \right),
\]

where \( \gamma_d > 0 \) is a constant that only depends on the dimension \( d \), and \( K \) and \( C \) are upper bounds on the sub-Gaussian norm of \( \epsilon_i \) and \( \mu_i \), and \( \mathbb{E}[\mu_i^2] \leq M \).

**Proof.** Define the nonsymmetric \( n \times n \) matrix \( B = [b_{ij}] \) in the following way,

\[
b_{ij} := \begin{cases} 
1 & i = j \\
0 & j \notin N_k(i) \\
-1/k & j \in N_k(j)
\end{cases}.
\]

(4.3)

Let \( A = [a_{ij}] = B^T B / n \). Also let \( \epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \) and \( \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n) \). Then we can rewrite \( f(k) \) in the following vector product form

\[
f(k) = (\epsilon + \mu)^T A (\epsilon + \mu).
\]

(4.4)

Using the triangle inequality, we have

\[
|f(k) - \mathbb{E}[f(k)]| = |\epsilon^T A\epsilon - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon^T A\epsilon] + 2\epsilon^T A\mu| \\
\leq |\epsilon^T A\epsilon - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon^T A\epsilon]| + 2|\epsilon^T A\mu|.
\]
Therefore it’s enough to find probability tail bounds on $|e^T A e - \mathbb{E}[e^T A e]|$ and $|e^T A \mu|$. Note that $A$ is random. To find such bounds we need to have information on the norm of $A$. Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 provide uniform bound on $\|A\|_2$ and $\|A\|_F$.

**Lemma 4.2.** For $A = B^T B / n$, where entries of $B$ are defined in 4.3, we have

$$\|A\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2(1 + 4 \gamma_d)}{n}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $\gamma_d$ is a constant that only depends on $d$.

**Lemma 4.3.** For $A = B^T B / n$, where entries of $B$ are defined in 4.3, we have

$$\|A\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{n} (1 + \gamma_d)^2, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\gamma_d$ is a constant that only depends on $d$.

1. Bound on $|e^T A e - \mathbb{E}[e^T A e]|$. Conditional on given sample $\{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ and therefore given $A$, by Hanson-Wright inequality [11] and Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|e^T A e - \mathbb{E}[e^T A e] | \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]} | \geq t | \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -c \min \left( \frac{t^2}{K^4 \|A\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{K^2 \|A\|_2^2} \right) \right]$$

$$\leq 2 \exp \left[ -n c \min \left( \frac{t^2}{2K^4(1 + 4 \gamma_d)^2}, \frac{t}{4K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2} \right) \right]. \tag{4.7}$$

Also note that

$$\mathbb{E} [e^T A e | \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}] = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} [\langle e^T B, e^T B \rangle]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} [\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i B_i, \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i B_i]$$

$$= \frac{(1 + 1/k)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_i^2]$$

$$= \frac{(1 + 1/k)}{n} \|\epsilon\|_2^2. \tag{4.8}$$
The right side of 4.8 does not depend on sample \( \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]} \). Therefore
\[
\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^T A \epsilon \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}] = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon^T A \epsilon].
\]

Putting 4.9 and 4.7 together gives us
\[
P(\|\epsilon^T A \mu\| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]})
= \mathbb{P}(\|\epsilon^T A \mu - \mathbb{E}[\epsilon^T A \epsilon] \| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]})
\leq 2 \exp \left[ -nc \min \left( \frac{t^2}{2K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)}, \frac{t}{4K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2} \right) \right].
\]

Note that 4.10 does not depend on \( \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]} \), therefore
\[
P(\|\epsilon^T A \mu\| \geq t)
\leq 2 \exp \left[ -nc \min \left( \frac{t^2}{2K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)}, \frac{t}{4K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2} \right) \right].
\]

2. Bound on \( |\epsilon^T A \mu| \).

By the Hoeffding’s inequality for any \( t \geq 0 \),
\[
P(|\epsilon^T A \mu| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}) = \mathbb{P}(|\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ji} \mu_i) \epsilon_j| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]})
\leq 2 \exp \left( \frac{-t^2}{2\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ji} \mu_i)^2} \right).
\]

Note that
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ji} \mu_j)^2 \leq \|A\|_2^2 \|\mu\|_2^2.
\]

Inequalities 4.12 and 4.13 together give
\[
P(|\epsilon^T A \mu| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}) \leq 2 \exp \left( \frac{-t^2}{2\|A\|_2^2 \|\mu\|_2^2} \right).
\]

Now by Lemma 4.3
\[
P(|\epsilon^T A \mu| \geq t \mid \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]}) \leq 2 \exp \left( \frac{-n^2t^2}{32(1 + \gamma_d)^4 \|\mu\|_2^2 / n} \right) = 2 \exp \left( \frac{-nt^2}{32(1 + \gamma_d)^4 \|\mu\|_2^2 / n} \right).
\]
By SLLN, $||\mu||_2^2/n \to E[\mu_i^2] = M$ almost surely. For any $\lambda > 0$, Hoeffding’s inequality gives

$$
P\left(||\mu||_2^2/n \geq E[m(x)^2] + \lambda\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2n\lambda^2}{C}\right).
$$

Therefore

$$
P(|\epsilon^TA\mu| \geq t)
= E[P(|\epsilon^TA\mu| \geq t | \{x_i\}_{i \in [n]})]
\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{32(1 + \gamma_d)^4(M + \lambda)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{2n\lambda^2}{C}\right).
$$

(4.15)

Combining 4.11 and 4.15 gives

$$
P(|f(k) - E[f(k)]| \geq t)
\leq P(|\epsilon^TA\epsilon - E[\epsilon^T A\epsilon]| \geq t/2) + P(|\epsilon^TA\mu| \geq t/4)
\leq 2 \exp\left[-n \min \left(\frac{t^2}{8K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)^2}, \frac{t}{16K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2}\right)\right]
+ 2 \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{512(1 + \gamma_d)^4(M + \lambda)}\right)
+ \exp\left(-\frac{2n\lambda^2}{C}\right).
$$

(4.16)

(4.17)

Using Lemma 4.1 for $f(k^*)$ and $f(\tilde{k})$ and union bound we have

$$
P(|MSE(k^*) - MSE(\tilde{k})| \geq t)
\leq P(|f(\tilde{k}) - E[f(\tilde{k})]| \geq t/2) + P(|f(k^*) - E[f(k^*)]| \geq t/2)
\leq \cup_{k=1}^n P(|f(k) - E[f(k)]| \geq t/2) + P(|f(k^*) - E[f(k^*)]| \geq t/2)
\leq 2(n + 1) \exp\left[-n \min \left(\frac{t^2}{32K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)^2}, \frac{t}{16K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2}\right)\right]
+ 2(n + 1) \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{2048(1 + \gamma_d)^4(M + \lambda)}\right)
+ (n + 1) \exp\left(-\frac{2n\lambda^2}{C}\right).
$$

Note that $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary therefore we simply set $\lambda = t$ and this completes
the proof of Theorem 2.1,

\[ P(|\text{MSE}(k^*) - \text{MSE}(\tilde{k})| \geq t) \leq 2(n + 1) \exp \left[ -nc \min \left( \frac{t^2}{32K^4(1 + 4\gamma_d)}, \frac{t}{16K^2(1 + \gamma_d)^2} \right) \right] + 2(n + 1) \exp \left( -\frac{nt^2}{2048(1 + \gamma_d)^4(M + t)} \right) + (n + 1) \exp(-\frac{2nt^2}{C}). \]

4.1. Proof of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3.

PROOF. Lemma 4.2. Let \( b_i \) be the \( i \)-th row of matrix \( B \). Then

\[
\|A\|^2_F = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{Tr}(A^T A) = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{Tr}(B^T B B^T B) = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{Tr}(B B^T B B^T) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{n}(1 + \frac{1}{k}) + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{n}(1 + \frac{1}{k}) + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle^2.
\]

For each \( i, j \in [n] \),

\[
\langle b_i, b_j \rangle = \left( -\frac{1}{k} \right) [1 \{ i \in N_k(j) \} + 1 \{ j \in N_k(i) \}] + \frac{1}{k^2} |N_k(i) \cap N_k(j)|,
\]

and therefore

\[ |\langle b_i, b_j \rangle| \leq \frac{2}{k}. \tag{4.18}\]

This gives

\[ \sum_{j \neq i} \langle b_i, b_j \rangle^2 \leq \frac{4}{k^2} |\{ j : \langle b_i, b_j \rangle \neq 0 \}|. \tag{4.19}\]
Now note that for each $i \in [n]$, $|\{j : \langle b_i, b_j \rangle \neq 0 \}|$ can not be large. In fact $\langle b_i, b_j \rangle \neq 0$ at most for those $j$’s that

(4.20) $$(\{i \} \cup N_k(i)) \cap (\{j \} \cup N_k(j)) \neq \emptyset.$$ By definition $|N_k(i)| = k$ and for any $\ell \in [n]$ by Corollary 6.1. in [6] there are at most $\gamma_d k$ indices $j$ such that $\ell \in N_k(j)$, where $\gamma_d$ is a constant depends only on $d$. Therefore

(4.21) $$|\{j : \langle b_i, b_j \rangle \neq 0 \}| \leq \gamma_d k(k + 1).$$

This gives us

\[
\|A\|_F^2 \leq (1 + 4\gamma_d)(1 + \frac{1}{k}) \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{2(1 + 4\gamma_d)}{n}.
\]

**Proof.** *Lemma 4.3.* Note that

(4.22) $$\|B\|_2 = \max_{\|x\|_2 = 1} \|Bx\|_2.$$ Therefore for any arbitrary $x$ such that $\|x\|_2 = 1$,

(4.23) $$\|Bx\|_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle b_i, x \rangle^2$$

(4.24) $$\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 + \frac{2}{k^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \in N_k(i)} x_j^2$$

(4.25) $$= 2\|x\|_2 + \frac{2}{k^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{\{i:j \in N_k(i)\}} x_j^2$$

(4.26) $$\leq 2(1 + \frac{\gamma_d}{k^2})\|x\|_2.$$

Therefore

\[
\|A\|_2 = \frac{\|B\|_2}{n} \leq \frac{4}{n} (1 + \frac{\gamma_d}{k^2})^2 \leq \frac{4}{n} (1 + \gamma_d)^2.
\]

\qed
An R language package knnopt will soon be made available on the CRAN repository.
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