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Abstract

We propose a one-step procedure to efficiently estimate the latent positions in random dot product graphs. Unlike the classical spectral-based methods such as the adjacency and Laplacian spectral embedding, the proposed one-step procedure takes both the low-rank structure of the expected value of the adjacency matrix and the Bernoulli likelihood information of the sampling model into account simultaneously. We show that for each individual vertex, the corresponding row of the one-step estimator converges to a multivariate normal distribution after proper scaling and centering up to an orthogonal transformation, with an efficient covariance matrix, provided that the initial estimator satisfies the so-called approximate linearization property. The one-step estimator improves the commonly-adopted spectral embedding methods in the following sense: Globally for all vertices, it yields a smaller asymptotic sum of squared-error, and locally for each individual vertex, the asymptotic covariance matrix of the corresponding row of the one-step estimator is smaller than those of the spectral embedding in spectra. The usefulness of the proposed one-step procedure is demonstrated via numerical examples and the analysis of a real-world Wikipedia graph dataset.
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1 Introduction

Statistical inference on graph data, an important topic in statistics and machine learning, has been pervasive in a variety of application domains, such as social networks (Young and Scheinerman, 2007; Girvan and Newman, 2002; Wasserman and Faust, 1994), brain connectomics (Priebe et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2019), political science (Ward et al., 2011), computer networks (Neil et al., 2013; Rubin-Delanchy et al., 2016), etc. Due to the high-dimensionality nature and the complex structure of graph data, classical statistical methods typically begin with finding a low-dimensional representation for the vertices in a graph using a collection of points in some Euclidean space, referred to as the latent positions of the vertices, followed by using these points as features for subsequent inference tasks, such as vertex clustering (Sussman et al., 2012) and classification (Sussman et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2013), regression (Mele et al., 2019), and nonparametric graph testing (Tang et al., 2017b).

Hoff et al. (2002) proposed the latent position graphs to formalize the idea of the latent positions: Each vertex $i$ in the graph is assigned a Euclidean vector $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the occurrence of an edge linking vertices $i$ and $j$ is a Bernoulli random variable with the success probability $\kappa(x_i, x_j)$, where $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, 1]$ is a symmetric link function. In this work, we study the random dot product graphs (Young and Scheinerman, 2007), a particular class of latent position graphs taking the link function to be the dot product of the latent positions: $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = x_i^T x_j$. The random dot product graph is of special interest due to the following two reasons: Firstly, the adjacency matrix of a random dot product graph can be viewed as the sum of a low-rank matrix and a mean-zero noise matrix, which facilitates the use of low-rank matrix factorization techniques for statistical inference on random dot produce graphs; Secondly, random dot product graphs can approximate general latent position graphs with positive symmetric definite link functions when the dimension of the latent positions $d$ grows with the number of vertices at a certain rate (Tang et al., 2013). The readers are referred to the survey paper Athreya et al. (2018a) for a thorough review on the recent development of random dot product graphs.

Low-rank matrix factorization methods, or more precisely, spectral-based methods, have
been widely used for estimating the latent positions for random dot product graphs due to the low expected rank of the observed adjacency matrix. Sussman et al. (2014) estimated the latent positions using the eigenvectors associated with the top $d$-largest eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix. The resulting estimator is referred to as the adjacency spectral embedding (ASE). Asymptotic characterization of the global behavior of the ASE for all vertices have been established, including consistency (Sussman et al., 2014) and the limit of the sum of squared-error (Tang et al., 2017a) as the number of vertices goes to infinity. Locally, for each individual vertex, Athreya et al. (2016) proved that the distribution of the corresponding row of the adjacency spectral embedding converges to a mean-zero multivariate normal distribution after proper scaling and centering, up to an orthogonal transformation, as the number of vertices goes to infinity. Another popular spectral-based method is the Laplacian spectral embedding (LSE), which does not directly estimate the latent positions, but computes the eigenvectors of the normalized Laplacian matrix of the adjacency matrix associated with the top $d$-largest eigenvalues (Rohe et al., 2011). The asymptotic theory of the LSE has also been established (Sarkar and Bickel, 2015; Tang and Priebe, 2018). Notably, Tang and Priebe (2018) showed that each row of the LSE converges to a mean-zero multivariate normal distribution after proper scaling and centering, up to an orthogonal transformation. These theoretical studies of the spectral-based methods lay a solid foundation for the development of subsequent inference tasks, such as clustering (Sussman et al., 2012; Rohe et al., 2011; Sarkar and Bickel, 2015), classification (Sussman et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2013), testing between graphs (Tang et al., 2017a,b), and parameter estimation in latent structure random graphs (Athreya et al., 2018b).

Despite the great success of the spectral-based methods for random dot product graphs, it has been pointed out in Xie and Xu (2019) that they are formulated in the low-rank matrix factorization fashion, but ignore the Bernoulli likelihood information contained in the sampling model. A fundamental question remains open: whether or not the adjacency/Laplacian spectral embedding is optimal for estimating the latent positions (or the transformation of them) due to the negligence of the the likelihood information? In this paper, we prove the sub-optimality of the ASE by showing that the asymptotic covariance matrix of each row
of the ASE is inefficient. Furthermore, we propose a novel one-step procedure for estimating the latent positions, and show that for each individual vertex, the corresponding row of the proposed one-step estimator converges to a multivariate normal distribution after $\sqrt{n}$-scaling and centering at the underlying true latent position, up to an orthogonal transformation. More importantly, the corresponding asymptotic covariance matrix is as efficient as the maximum likelihood estimator as if the rest latent positions are known, provided that the procedure is initialized at an estimator satisfying the approximate linearization property, which will be defined later. In particular, we show that the efficient covariance matrix is no greater than the asymptotic covariance matrix of the corresponding row of the ASE in spectra. Besides the local efficiency for each individual vertex, the proposed one-step estimator for the latent positions has a smaller sum of squared-error than the ASE globally for all vertices as well.

The general one-step procedure, which finds a new estimator via a single iteration of the Newton-Raphson update given a $\sqrt{n}$-consistent initial estimator, has been applied to M-estimation theory in classical parametric models to produce an efficient estimator (Van der Vaart, 2000). Even when the maximum likelihood estimator does not exist (e.g., Gaussian mixture models), the one-step procedure could still be efficient. This motivates us to extend the one-step procedure from classical parametric models to efficient estimation in high-dimensional random graphs, because neither the existence nor the uniqueness of the maximum likelihood estimator for random dot product graphs has been established. Unlike the ASE, the proposed one-step procedure takes both the low-rank structure of the mean matrix and the likelihood information of the sampling model into account simultaneously. This work represents, to the best of our knowledge, the first effort in the literature addressing the efficient estimation problem for random dot product graphs.

Moreover, we prove the asymptotic sub-optimality of the widely adopted LSE by applying the one-step procedure to construct an estimator for the normalized Laplacian matrix of the adjacency matrix, and show that it dominates the LSE in the following sense: Locally for each individual vertex, the corresponding row of the new estimator converges to a mean-zero multivariate normal distribution after proper scaling and centering, up to an
orthogonal transformation, and the asymptotic covariance matrix is no greater than that of the corresponding row of the LSE in spectra; Globally for all vertices, it yields a smaller sum of squared-error than the LSE.

The remaining part of the paper is structured as follows. We review the background on random dot product graphs, including the existing theory for the ASE (Athreya et al., 2016), in Section 2.1. The theory for estimating a single latent position with the rest being known, which motivates us to pursue the efficient estimation task, is established in Section 2.2. Section 3 elaborates on the proposed one-step procedure for estimating the entire latent position matrix, establishes its asymptotic theory, and shows that it dominates the ASE as the number of vertices goes to infinity. In Section 4 we apply the proposed one-step procedure to construct an estimator for the normalized Laplacian matrix, and show that it dominates the LSE asymptotically. Section 5 demonstrates the usefulness of the proposed one-step procedure via numerical examples and the analysis of a real-world Wikipedia graph data. We conclude the paper with discussion in Section 6. The technical proofs are deferred to the Supplementary Material.

Notations: The $d \times d$ identity matrix is denoted by $I_d$, and the vector with all entries being 1 is denoted by the boldface $1$. We define the notation $[n]$ to be the set of all consecutive positive integers from 1 to $n$: $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The symbols $\lesssim$ and $\gtrsim$ mean the corresponding inequality up to a constant, i.e., $a \lesssim b$ ($a \gtrsim b$) if $a \leq Cb$ ($a \geq Cb$) for some constant $C > 0$, and we use the shorthand notation $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. We use the notation $\mathcal{O}(n, d)$ to denote the set of all orthonormal $d$-frames in $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n, d) = \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} : U^T U = I_d\}$, where $n \geq d$, and write $\mathcal{O}(d) = \mathcal{O}(d, d)$. The notation $\|x\|$ is used to denote the Euclidean norm of a vector $x = [x_1, \ldots, x_d]^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., $\|x\| = (\sum_{k=1}^d x_k^2)^{1/2}$. For any two vectors $x = [x_1, \ldots, x_d]^T$ and $y = [y_1, \ldots, y_d]^T$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, the inequality $x \leq y$ means that $x_k \leq y_k$ for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. For any two positive semidefinite matrices $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_2$ of the same dimension, the notation $\Sigma_1 \preceq \Sigma_2$ ($\Sigma_1 \succeq \Sigma_2$) means that $\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1$ ($\Sigma_1 - \Sigma_2$) is positive semidefinite, and we say that $\Sigma_1$ is no greater (no less) than $\Sigma_2$ in spectra. For any rectangular matrix $X$, we use $\sigma_k(X)$ to denote its $k$th largest singular value. For a matrix $X = [x_{ik}]_{n \times d}$, we use $\|X\|_2$ to denote the spectral norm $\|X\|_2 = \sigma_1(X)$. 

5
\[ \|X\|_F \text{ to denote the Frobenius norm } \|X\|_F = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{d} x_{ik}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \text{ and } \|X\|_{2\to\infty} \text{ to denote the two-to-infinity norm } \|X\|_{2\to\infty} = \max_{i \in [n]} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{d} x_{ik}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \]

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Background on random dot product graphs

Denote \( X = \{x = [x_1, \ldots, x_d]^T \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1, \ldots, x_d > 0, \|x\| < 1\} \) the space of latent positions, and \( \mathcal{X}^n = \{X = [x_1, \ldots, x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} : x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{X}\} \). Given an \( n \times d \) matrix \( X = [x_1, \ldots, x_n]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n \) and a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \in (0, 1] \), a symmetric and hollow (i.e., the diagonal entries are zeros) random matrix \( A = [A_{ij}]_{n \times n} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n} \) is said to be the adjacency matrix of a random dot product graph on \( n \) vertices \( |n| = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) with latent positions \( X \), denoted by \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X) \), if \( A_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\rho_n x_i^T x_j) \) independently, \( 1 \leq i < j \leq n \). Namely, the distribution of \( A \) can be written as

\[ p_X(A) = \prod_{i<j} (\rho_n x_i^T x_j)^{A_{ij}} (1 - \rho_n x_i^T x_j)^{1-A_{ij}}. \]

When \( \rho_n \equiv 1 \) for all \( n \), the resulting graph is dense, in the sense that the expected number of edges \( \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i<j} A_{ij}) \) grows quadratically in \( n \), and when \( \rho_n \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), the corresponding graph is sparse, namely, the expected number of edges is sub-quadratically in \( n \) \((\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i<j} A_{ij}) = \text{o}(n^2))\).

The goal of this work is to estimate the latent positions \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), which are treated as deterministic parameters. In some cases, the latent positions \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) are considered as latent random variables that are independently sampled from some underlying distribution \( F \) on \( \mathcal{X} \) (see, for example, Athreya et al., 2016; Sussman et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2017b; Tang and Priebe, 2018). For deterministic latent positions, we require that there exists some cumulative distribution function \( F \) on \( \mathcal{X} \), such that

\[ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |F_n(x) - F(x)| \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \quad (2.1) \]

where \( F_n(x) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 \{ x_i \leq x \} \) is the empirical distribution function by treating the latent positions \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) as independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data. Condition
(2.1) is similar to the case where \(x_i\)'s are random in the following sense: When \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) are independent random variables sampled from \(F\), the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem asserts that (2.1) holds with probability one with respect to the randomness of the infinite i.i.d. sequence \((x_i)_{i=1}^\infty\).

**Remark 1** The latent positions \(X\) can only be identified up to an orthogonal transformation since for any orthogonal matrix \(W \in O(d)\) and \(i, j \in [n]\), \(x_i^T x_j = (W x_i)^T (W x_j)\). Furthermore, for any \(d' > d\) and any latent position matrix \(X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}\), there exists another matrix \(X' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d'}\), such that \(RDPG(X)\) and \(RDPG(X')\) yield the same distribution of \(A\). The latter source of non-identifiability can be avoided for large \(n\) by requiring the second moment matrix \(\Delta = \int_X x x^T F(dx)\) to be non-singular (Tang and Priebe, 2018).

Random dot product graphs have connections with the simplest Erdős-Rényi models and the popular stochastic block models. When \(F\) is a point mass at some \(p \in (0, 1)\), namely, \(F(dx) = \delta_p(dx)\), the resulting random dot product graph coincides with an Erdős-Rényi graph, with \((A_{ij})_{i<j}\) being independent Bernoulli\((p^2)\) random variables. When \(F\) is a finitely discrete distribution on \(X\): \(F(dx) = \sum_{K} w_k \delta_{\nu_k}(dx)\) for \(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_K \in X\) and \(\sum_{K} w_k = 1\), there exists a cluster assignment function \(\tau: [n] \rightarrow [K]\) such that \((1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n 1\{\tau(i) = k\} \rightarrow w_k\) for all \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, K\) as \(n \rightarrow \infty\). Denoting \(B = [B_{kl}]_{K \times K} := [\nu_k^T \nu_l]_{K \times K}\) and \(x_i = \nu_{\tau(i)}\), \(i \in [n]\), we see that \(A_{ij}\) independently follows Bernoulli\((B_{\tau(i)\tau(j)}) = Bernoulli(x_i^T x_j)\) for \(i < j\), \(i, j \in [n]\). Thus the random dot product graph \(RDPG(X)\) with \(X = [x_1, \ldots, x_n]^T\) becomes a stochastic block model with a positive semidefinite block probability matrix \(B\) and a cluster assignment function \(\tau\).

To estimate the latent positions, Sussman et al. (2014) proposed to solve the least-squared problem

\[
\hat{X}^{(ASE)}(\text{ASE}) = \arg \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}} \|A - XX^T\|_F^2.
\]  

(2.2)

The resulting solution \(\hat{X}^{(ASE)}\) to (2.2) is referred to as the *adjacency spectral embedding* (ASE) of \(A\) into \(\mathbb{R}^d\). Note that \(\mathbb{E}(A) = \rho_n XX^T\) is a positive semidefinite low-rank matrix and \(\|A - XX^T\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - x_i^T x_j)^2\) is exactly the empirical squared-error loss. Hence the problem (2.2) becomes a naive empirical risk minimization problem if we regard
\( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} \) as an estimator for \( \rho_n^{1/2} X \), and the solution to (2.2) can be conveniently computed

(Eckart and Young, 1936): \( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} \) is the matrix of eigenvectors associated with the top \( d \)-largest eigenvalues of \( A \), scaled by the square-root of these eigenvalues.

Sussman et al. (2014) proved that \( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} = [\hat{x}_1^{(\text{ASE})}, ..., \hat{x}_n^{(\text{ASE})}]^T \) is a consistent estimator for \( \rho_n^{1/2} X \) globally for all vertices: \( (1/n)\| \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} W - X \|_F^2 \) converges to 0 in probability as \( n \to \infty \) for some orthogonal \( W \in \mathbb{O}(d) \). Furthermore, for each fixed vertex \( i \in [n] \), the asymptotic distribution of \( \hat{x}_i^{(\text{ASE})} \) after proper scaling and centering has been established (Athreya et al., 2016; Tang and Priebe, 2018). Denote \( X_0 \) the true latent position matrix that generates the observed adjacency matrix \( A \) according to the sampling model \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \), and \( X \) any latent position matrix in \( X_n \). We summarize these findings in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** (Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 of Tang and Priebe, 2018) Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) with a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \) and condition (2.1) hold for some \( X_0 = [x_{01}, ..., x_{0n}]^T \in X_n \). Suppose either \( \rho_n \equiv \rho \) for all \( n \) or \( \rho_n \to 0 \) but \( (\log n)^4/(n \rho_n) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), and denote \( \rho = \lim_{n \to \infty} \rho_n \). Let \( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} = [\hat{x}_1^{(\text{ASE})}, ..., \hat{x}_n^{(\text{ASE})}]^T \) be the ASE defined by (2.2). Denote

\[
\Delta = \int_X x x^T F(dx), \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(x) = \Delta^{-1} \left[ \int_{X} \left\{ x_1^T x_1 \left( 1 - \rho x_1^T x_1 \right) \right\} x_1 x_1^T F(dx_1) \right] \Delta^{-1},
\]

and assume that \( \Delta \) and \( \Sigma(x) \) are strictly positive definite for all \( x \). Then there exists an orthogonal matrix \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) such that

\[
\| \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0 \|_F^2 \overset{a.s.}{\to} \int_X \text{tr} \{ \Sigma(x) \} F(dx),
\]  

and for any fixed index \( i \in [n] \),

\[
\sqrt{n}(W^T \hat{x}_i^{(\text{ASE})} - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}) \overset{d}{\to} N(0, \Sigma(x_{0i})).
\]  

### 2.2 Motivation: Efficiency in estimating a single latent position

Theorem 1 suggests the following two properties of the ASE: Globally for all vertices, \( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} \) is a consistent estimator for \( \rho_n^{1/2} X_0 \) as there exists an orthogonal matrix \( W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \) such that the sum of squared-error \( \| \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} W - X_0 \|_F^2 \) can be fully characterized by (2.3) as \( n \to \infty \); Locally, for each fixed vertex \( i \in [n] \), the distribution of the \( i \)th row \( \hat{x}_i^{(\text{ASE})} \) of \( \hat{X}^{(\text{ASE})} \) after \( \sqrt{n} \)-scaling and centering at \( \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i} \), converges to a mean-zero multivariate
normal distribution with covariance matrix $\Sigma(x_0)$, up to an orthogonal transformation $W$.

Nevertheless, it remains open whether the results of Theorem 1 are optimal. In this work, we will propose an estimator $\hat{X}$ for the latent positions that dominates the ASE asymptotically in the following sense: Globally for all vertices, it yields a smaller asymptotic sum of squared-error $\|\hat{x}W - X_0\|^2_F$ than (2.3) for some orthogonal $W$; Locally for each fixed vertex $i \in [n]$, the corresponding row of $\hat{X}$, after $\sqrt{n}$-scaling and centering at $\rho_n^1/2x_0i$, also converges to a mean-zero multivariate normal distribution, up to an orthogonal transformation $W$, but the asymptotic covariance matrix is smaller than $\Sigma(x_0)$ in spectra.

Before directly estimating the entire latent position matrix $X_0$, we begin with estimating a single latent position $x_0i$ when the rest latent positions are known, which motivates the development of the proposed efficient estimation procedure. Specifically, for a fixed $i \in [n]$, we estimate $x_0i$ via the maximum likelihood estimator, assuming that the rest latent positions $\{x_0j : j \in [n], j \neq i\}$ are known. For simplicity, we assume that the sparsity factor $\rho_n \equiv 1$ for all $n$ in this subsection. The result is summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** Let $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ for some $X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n$, and condition (2.1) hold. Assume that there exists some constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta \leq \min_{j \in [n]} x_0j^T x_0j \leq \max_{j \in [n]} x_0j^T x_0j \leq 1 - \delta$. Fixing $i \in [n]$, we estimate $x_{0i}$ with $\{x_0j : j \in [n], j \neq i\}$ being known, and suppose the parameter space is $\Theta_n = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \delta \leq \min_{j \in [n]} x^T x_0j \leq \max_{j \in [n]} x^T x_0j \leq 1 - \delta\}$. Further assume that $x_{0i}$ is in the interior of $\Theta_n$, and for any $x \in \Theta_n$, denote

$$G(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \frac{x_1 x_1^T}{x^T x_1 (1 - x^T x_1)} \right\} F(dx_1).$$

Then the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{x}_{0i}^{(MLE)} = \arg \max_{x \in \Theta_n} \ell_A(x)$ is consistent for $x_{0i}$, and

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{x}_{0i}^{(MLE)} - x_{0i}) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, G(x_{0i})^{-1}). \quad (2.5)$$

Recall that for the $i$th row $\hat{x}_i^{(ASE)}$ of the ASE, $\sqrt{n}(W^T \hat{x}_i^{(ASE)} - x_{0i}) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \Sigma(x_{0i}))$ for some orthogonal $W \in \mathcal{O}(d)$ by Theorem 1. We now claim that $\Sigma(x_{0i}) - G(x_{0i})^{-1}$ is positive semidefinite. In fact, since $F_n(\cdot) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{x_i \leq \cdot\}$ converges to $F$ in total variation
distance according to condition (2.1), it follows that for any \( x \in \Theta_n \),

\[
\Delta_n := \int_\mathcal{X} xx^T F_n(dx) = \frac{1}{n} X_0^T X_0 \rightarrow \Delta,
\]

\[
\Sigma_n(x) := \Delta_n^{-1} \left[ \int_\mathcal{X} \left\{ x^T x_1 (1 - x^T x_1) \right\} x_1 x_1^T F_n(dx_1) \right] \Delta_n^{-1}
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T X_0 \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T D(x) X_0 \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T X_0 \right)^{-1} \rightarrow \Sigma(x_{0i}),
\]

\[
G_n(x) := \int_\mathcal{X} \left\{ \frac{x_1 x_1^T}{x^T x_1 (1 - x^T x_1)} \right\} F_n(dx_1) = \frac{1}{n} X_0^T D(x)^{-1} X_0 \rightarrow G(x),
\]

where \( D(x) = \text{diag}\{ x^T x_0 (1-x^T x_0), \ldots, x^T x_{0n} (1-x^T x_{0n}) \} \). Now let \( X_0 \) yield singular value decomposition \( X_0 = U_0 S_0^{1/2} V_0^T \) with \( U_0 \in \mathcal{O}(n,d), S_0^{1/2} \) being diagonal, and \( V_0 \in \mathcal{O}(d) \). We see immediately that

\[
\Sigma_n(x) = \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T X_0 \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T D(x) X_0 \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T X_0 \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
= n (V_0 S_0^{-1} V_0^T) (V_0 S_0^{1/2} U_0^T D(x) U_0 S_0^{1/2} V_0^T) (V_0 S_0^{-1} V_0^T)
\]

\[
= n V_0 S_0^{-1/2} (U_0^T D(x) U_0) S_0^{-1/2} V_0^T,
\]

\[
G_n(x)^{-1} = n (X_0^T D(x)^{-1} X_0)^{-1} = n (V_0 S_0^{1/2} U_0^T D(x)^{-1} U_0 S_0^{1/2} V_0^T)^{-1}
\]

\[
= n V_0 S_0^{-1/2} (U_0^T D(x)^{-1} U_0)^{-1} S_0^{-1/2} V_0^T.
\]

Since \( U_0^T U_0 = I_d \), it follows that \( U_0^T D(x) U_0 - (U_0^T D(x)^{-1} U_0)^{-1} \) is positive semidefinite (Marshall and Olkin, 1990), and hence, \( \Sigma(x) - G(x)^{-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \Sigma_n(x_{0i}) - G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \} \) is positive semidefinite for any \( x \in \Theta_n \). The conclusion of this example is that the ASE is inefficient for estimating the latent position \( x_{0i} \) for vertex \( i \) when the rest latent positions are known in terms of the asymptotic covariance matrix, in contrast to the efficiency of the maximum likelihood estimator. We will see in Section 3 that when all the latent positions are unknown, we can still construct an estimator \( \hat{X} = [\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T \), such that for each individual vertex \( i \), \( \sqrt{n} (W^T \hat{x}_i - \rho_i^{1/2} x_{0i}) \) converges to a multivariate normal distribution up to an orthogonal \( W \in \mathcal{O}(d) \), but the covariance matrix is the same as that of the maximum likelihood estimator as if the rest latent positions are known.
3 Efficient Estimation via a One-step Procedure

The inefficiency of the ASE, indicated by $\Sigma(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \succeq G(\mathbf{x}_{0i})^{-1}$, is due to the fact that the ASE is a least-squared type estimator not depending on the likelihood function of the sampling model. In contrast, the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(MLE)}$ utilizes the Bernoulli likelihood function $\ell_{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \neq i} \{A_{ij} \log(\mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}) + (1 - A_{ij}) \log(1 - \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j})\}$, and hence is asymptotically efficient. One strategy for taking advantage of the likelihood information is the maximum likelihood method for estimating the entire latent position matrix $\mathbf{X}$ as an alternative to the ASE. Unfortunately, when all latent positions are unknown, the random dot product graph model belongs to a curved exponential family rather than a canonical exponential family, and hence, neither the existence nor the uniqueness of the maximum likelihood estimator of random dot product graphs has been established. As pointed out in Bickel and Doksum (2015), properties of the maximum likelihood estimator in curved exponential families are harder to develop than the canonical ones. Therefore we seek another approach to find an estimator that is asymptotically equivalent to the maximum likelihood estimator. Recall that when $\{\mathbf{x}_{0j} : j \in [n], j \neq i\}$ are known, the maximum likelihood estimator is a solution to the estimating equation

$$
\Psi_{n}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (A_{ij} - \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \mathbf{x}_{0j}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}(1 - \mathbf{x}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}) = 0.
$$

Then given an “appropriate” initial guess of the solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$, we can perform a one-step Newton-Raphson update to obtain another estimator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(OS)}$ that is closer to the zero of the estimating equation $\Psi_{n}$ (see, for example, Section 5.7 of Van der Vaart, 2000):

$$
\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(OS)} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i} + \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{0j} \mathbf{x}_{0j}^{T}}{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}(1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j})} \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(A_{ij} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \mathbf{x}_{0j}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}(1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j})}{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j}(1 - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{0j})} \right\}.
$$

(3.1)

In the case of estimating $\mathbf{x}_{0i}$ with the rest latent positions being known, the requirement for $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$ is that it is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent for $\mathbf{x}_{0i}$, and the resulting one-step estimator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(OS)}$ is as efficient as the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(MLE)}$ (Van der Vaart, 2000).

The above result motivates us to generalize the one-step estimator (3.1) to the case where the latent positions $\mathbf{x}_{01}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{0n}$ are all unknown. Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1}, \ldots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{n}]^{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be an initial
estimator $\tilde{X}$ for $X_0$. An intuitive choice for generalizing the one-step updating scheme (3.1) to the case of unknown $(x_{ij})_{j \neq i}$ is to substitute the unknown $x_{0j}$ by the initial estimator $\tilde{x}_j$, $j \neq i$ and $j \in [n]$ in (3.1). We thus define the following one-step estimator $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]^T$ for $X_0$:

$$\tilde{x}_i = \bar{x}_i + \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\bar{x}_j \bar{x}_j^T}{\bar{x}_i^T \bar{x}_j (1 - \bar{x}_i^T \bar{x}_j)} \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - x_{0}^T \bar{x}_j) \bar{x}_j \right\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \quad (3.2)$$

Unlike the coarse $\sqrt{n}$-consistency requirement for the initial estimator in the case of estimating a single latent position with the rest being known, we need to require that the initial estimator $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]$ for the entire latent position matrix $X_0$ satisfies a finer condition, referred to as the approximate linearization property, which is defined below.

**Definition 1** (Approximate linearization property) Given $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ with a sparsity factor $\rho_n$, where $X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T$, an estimator $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]^T$ is said to satisfy the approximate linearization property, if there exists an orthogonal matrix $W \in O(d)$ and an $n \times d$ matrix $\tilde{R} = [\tilde{R}_1, \ldots, \tilde{R}_n]^T$ with $\|\tilde{R}\|_F^2 = O_{\sqrt{\rho}}((n\rho_n)^{-1}(\log n)^{\omega})$ for some $\omega \geq 0$, such that

$$W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i} = \rho_n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{ij} + \tilde{R}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\{\zeta_{ij} : i, j \in [n]\}$ is a collection of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sup_{i, j \in [n]} \|\zeta_{ij}\| \lesssim 1/n$.

The approximate linearization property describes that the deviation of the estimator $\tilde{X}$ after an appropriate orthogonal alignment $W$ from the true value $X_0$ can be approximately controlled by a linear combination of the centered Bernoulli random variables $(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})_{i < j}$.

Having defined the approximate linearization property that is required for the initial estimator $\tilde{X}$ of the one-step procedure (3.2), we present the following two theorems, which are the main technical results of this paper.

**Theorem 3** Let $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ with a sparsity factor $\rho_n$ for some $X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n$. Assume that condition (2.1) holds, and there exists some constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta \leq \min_{i, j} x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \leq \max_{i, j} x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \leq 1 - \delta.$$ 

Denote $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]^T$ the one-step estimator defined by (3.2) based on an initial estimator $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]^T$ satisfying the approximate
linearization property (3.3). Denote

$$G_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x_{0j}x_j^T}{x^T x_0 (1 - \rho_n x^T x_0)}$$

for any $x \in X$ such that $x^T x_0 \in [\delta, 1 - \delta]$ for all $j \in [n]$. If either $\rho_n \equiv 1$ for all $n$ or $\rho_n \to 0$ but $(\log n)^2 (1/\omega)/(n \rho_n^5) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then there exists some orthogonal matrix $W \in O(d)$ such that

$$W^T \hat{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_0 i = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0j}^T x_0 (1 - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})} G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} + \hat{R}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\|\hat{R}_i\| = O_p(n^{-1} \rho_n^{-5/2} (\log n)^{(1/\omega)})$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\hat{R}_i\|^2 = O_p((n \rho_n^5)^{-1} (\log n)^2 (1/\omega))$.

**Theorem 4** Let $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ with a sparsity factor $\rho_n$ for some $X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in X^n$. Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3 hold, and denote $\rho = \lim_{n \to \infty} \rho_n$. Then there exists some orthogonal matrix $W \in O(d)$ such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$\left\|\hat{X} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0\right\|_F^2 \xrightarrow{p} \int_X \left\{ \text{tr} \{ G(x)^{-1} \} \right\} F(dx), \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$G(x) = \int_X \frac{x_1 x_1^T}{x^T x_0 (1 - \rho x^T x_0)} F(dx_1),$$

and for each fixed $i \in [n]$,

$$\sqrt{n}(W^T \hat{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_0 i) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, G(x_{0i})^{-1}). \quad (3.6)$$

Since we have already shown that $\Sigma(x_{0i}) \succeq G(x_{0i})^{-1}$ for all $i \in [n]$, it follows that

$$\left\|\hat{X} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0\right\|_F^2 - \left\|\hat{X}^{(ASE)} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0\right\|_F^2$$

$$\xrightarrow{p} \int_X \left\{ \text{tr} \{ \Sigma(x) - G(x) \} \right\} F(dx) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma(x_{0i}) - G(x_{0i})^{-1} \} \geq 0,$$

and hence we conclude that the one-step estimator $\hat{X}$ improves the ASE $\hat{X}^{(ASE)}$ globally for all vertices asymptotically. Furthermore, locally for every fixed vertex $i \in [n]$, the $i$th row of the one-step estimator $\hat{x}_i$ is asymptotically efficient, in the sense that it has the same asymptotic covariance matrix with that of the maximum likelihood estimator as if the rest latent positions are known, and this covariance matrix is no greater than that of the
corresponding row of the ASE in spectra.

**Remark 2** Theorem 3 asserts that the one-step estimator \( \hat{X} \) dominates the ASE locally for each individual vertex and globally for all vertices, under the density assumption that
\[
(n\rho_n^5)^{-1}(\log n)^{2(1+\omega)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\]
When the graph is dense, i.e., \( \rho_n \equiv 1 \) for all \( n \), it is easy to show that this condition holds. When \( \rho_n^{-1} \) is a polynomial of \( \log n \), indicating that the graph is moderately sparse, this condition still holds. This condition starts to fail when the graph becomes very sparse, e.g., \( \rho_n^{-1} \asymp n^t \) for some \( t \geq 1/5 \), in which case statistical inference becomes challenging due to the weak signal.

It has been shown in Athreya et al. (2016) and Tang and Priebe (2018) that for the ASE \( \hat{X}^{(ASE)} \), there exists an orthogonal \( W \in O(d) \) such that
\[
W^T \hat{X}^{(ASE)}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i} = \rho_n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) [X_0^T X_0]^{-1} j + \hat{R}_i^{(ASE)},
\]
where \( [X_0^T X_0]^{-1} j \) denotes the vector formed by transposing the \( j \)th row of \( X_0^T X_0 )^{-1} \), and \( (\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\hat{R}_i^{(ASE)}||_F^2)^{1/2} = O_P((n\rho_n)^{-1}) \). Thus, the ASE satisfies the approximate linearization property \((3.3)\) with \( \omega = 0 \) and \( \zeta_{ij} = [X_0^T X_0]^{-1} j \), and hence, \( \hat{X}^{(ASE)} \) can be chosen to be an initial estimator for the one-step procedure in practice.

**Remark 3** Theorem 4 implies that the one-step estimator \( \hat{X} \) initialized with an estimator that satisfies the approximate linearization property \((3.3)\) also satisfies \((3.3)\), when the graph is dense (\( \rho_n \equiv 1 \) for all \( n \)). In this case, one can apply the one-step procedure multiple times, and the resulting estimator still has the same asymptotic behavior as given by Theorem 3. This multi-step updating strategy is of practical interest for more accurate estimation when the sample size is insufficient for asymptotic approximation.

**Proofs sketch for Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.** The key for proving Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 is the formula \((3.4)\). From here, we can apply the logarithmic Sobolev concentration inequality to \((3.4)\) (see, for example, Section 6.4 in Boucheron et al., 2013) to show that \( \| \hat{X}^T W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0 \|_F^2 \) converges in probability to its expectation, which is exactly \((3.5)\). The asymptotic normality \((3.6)\) of \( \hat{x}_i \) can be obtained by directly applying the Lyapunov’s
central limit theorem to
\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \frac{A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right) G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j},
\]
which is a sum of independent random variables. We now sketch the derivation for (3.4).

By construction of the one-step estimator (3.2), we have,
\[
W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i} = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \frac{A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right) G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} + (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i})
\]
\[
+ G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} R_{i1} + R_{i2} R_{i1} + R_{i3},
\]
where
\[
R_{i1} = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \phi_{ij}(\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_i, \rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j) - \phi_{ij}(x_{0i}, x_{0j}) \right\},
\]
\[
\phi_{ij}(u, v) = \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n u^T v)}{u^T v (1 - \rho_n u^T v)},
\]
\[
R_{i2} = W^T \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{x}_j \tilde{x}_j^T (1 - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j) \right\}^{-1} W - G_n(x_{0i})^{-1},
\]
\[
R_{i3} = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} R_{i2} x_{0j}.
\]

For $R_{i1}$, we apply Taylor’s expansion to $\phi_{ij}$ together with the result
\[
\|\tilde{X} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0\|_2 \to_{\infty} = O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)}/2}{\sqrt{n\rho_n}} \right),
\]
which is a variation of Lemma 2.1 in Lyzinski et al. (2014), to obtain
\[
R_{i1} = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} E_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial \phi_{ij}}{\partial u^T} (x_{0i}, x_{0j}) \right\} (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_i - x_{0i}) + O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)}}{n^{3/2}} \right)
\]
\[
= -G_n(x_{0i}) (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}) + O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)}}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\]

For $R_{i2}$, we directly obtain from $\|\tilde{X} W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0\|_2 \to_{\infty} = O_p ((n\rho_n)^{-1/2}(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2})$ and the Lipschitz continuity of the function $(u, v) \mapsto \{u^T v (1 - \rho_n u^T v)\}^{-1} vv^T$ to conclude that
\[
|R_{i2}| = O_p (\rho_n^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} (\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}).
\]
Finally, an application of Hoeffding’s inequality in conjunction with the union bound yields $|R_{i3}| = O_p (\rho_n^{-3/2} n^{-1} (\log n)^{(1/\omega)})$. Thus we obtain
that
\[
W^T \hat{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_0 = \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0)}{x_0^T x_0 (1 - \rho_n x_0^T x_0)} G_n(x_0)^{-1} x_0 j + O_{\mathbb{F}_0} \left( \frac{\log n}{n^{5/2}} \right).
\]

The result \( \sum_{i=1}^n \| \hat{R}_i \|^2 = O_{\mathbb{F}_0} \left( (n \rho_n^5 n)^{-1} (\log n)^2 (1 + \omega) \right) \) follows a similar but more technical argument. The detailed proof is provided in Section B of Supplementary Material.

4 A One-step Estimator for the Laplacian Matrix

Instead of directly analyzing the adjacency matrix \( A \), another widely adopted technique for statistical analysis on random graphs is based on the normalized Laplacian of \( A \), which is particularly useful for clustering in stochastic block models (Rohe et al., 2011; Sarkar and Bickel, 2015). Formally, the normalized Laplacian of a matrix \( M \) with non-negative entries, denoted by \( \mathcal{L}(M) \), is defined by
\[
\mathcal{L}(M) = \left( \text{diag}(M1) \right)^{-1/2} M \left( \text{diag}(M1) \right)^{-1/2},
\]
where, given \( z = [z_1, \ldots, z_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \text{diag}(z) \) is the \( n \times n \) diagonal matrix with \( z_1, \ldots, z_n \) being its diagonal entries. Here we follow the definition of normalized Laplacian adopted in Tang and Priebe (2018) in contrast to the combinatorial Laplacian \( \text{diag}(M1) - M \) that has been applied to graph theory (see, for example, Merris, 1994). For the adjacency matrix \( A \), the \((i, j)\) entry of the normalized Laplacian matrix \( \mathcal{L}(A) \) can be viewed as the connection between vertices \( i \) and \( j \) normalized by the square-root of the degrees of these two vertices.

Recall that the edge probability matrix \( \rho_n XX^T \) is positive semidefinite low-rank when \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X) \) with a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \). Similarly, the normalized Laplacian of \( \rho_n XX^T \) can also be viewed as a positive semidefinite low-rank matrix:
\[
\mathcal{L}(\rho_n XX^T) = \left( \text{diag}(XX^T 1) \right)^{-1/2} XX^T \left( \text{diag}(XX^T 1) \right)^{-1/2} = YY^T,
\]
where \( Y = [y_1, \ldots, y_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \), and \( y_i = x_i (\sum_{j=1}^n x_i x_j)^{-1/2} \). Following the same spirit of the formulation of the ASE through (2.2), one can analogously define the Laplacian spectral
embedding (LSE) $\hat{X}$ of $A$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ by solving the least-squared problem (Rohe et al., 2011)

$$\hat{X} = \arg \min_{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}} \| L(A) - YY^T \|_F^2.$$ (4.1)

Similar to the ASE $\hat{X}^{(ASE)}$, the consistency and asymptotic distribution results hold for $\hat{X}$ as an estimator for $Y$ as well:

**Theorem 5** (Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 of Tang and Priebe, 2018) Let $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ with a sparsity factor $\rho_n$ for some $X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n$. Assume that condition (2.1) holds. Suppose either $\rho_n \equiv 1$ for all $n$ or $\rho_n \to 0$ but $(\log n)^4/(n\rho_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and denote $\rho = \lim_{n \to \infty} \rho_n$. Let $\hat{X} = [\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T$ be the LSE of $A$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined by (4.1). Define the following quantities:

$$Y_0 = [y_{01}, \ldots, y_{0n}]^T, \quad y_{0i} = \frac{x_{0i}}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}}}, \quad \mu = \int_{\mathcal{X}} x F(dx), \quad \tilde{\Delta} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} x^T \frac{x}{\mu} F(dx),$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(x) = \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \left( \tilde{\Delta}^{-1} - \frac{x \mu^T}{2 \mu^T x} \right) \left[ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ \frac{x^T x (1 - \rho x^T x)}{(\mu^T x)^2} x_1 x_1^T \right\} F(dx) \right] \left( \tilde{\Delta}^{-1} - \frac{x \mu^T}{2 \mu^T x} \right)^T.$$

Then there exists an orthogonal $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$n \rho_n \| \hat{X} W - Y_0 \|_F^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \int \text{tr}\{\tilde{\Sigma}(x)\} F(dx),$$ (4.2)

and for any fixed $i \in [n]$,

$$n \rho_n^{1/2} (W^T \hat{x}_i - y_{0i}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \tilde{\Sigma}(x_{0i})).$$ (4.3)

Similar to the ASE, the LSE is also a least-squared type estimator and does not involve the likelihood function. Therefore, to estimate the normalized Laplacian matrix $L(X_0 X_0)^T$ leveraging the likelihood information of the sampling model, we propose the following one-step estimator $\hat{Y}$ for $Y_0$ based on the one-step estimator $\hat{X} = [\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n]^T$ defined in (3.2) and an initial estimator $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n]^T$ that satisfies the approximate linearization property (3.3):

$$\hat{Y} = [\hat{y}_1, \ldots, \hat{y}_n]^T, \quad \hat{y}_i = \frac{\hat{x}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \hat{x}_j^T \hat{x}_j}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$ (4.4)

The likelihood information is thus absorbed into $\hat{Y}$ through the one-step estimator $\hat{X}$ for $X_0$. We characterize the global and local behavior of the one-step estimator $\hat{Y}$ for the normalized
Laplacian matrix via the following two theorems.

**Theorem 6** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) with a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \) for some \( X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n \). Assume that the condition (2.1) holds and the conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Denote \( \hat{Y} = [\hat{y}_1, \ldots, \hat{y}_n]^T \) the one-step estimator for the normalized Laplacian matrix defined by (4.4), and \( \mu_n = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n x_{0i} \). If \( (\log n)^2(1/\omega)(n\rho_n^6)^{-1} \rightarrow 0 \), then there exists some orthogonal matrix \( W \in \Omega(d) \) such that

\[
\sqrt{n}(W^T\hat{y}_i - y_{0i}) = \rho_n^{-1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_n^T x_{0i}}} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i}\mu_n^T}{2\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \right) (W^T\hat{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}) + R_i^{(L)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n,
\]

where \( \|R_i^{(L)}\| = O_p((n\rho_n^3)^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\omega}) \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^n \|R_i^{(L)}\|^2 = O_p((n\rho_n^6)^{-1}(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}) \).

**Theorem 7** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) with a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \) for some \( X_0 = [x_{01}, \ldots, x_{0n}]^T \in \mathcal{X}^n \). Assume the conditions of Theorem 6 hold. Denote \( \hat{Y} = [\hat{y}_1, \ldots, \hat{y}_n]^T \) the one-step estimator for the normalized Laplacian matrix defined by (4.4), and

\[
\hat{G}(x) = \frac{1}{(\mu^T x)} \left( I_d - \frac{x\mu^T}{2\mu^T x} \right) G(x)^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x\mu^T}{2\mu^T x} \right)^T
\]

for any \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) such that \( x^T x_j \in [\delta, 1 - \delta] \) for any \( j \in [n] \), where \( \mu = \int_{\mathcal{X}} x F(dx) \), and \( G(\cdot) \) is defined in Theorem 4. Then there exists some orthogonal matrix \( W \in \Omega(d) \) such that

\[
n\rho_n \left\| \hat{Y}W - Y_0 \right\|^2_F \xrightarrow{p} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{tr} \left\{ \hat{G}(x) \right\} F(dx), \quad (4.5)
\]

and for each fixed \( i \in [n] \),

\[
n\rho_n^{1/2}(W^T\hat{y}_i - y_{0i}) \xrightarrow{L} N(0, \hat{G}(x_{0i})). \tag{4.6}
\]

In Section 3 it is shown that the one-step estimator \( \hat{X} \) dominates the ASE \( \hat{X}^{(ASE)} \) for estimating \( X_0 \) asymptotically. Here we argue that \( \hat{Y} \) dominates the LSE \( \hat{X} \) asymptotically as well. Denote \( A = \text{diag}\{(\mu_n^T x_{0j})^{-1}, \ldots, (\mu_n^T x_{0n})^{-1}\} \) and

\[
\tilde{\Delta}_n = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left( \frac{x_1 x^T_1}{\mu_n^T x_1} \right) F_n(dx_1) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{x_{0j} x^T_{0j}}{\mu_n^T x_{0j}} = \frac{1}{n} X_{0}^T \Lambda X_0 \rightarrow \tilde{\Delta}.
\]

Suppose \( X_0 \) yields the singular value decomposition \( X_0 = U_0 S_0^{1/2} V_0^T \) with \( U_0 \in \Omega(n, d) \), \( S_0^{1/2} \) being diagonal, and \( V_0 \in \Omega(d) \). By Corollary 2.1 in Pecaric et al. (1996) we have

\[
(U_0^T \Lambda U_0)(U_0^T D(x) U_0)(U_0^T \Lambda U_0) \succeq U_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda U_0,
\]
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implying that
\[
\tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda X_0 \right) \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} = n (X_0^T \Lambda X_0)^{-1} (X_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda X_0) (X_0^T \Lambda X_0)^{-1}
\]
\[
= n V_0 S_0^{-1/2} (U_0^T \Lambda U_0)^{-1} (U_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda U_0) (U_0^T \Lambda U_0)^{-1} S_0^{-1/2} V_0^T
\]
\[
\geq n V_0 S_0^{-1/2} (U_0^T D(x)^{-1} U_0)^{-1} S_0^{-1/2} V_0^T
\]
\[
= n (V_0 S_0^{-1/2} U_0^T D(x)^{-1} U_0 S_0^{1/2} V_0^T)^{-1}
\]
\[
= \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T D(x)^{-1} X_0 \right)^{-1}.
\]

Since \( \tilde{\Delta}_n \mu_n = \mu_n \), it follows that
\[
\tilde{\Sigma}_n(x) := \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \left( \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}^T x_{0j} \right\} \left( \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right)^T
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \left( \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} - \frac{x \mu_n^T \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1}}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda X_0 \right) \left( \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} - \frac{x \mu_n^T \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1}}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right)^T
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right) \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T \Lambda D(x) \Lambda X_0 \right) \tilde{\Delta}_n^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right)^T
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} X_0^T D(x)^{-1} X_0 \right)^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x} \right)^T \rightarrow \tilde{G}(x)
\]
as \( n \to \infty \). Therefore, \( \tilde{\Sigma}(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\Sigma}_n(x) \geq \tilde{G}(x) \). This shows that locally for the vertex \( i \), the one-step estimator \( \hat{Y} \) improves the LSE \( \hat{X} \) asymptotically in terms of smaller asymptotic covariance matrix in spectra. In addition,
\[
n \rho_n \| \hat{Y} W - Y_0 \|_F^2 - n \rho_n \| \hat{X} W - Y_0 \|_F^2 \overset{p_n}{\rightarrow} \int_X \text{tr} \{ \tilde{\Sigma}(x) - \tilde{G}(x) \} F(dx) \geq 0.
\]
Namely, the one-step estimator \( \hat{Y} \) also improves the LSE globally for all vertices in terms of the sum of squared-error \( \| \hat{Y} W - Y_0 \|_F^2 \).
5 Numerical Examples

5.1 A two-block stochastic block model example

We first consider generating simulated data using the following rank-one stochastic block model with two communities on \( n \) vertices. The block probability matrix is given by

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix} p^2 & pq \\ pq & q^2 \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( p, q \in (0, 1) \), and the cluster assignment function \( \tau : [n] \to \{2\} \) satisfies

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{\{\tau(i) = 1\}} = \pi_1, \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1_{\{\tau(i) = 2\}} = \pi_2,
\]

where \( \pi_1 + \pi_2 = 1 \).

The distribution \( F \) satisfying condition (2.1) can be explicitly computed: \( F(dx) = \pi_1 \delta_p(dx) + \pi_2 \delta_q(dx) \) with \( \pi_1 + \pi_2 = 1 \), \( p, q \in (0, 1) \). We focus on clustering the vertices as a subsequent inference task after estimating the latent positions, or the transformation of them corresponding to the normalized Laplacian matrix. To estimate the latent positions or their transformations, we compute the following four estimates: the ASE (2.2), the one-step estimator (3.2) initialized at the ASE, abbreviated as OSE-A, the LSE (4.1), and the one-step estimator (4.4) for the normalized Laplacian matrix, abbreviated as OSE-L. These estimated latent positions, or their transformations, are then used as input features for clustering vertices.

Our goal is to compare the performance of clustering using these four estimates. Therefore, a criterion that is independent of the choice of the clustering algorithm, but focuses on the distributions of the input features, is needed. To this end, we introduce the concept of minimum pairwise Chernoff distance. Let \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) be i.i.d. following a distribution \( F \in \{F_1, \ldots, F_K\} \), where \( F_k(dx) = f_k(x)dx, k \in [K] \), and suppose the task is to determine whether \( F = F_k \) for \( k \in [K] \). Assume that \( F = F_k \) with prior probability \( \pi_k, k \in [K] \). Then for any decision rule \( u \), the risk of \( u \) is

\[
r(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \sum_{l \neq k} p_{kl}(u),
\]

where \( p_{kl}(u) \) is the probability that the decision rule \( u \) assigns \( F = F_l \) when the underlying true distribution is \( F = F_l \). In the context of vertex clustering, the decision rule \( u \) plays the role of a clustering
algorithm, and \( x_i \)'s are treated as either one of the aforementioned four estimates. Since we are interested in a criterion that does not depend on \( u \), it is natural to investigate the behavior of the risk when the optimal decision rule is applied. The following result characterized the optimal error rate (Leang and Johnson, 1997):

\[
\inf \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \epsilon(u) = - \min_{k \neq l} C(F_k, F_l),
\]

where \( C(F_k, F_l) \) is the Chernoff information between \( F_k \) and \( F_l \) defined by (Chernoff, 1952, 1956)

\[
C(F_k, F_l) = \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \left\{ -\log \int f_k(x)^t f_l(x)^{1-t} \, dx \right\},
\]

and \( \min_{k \neq l} C(F_k, F_l) \) is the minimum pairwise Chernoff distance. This quantity describes the asymptotic decaying rate of the error for the optimal decision rule, with larger values indicating smaller optimal error rate. In our context, since the asymptotic distributions of the four estimators are multivariate normal, it is useful to derive the Chernoff information for two multivariate normal distributions:

\[
C(F_k, F_l) = \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \left\{ \frac{t(1-t)}{2} (\mu_k - \mu_l)^T V_t^{-1} (\mu_k - \mu_l) + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|V_t|}{|V_k|^t |V_l|^{1-t}} \right\},
\]

where \( F_k = N(\mu_k, V_k) \) and \( F_l = N(\mu_l, V_l) \), and \( V_t = tV_k + (1-t)V_l \). Note that the term \((1/2) \log \{|V_t|/(|V_k|^t |V_l|^{1-t})\}\) is negligible for sufficiently large \( n \).

For a \( K \)-block stochastic block model with a positive semidefinite block probability matrix \( B = (X^*_0)(X^*_0)^T \), where \( X^*_0 = [x^*_{01}, \ldots, x^*_{0K}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d} \), \( d \leq K \), and a cluster assignment function \( \tau : [n] \to [K] \) satisfying \((1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{\tau(i) = k\} \to \pi_k \) for \( k \in [K] \) and \( \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k = 1 \), we define the following quantities for the ASE, the LSE, the OSE-A, and the OSE-L, respectively:

\[
\rho^*_\text{ASE} = \min_{k \neq l} \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{nt(1-t)}{2} (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l})^T \Sigma^{-1}_{kl}(t) (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l}),
\]

\[
\rho^*_\text{LSE} = \min_{k \neq l} \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{n^2t(1-t)}{2} (y^*_{0k} - y^*_{0l})^T \Sigma^{-1}_{kl}(t) (y^*_{0k} - y^*_{0l}),
\]

\[
\rho^*_\text{OSE-A} = \min_{k \neq l} \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{nt(1-t)}{2} (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l})^T G^{-1}_{kl}(t) (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l}),
\]

\[
\rho^*_\text{OSE-L} = \min_{k \neq l} \sup_{t \in (0, 1)} \frac{nt(1-t)}{2} (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l})^T G^{-1}_{kl}(t) (x^*_{0k} - x^*_{0l}),
\]
\[
\rho_{\text{OSE-L}}^* = \min_{k \neq l, t \in (0,1)} \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \frac{n^2 t(1-t)}{2} (y_{0k}^* - y_{0l}^*)^T \tilde{G}_{kl}^{-1}(t)(y_{0k}^* - y_{0l}^*),
\]

where
\[
\Sigma_{kl}(t) = t \Sigma(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \Sigma(x_{0l}^*), \quad \tilde{\Sigma}_{kl}(t) = t \tilde{\Sigma}(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \tilde{\Sigma}(x_{0l}^*),
\]
\[
G_{kl}(t) = t G(x_{0k}^*)^{-1} + (1-t) G(x_{0l}^*)^{-1}, \quad \tilde{G}_{kl}(t) = t \tilde{G}(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \tilde{G}(x_{0l}^*),
\]
and \(y_{0k}^* = x_{0k}^* \sum_{t=1}^K n \pi_k (x_{0k}^*)^T T(x_{0l}^*)^{-1/2}\). These quantities are motivated by the use of the minimum pairwise Chernoff distance for measuring clustering performance. Note that for all \(t \in (0,1)\), we have seen in Section 3 and Section 4 that
\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma_{kl}(t) &= t \Sigma(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \Sigma(x_{0l}^*) \geq t G(x_{0k}^*)^{-1} + (1-t) G(x_{0l}^*)^{-1} = G_{kl}(t), \\
\tilde{\Sigma}_{kl}(t) &= t \tilde{\Sigma}(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \tilde{\Sigma}(x_{0l}^*) \geq t \tilde{G}(x_{0k}^*) + (1-t) \tilde{G}(x_{0l}^*) = \tilde{G}_{kl}(t).
\end{align*}
\]

It follows that \(\rho_{\text{ASE}}^* \leq \rho_{\text{OSE-A}}^*\) and \(\rho_{\text{LSE}}^* \leq \rho_{\text{OSE-L}}^*\) regardless of the choice of the underlying true latent positions. Namely, the decaying rate of the optimal decision error using the OSE-A is always smaller than that using the ASE, and the same holds for the comparison between the OSE-L and the LSE. We also note that the above criteria are independent of the choice of the clustering algorithm and only depend on the distribution of the input features.

Specialized to the two-block stochastic block model example considered in this subsection, we obtain by simple algebra that
\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_{\text{OSE-A}}^* &= \frac{n(p-q)^2}{2} \left\{ G(p)^{-1/2} + G(q)^{-1/2} \right\}^{-1}, \\
\rho_{\text{OSE-L}}^* &= \frac{n(p-q)^2}{2} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q}}{2 \sqrt{p}} G(p)^{-1/2} + \frac{\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q}}{2 \sqrt{q}} G(q)^{-1/2} \right\}^{-1},
\end{align*}
\]

where
\[
G(p) = \frac{\pi_1 p^2}{p^2(1-p^2)} + \frac{\pi_2 q^2}{pq(1-pq)}, \quad G(q) = \frac{\pi_1 p^2}{pq(1-pq)} + \frac{\pi_2 q^2}{q^2(1-q^2)}.
\]

In particular, when \(p \neq q\), \(\rho_{\text{OSE-A}}^* < \rho_{\text{OSE-L}}^*\) if and only if \(q > p\). Namely, when \(q < p\), the OSE-A dominates the OSE-L in terms of the optimal error rate, and when \(q > p\) the OSE-L outperforms the OSE-A. To visualize this result, we fix \(\pi_1 = 0.6, \pi_2 = 0.4\), let \(p\) range over \([0.2, 0.8]\), \(r = q-p\) range over \([-0.15, 0.15]\), compute the ratio \(\rho_{\text{OSE-A}}^*/\rho_{\text{OSE-L}}^*\), and plot the numerical results in Figure 1.

Besides the aforementioned large sample conclusion, we perform two finite-sample exper-
Figure 1: Heatmap and level curves of the ratio $\rho_{\text{OSE-}\Lambda}/\rho_{\text{OSE-L}}$ for $p \in [0.2, 0.8]$ and $r \in [-0.15, 0.15] \{0\}$ for the two-block stochastic block model example.

**Remark 4** Unlike the minimum pairwise Chernoff distance, which is an asymptotic criterion
Table 1: The two-block stochastic block model example: Rand indices of the GMM-based clustering algorithm using different estimates. For each setup $p = 0.6, q = 0.4$ and $p = 0.45, q = 0.6$, the Rand indices are averaged over 100 Monte Carlo replicates of adjacency matrices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>ASE</th>
<th>OSE-A</th>
<th>LSE</th>
<th>OSE-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p = 0.6, q = 0.4$</td>
<td>0.9049</td>
<td>0.9083</td>
<td>0.9023</td>
<td>0.9038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 0.45, q = 0.6$</td>
<td>0.7771</td>
<td>0.7790</td>
<td>0.7840</td>
<td>0.7853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparing the performance of different estimators in terms of the subsequent optimal clustering task and does not depend on the clustering algorithm, the Rand index can only reflect the behavior of the clustering result and may depend on the clustering method we choose.

5.2 A three-block stochastic block model example

We next consider the following three-block stochastic block model on $n$ vertices with the block probability matrix $B = (X_0^*)'(X_0^*)$, where

$$(X_0^*)' = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.6 \\ 0.3 & 0.6 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix},$$

and a cluster assignment function $\tau : [n] \to [3]$, such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}\{\tau(i) = 1\} \to 0.3, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}\{\tau(i) = 2\} \to 0.3, \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}\{\tau(i) = 3\} \to 0.4.$$  

The corresponding distribution $F$ satisfying condition (2.1) is $F(dx) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \pi_k \delta_{x^*_k}(dx)$, where $\pi_1 = \pi_2 = 0.3, \pi_3 = 0.4, x^*_0 = [0.3, 0.3]^T, x^*_2 = [0.3, 0.6]^T$, and $x^*_3 = [0.6, 0.3]^T$. For each $n \in \{500, 600, \ldots, 1200\}$, we generate 100 replicates of the simulated adjacency matrices from the above sampling model, and then estimate the latent positions (or the transformation of them corresponding to the normalized Laplacian matrix) by the following four methods: the ASE (2.2), the one-step estimator (3.2) initialized at the ASE (OSE-A), the LSE (4.1), and the one-step estimator (4.4) for the normalized Laplacian matrix (OSE-L). The goal is to compare the performance of vertex clustering with the GMM-based clustering algorithm applied to these estimates.

Table 2 lists the Rand indices of the GMM-based clustering applied to the four es-
Table 2: The three-block stochastic block model example: Rand indices of the GMM-based clustering algorithm using different estimates. The number of vertices $n$ ranges over \{500, 600, \ldots, 1200\}, and for each $n$, the Rand indices are averaged over 100 Monte Carlo replicates of adjacency matrices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>ASE</th>
<th>OSE-A</th>
<th>LSE</th>
<th>OSE-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n = 500$</td>
<td>0.89753</td>
<td>0.88890</td>
<td>0.82177</td>
<td>0.89184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 600$</td>
<td>0.93518</td>
<td>0.93200</td>
<td>0.89716</td>
<td>0.93164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 700$</td>
<td>0.95635</td>
<td>0.95494</td>
<td>0.93754</td>
<td>0.95519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 800$</td>
<td>0.96880</td>
<td>0.96860</td>
<td>0.95777</td>
<td>0.96863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 900$</td>
<td>0.97628</td>
<td>0.97651</td>
<td>0.96975</td>
<td>0.97641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 1000$</td>
<td>0.98381</td>
<td>0.98359</td>
<td>0.97850</td>
<td>0.98384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 1100$</td>
<td>0.98918</td>
<td><strong>0.98940</strong></td>
<td>0.98600</td>
<td>0.98936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 1200$</td>
<td>0.99166</td>
<td><strong>0.99173</strong></td>
<td>0.98920</td>
<td>0.99160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

timates in comparison with the underlying true cluster assignment, and these Rand indices are averaged over the 100 Monte Carlo replicates. When the number of vertices $n \in \{500, 600, \ldots, 900\}$, the clustering results based on the ASE outperform the rest competitors. However, as $n$ increases with $n \geq 900$, the best result is given by either the OSE-A or the OSE-L. In particular, when $n \in \{1100, 1200\}$, the OSE-A and the OSE-L yield better results than the ASE and the LSE, respectively. These numerical results are in accordance with the fact that asymptotically, the ASE and the LSE are dominated by the OSE-A and OSE-L, respectively.

For each $n \in \{600, 900, 1200\}$, we also compute the OSE-A $\hat{X}$ and the OSE-L $\hat{Y}$ for each block, as well as the corresponding cluster-specific sample covariance matrices after applying the appropriate orthogonal transformation towards the underlying true $X_0$ and $Y_0$, for one randomly selected instance among the 100 replicated adjacency matrices. The results are tabulated in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively, in comparison with the limit covariance matrices given by Theorem 4 and Theorem 7. It can be seen that as $n$ increases, the sample covariance matrices converge to their corresponding cluster-specific limit covariance matrices. The scatter points of $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{Y}$ after applying the orthogonal alignment matrix $W$ towards $X_0$ and $Y_0$ are visualized in Figure 2, along with the cluster-specific 95% empirical and asymptotic confidence ellipses in dashed lines and solid lines, respectively. These figures also validate the aforementioned limit results.
Figure 2: Scatter plots of the OSE-A and OSE-L in the three-block stochastic block model example with \( n \) vertices, with \( n \in \{600, 900, 1200\} \). The scatter points are colored according to the cluster assignment of the corresponding vertices. For each specific cluster, the 95\% empirical confidence ellipses are displayed by the dashed lines, along with the 95\% asymptotic confidence ellipses drawn using the solid lines, as provided by Theorem 4 and Theorem 7.
Table 3: Three-block stochastic block model example: the cluster-specific sample covariance matrices for the OSE-A with the number of vertices \( n \in \{600, 900, 1200\} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( n = 600 )</th>
<th>( n = 900 )</th>
<th>( n = 1200 )</th>
<th>Limit covariance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.76 -3.65</td>
<td>3.65 -3.67</td>
<td>3.55 -3.16</td>
<td>3.22 -2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.65 4.62</td>
<td>-3.67 4.76</td>
<td>-3.16 4.03</td>
<td>-2.90 3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.76 -3.80</td>
<td>4.85 -4.70</td>
<td>4.40 -4.43</td>
<td>3.84 -3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.80 5.21</td>
<td>-4.70 6.30</td>
<td>-4.43 5.92</td>
<td>-3.52 4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.81 -4.75</td>
<td>5.32 -4.58</td>
<td>4.66 -4.14</td>
<td>3.96 -3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.75 5.18</td>
<td>-4.58 5.30</td>
<td>-4.14 5.05</td>
<td>-3.50 4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Three-block stochastic block model example: the cluster-specific sample covariance matrices for the OSE-L with the number of vertices \( n \in \{600, 900, 1200\} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( n = 600 )</th>
<th>( n = 900 )</th>
<th>( n = 1200 )</th>
<th>Limit covariance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-15.75 17.79</td>
<td>-15.61 18.02</td>
<td>-14.03 15.88</td>
<td>-12.78 14.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.30 -11.05</td>
<td>12.96 -13.73</td>
<td>12.12 -13.09</td>
<td>10.23 -10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-11.05 12.82</td>
<td>-13.73 15.79</td>
<td>-13.09 15.15</td>
<td>-10.48 11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-13.32 14.05</td>
<td>-12.98 14.21</td>
<td>-11.81 13.30</td>
<td>-10.16 11.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Wikipedia Graph data

We finally investigate the performance of the proposed one-step estimation procedure to a real-world Wikipedia graph dataset, which is available at http://www.cis.jhu.edu/~parky/Data/data.html. The Wikipedia graph dataset consists of an adjacency matrix among \( n = 1382 \) Wikipedia articles that are within two hyperlinks of the article “Algebraic Geometry”, and these articles are further manually labeled according to one of the following 6 descriptions: People, Places, Dates, Things, Math, and Category. To determine a suitable embedding dimension \( d \) for the random dot product graph model, we follow the ad-hoc approach of Zhu and Ghodsi (2006) and computes

\[
\hat{d} = \arg \max_{d=1,2,...,q} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{d} \log f(\sigma_k(A); \hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\sigma}^2) + \sum_{k=d+1}^{q} \log f(\sigma_k(A); \hat{\mu}_2, \hat{\sigma}^2) \right\},
\]
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where \( f(x; \mu, \sigma^2) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} \exp\left\{ -(x - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} \) is the normal density with mean \( \mu \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \),

\[
\mu_1 = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^{d} \sigma_k(A), \quad \mu_2 = \frac{1}{p - d} \sum_{k=d+1}^{p} \sigma_k(A), \quad \bar{\sigma}^2 = \frac{(d - 1)s_1^2 + (p - d - 1)s_2^2}{p - 2},
\]

\( s_1^2, s_2^2 \) are the sample variances of \( \{\sigma_k(A)\}_{k=1}^{d} \) and \( \{\sigma_k(A)\}_{k=d+1}^{p} \), respectively, and \( q \) is an upper bound for the embedding dimension. Here we select \( q = 50 \) as a conservative upper bound, resulting in \( \widehat{d} = 11 \).

We next compute the ASE, the LSE, the OSE-A, and the OSE-L, with the embedding dimension \( d = 11 \), and then apply the GMM-based clustering algorithm to these estimates, with the number of clusters being 6. We next compare the similarity between the manually assigned 6 class labels and these clustering results by computing the respective Rand indices, which are tabulated in Table 5. The results show that the one-step procedure for the Laplacian matrix outperforms the rest competitors, as it provides the clustering result that is most similar to the original class label assignment among the four methods.

Table 5: Wikipedia Graph Data: Rand indices of the GMM-based clustering algorithm applied to the ASE, the LSE, the OSE-A, and the OSE-L, respectively, with the number of clusters being 6, in comparison with the corresponding manual labels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ASE</th>
<th>LSE</th>
<th>OSE-A</th>
<th>OSE-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rand Index</td>
<td>0.7429</td>
<td>0.7350</td>
<td>0.7413</td>
<td><strong>0.7538</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Wikipedia Graph Data: Rand indices of the GMM-based clustering algorithm applied to the ASE, the LSE, the OSE-A, and the OSE-L, respectively, with the number of clusters being 2, in comparison with the corresponding one-versus-all manual labels for the class “Dates”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ASE</th>
<th>LSE</th>
<th>OSE-A</th>
<th>OSE-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rand Index</td>
<td>0.5289</td>
<td>0.5097</td>
<td><strong>0.5432</strong></td>
<td>0.5313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides evaluating the performance of the overall clustering for the 6 manually-assigned labels, we also specifically focus on the comparison of the article class “Dates” against the rest articles. We apply the GMM-based clustering algorithm to the aforementioned four estimates again, but with the number of clusters being 2, and tabulate the Rand indices in
Figure 3: Wikipedia graph data: The scatter plots of the first-versus-second dimension of the four estimates. The scatter points are colored according to whether the articles are in the class “Dates” or the others. The 95% empirical cluster-specific confidence ellipses are displayed by the dashed lines.
Table 6. We can see that the proposed one-step procedure improves the clustering accuracy as well when we focus on the comparison between the article class “Dates” against the rest labels. The scatter plots of the first-versus-second dimension of the four estimates are visualized in Figure 3, along with the cluster-specific 95% empirical confidence ellipses in dashed lines. It can be clearly seen that the OSE-A and the OSE-L outperform the ASE and the LSE, as the one-step procedure results in better separation of the articles in the “Dates” class from the rest articles.

6 Discussion

We assume that the embedding dimension $d$ for the random dot product graph is known throughout the paper. The proposed one-step procedure is also valid when the true dimension $d$ for the underlying sampling model is unknown, but the method proceeds by first finding the ASE into $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$ for some $d' \geq 1$ and $d' < d$ (i.e., when the dimension is under-estimated), and then computing the one-step estimator based on $d'$. Our Theorem 4 and Theorem 7 still hold and can be easily proved as suggested by Tang and Priebe (2018). On the other hand, leveraging Bayesian methods when the dimension $d$ is unknown is a promising future direction in light of the recent progress in Bayesian theory and methods for low-rank matrix models with undetermined rank (Bhattacharya and Dunson, 2011; Rocková and George, 2016) and network models (Caron and Fox, 2017; Xie and Xu, 2019).

We have shown that the one-step procedure produces an estimator enjoying fascinating asymptotic properties both globally for all vertices and locally for each individual vertex. Nevertheless, for problems with relatively small sample sizes, we found in simulation examples that the one-step estimators do not necessarily provide us with better numerical results compared to the classical adjacency/Laplacian spectral embedding. Since the one-step procedure is exactly a single iteration of the Newton-Raphson algorithm with the observed Hessian matrix replaced by the negative Fisher information matrix, we hope to develop an iterative algorithm for finding a local maximum of the likelihood function by repeating the one-step procedure multiple times until convergence. Such an iterative algorithm can be implemented in conjunction with the regularization of the Fisher information matrix and
backtracking procedure for finding suitable step sizes to achieve faster convergence (Nocedal
and Wright, 2006). Furthermore, developing a scalable version of such an algorithm will be
highly desirable for the emerging big data and large graphs. It will also be useful to explore
the statistical properties of the estimator obtained by the iterative algorithm, and establish
its theoretical guarantee. We defer these research topics to future work.

**Supplementary Material**

The supplementary material contains the proofs of the technical results in Section 3 and
Section 4.
A Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. We begin the proof with writing down the likelihood function for \( x_i \):

\[
\ell_A(x_i) = \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij} \log(x_i^T x_{0j}) + (1 - A_{ij}) \log(1 - x_i^T x_{0j})
\]

For convenience we denote the following functions:

\[
M_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \ell_A(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \{ A_{ij} \log(x_j^T x_{0j}) + (1 - A_{ij}) \log(1 - x_j^T x_{0j}) \},
\]

\[
M(x) = \mathbb{E}_0\{M_n(x)\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \{ x_{0j}^T x_{0j} \log(x_j^T x_{0j}) + (1 - x_{0j}^T x_{0j}) \log(1 - x_j^T x_{0j}) \},
\]

\[
\Psi_n(x) = \frac{\partial M}{\partial x}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - x_j^T x_{0j})}{x_j^T x_{0j}(1 - x_j^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j},
\]

\[
\Psi(x) = \mathbb{E}_0\{\Psi_n(x)\} = \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial M}{\partial x}(x) \right\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ \frac{(x_{0j} - x)^T x_{0j}}{x_j^T x_{0j}(1 - x_j^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j}.
\]

Denote \( \Psi_{nk} \) the \( k \)th component of \( \Psi_n \), i.e.,

\[
\Psi_{nk}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - x_j^T x_{0j})}{x_j^T x_{0j}(1 - x_j^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0jk}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, d,
\]

where \( x_{0j} = [x_{0j1}, \ldots, x_{0jd}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Simple algebra shows that

\[
\frac{\partial^2 M_n}{\partial x \partial x^T}(x) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{x_{0j} x_{0j}^T}{x_j^T x_{0j}(1 - x_j^T x_{0j})} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(A_{ij} - x_j^T x_{0j})(1 - 2x_j^T x_{0j})x_{0j} x_{0j}^T}{x_j^T x_{0j}(1 - x_j^T x_{0j})^2},
\]
\[
\frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial x \partial x^T}(x) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{(x^T x_{0j})^2 - 2x^T x_{0j} x^T x_{0i} + x^T x_{0i}}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T,
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \Psi_{nk}}{\partial x \partial x^T}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{x_{0j} (1 - 2x^T x_{0j})}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\}^2 x_{0j} x_{0j}^T
+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{(1 - 2x^T x_{0j}) + 2(A_{ij} - x^T x_{0j})}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T
+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{2(A_{ij} - x^T x_{0j})(1 - 2x^T x_{0j})^2}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T.
\]

Clearly, \( \Theta_n \) is compact and \( M_n(x) \) is continuous. Therefore \( \tilde{x}_i = \arg \max_{x \in \Theta_n} M_n(x) \) exists with probability one. Furthermore, by Shannon’s lemma (see, for example, Lemma 2.2.1 in Bickel and Doksum, 2015), we know that \( M(x) \) is maximized at \( x = x_{0i} \). Since \( x^T x_{0j} \in [\delta, 1 - \delta] \) for all \( j \in [n] \), implying that

\[
-\frac{\partial^2 M}{\partial x \partial x^T}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{(x^T x_{0j})^2 - 2x^T x_{0j} x^T x_{0j} + x^T x_{0j}}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T
\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{(x^T x_{0j})^2 - 2x^T x_{0j} x^T x_{0j} + (x^T x_{0j})^2}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \left\{ \frac{(x^T x_{0j} - x^T x_{0j})^2}{x^T x_{0j} (1 - x^T x_{0j})} \right\} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T \leq O,
\]

it follows that for all \( \epsilon > 0 \),

\[
\sup_{|x - x_{0i}| > \epsilon} M(x) < M(x_{0i}), \quad (A.1)
\]

since \( x_{0i} \) is in the interior of \( \Theta_n \) and the Hessian of \( M \) is strictly negative definite for all \( x \in \Theta_n \).

We first claim that

\[
\sup_{x \in \Theta_n} |M_n(x) - M(x)| \xrightarrow{P_0} 0. \quad (A.2)
\]

Define a stochastic process \( \{J(x) = M_n(x) - M(x) : x \in \Theta_n\} \). Since for any \( x_1, x_2 \in \Theta_n \), there exists a constant \( K_\delta \) only depending on \( \delta > 0 \), such that

\[
\left| \log \left( \frac{x_{1}^T x_{0j}}{1 - x_{1}^T x_{0j}} \right) - \log \left( \frac{x_{2}^T x_{0j}}{1 - x_{2}^T x_{0j}} \right) \right| \leq \sup_{x \in \Theta_n, j \in [n]} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log \left( \frac{x^T x_{0j}}{1 - x^T x_{0j}} \right) \right\| \|x_1 - x_2\|
\]
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\[ \leq K_\delta \| \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \|, \]

it follows from Hoeffding’s inequality that
\[ \mathbb{P}_0 (| J(\mathbf{x}_1) - J(\mathbf{x}_2) |) \leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{2nt^2}{K_\delta^2 \| \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \|^2} \right), \]
implying that \( J(\cdot) \) is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to \( K_\delta n^{-1/2} \| \cdot \| \). Hence the packing entropy can also be bounded: There exists some large constant \( C > 0 \), such that
\[ \log \mathcal{D} \left( \epsilon, \Theta_n, \frac{K_\delta}{\sqrt{n}} \| \cdot \| \right) \leq d \log \left( \frac{C}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}} \right). \]

Hence, by the fact that \( \sup_{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \Theta_n} K_\delta n^{-1/2} \| \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \| \leq cn^{-1/2} \) for some constant \( c \in (0, C) \), a maximum inequality for sub-Gaussian process (see, for example, Corollary 8.5 in Kosorok, 2008), and the change of variable \( u = \log \{ C/(\epsilon \sqrt{n}) \} \), we have
\[ \mathbb{E}_0 \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Theta_n} | J(\mathbf{x}) | \right) \leq \mathbb{E}_0 (| J(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) |) + \int_0^{cn^{-1/2}} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{D} \left( \epsilon, \Theta_n, \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} \| \cdot \| \right)} \, d\epsilon \]
\[ \leq \sqrt{\text{var}_0 (J(\mathbf{x}_{0i}))} + \int_0^{cn^{-1/2}} \sqrt{\log \frac{C}{\epsilon \sqrt{n}}} \, d\epsilon \]
\[ = \left\{ \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0 (1 - \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0) \log \frac{\mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0}{1 - \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_0} \right\}^{1/2} + \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{ue^{-u}} \, du \rightarrow 0 \]
as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). Therefore we conclude that \( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Theta_n} | J(\mathbf{x}) | = o_{\mathbb{P}_0} (1) \).

In the proof below we shall drop the superscript (MLE) from \( \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(\text{MLE})} \) and write \( \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i^{(\text{MLE})} \) for short. We next use the claim (A.2) to show that \( \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \) is consistent for \( \mathbf{x}_{0i} \). The proof here is quite similar to that of Theorem 5.7 in Van der Vaart (2000) and presented here for completeness. In fact, this implies that \( M_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\rightarrow} M(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \). Furthermore, \( \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \) is the maximizer of \( M_n \), implying that
\[ M(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) - M(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) = M_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0} (1) - M(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \leq M_n(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) - M(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0} (1) \]
\[ \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Theta_n} | J(\mathbf{x}) | + o_{\mathbb{P}_0} (1) = o_{\mathbb{P}_0} (1). \]

This shows that \( \mathbb{P}_0 (M(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) - M(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \geq \eta) \rightarrow 0 \) for all \( \eta > 0 \). Recall that by (A.1) for all \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exists some \( \eta(\epsilon) > 0 \), such that \( \| \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{0i} \| > \epsilon \) implies \( M(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \leq M(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) - \eta(\epsilon) \).
Namely, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\eta = \eta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$
P_0 (||\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}|| > \epsilon) \leq P_0 (M(x_{0i}) - M(\hat{x}_i) \geq \eta) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof of consistency of $\hat{x}_i$ for $x_{0i}$.

We finally show the asymptotic normality of $\hat{x}_i$. Since $\hat{x}_i$ is consistent for $x_{0i}$, it follows that with probability tending to one, $\hat{x}_i$ is in the interior of $\Theta_n$ since $x_{0i}$ is. Assume this event occurs. By Taylor’s expansion, we have, for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, that

$$0 = \Psi_{nk}(\hat{x}_i) = \Psi_{nk}(x_{0i}) + \frac{\partial \Psi_{nk}}{\partial x^T}(x_{0i})(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i})^T \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_{nk}}{\partial x \partial x^T}(\tilde{x}) \right\}(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}),$$

where $\tilde{x}$ lies on the line segment linking $x_{0i}$ and $\hat{x}_i$. Since for any $x \in \Theta_n$,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_{nk}}{\partial x \partial x^T}(x) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (1 + 2(1 - \delta))||x_{0j}||^2 \cancel{\frac{1}{\delta^2}(1 - \delta)^2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (3 - 2\delta + 2(2 - \delta))||x_{0j}||^2 \cancel{\frac{1}{\delta^2}(1 - \delta)^2} \leq 1,$$

it follows that the Hessian of $\Psi_{nk}(\tilde{x})$ is bounded in probability. Observe that,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(x_{0i})}{\partial x^T} \right\} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{x_{0j} x_{0j}^T}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - x_{0i}^T x_{0j})},$$

and for any $s, t \in [d]$,

$$\text{var}_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(x_{0i})}{\partial x_t} \right\} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(2x_{0i}^T x_{0j})^2 (x_{0is} x_{0jt})^2}{x_{0is}^2 x_{0jt} (1 - x_{0i}^T x_{0j})^3} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, it follows from the law of large numbers that

$$\frac{\partial \Psi_n(x_{0i})}{\partial x^T} = -G_n(x_{0i}) + o_{P_0}(1).$$

Therefore, we conclude from the Taylor’s expansion and $\hat{x}_i - x_{0i} = o_{P_0}(1)$ that

$$-\Psi_n(x_{0i}) = \left\{ -G_n(x_{0i}) + o_{P_0}(1) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i})^T O_{P_0}(1) \right\} (\hat{x}_i - x_{0i})$$

$$= \left\{ -G_n(x_{0i}) + o_{P_0}(1) \right\} (\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}).$$

Namely,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}) = \left\{ G_n(x_{0i}) + o_{P_0}(1) \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{(A_{ij} - x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}.$$
Observe that

\[
\sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (A_{ij} - x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j} \right\|^3 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \frac{(2 - \delta)^3 \| x_{0j} \|^3}{\{\delta(1 - \delta)\}^3} \to 0,
\]

it follows from Lyapunov’s central limit theorem that \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{x}_i - x_{0i}) \overset{d}{\to} N(0, G(x_{0i})^{-1}) \). The proof is thus completed.

\[\square\]

### B Proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4

#### B.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 3, we first present a collection of technical lemmas for bounding the remainder \( \hat{R}_i \) in (3.4). The proofs of these lemmas are deferred to Section D.

**Lemma B.1** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) and assume the conditions in Theorem 3 holds. Let an estimator \( \tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) satisfy the approximate linearization property (3.3) with an orthogonal matrix \( W \in O(d) \). Then

\[
\| \tilde{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0 \|_2 \to \infty = O_p_0 \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1+\omega)/2}}{n\rho_n^{1/2}} \right).
\]

**Lemma B.2** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) with sparsity factor \( \rho_n \), and assume the conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Let an estimator \( \tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) satisfy the approximate linearization property (3.3) with an orthogonal matrix \( W \in O(d) \). Then

\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \left\| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_n x_{0j} x_{0j}^T (1 - \rho_n x_{0i} x_{0j}) \right\| = O_p_0 \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1+\omega)/2}}{n\rho_n^{1/2}} \right).
\]

**Lemma B.3** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) with sparsity factor \( \rho_n \) and assume the conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Let an estimator \( \tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \) satisfy the approximate linearization property (3.3) with an orthogonal matrix \( W \in O(d) \). Suppose \( \{\alpha_{ijk} : i \in [n], j \in [d], k \in [d]\} \) is a collection
of deterministic vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\sup_{i,j \in [n], k \in [d]} \|\alpha_{ijk}\| < \infty$. Then

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \alpha_{ijk} (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_i - x_{0i}) \right| = O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/2 + (1+\omega)/2}}{n\rho_n} \right).$$

Lemma B.4 Let $A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0)$ with sparsity factor $\rho_n$, and assume the conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Let an estimator $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ satisfy the approximate linearization property (3.3) with an orthogonal matrix $W \in \mathbb{O}(d)$. Suppose $\{\beta_{ijk} : i, j \in [n], k \in [d]\}$ is a collection of deterministic vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sup_{i,j \in [n], k \in [d]} \|\beta_{ijk}\| < \infty$. Then for each individual $i \in [n]$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j - x_{0j})^T \beta_{ijk} \right| = O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{\omega/2}}{n\rho_n^{3/2}} \right)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j - x_{0j})^T \beta_{ijk} \right\}^2 = O_p \left( \frac{(\log n)^{\omega}}{n\rho_n^3} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $W$ be the matrix satisfying (3.3). For any $X = [x_1, \ldots, x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, denote $H_i(X) = (1/n) \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j \{ (x_j^T x_j)(1 - x_j^T x_j) \}^{-1} x_j^T$. By definition,

$$W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}$$

$$= (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i})$$

$$+ W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) - \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j) (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j)}{\rho_n^{-1/2} x_i^T \tilde{x}_j (1 - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j)} - \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} (W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) - W) x_{0j}$$

$$= (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i})$$

$$+ G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j) (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j)}{\rho_n^{-1/2} x_i^T \tilde{x}_j (1 - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j)} - \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}$$

$$+ \{W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) - W - G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \}$$

$$\times \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j) (\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j)}{\rho_n^{-1/2} x_i^T \tilde{x}_j (1 - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j)} - \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}.$$
\[ + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \{W^T H_i(\tilde{X})^{-1} W - G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}\} x_{0j} \]

\[ + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} \]

\[ = (W^T \tilde{X}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}) + G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} R_{i1} + R_{i2} R_{i1} + R_{i3} \]

\[ + \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}, \]

where

\[ R_{i1} = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{(A_{ij} - \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j)(\rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j)}{\rho_n^{-1/2} \tilde{x}_j(1 - \rho_n \tilde{x}_i^T \tilde{x}_j)} - \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}, \]

\[ R_{i2} = W^T H_i(\tilde{X})^{-1} W - G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}, \]

\[ R_{i3} = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} R_{i2} x_{0j}. \]

We first analyze \( R_{i1} \). Denote the function \( \phi_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) by

\[ \phi_{ij}(u, v) = \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n u^T v) v}{u^T v(1 - \rho_n u^T v)}, \quad i, j \in [n], \]

and let \( \phi_{ij} = [\phi_{ij1}, \ldots, \phi_{ijd}]^T \). By Taylor’s expansion, we have, If \( \|u - x_{0i}\| < \epsilon \) and \( \|v - x_{0j}\| < \epsilon \) for sufficiently small \( \epsilon > 0 \), and \( \delta \leq \min_{i,j \in [n]} \|x_{0i} - x_{0j}\| \leq \max_{i,j \in [n]} \|x_{0i} - x_{0j}\| \leq 1 - \delta \) for some constant \( \delta > 0 \), then

\[ \phi_{ijk}(u, v) - \phi_{ijk}(x_{0i}, x_{0j}) \]

\[ = -\left\{ \frac{\rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right\}^T (u - x_{0i}) - \frac{\rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} (v - x_{0j}) \]

\[ - \left[ x_{0i}^T (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})(1 - 2\rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j} \right]^T (u - x_{0i}) \]

\[ + \left[ (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) e_k - x_{0i}^T x_{0j}(1 - 2\rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j} \right]^T (v - x_{0j}) + R_{ijk}, \]

where \( \max_{i,j \in [n], k \in [d]} |R_{ijk}| \leq C_\delta \max(\|u - u_0\|^2, \|v - v_0\|^2) \) for some constant \( \delta \) only depending on \( \delta \). Applying the above fact to \( R_{i1} \), we derive

\[ R_{i1} = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\{ \phi_{ij}(\rho_n^{1/2} W^T \tilde{X}_i, \rho_n^{1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j) - \phi_{ij}(x_{0i}, x_{0j}) \right\} \]
\[- \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}^T}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j}} \left( \rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_i - x_{0i} \right) \]
\[- \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}^T}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j}} \left( \rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_j - x_{0j} \right) \]
\[- \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})(1 - 2 \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j} x_{0j}^T}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j}(1 - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})} \right] \left( \rho_n^{-1/2} W^T \tilde{x}_i - x_{0i} \right) \]
\[= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} R_{ij}^2}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{ij}, \]

where \( R_{ij} \)'s are such that \( \max_{i,j \in [n]} \| R_{ij} \| \lesssim \| \rho_n^{-1/2} \tilde{X} W - X_0 \|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}^{2} \) when \( \| \rho_n^{-1/2} \tilde{X} W - X_0 \|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}^{2} \) is sufficiently small. Clearly,

\[ R_{i11} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x_{0j}^T x_{0j}^T}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j}} \left( W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{-1/2} x_{0i} \right) = G_n (x_{0i}) (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{-1/2} x_{0i}). \]

Furthermore, Lemma B.2 shows that \( \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i12} \| = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( (n \sqrt{\rho_n})^{-1} (\log n)^{1/\omega}/2 \right). \) In addition, we have \( \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i13} \| = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( (n \rho_n)^{-1} (\log n)^{1/2+1/\omega}/2 \right) \) by Lemma B.3, \( \| R_{i14} \| = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( (n \rho_n^{3/2})^{-1} (\log n)^{\omega}/2 \right) \) by Lemma B.4, and

\[ \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \max_{j \in [n]} \| R_{ij} \| = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n \rho_n^{5/2}} \right) \]

by Lemma B.1. This shows that

\[ \| R_{i1} + R_{i11} \| = \| R_{i1} + G_n (x_{0i}) (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{-1/2} x_{0i}) \| \]
\[ \leq \| R_{i12} \| + \| R_{i13} \| + \| R_{i14} \| + \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \max_{i,j \in [n]} \| R_{ij} \| = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n \rho_n^{5/2}} \right), \]

and hence,

\[ \| R_{i1} \| \leq \| G_n (x_{0i}) \| \| \tilde{X} W - \rho_n^{-1/2} X_0 \|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n \rho_n^{5/2}} \right) = O_{\overline{p}_0} \left( \sqrt{(\log n)^{1/\omega}} / n \rho_n \right). \]
by Lemma B.1.

Next we focus on $R_{i2}$. Since the function $(u, v) \mapsto \{u^T v (1 - \rho_n u^T v)\}^{-1} v v^T$ is Lipschitz continuous in a neighborhood of $(x_{0i}, x_{0j})$, it follows immediately that

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F \lesssim \|\rho_n^{-1/2} \tilde{X} W - X_0\|_{2 \to \infty}$$

when $\|\rho_n^{-1/2} \tilde{X} W - X_0\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq C_1 \rho_n^{-1} \sqrt{n^{-T}} (\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}$. Namely,

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}}{\rho_n \sqrt{n}} \right)$$

by Lemma B.1. Furthermore, by the fact that $G_n(x_{0i}) \to G(x_{0i})$ as $n \to \infty$, that $G_n(x_{0i}) - \Delta$ is positive definite for sufficiently large $n$, and that

$$|\lambda_d(W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W) - \lambda_d(G_n(x_{0i}))| \leq \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F^2,$$

(see, for example, Hoffman and Wielandt, 2003), we conclude that

$$\min_{i \in [n]} \lambda_d(W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W) \geq \lambda_d(G_n(x_{0i})) - \max_{i \in [n]} \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F^2 \geq \lambda_d(\Delta) - o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1),$$

namely, $\max_{i \in [n]} \lambda_d^{-1}(W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W) = O_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1)$. Therefore,

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{i2}\|_F = \max_{i \in [n]} \|\{W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W\}^{-1} \{W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\} G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}\|_F$$

$$\lesssim \max_{i \in [n]} \lambda_d^{-1}(W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W) \max_{i \in [n]} \|G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}\|_F \max_{i \in [n]} \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F$$

$$\leq O_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \|\Delta^{-1}\|_F \max_{i \in [n]} \|W^T H_i(\tilde{X}) W - G_n(x_{0i})\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}}{\rho_n \sqrt{n}} \right)$$

We finally move forward to analyze $R_{i3}$. Since

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{i3}\|_F \leq \max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{i2}\|_F \sqrt{\max_{j \in [n]} \sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \max_{j \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}) x_{0jk}}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})}}$$

and by Hoeffding’s inequality and the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \left( \max_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j}) x_{0jk}}{x_{0j}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})} > t \sqrt{n \log n} \right)$$

$$= 2n \exp \left[ - \frac{2t^2 n \log n}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{0jk}^2 \{x_{0j}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0j}^T x_{0j})\}^{-2}} \right]$$

$$\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -(Mt^2 - 1) \log n \right\}$$
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for some constant \( M > 0 \). Hence,
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{d} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0jk} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \sqrt{\log n / n \rho_n} \right),
\]
and hence, \( \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i3} \|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} (\rho_n^{-3/2} n^{-1} (\log n)^{1/2+(1/\omega)/2}) \). Therefore, we conclude that
\[
W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i} = (W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_{0i}) + G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} R_1 + R_2 R_1 + R_3
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}^T x_{0i} \left( 1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right) G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) x_{0j}^T x_{0i} \left( 1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right) G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} + \hat{R}_i,
\]
where
\[
\| \hat{R}_i \| = \| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} (R_{i1} + R_{i11}) + R_{i2} R_1 + R_{i3} \|
\]
\[
= \| \Delta_{n}^{-1} \|_F \| R_{i1} + R_{i11} \| + (\| R_{i2} \|_F \| R_{i1} \| + \| R_{i3} \|)
\]
\[
= O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^{5/2}} \right) + O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^{3/2}} \right) + O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/2+(1/\omega)/2}}{n^{3/2}} \right)
\]
\[
= O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^{5/2}} \right).
\]
We now proceed to prove that \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \hat{R}_i \|^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} ((n \rho_n^5)^{-1} (\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}) \). Observe that by Lemma B.4 we have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} (-R_{i12} - R_{i13} + R_{i14}) \|^2
\]
\[
\leq 3n \| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \|_F^2 \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i12} \|^2 + \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i13} \|^2 \right\} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| R_{i14} \|^2
\]
\[
\leq n \| \Delta^{-1} \|_F^2 \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i12} \|^2 + \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{i13} \|^2 \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| R_{i14} \|^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n^{3/2}} \right),
\]
and that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{ij} \right\|^2 \leq n \| \Delta^{-1} \|_F^2 \left( \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{ij} \| \right)^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n^{3/2}} \right).
\]
Besides, by the above derivation we have

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|R_{i2}R_{i1}\|^2 \leq \max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{i2}\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|R_{i1}\|^2 \]

\[ \leq O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^2 \rho_n} \right) \left\{ n \max_{i \in [n]} \|G_n(x_{0i})\|_F^2 \frac{1}{2} \|XW - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0\|_F^2 \right\} \]

\[ + O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^2 \rho_n} \right) \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| R_{i12} + R_{i13} - R_{i14} - \frac{1}{n} \rho_n \sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{ij} \right\|^2 \right\} \]

\[ = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n^2 \rho_n^2} \right), \]

and

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|R_{i3}\|_F^2 \leq n \max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{i3}\|_F^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n^2 \rho_n^3} \right). \]

Therefore, we conclude that

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\tilde{R}_i\|^2 \leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}(-R_{i12} - R_{i13} + R_{i14})\|^2 + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \rho_n \sum_{j=1}^{n} R_{ij}\|^2 \]

\[ + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|R_{i2}R_{i1}\|^2 + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|R_{i3}\|^2 \]

\[ = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n^2 \rho_n^5} \right). \]

The proof is thus completed. \(\square\)

### B.2 Proof of Theorem 4

We begin the proof of Theorem 4 with the following two technical lemmas:

**Lemma B.5** Let \( A \sim \text{RDPG}(X_0) \) and assume the conditions in Theorem 4 holds. Denote \( Z = Z(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij}\|^2, \) where \( \{\gamma_{ij} : i, j \in [n]\} \) is a collection of deterministic vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \|\gamma_{ij}\| \lesssim (n \sqrt{\rho_n})^{-1}. \) Then \( Z = \mathbb{E}_0(Z) + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1). \)

**Lemma B.6** Let \( G_n(x) \) be defined as in Theorem 3, \( G(x) \) defined as in Theorem 2, \( \tilde{G}(x) \) be defined as in Theorem 7. Denote

\[ \tilde{G}_n(x) = \frac{1}{\mu_n^T x} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2x^T \mu_n} \right) G_n(x)^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x \mu_n^T}{2x^T \mu_n} \right), \]
where \( \mathbf{\mu}_n = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_{0i} \). Let \( \mathcal{X}(\delta) \) be the set of all \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \) such that any \( \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{X}(\delta) \) satisfy \( \delta \leq \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{u} \leq 1 - \delta \), where \( \delta > 0 \) is some small constant independent of \( n \). Then

\[
\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| \mathbf{G}_n(\mathbf{x})^{-1} - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \|_F \to 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_n(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{x}) \|_F \to 0
\]

as \( n \to \infty \).

**Proof of Theorem 4.** Let \( \mathbf{W} \) be the orthogonal matrix satisfying (3.3). Denote

\[
\gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \frac{\mathbf{G}_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{0j}}{\mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j} (1 - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j})}.
\]

First note that \( \mathbf{G}_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i})^{-1} \geq \mathbf{\Delta} \) for sufficiently large \( n \), and hence,

\[
\sup_{i,j \in [n]} \| \gamma_{ij} \| \leq \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \frac{\| \mathbf{G}_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i})^{-1} \| \| \mathbf{x}_{0j} \|}{\mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j} (1 - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j})} \leq \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \frac{\| \mathbf{\Delta} \|_2}{\delta (1 - \delta)} \leq \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}}. \tag{B.1}
\]

Also observe that

\[
\mathbb{E}_0 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right\|^2 \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ (A_{ia} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})(A_{ib} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0b}) \gamma_{ia}^T \gamma_{ib} \right\} \mathbf{x}_{0a} \right\|^2 \\
= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ (A_{ia} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})^2 \| x_{0a} \| \right\} \mathbf{x}_{0a} \mathbf{G}_n^{-2}(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \mathbf{x}_{0a} \\
= \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \| x_{0a} \| \mathbf{x}_{0a} \mathbf{G}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \right] \\
= \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \| x_{0a} \| \mathbf{x}_{0a} \mathbf{G}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \right] \\
= \frac{1}{n} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^n \| x_{0a} \| \mathbf{x}_{0a} \mathbf{G}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{0i}) \right].
\]

By Theorem 3 and Lemma B.5, we can write

\[
\| \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}_0 \|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^n \| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_i \|^2 \\
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \| \mathbf{G}_n(\mathbf{x}_{0i})^{-1} \| \right\} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0i}^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} + O_{\rho_0}(1) + O_{\rho_0} \left( \frac{\log n)^{2(1\omega)}}{n \rho_0^2} \right).
\]
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By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

\[
\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{R}_{ij}^T \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right| \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \mathbf{R}_i \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right\|^2 \right\}^{1/2}
\]

\[
= O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr}\{G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}\} + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \right\}^{1/2}
\]

\[
= o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1).
\]

Hence, by condition (2.1) and the uniform convergence of $G_n(x)^{-1} \rightarrow G(x)^{-1}$ for all $x$ (Lemma B.6), we obtain (see, for example, Exercise 3 in Section 4.4 of Chung, 2001)

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr}\{G_n(x_{0i})\} = \int \text{tr}\{G_n(x)^{-1}\} F_n(dx) \rightarrow \int \text{tr}\{G(x)^{-1}\} F(dx).
\]

This completes the first part of the theorem. For the second part, we observe that

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \left( A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right) \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} \right\|^3 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{(n \rho_n)^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \left( A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right)^3 \right\} \left\| \mathbf{G}_n^{-1}(x_{0i}) \right\|^3 \left\| x_{0j} \right\|^3 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \rightarrow 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \text{var}_0 \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \left( A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right) \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} \right\}
\]

\[
= \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} \text{var}_0 \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \left( A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \right) \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} \right\}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} \rho_n \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} x_{0j}^T \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} = \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}(x_{0i})^{-1}.
\]

It follows from the Lyapunov’s central limit theorem and Theorem 3 that

\[
\sqrt{n}(\mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{0i}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} \mathbf{G}_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j} + o_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \mathbf{G}(x_{0i})^{-1}).
\]

The proof is thus completed. □
Proof of Theorems 6 and 7

Proof of Theorem 6. Let $W$ be the orthogonal matrix satisfying (3.3). Define a function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$h(x, T) = [h_1(x, T), \ldots, h_d(x, T)]^T = \frac{x}{\sqrt{(1/n) \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 t_j}}, \quad \text{where } T = [t_1, \ldots, t_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}.$$

Simple algebra shows that for $k = 1, \ldots, d$

$$\frac{\partial h_k}{\partial x^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) = \rho_n^{-1/2}(x_0^T \mu_n)^{-3/2} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_{0j} e_k^T - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j=1}^n e_k^T x_0 j x_{0j}^T \right),$$

$$\frac{\partial h_k}{\partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) = -\frac{1}{2n \rho_n^1} (x_0^T \mu_n)^{-3/2} e_k^T x_0i x_{0j},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial x \partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) = \rho_n^{-1}(\mu_n^T x_0i)^{-3/2} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} e_k^T \mu_n - \frac{1}{2} \mu_n e_k + \frac{3}{4} (e_k^T x_0)(\mu_n^T x_0i)^{-1} \mu_n \right\},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial t_i \partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) = -\frac{1}{2n \rho_n^1}(\mu_n^T x_0i)^{-3/2} \left\{ e_k x_0i + (e_k^T x_0i) I - \frac{3}{2n} (e_k^T x_0)(\mu_n^T x_0i)^{-1} x_0i x_0i^T \right\},$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial t_i \partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) = \frac{3}{4n^2 \rho_n^1} (e_k^T x_0i)(\mu_n^T x_0i)^{-5/2} x_0i x_0i^T.$$

Note that

$$\sup_{j \in [n]} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial x \partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) \right\|_F = O \left( \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \right), \quad \sup_{j \in [n]} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 h_k}{\partial t_i \partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) \right\|_F = O \left( \frac{1}{n^2 \rho_n} \right).$$

It follows from Taylor’s expansion that

$$h(W^T \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{X}W) = h(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0) + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0)(W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^1 x_0i)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial h}{\partial t_j^T}(\rho_n^1 x_0i, \rho_n^1 X_0)(W^T \tilde{x}_j - \rho_n^1 x_0j)$$

$$+ R_{x_i} + \sum_{j=1}^n R_{x_i t_j} + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n R_{t_j t_l},$$

where

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \| R_{x_i} \| \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{1+\omega}}{\rho_n^3 n}, \quad \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \| R_{x_i t_j} \| \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{1+\omega}}{n^2 \rho_n^3}, \quad \sup_{j,l \in [n]} \| R_{t_j t_l} \| \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{1+\omega}}{n^3 \rho_n^3}.$$
when
\[
\|\hat{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq C_c \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}}{\sqrt{n\rho_n}}, \quad \|\hat{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq C_c \frac{(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2}}{\sqrt{n\rho_n}}
\]
for some constant \(C_c > 0\). Note that by Theorem 3, we have
\[
\|\hat{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d} \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) [G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}]_k \right| + O_P \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n^{5/2}} \right).
\]
By Hoeffding’s inequality and the union bound, we see that
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) [G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}]_k \right| = O_P \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n\rho_n}} \right).
\]
Thus, we conclude that \(\|\hat{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2}X_0\|_{2 \to \infty} = O_P((n\rho_n)^{-1/2}(\log n)^{(1/\omega)/2})\). Invoking this fact and Lemma B.1, we see that
\[
\sqrt{n}(W^T\tilde{y}_i - y_{0i}) = h(W^T\tilde{x}_i, \hat{X}W) - h(\rho_n^{1/2}x_{0i}, \rho_n^{1/2}X_0)
\]
\[
= \rho_n^{-1/2} (\mu_i^T x_{0i})^{-3/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_{0i}^T x_{0j} I_d - \frac{1}{2} x_{0i} x_{0j}^T) \right\} (W^T\tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0i})
\]
\[
+ R_{1i}^{(L)} + R_{2i}^{(L)},
\]
where
\[
R_{1i}^{(L)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Xi_{ij} (W^T\tilde{x}_j - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0j}), \quad \Xi_{ij} = [\xi_{ij1}, \ldots, \xi_{ijd}]^T = -\frac{1}{2n\sqrt{\rho_n}} (x_{0i}^T \mu_n)^{-3/2} x_{0j} x_{0i}^T,
\]
and
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{1i}^{(L)}\| \leq \max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{x_i}\| + n \max_{j \in [n]} \|R_{x_i t_j}\| + n^2 \max_{j, l} \|R_{t_j t_l}\| = O_P \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}}{n\rho_n^2} \right).
\]
By an argument that is similar to the proof of Lemma B.3, we see that
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \|R_{1i}^{(L)}\| \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{d} \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_{ijk} (W^T\tilde{x}_j - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0j}) \leq O_P \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1/\omega}/2}{n\rho_n} \right).
\]
Hence we conclude that
\[
\sqrt{n}(W^T\tilde{y}_i - y_{0i}) = \rho_n^{-1/2} (\mu_i^T x_{0i})^{-3/2} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_{0i}^T x_{0j} I_d - \frac{1}{2} x_{0i} x_{0j}^T) \right\} (W^T\tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0i}) + R_{i}^{(L)}
\]
\[
= \rho_n^{-1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_i^T x_{0i}}} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i}^T \mu_n}{2\mu_i^T x_{0i}} \right) (W^T\tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0i}) + R_{i}^{(L)},
\]
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where \( \max_{i \in [n]} \| R_i^{(1)} \| = O_{\varphi_0}((n \rho_n^3)^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\omega}) \). This further implies that \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| R_i^{(1)} \|^2 = O_{\varphi_0}((n \rho_n^6)^{-1}(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}) \). The proof is thus completed.

\[ \square \]

**Proof of Theorem 7.** Let \( W \) be the orthogonal matrix satisfying (3.3). Denote

\[
\gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{p_n}} \left( \mu_n^T x_{0i} \right)^{-1/2} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i} \mu_n^T}{\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \right) \frac{G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} x_{0j}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})}.
\]

First note that \( \| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \|_2 \leq \| \Delta^{-1} \|_2 \) for sufficiently large \( n \), and hence,

\[
\sup_{i,j \in [n]} \| \gamma_{ij} \| \leq \frac{1}{n\sqrt{p_n}} \delta^{-1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \frac{\| G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \| \| x_{0j} \|}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \lesssim \frac{1}{n\sqrt{p_n}}. \tag{C.1}
\]

Also observe that

\[
\mathbb{E}_0 \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ (A_{ia} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0a})(A_{ib} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0b}) \gamma_{ia} \gamma_{ib} \right\}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{\left( \mu_n^T x_{0i} \right)^{1/2}} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i} \mu_n^T}{\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \right) G_n(x_{0i})^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i} \mu_n^T}{\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \right)^T \right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr}\{ \tilde{G}_n(x_{0i}) \}.
\]

Denote

\[
\tilde{R}_i^{(1)} = (\mu_n^T x_{0i})^{-1/2} \left( I_d - \frac{x_{0i} \mu_n^T}{\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \right) \tilde{R}_i + \rho_n^{1/2} R_i^{(1)}.
\]

Clearly, \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \tilde{R}_i^{(1)} \|^2 = O_{\varphi_0}((n \rho_n^5)^{-1}(\log n)^2) \). By Theorem 6 and Lemma B.5, we can write

\[
n \rho_n \left\| \tilde{Y} W - Y_0 \right\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} \right\|^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\tilde{R}_i^{(1)})^T \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \tilde{R}_i^{(1)} \|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr}\{ \tilde{G}_n(x_{0i}) \} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\tilde{R}_i^{(1)})^T \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} + o_{\varphi_0}(1) + O_{\varphi_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{2(1/\omega)}}{n \rho_n^2} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr}\{ \tilde{G}_n(x_{0i}) \} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\tilde{R}_i^{(1)})^T \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \gamma_{ij} + o_{\varphi_0}(1).
\]
By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma B.5,
\[
\left| \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{R}^{(L)}_{i})^T \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0) \gamma_{ij} \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \hat{R}^{(L)}_{i} \| \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0) \gamma_{ij} \right) \right\}^{1/2} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \| \hat{R}^{(L)}_{i} \|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0) \gamma_{ij} \right) \right\}^{2} \leq o_p(1).
\]

Furthermore, by condition (2.1) and Lemma B.6, we see that
\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{tr} \{ \tilde{G}_n(x_{0i}) \} = \int \text{tr} \{ \tilde{G}(x) \} F_n(dx) \to \int \text{tr} \{ \tilde{G}(x) \} F(dx).
\]
This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem. For the second part, we see that
\[
\frac{1}{\mu_n^T x_{0i}} \left( I_d - \frac{x_0 i \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x_0} \right) G(x_{0i})^{-1} \left( I_d - \frac{x_0 i \mu_n^T}{2 \mu_n^T x_0} \right) = \tilde{G}_n(x_{0i}) \to \tilde{G}(x_{0i}).
\]
The result directly follows from the asymptotic normality of \( \sqrt{n}(W^T \tilde{x}_i - \rho_n^{1/2} x_0) \). The proof is thus completed.

D Proofs of Technical Lemmas

Proof of Lemma B.1. The proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 2 in Tang et al. (2017b), except that we consider the case where a sparsity factor \( \rho_n \) is taken into account, and the proof is presented here for the sake of completeness. Recall from (3.3) that
\[
\| \tilde{X}W - \rho_n^{1/2} X_0 \|_{2 \to \infty} \leq \rho_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{d} \max_{i \in [n], k \in [d]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0) \zeta_{ij} \right| + \| \tilde{R} \|_F.
\]
where \( \zeta_{ij} = [\zeta_{ij1}, \ldots, \zeta_{ijd}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^d \). By Hoeffding’s inequality, the union bound, and the condition that \( \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \| \zeta_{ij} \| \leq 1/n \), for any \( t > 0 \), we have,
\[
\mathbb{P}_0 \left( \max_{i \in [n], k \in [k]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_0^T x_0) \zeta_{ijk} \right| > t \right) \leq 2nd \exp \left( -\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \zeta_{ijk}^2} \right) = 2nd \exp \left\{ -Knt^2 \right\}
\]
for some constant \( K > 0 \). Therefore, for any \( c > 0 \), there exists some constant \( C_c > 0 \) and \( n_c \in \mathbb{N}_+ \), such that for all \( n \geq n_c \).

\[
\mathbb{P}_0 \left( \rho_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{d} \max_{i \in [n], k \in [d]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{ijk} \right| > C_c \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n \rho_n}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n^c}.
\]

This shows that

\[
\rho_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{d} \max_{i \in [n], k \in [d]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{ijk} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n \rho_n}} \right).
\]

The proof is completed by applying the condition that \( \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( (n \rho_n)^{-1/2} (\log n)^{\omega/2} \right) \).

**Proof of Lemma B.2.** Recall by condition (3.3) that for any \( j \in [n] \),

\[
[W^T \tilde{x}_j - \rho_n^{-1/2} x_{0j}]_k = \rho_n^{-1/2} \sum_{a=1}^n (A_{ja} - \rho_n x_{0a}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{iak} + \tilde{R}_{jk}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, d,
\]

where \( \zeta_{ijk} = [\zeta_{ij1}, \ldots, \zeta_{ijd}]^T \). It follows that for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, d \),

\[
\frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^d \rho_n x_{0j} x_{0is} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{a=1}^d x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0a}^T x_{0j}) (A_{ja} - \rho_n x_{0a}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{ias} \right) + \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^d x_{0j} x_{0is} \tilde{R}_{js}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^d \sum_{j<k} Z_{iks} \left( \sum_{j>a} Z_{iks} + \sum_{j=1}^n Z_{iksj} \right) + \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^d x_{0j} x_{0is} \tilde{R}_{js},
\]

where

\[
Z_{iks} = \frac{x_{0j} x_{0is}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} (A_{ja} - \rho_n x_{0a}^T x_{0j}) \zeta_{ias}.
\]

Observe that by Hoeffding’s inequality and the union bound,

\[
\mathbb{P}_0 \left( \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \sum_{j<k} Z_{iks} \right| > t \right) \leq 2n \exp \left[ -2n^2 \rho_n t^2 \left( \sum_{j<k} \left( \frac{\zeta_{ias} x_{0j} x_{0is}}{x_{0i}^T x_{0j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j})} \right)^2 \right)^{-1} \right]
\]

\[
\leq 2n \exp \left( -Kn^2 \rho_n t^2 \right).
\]
Proof of Lemma B.3. First observe that by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,
\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} Z_{i k s j a} = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^2 \rho_n}} \right),
\]
and hence, a similar argument yields that
\[
\frac{1}{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} Z_{i k s j a} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^2 \rho_n}} \right).
\]
In addition, by the fact that \( \|\tilde{R}\|_F^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0}((n \rho_n)^{-1}(\log n)^\omega) \) we have
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{d} x_{0 j k} x_{0 i s} \frac{x_{0 i s}^T x_{0 i j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0 i}^T x_{0 j})}{\|x_{0 i s}\|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \tilde{R}_{j s} \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \|\tilde{R}\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{\sqrt{(\log n)^\omega}}{n^{1/2} \rho_n} \right).
\]
Therefore, we conclude that
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} Z_{i k s j a} \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n \sqrt{n \rho_n}} \sum_{k=1}^{d} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} x_{0 j k} x_{0 i s} \frac{x_{0 i s}^T x_{0 i j} (1 - \rho_n x_{0 i}^T x_{0 j})}{\|x_{0 i s}\|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \rho_n}} \tilde{R}_{j s} \right|
\]
\[
= O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1 + \omega)/2}}{n^{1/2} \rho_n} \right),
\]
and the proof is thus completed. \(\square\)
for some constant $K > 0$. This shows that

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ijkl}(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \right| = O_{F_0} \left( \sqrt{\log n} \right).$$

Hence, we conclude from Lemma B.1 that

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \alpha_{ijkl}^{T}(\rho_n^{-1/2}W^{T}x_i - x_{0i}) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_n}} \|W - \rho_n^{-1/2}X_0\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ijkl}(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) \right|$$

$$= O_{F_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{(1/2) + (\log 2)/2}}{n \rho_n} \right).$$

The proof is thus completed.

**Proof of Lemma B.4.** Denote $\beta_{ijk} = [\beta_{ijk1}, \ldots, \beta_{ijkl}]^T$. Recall the approximate linearization property (3.3) that

$$[W^{T}x_j - \rho_n^{1/2}x_{0j}]_s = \rho_n^{-1/2} \sum_{a=1}^{n} (A_{ja} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0a}) \zeta_{ias} + \tilde{R}_{js}, \quad s = 1, 2, \ldots, d,$$

where $\zeta_{ia} = [\zeta_{ia1}, \ldots, \zeta_{iad}]^T$. It follows that

$$Q_{ik} := \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) (\rho_n^{-1/2}W^{T}x_j - x_{0j})^T \beta_{ijk}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} + \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \beta_{iksja} \tilde{R}_{js},$$

where $z_{iksja} = \zeta_{ias} \beta_{iksja}(A_{ij} - \rho_n x_{0i}^T x_{0j}) (A_{ja} - \rho_n x_{0a}^T x_{0a})$. Clearly,

$$\frac{1}{n^2 \rho_n^{3}} \max_{i \in [n]} \left\{ \left( \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \right)^2 \right\} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^2 \rho_n^{3}} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_0(z_{iksja} z_{ikshb}).$$

We now argue that the summation $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_0(z_{iksja} z_{ikshb})$ is upper bounded by $\sup_{i,j} \|\zeta_{ij}\|^2 n^2 \rho_n$ up to a multiplicative constant. Note that as the indices $j, a, h, b$ ranging over $[n]$, $\mathbb{E}_0(z_{iksja} z_{ikshb})$ is nonzero only if the cardinality of the collection of random variables $\{A_{ij}, A_{ih}, A_{aj}, A_{bh}\}$ is 2 or 4. These cases occur only if either one of the following cases happens:
1. $A_{ij}$ and $A_{ih}$ are the same random variable, and $A_{aj}$, $A_{bh}$ are the same random variable. This happens only if one the following cases occur:

   (a) $(i, j) = (i, h), (a, j) = (b, h) \Rightarrow j = h, a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n^2)$;
   (b) $(i, j) = (h, i), (a, j) = (b, h) \Rightarrow i = j = h, a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n)$;
   (c) $(i, j) = (i, h), (a, j) = (h, b) \Rightarrow j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n)$;
   (d) $(i, j) = (h, i), (a, j) = (h, b) \Rightarrow i = j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is 1;

2. $A_{ij}$ and $A_{aj}$ are the same random variable, and $A_{ih}, A_{bh}$ are the same random variable. This happens only if one the following cases occur:

   (a) $(i, j) = (a, j), (i, h) = (b, h) \Rightarrow i = a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n^2)$;
   (b) $(i, j) = (j, a), (i, h) = (b, h) \Rightarrow i = j = a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n)$;
   (c) $(i, j) = (a, j), (i, h) = (h, b) \Rightarrow i = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is $O(n)$;
   (d) $(i, j) = (j, a), (i, h) = (h, b) \Rightarrow i = j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is 1;

3. $A_{ij}$ and $A_{bh}$ are the same random variable, and $A_{ih}, A_{aj}$ are the same random variable. This happens only if one the following cases occur:

   (a) $(i, j) = (b, h), (i, h) = (a, j) \Rightarrow i = b = a, h = j$, and the number of terms is $O(n)$;
   (b) $(i, j) = (h, b), (i, h) = (a, j) \Rightarrow i = j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is 1;
   (c) $(i, j) = (b, h), (i, h) = (j, a) \Rightarrow j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is 1;
   (d) $(i, j) = (h, b), (i, h) = (j, a) \Rightarrow i = j = h = a = b$, and the number of terms is 1.

Therefore, the number of nonzero terms in the summation

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \max_{i \in [n]} \max_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_0(z_{iksj} z_{ikshb}) \]

is $O(n^2)$. Furthermore, the centered second and fourth moments of Bernoulli($\rho_n x_{ik}^T x_{0j}$) is upper bounded by $\rho_n$. Therefore, we obtain that

\[ \frac{1}{n^2 \rho_n^2} \max_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_0 \left( \left( \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksj} \right)^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{n^2 \rho_n^3} \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \| \zeta_{ij} \|^2 n^2 \rho_n \lesssim \frac{1}{(n\rho_n)^2}. \]
In addition,
\[
\max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \beta_{ijks} R_{js} \right|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \max_{i \in [n]} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0j})^2 \beta_{ijks}^2 \right\}^{1/2} \| \tilde{R} \|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{\omega/2}}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \right).
\]
Namely, this implies that for each individual \(i \in [n]\),
\[
\left| \frac{1}{n \sqrt{\rho_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0j})(\rho_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{W}^T \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j - \mathbf{x}_{0j})^T \beta_{ijk} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{\omega/2}}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \right)
\]
Furthermore,
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0 \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \right)^2 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{n \rho_n^3} \max_{i \in [n]} \left\{ \left( \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \right)^2 \right\} \ll \frac{1}{n \rho_n^2},
\]
implying that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \right\}^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{1}{n \rho_n^2} \right)
\]
by Markov’s inequality. Therefore, we conclude that
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0j})(\rho_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{W}^T \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j - \mathbf{x}_{0j})^T \beta_{ijk} \right\}^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n \rho_n^{3/2}} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{a=1}^{n} z_{iksja} \right\}^2 + 2n \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{1}{n \rho_n} \sum_{s=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (A_{ij} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0j}) \beta_{ijks} R_{js} \right|^2
\]
\[
= O_{\mathbb{P}_0} \left( \frac{(\log n)^{\omega}}{n \rho_n^{3}} \right).
\]
The proof is thus completed.

**Proof of Lemma B.5.** The proof of Lemma D.1 relies on the following logarithmic Sobolev concentration inequality:

**Lemma D.1** (Theorem 6.7 in Boucheron et al., 2013) Let \( A, A' \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n} \) be two symmetric hollow random adjacency matrices, \( Z = Z(A) \) be a measurable function of of \( A \). Denote by \( A^{(kl)} \) the adjacency matrix obtained by replacing the \((k, l)\) and \((l, k)\) entries of \( A \) by those
of $\mathbf{A}'$, and $Z_{kl} = Z(\mathbf{A}^{(kl)})$. If there exists a constant $v > 0$ such that

$$
P\left(\sum_{k<l}(Z - Z_{kl}) > v\right) \leq \eta,
$$

then for all $\epsilon > 0$, $P(|Z - E(Z)| > t) \leq 2 \exp\{-t^2/(2\epsilon)\} + \eta$.

Let $\mathbf{A}'$ be another symmetric hollow random adjacency matrix. Denote by $\mathbf{A}^{(kl)}$ the adjacency matrix obtained by replacing the $(k, l)$ and $(l, k)$ entries of $\mathbf{A}$ by those of $\mathbf{A}'$, and $Z_{kl} = Z(\mathbf{A}^{(kl)})$ Since that $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}^{(kl)}$ only differs by the $(k, l)$ and $(l, k)$ entries, and that the entries of $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}'$ are binary, we see that when $Z - Z_{kl} \neq 0$,

$$(A_{kl} - A'_{kl})(Z - Z_{kl}) = C_{1kl} + C_{2kl} + c_{kl},$$

where

$$C_{1kl} = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{n} (A_{ka} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a}) \gamma_{kl}^T \gamma_{ka},$$

$$C_{2kl} = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{n} (A_{la} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0l}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a}) \gamma_{lk}^T \gamma_{la},$$

and $c_{kl} = (1 - 2\rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0l})(\|\gamma_{kl}\|^2 + \|\gamma_{lk}\|^2) - 2(A_{kl} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0l})\|\gamma_{kl}\|^2 - 2(A_{lk} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0l}^T \mathbf{x}_{0k})\|\gamma_{lk}\|^2$.

Since

$$\sum_{k<l} \mathbb{E}_0(C^2_{1kl}) = 4 \sum_{k<l} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0\{(A_{ka} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})(A_{kb} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0b})\}(\gamma_{kl}^T \gamma_{ka})(\gamma_{kl}^T \gamma_{kb})$$

$$= 4 \sum_{k<l} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0\{(A_{ka} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})^2\}(\gamma_{kl}^T \gamma_{ka})^2$$

$$\leq 4 \sum_{k<l} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a}(1 - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})\|\gamma_{kl}\|^2\|\gamma_{ka}\|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n\rho_n},$$

$$\sum_{k<l} \mathbb{E}_0(C^2_{2kl}) = 4 \sum_{k<l} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0\{(A_{la} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0l}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})(A_{lb} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0l}^T \mathbf{x}_{0b})\}(\gamma_{lk}^T \gamma_{la})(\gamma_{lk}^T \gamma_{lb})$$

$$= 4 \sum_{k<l} \sum_{a=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_0\{(A_{la} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0l}^T \mathbf{x}_{0a})^2\}(\gamma_{lk}^T \gamma_{la})^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n\rho_n},$$

$$\sum_{k<l} \mathbb{E}_0(c^2_{kl}) \leq 6 \sum_{k<l} (1 - 2\rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0l})(\|\gamma_{kl}\|^4 + \|\gamma_{lk}\|^4)$$

$$+ 6 \sum_{k<l} \mathbb{E}_0\{(A_{kl} - \rho_n \mathbf{x}_{0k}^T \mathbf{x}_{0l})^2\}(\|\gamma_{kl}\|^4 + \|\gamma_{lk}\|^4)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{n^2\rho_n^2} + \frac{\rho_n}{n^2\rho_n^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^2\rho_n},$$

54
we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_0\{\sum_{k<l}(Z - Z_{kl})^2\} \leq C/(n\rho_n)$ for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore, by Markov’s inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k<l}(Z - Z_{kl})^2 > \frac{1}{\log n}\right) \leq \frac{C\log n}{n\rho_n} \leq \frac{C(\log n)^2}{n\rho_n^2} \to 0.$$ 

Invoking Lemma D.1, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_0(|Z - \mathbb{E}_0(Z)| > \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}_0\left|Z - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}\{G_n(x_{0i})^{-1}\}\right| > \epsilon \leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 \log n\right) + \frac{C\log n}{n\rho_n} \to 0$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$. The proof is thus completed.

**Proof of Lemma B.6.** We first show that $G_n(x) \to G(x)$ as $n \to \infty$ uniformly for all $x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)$. It suffices to show that for all $s, t \in [d]$,

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left|\int \frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)} F_n(dx) - \int \frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)} F(dx)\right| \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, where $x = [x_1, \ldots, x_d]^T$ and $u = [u_1, \ldots, u_d]^T$. By the multivariate integration by parts, we have,

$$\left|\int \frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)} F_n(dx) - \int \frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)} F(dx)\right| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |F_n(x) - F(x)| \left|\int \frac{\partial^d}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_d} \left\{\frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)}\right\} dx\right| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |F_n(x) - F(x)| \left|\int \frac{\partial^d}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_d} \left\{\frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)}\right\} dx\right|.$$ 

Therefore, it is in turn sufficient to show that for all $s, t \in [d]$,

$$\sup_{x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left|\frac{\partial^d}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_d} \left\{\frac{x_s x_t}{x^T u(1 - \rho_n x^T u)}\right\}\right| < \infty.$$ 

The cases where $d = 1$ and $d = 2$ are trivial and we assume that $d \geq 3$. Let us first consider the case where $s \neq t$, and without loss of generality we may also assume that $s = d - 1$, $t = d$. Denote $f(y) = 1/y$, $g_n(x, u) = u^T x(1 - \rho_n u^T x)$. By the multivariate Faà di Bruno’s formula (Hardy, 2006),

$$h_n(x, u) = \frac{\partial^{d-2} f(g_n(x, u))}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_{d-2}} = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} f(|\pi|)(y) \prod_{B \in \pi} \frac{\partial^{|B|} g_n(x, u)}{\prod_{j \in B} \partial x_j},$$
where \( \pi \in \Pi \) ranges over the set of all partitions of \([d - 2]\), \( B \in \pi \) ranges over all sets in the partition \( \pi \), \(|\pi|\) is the number of sets in the partition \( \pi \), and \(|B|\) is the cardinality of the set \( B \). Clearly,

\[
\frac{\partial^d \{x_{d-1}x_d f(g_n(x, u))\}}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_d} = x_{d-1} \frac{\partial h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} + x_{d-1} \frac{\partial h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_{d-1}} + x_{d-1} x_d \frac{\partial^2 h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_{d-1} \partial x_d}.
\]

Directly computation of derivatives yields

\[
\frac{\partial h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_{d-1}} = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \{D_{\pi_1}(x, u) + D_{\pi_2}(x, u)\},
\]

\[
D_{\pi_1}(x, u) = f^{(|\pi|+1)}(y) \frac{\partial g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_{d-1}} \prod_{B \in \pi} \frac{\partial |B| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j},
\]

\[
D_{\pi_2}(x, u) = f^{(|\pi|)}(y) \sum_{B \in \pi} \frac{\partial |B|+1 g_n(x, b u)}{\partial x_{d+1}} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j},
\]

\[
\frac{\partial D_{\pi_1}(x)}{\partial x_d} = f^{(|\pi|+2)}(y) \frac{\partial g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{\partial |B|+1 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j} + f^{(|\pi|+1)}(y) \frac{\partial^2 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d \partial x_{d-1}} \prod_{B \in \pi} \frac{\partial |B| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j} + f^{(|\pi|+1)}(y) \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{\partial |B|+1 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j}.
\]

\[
\frac{\partial D_{\pi_2}(x)}{\partial x_d} = f^{(|\pi|)}(y) \frac{\partial g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{\partial |B|+1 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j} + f^{(|\pi|)}(y) \frac{\partial |B|+2 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d \partial x_{d-1}} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j} + f^{(|\pi|)}(y) \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{\partial |B|+1 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \prod_{C \in \pi \setminus \{B\}} \frac{\partial |C|+1 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \prod_{D \in \pi \setminus \{B, C\}} \frac{\partial |D| g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_j}.
\]

Note that for any finite \( t \in \mathbb{N}_+ \),

\[
\sup_{x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |f^{(t)}(y)| = t! \sup_{x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \{x^T u (1 - \rho_n x^T u)^{-(t+1)} \} \leq \frac{t!}{\delta^{2(t+1)}} < \infty,
\]

and for any \( k, l \in [d] \),

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_k} \right| = |u_k - 2 \rho_n (u^T x) u_k| \leq 3,
\]
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\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial^2 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_k \partial x_l} \right| = | -2 \rho_n u_k u_l | \leq 3, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial^2 g_n(x, u)}{\partial x_k \partial x_l} \right| = 0.
\]

Therefore, by the fact that the summations \( \sum_{B \in \pi} \) and \( \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \) have finitely many terms, we see immediately that

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |h_n(x, u)| < \infty, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |D_{\pi_1}(x, u)| < \infty, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |D_{\pi_2}(x, u)| < \infty,
\]

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d} D_{\pi_1}(x, u) \right| < \infty, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d} D_{\pi_2}(x, u) \right| < \infty,
\]

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d} \right| \leq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |D_{\pi_1}(x, u)| + \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} |D_{\pi_2}(x, u)| < \infty,
\]

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial^2 h_n(x, u)}{\partial x_d \partial x_{d-1}} \right| \leq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d} D_{\pi_1}(x, u) \right| + \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d} D_{\pi_2}(x, u) \right| < \infty.
\]

Hence we finish proving that

\[
\sup_{n \geq 1, x, u \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{\partial^d}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_d} \left\{ \frac{x_k x_l}{u^T x (1 - \rho_n u^T x)} \right\} \right| < \infty
\]

when \( s \neq t \). The proof for case where \( s = t \) follows the exactly same lines as that for the case where \( s \neq t \). Therefore, we conclude that \( \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| G_n(x) - G(x) \|_F \to 0 \).

We next show that \( \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| G_n(x)^{-1} - G(x)^{-1} \|_F \to 0 \). This immediately follows from the inequality

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| G_n(x) - G(x) \|_F \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| G_n(x)^{-1} \|_F \| G_n(x) - G(x) \|_F \| G(x)^{-1} \|_F,
\]

the fact that \( G_n(x) \succeq (1/2) \Delta \) and \( G(x) \succeq \Delta \) for sufficiently large \( n \), and the uniform convergence of \( G_n(x) \to G(x) \) for all \( x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta) \).

We finally show that \( \tilde{G}_n(x) - \tilde{G}(x) \) uniformly for all \( x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta) \). This result also follows from the fact that

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left| \frac{1}{\mu_n^T x} - \frac{1}{\mu^T x} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \| \mu_n - \mu \| \to 0, \quad \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \left\| \frac{x \mu_n^T}{(\mu_n^T x)^2} - \frac{x \mu^T}{(\mu^T x)^2} \right\|_F \leq \frac{3}{\delta^4} \| \mu_n - \mu \| \to 0,
\]

and the uniform convergence result \( \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}(\delta)} \| G_n(x)^{-1} - G(x)^{-1} \|_F \to 0 \). The proof is thus completed. \( \square \)
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