

Information-Theoretic Limits for the Matrix Tensor Product

Galen Reeves

May 25, 2020

Abstract

This paper studies a high-dimensional inference problem involving the matrix tensor product of random matrices. This problem generalizes a number of contemporary data science problems including the spiked matrix models used in sparse principal component analysis and covariance estimation. It is shown that the information-theoretic limits can be described succinctly by formulas involving low-dimensional quantities. On the technical side, this paper introduces some new techniques for the analysis of high-dimensional matrix-valued signals. Specific contributions include a novel extension of the adaptive interpolation method that uses order-preserving positive semidefinite interpolation paths and a variance inequality based on continuous-time I-MMSE relations.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The matrix tensor product and related models	3
1.2	Overview of contributions	4
1.3	Related work	4
1.4	Notation	5
2	Information functions	5
2.1	Entropy under Gaussian convolution	6
2.2	The convex conjugate	7
2.3	Multivariate functions	7
2.4	Overlap and free energy	8
3	Statement of main results	9
3.1	Symmetric case	9
3.2	Asymmetric case	10
4	Proof of Theorem 6	11
4.1	Interpolation with order-preserving paths	11
4.2	Canceling the remainder	12
4.3	Simplification of bound	12
5	Proof of Theorem 10	13
5.1	Decomposition along path	13
5.2	Lower bound	14
5.3	Upper bound	15
6	Overlap concentration via continuous-time perturbations	17
6.1	Decomposition of overlap	17
6.2	Positive semidefinite frame for symmetric matrices	17
6.3	Proof of Theorem 13	19

A	Comparison lemma for differential equations	20
B	Variance inequality from pointwise I-MMSE	21
C	Gradients of convex functions	24
D	Properties of the approximation formula	24
	D.1 Alternative characterizations	24
	D.2 The role of convexity	26

1 Introduction

Inference problems involving the estimation and factorization of large structured matrices play a central role in the data sciences. The last decade has witnessed significant progress on theory and algorithms for a variety of models involving low-rank structure, such as the spiked matrix models used in low-rank covariance estimation [1,2], sparse principal component analysis (PCA) [3], and clustering [4,5], as well as related models involving sparse graphical structure, such as the stochastic block model (SBM) for community detection [6,7].

To understand the fundamental (or information-theoretic) limits of inference a recent line of work [8–29] has focused on exact characterizations of the asymptotic mutual information and minimum-mean squared error (MMSE). This body of work focuses on problem settings where the probability distributions of all unknown quantities are known and there are no constraints on computational complexity. The limits are described by single-letter formulas (i.e., analytical expressions that can be approximated numerically) that characterize the leading order terms in the mutual information and MMSE.

The value of exact formulas is that they provide detailed information about the role of different model parameters (e.g., the amount or quality of data). Even more they can describe phase transitions that delineate between problem regimes with drastically different behaviors with respect to the quality of inference and computational complexity. The development of this type of theory often follows a two-part sequence where the formulas are first conjectured using heuristic approaches, such as the replica method, and then proven rigorously later on using very different techniques [30–34]. While the emphasis on single-letter formulas is standard in areas such as information theory and statistical physics, it differs from some of the other approaches used in the data sciences, which focus instead on order-optimal bounds or rates of convergence.

In this context, the contribution of this paper is a rigorous analysis of the fundamental limits for a broad class of problems related to the matrix tensor product (or Kronecker product) of large random matrices with low-dimensional structure. Specifically we introduce a model that generalizes existing models in the literature and we provide single-letter formulas for the mutual information and MMSE. These formulas recover a number of existing results as special cases and also provide new results for settings that could not be analyzed previously.

On the technical side, a further contribution of this paper is the development of techniques for the analysis of high-dimensional matrix-valued signals. Our formulas leverage functional properties of entropy under Gaussian convolution, using ideas introduced in analysis of multi-layer networks [19] and used more recently for matrix factorization problems motivated by community detection [24–26]. The proof builds upon the adaptive interpolation method [35,36], which represents an evolution of earlier interpolation techniques in the statistical physics literature [37,38]. In this direction, one of the key steps in this paper is the introduction of matrix-valued interpolation paths that satisfy a certain order-preserving property that is easier to work with than the regularity conditions used in previous work. Further innovations include a new method for controlling overlap concentration using perturbations parameterized by positive semidefinite matrices and a variance inequality between overlap and the free energy that is based on continuous-time I-MMSE relationships [39,40].

1.1 The matrix tensor product and related models

This paper studies a model consisting of the matrix tensor product (or Kronecker product) observed in additive Gaussian noise with an arbitrary coupling matrix. Throughout this paper, we use \mathbf{X} to denote a real $n \times d$ random signal matrix with known distribution. The bulk of the analysis focuses on non-asymptotic bounds that hold uniformly for any signal matrix satisfying a finite fourth moment constraint. In the final stages of our proof these bounds are shown to be asymptotically tight in scaling regimes in which the number of rows n increases while the number of columns d is fixed, or at least grows much more slowly than n .

Definition 1. The matrix tensor product model with coupling matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 d_2 \times m}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2)B + \mathbf{W} \quad (1)$$

where $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times d_2}$ is a pair of jointly random signal matrices, $(\mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2)$ denotes the $n_1 n_2 \times d_1 d_2$ obtained by the Kronecker product, and $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 n_2 \times m}$ is noise matrix that has i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. Equivalently, the rows of \mathbf{Y} are in one-to-one correspondence with the set of m -dimensional observations $\{Y_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq n_1, 1 \leq j \leq n_2\}$ given by

$$Y_{ij} = (X_{1i} \otimes X_{2j})B + W_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

where X_{1i} and X_{2j} denote the i -th and j -th rows of \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 and each W_{ij} is an independent m -dimensional standard Gaussian vector.

The matrix tensor model defined above is general in the sense that it allows for any linear combination of the rows of the tensor product. The spiked matrix models used for sparse PCA and covariance estimation can be represented by this model with specific choice of the coupling matrix B . To see this correspondence, suppose that $d_1 = d_2$ and let B be the $d^2 \times 1$ vector obtain by stacking the columns of $\sqrt{\lambda/n}I_d$. Then, (1) is equivalent to the asymmetric low-rank matrix estimation model (or spiked Wishart model) given by

$$\mathbf{Y} = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} \mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{X}_2^\top + \mathbf{W}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{W} is an $n_1 \times n_2$ noise matrix with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. The case where $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{X}$ recovers the symmetric spiked-matrix model (or spiked Wigner model).

A generalization of the usual spiked matrix model was introduced to study the k -community degree-balanced SBM [24, 25]. In the setting of diverging average degree, the community detection problem can be modeled using

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}B\mathbf{X}^\top + \mathbf{W}, \quad (4)$$

where B is a $d \times d$ coupling matrix ($d = k - 1$) that models the interactions between different communities. In this model, positivity (or negativity) of an eigenvalue of B corresponds to assortativeness (or disassortativeness) in the community interactions. An indefinite coupling matrix is needed to model the full range of behaviors seen in real-world networks [41].

A further generalization of (4) is the multiview spiked matrix model used to study community detection with multiple correlated networks [26]. This model is given by

$$\mathbf{Y}_l = \mathbf{X}B_l\mathbf{X}^\top + \mathbf{W}_l, \quad l = 1, \dots, L, \quad (5)$$

where each B_l is associated with a different network. By vectorization, this model is an instance of (1) with $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{X}$ and $B = [\text{vec}(B_1), \dots, \text{vec}(B_L)]$.

The main result of this paper is an approximation formula for the mutual information and MMSE associated with the matrix tensor product model. Rather than focusing on (1) directly we consider a symmetric form that is easier to work with.

Definition 2. The symmetric matrix tensor product model with $d^2 \times d^2$ positive semidefinite matrix S is given by

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} = \mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{X}$ is $n^2 \times d^2$ and \mathbf{W} is a noise matrix with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries.

In fact, there is no loss in generality in restricting our attention to the symmetric case.

Lemma 1. *The matrix tensor product model (1) and the symmetric form (6) are equivalent in the sense that either one can be used to represent the other.*

Proof. The mapping from (6) to (1) is obvious. The reverse direction is based on two steps. First, any pair $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)$ can be embedded into a single $(n_1 + n_2) \times (d_1 + d_2)$ block-diagonal matrix via the matrix direct product $\mathbf{X}_1 \oplus \mathbf{X}_2 = \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)$. The tensor product $\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{X}$ then includes $\mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2$ as subset of the columns and row. Second, by orthogonal invariance of the standard Gaussian distribution, the projected observation $\mathbf{Y} B^\top$ is a sufficient statistic for inference about \mathbf{X} , and thus there is no loss in generality in considering only positive semidefinite coupling matrices. \square

1.2 Overview of contributions

This paper provides theoretical guarantees for optimal estimation in the matrix tensor product model. We derive a single-letter approximation formula for the mutual information and provide a rigorous non-asymptotic bound on the approximation error (Theorem 6). Similar in spirit to recent work focusing on spiked matrix models with generative priors [28], this result is stated under general conditions that depend only on the variance of the free energy. Combining this result with a more common (and more restrictive) separability assumption leads to a bound in which the error decays at rate $n^{-1/5}$ in the problem dimension (Theorem 8). Although it is unlikely that this is the optimal rate of convergence it is, to the best of our knowledge, the strongest rate that has been proven in the literature. Some implications of these results for the MMSE are given in Theorem 9.

Our proof builds upon the method of adaptive interpolation used in previous work on spiked matrix models [27, 29, 35, 36] and shares the same basic outline of 1) specifying an interpolation path via a first-order ordinary differential equation and 2) introducing a perturbation to the problem to guarantee overlap concentration (almost everywhere) and thus cancel a remainder term. The main novelty in our approach is that we are able to perform these steps in a more general setting that allows us to address the matrix tensor product model.

Two new ideas are the following:

- **Order-preserving interpolation path:** The interpolation paths are parameterized by positive semidefinite matrices and satisfy an order-preserving property. This property can be verified thanks to a comparison inequality for differential equations (Lemma 20). As a consequence, matrix-valued perturbations can be introduced directly along the interpolation path.
- **Continuous time variance inequality:** Inspired by pointwise I-MMSE relationships [39, 40] we introduce a continuous time coupling of the noise in the perturbation model. Leveraging the power of Ito calculus, we derive a variance inequality (Lemma 23) that provides a direct link between the variance of the free energy and the variation in the overlap matrix. This approach simplifies certain aspects of the analysis and allows for concentration under weaker assumptions on the scaling of the problem dimension.

1.3 Related work

A great deal of work has focused on the information-theoretic [13–29] and algorithmic [42–48] limits of recovery in spiked matrix models. Two special cases are now well understood: the spiked Wigner model,

which is equivalent to (4) with a positive semidefinite coupling matrix B , and the spiked Wishart model (3) in the setting where \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 are independent matrices with i.i.d. rows. Using the replica method, Lesieur et al. [4, 9, 34] provided conjectured formulas for the asymptotic mutual information and MMSE. The special case of the rank-one ($d = 1$) spiked Wigner model was proven rigorously by Krzakala et al. [15] and Barbier et al. [16]. The case of low-rank matrices ($d \geq 1$) was proven for the spiked Wigner model by Lelarge and Miolane [17] and for the spiked Wishart model by Miolane [18].

The role of the coupling matrix in the symmetric model (4) was investigated by Reeves et al. [24, 25], who provided one-sided bounds on the formulas for the mutual information and MMSE. Subsequent work by Mayya and Reeves [26] extended this approach to the multiview version (5). Concurrent to the work in the present paper, Barbier and Reeves [49] provide an exact characterization for a special case of the multiview model (5) that satisfies an additional convexity property. Specifically it is assumed that B_1, \dots, B_L are such that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L \{B_\ell \otimes B_\ell + (B_\ell \otimes B_\ell)^\top\} \succeq 0. \quad (7)$$

This assumption is restrictive in the sense that it precludes the model equivalence in Lemma 1.

In comparison to previous work, this paper is the first to consider the general setting of the matrix tensor product (1). Special cases of our general result include the following settings:

- The spiked Wishart model (3) with an arbitrary distribution on the matrices $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)$. Note that this includes the spiked Wigner model as a special case.
- The spiked matrix model (4) and the multiview version (5) with arbitrary coupling matrices.

The approach in this paper builds upon the method of adaptive interpolation, which has been applied primarily in the case of rank-one estimation problems [27, 35, 36] and more recently to the setting of low-rank even order tensors [29]. Some different approaches include the cavity method [17, 18], large deviations techniques [20, 28], and the analysis of Hamilton-Jacobi equations [21, 22].

1.4 Notation

We use \mathbb{S}^d , \mathbb{S}_+^d and \mathbb{S}_{++}^d to denote the space of $d \times d$ symmetric, positive semidefinite, and positive definite matrices, respectively. The trace inner product between matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is given by $\langle A, B \rangle := \text{tr}(A^\top B)$. For each $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we use $\text{vec}(A)$ to denote the $mn \times 1$ vector obtained by stacking the columns in A . The Kronecker product (or tensor product) is denoted by \otimes and the Kronecker power is denoted by $A^{\otimes k} = \otimes_{\ell=1}^k A$. Unless specified otherwise, $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the p -Shatten matrix norm.

2 Information functions

Throughout this paper we use the following convention:

- \mathbf{W} denotes a matrix with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries.
- \mathbf{X} is an $n \times d$ random signal matrix with finite second moments $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2] < \infty$.
- \mathbf{Y} denotes an observation of a function of \mathbf{X} corrupted by additive Gaussian noise.
- \mathbf{Z} denotes a generic observation taking values in a set \mathcal{Z} .

All of these random quantities are defined on the same probability space and their probability distributions are known throughout. We use \mathcal{G} to denote the sigma-field generated by a set of observations. The conditional expectation of \mathbf{X} given \mathcal{G} is an $n \times d$ random matrix denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}]$.

Our analysis focus on two closely related estimation-theoretic quantities, both of which are represented by $d \times d$ positive semidefinite matrices. The MMSE matrix introduced in [24, 25, 50] is given by

$$\text{MMSE}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{X} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}])^\top (\mathbf{X} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}])], \quad (8)$$

It is important to note that the expectation is taken with respect to \mathcal{G} and thus this is a non-random matrix. The trace corresponds to the usual scalar MMSE, which is given by $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2]$. The second matrix of interest is the maximum mean overlap (MMO) given by

$$\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}]]. \quad (9)$$

These matrices satisfy $\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}) + \text{MMSE}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$ and thus provide equivalent information whenever \mathbf{X} has finite second moments (as is assumed throughout this paper). While the MMSE is perhaps more familiar from an estimation-theoretic point of the view, the MMO is more closely related to the analysis in statistical physics.

An important property of these matrices is that they satisfy a data processing inequality. Specially, the MMO matrix is an order-preserving operator with respect to the partial order on sigma-algebras generated by inclusion and the partial order on symmetric matrices generated by the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. Equivalently, the MMSE is an order-reversing operator.

Lemma 2 (Data processing inequality [51, Proposition 5]). *If $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2$ then*

$$\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}_1) \preceq \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}_2). \quad (10)$$

2.1 Entropy under Gaussian convolution

Our analysis also leverages a fundamental relationship between the MMSE and the entropy under Gaussian convolution. Given $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$, let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be the output of the additive Gaussian noise observation model:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}, \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{W} is an $n \times d$ noise matrix with standard Gaussian entries. Following [50], the conditional mutual information function $I_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}} : \mathbb{S}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined according to

$$I_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S) = I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z}). \quad (12)$$

Similarly, the conditional relative entropy function $D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}} : \mathbb{S}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined according to

$$D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S) := \int_{\mathbf{Z}} D(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z}=\mathbf{z}} \parallel P_{\mathbf{W}}) dP_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{z}), \quad (13)$$

where $D(P \parallel Q)$ denotes the relative entropy (Kullback–Leibler divergence) between probability measures P and Q defined on the same space. To lighten the notation, we often use the shorthand notation $I(S)$ and $D(S)$ where the dependence on the pair (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) is implicit. Similar to the MMSE and MMO, it can be verified that these function are affine transformations of each other:

$$I(S) + D(S) = \frac{1}{2} \langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}] \rangle \quad (14)$$

These functions satisfy a number of important functional properties. The following results follow from [50, 52–55]; see [24, Appendix D].

Lemma 3 (I-MMSE Relation). *For any absolutely continuous function $S : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$,*

$$D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S(1)) - D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S(0)) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle S'(t), \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{Z}) \rangle dt \quad (15)$$

where $S'(t)$ denotes a weak derivative of $S(t)$ and $\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{X}S(t)^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}$.

Lemma 4 (Convexity and smoothness). *The relative entropy is convex on \mathbb{S}_+^d and infinitely differentiable on \mathbb{S}_{++}^d with*

$$\nabla D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S) = \frac{1}{2} \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \quad (16)$$

$$\nabla^2 D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j | \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})^{\otimes 2}]. \quad (17)$$

Lemma 5 (Data processing inequality). *The relative entropy and MMO are order-preserving in the sense that $S_1 \preceq S_2$ implies that $D(S_1) \leq D(S_2)$ and $\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Z}) \preceq \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Y}_2, \mathbf{Z})$.*

2.2 The convex conjugate

Next it is useful to extend the domain of the relative entropy function to the space of symmetric matrices. While there are a variety of extensions that could be considered, we will use the convention that $D: \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is equal to $+\infty$ whenever $S \notin \mathbb{S}_+^d$. Then, D is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function whose effective domain is given by $\text{dom } D = \mathbb{S}_+^d$.

The convex conjugate $D^*: \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is defined by

$$D^*(Q) := \sup_{S \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q \rangle - D(S) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

The factor of $1/2$ is introduced for notational convenience to mirror the factor of one half appearing in the expression of the gradient. By the Fenchel-Moreau theorem [56, Theorem 13.37], the biconjugate (i.e., the conjugate of the conjugate function) is equal to D , and thus

$$D(S) = \sup_{Q \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q \rangle - D^*(Q) \right\}. \quad (19)$$

The domain of the convex conjugate is non-empty and satisfies

$$\text{dom } D^* \subseteq \{Q \in \mathbb{S}^d : Q \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\}. \quad (20)$$

The sub-differentials are set-valued mappings given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_2 D(S) &= \{Q \in \mathbb{S}^d : Q \preceq \text{MMO}(S), \quad \langle S, \text{MMO}(S) - Q \rangle = 0\} \\ \partial_2 D(Q) &= \{S \in \mathbb{S}^d : Q \preceq \text{MMO}(S), \quad \langle S, \text{MMO}(S) - Q \rangle = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the shorthand notation $\text{MMO}(S) = \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z})$.

Example 1. If \mathbf{X} has finite entropy $H(\mathbf{X})$ then $D^*(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]) = H(\mathbf{X})$. Alternatively, if \mathbf{X} has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure, then $D^*(Q)$ increases to $+\infty$ as Q increases $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$.

Example 2. If the entries of \mathbf{X} are i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables then

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathbf{X}}(S) &= \frac{n}{2} (\text{tr}(S) - \log \det(I_d + S)), & 0 \preceq S \\ D_{\mathbf{X}}^*(Q) &= \frac{n}{2} (-\text{tr}(Q)) - \log \det(I_d - Q), & 0 \preceq Q \prec I_d. \end{aligned}$$

2.3 Multivariate functions

Given a pair of random matrices $(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2)$ the bivariate relative entropy function is defined by

$$D_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2}(S_1, S_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}_1 \oplus \mathbf{X}_2}(S_1 \oplus S_2), \quad (21)$$

where \oplus denotes the matrix direction sum (i.e., $A \oplus B = \text{diag}(A, B)$). This function inherits the functional properties derived in the case of a single matrix, such as convexity, smoothness, and the data processing inequality.

Example 3. If \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 are independent. Then,

$$D_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2}(S_1, S_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}_1}(S_1) + D_{\mathbf{X}_2}(S_2), \quad 0 \preceq S_k \quad (22)$$

$$D_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2}^*(Q_1, Q_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}_1}^*(Q_1) + D_{\mathbf{X}_2}^*(Q_2), \quad Q_k \in \text{dom } 2D_{\mathbf{X}_k}^*. \quad (23)$$

Example 4. If $\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{X}$ then

$$D_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}}(S_1, S_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}}(S_1 + S_2), \quad 0 \preceq S_k \quad (24)$$

$$D_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}}^*(Q_1, Q_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}}^*(\max(Q_1, Q_2)), \quad Q_k \in \text{dom } 2D_{\mathbf{X}}^*, \quad (25)$$

where $\max(A, B) := \frac{1}{2}(A + B + (A - B)_+ + (B - A)_+)$ and $(M)_+$ denotes the positive semidefinite matrix obtained by applying the function $\lambda \mapsto \max(\lambda, 0)$ to the eigenvalues of M .

2.4 Overlap and free energy

The information functions considered so far have all been non-random quantities that depend on the average difference between the marginal distribution of the signal $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ and the (random) conditional distribution given the observations $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathcal{G}}$. To understand whether these averages represent the typical behavior it is useful to consider certain random quantities whose distributions provide further information about the variability in $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathcal{G}}$.

Let \mathbf{X} be the $n \times d$ random signal matrix and let \mathcal{G} be the sigma-field generated by a set of observations. The overlap matrix is the $d \times d$ random matrix given by

$$\mathbf{O} = (\mathbf{X}^1)^\top \mathbf{X}^2, \quad (26)$$

where \mathbf{X}^1 and \mathbf{X}^2 are replicas that are drawn independently from the conditional distribution of \mathbf{X} given \mathcal{G} . The conditional independence of the replicas means that the conditional expectation of the overlap is a positive semidefinite matrix given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} | \mathcal{G}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}]. \quad (27)$$

Taking the expectation with respect to \mathcal{G} , we recover the MMO matrix. The extent to which the overlap concentrates about its mean provides an important measure of the amount of dependence between the signal components under $P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathcal{G}}$.

The second random quantity of interest is a function of the instantaneous or pointwise information contained in the observations. Specifically, given a random pair (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) and positive semidefinite matrix S , we define the random variable

$$F := \log \frac{dP_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z}}}{dP_{\mathbf{W}}}(\mathbf{Y} | \mathbf{Z}), \quad (28)$$

where \mathbf{Y} is drawn from the additive Gaussian noise model (11) with parameter S . With some abuse of terminology we will refer to this variable simply as the free energy. From this definition, it follows that the expectation with respect to the pair (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) is equal to the relative $\mathbb{E}[F] = D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S)$. Moreover, a straightforward expansion of the Gaussian density gives an alternative representation:

$$F = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times d}} \exp \left\{ \langle \mathbf{x} S^{1/2}, \mathbf{Y} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} \rangle \right\} dP_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{Z}). \quad (29)$$

Finally, the variance of the free energy is defined as

$$V_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(S) := \mathbb{E}[(F - \mathbb{E}[F])^2] \quad (30)$$

In contrast to the overlap, a useful property of the free energy is its variance can often be bounded under relatively mild assumptions.

3 Statement of main results

3.1 Symmetric case

Our main result is stated for a version of the symmetric tensor product. Given a pair of positive semidefinite matrices $(R, S) \in \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d^2}$ define

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}R^{1/2} + \mathbf{W} \\ \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}' \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}' have i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. We use $D(R, S) = D_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \mathbf{Z}}(R, S)$ to denote the bivariate relative entropy function associated with the observation \mathbf{Y} and a generic observation \mathbf{Z} . Furthermore, the special case $S = 0$ is denoted by $D_0(R) := D(R, 0) = D_{\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}}(R)$.

Definition 3. The approximation formula associated with (31) is given by

$$\hat{D}(R, S) := \sup_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_+^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R, Q \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(Q) \right\} \quad (32)$$

where $D_0^*(Q)$ is the convex conjugate of $D_0(R)$.

As shown in Appendix D, the approximation formula has many of the same properties as the relative entropy function. In particular, it non-negative, convex, and order-preserving. An important difference, however, is that it need not be differentiable everywhere.

Our main result is the following non-asymptotic bound on the difference between the relative entropy function and the approximation formula.

Theorem 6. *Suppose that \mathbf{X} has bounded fourth moments $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4] \leq B^4$. For each pair $(R, S) \in \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d^2}$,*

$$\left| D(R, S) - \hat{D}(R, S) \right| \leq C \inf_{\rho \in (0, \infty)} \left(d\rho B^2 + \|S\|_\infty \left(\frac{B^3}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \inf_{\delta \in (0, \rho]} d^2 \left\{ \frac{\bar{V}(\rho)}{\delta^2} + \frac{\delta B^4}{\rho} \right\} \right) \right) \quad (33)$$

where C is a numerical constant,

$$\bar{V}(\rho) := \sup_{\tilde{R} \leq 3(\rho d + \|S\|_\infty B^2) I_d} V_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \mathbf{Z}}(R + \tilde{R}, S), \quad (34)$$

and $V_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \mathbf{Z}}(R, S)$ is the variance of the free energy associated with (31)

To compare with other results in the literature, consider the following bound on the variance of the free energy.

Lemma 7. *Suppose that the rows of \mathbf{X} are bounded almost surely $\|X_i\| \leq b$ and for each realization of \mathbf{Z} , the conditional distribution $P_{\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}}(\cdot | \mathbf{Z})$ factorizes as a product distribution over the rows. Then*

$$V_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \mathbf{Z}}(R, S) \leq C(n\|R\|_\infty b^4 + n^2\|S\|_\infty b^8). \quad (35)$$

Proof. This result follows straightforwardly from the approach in [27, Section 6.3]. \square

Define the scaled functions:

$$\mathcal{D}_n(R, S) = \frac{1}{n} D(R, \frac{1}{n} S), \quad \hat{\mathcal{D}}_n(R, S) = \frac{1}{n} \hat{D}(R, \frac{1}{n} S). \quad (36)$$

The next result follows straightforwardly from Theorem 6 and Lemma 7.

Theorem 8. Let (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 7 with constant $b \in (0, \infty)$. For each $c_0 \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a constant $C_{b,d}$ such that

$$|\mathcal{D}_n(R, S) - \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_n(R, S)| \leq C_{b,d} n^{-1/5} \quad (37)$$

uniformly for all $\max(\|R\|_\infty, \|S\|_\infty) \leq c_0$.

The gradients of the relative entropy function provide information about the MMSE matrix. Specifically, letting $\mathcal{D}_n(R, S)$ be given by (36) we have

$$\nabla_R \mathcal{D}_n(R, S) = \frac{1}{2n} \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \quad (38)$$

$$\nabla_S \mathcal{D}_n(R, S) = \frac{1}{2n^2} \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} \mid \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}). \quad (39)$$

The next result follows from Lemma 24.

Theorem 9. Suppose that \mathcal{D}_n converges pointwise to limit \mathcal{D} . Then, \mathcal{D} is convex and differentiable almost everywhere. Furthermore:

(i) For each $T \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \nabla_R \mathcal{D}_n(R, S), T \rangle \leq \sup_{Q \in \partial 2\mathcal{D}(R)} \langle Q, T \rangle. \quad (40)$$

(ii) For each $T \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$ such that $T \preceq \epsilon R$ for some $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \nabla_R \mathcal{D}_n(R, S), T \rangle \geq \inf_{Q \in \partial 2\mathcal{D}(R)} \langle Q, T \rangle. \quad (41)$$

(iii) For each $R \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ such that $\mathcal{D}(R, S)$ is differentiable,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla_R \mathcal{D}_n(R, S) = \nabla \mathcal{D}(R, S). \quad (42)$$

3.2 Asymmetric case

Given a tuple of positive semidefinite matrices $(R_1, S_2, S) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d_1} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d_2} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d_1 d_2}$ define

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}_1 R_1^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}_1 \\ \mathbf{X}_2 R_2^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}_2 \\ (\mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2) S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}' \end{cases}, \quad (43)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{W}'$ have i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. We use $D(R_1, R_2, S) = D_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2 | \mathbf{Z}}(R_1, R_2, S)$ to denote the relative entropy function associated with the observation \mathbf{Y} and a generic observation \mathbf{Z} . The special case $S = 0$ is denoted by $D_0(R_1, R_2) = D_{\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2 | \mathbf{Z}}(R_1, R_2)$.

Definition 4. The approximation formula associated with (43) is given by

$$\widehat{D}(R_1, R_2, S) := \sup_{(Q_1, Q_2) \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d_1} \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R_1, Q_1 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle R_2, Q_2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rangle - D_0^*(Q_1, Q_2) \right\} \quad (44)$$

where D_0^* is the convex conjugate of D_0 .

The approximation formula for the asymmetric model (43) is equivalent to the one for the symmetric model (31).

4 Proof of Theorem 6

The proof has two main steps. First we use adaptive interpolation to bound the difference in terms of a remainder term. Then, we show that under an appropriate perturbation, this error can be made small.

4.1 Interpolation with order-preserving paths

The high-level idea is to describe an interpolation path parameterized by $t \in [0, 1]$ that maps from the original problem of interest at time $t = 0$ to a setting involving only the direct observation model at time $t = 1$. The interpolation path is described by a family of functions $(\phi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}}$ where $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^d$ and $\phi_\epsilon : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$ is absolutely continuous with $\phi_\epsilon(0) = \epsilon$. The interpolation model associated with each pair (R, S) is defined by

$$\mathbf{Y}_{t,\epsilon} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(R + \phi_\epsilon(t))^{1/2} + \mathbf{W} \\ \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}' \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

where $(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}')$ are independent noise matrices with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries. The overlap matrix associated with this path is given by $\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} := (\mathbf{X}_{t,\epsilon}^1)^\top \mathbf{X}_{t,\epsilon}^2$ where $\mathbf{X}_{t,\epsilon}^1$ and $\mathbf{X}_{t,\epsilon}^2$ are conditionally independent draws from the conditional distribution of \mathbf{X} given $(\mathbf{Y}_{t,\epsilon}, \mathbf{Z})$. By Lemma 4 and the property $(A \otimes B) \otimes (C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$, the partial gradients $D(R, S)$ can be expressed in terms of the overlap:

$$\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{Y}_{t,\epsilon}, \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}] \quad (46a)$$

$$\text{MMO}(\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} \mid \mathbf{Y}_{t,\epsilon}, \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}^{\otimes 2}]. \quad (46b)$$

The remainder term is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\epsilon) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}^{\otimes 2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}]^{\otimes 2} \rangle dt. \quad (47)$$

Definition 5 (Order-preserving). The family of functions $(\phi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}}$ is said to be strongly order preserving if the mapping $\epsilon \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon) - \epsilon$ is order preserving. In other words, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\epsilon_1 \preceq \epsilon_2 \implies \Phi(t, \epsilon_1) - \epsilon_1 \preceq \Phi(t, \epsilon_2) - \epsilon_2 \quad (48)$$

Remark 1. The order-preserving assumption can be seen as a natural extension of regularity conditions used earlier versions of the adaptive interpolation method (see e.g., [13, Supplement, Definition 1]), which require that the mapping $\epsilon \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon)$ is a \mathcal{C}^1 diffeomorphism, whose Jacobian is greater than or equal to 1. Unlike the conditions used previously, the order-preserving property does not require continuity.

Theorem 10. Fix any $(R, S) \in \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d^2}$ and bounded set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{S}_+^d$.

- (i) (Lower bound) For each $q^* \in \partial_1 \hat{D}(R, S)$, there exists a family of strongly order-preserving functions $(\phi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}}$ such that for all $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$D(R + \epsilon, S) \geq \hat{D}(R, S) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon, q^* \rangle + \mathcal{R}(\epsilon). \quad (49)$$

- (ii) (Upper bound) There exists a family of strongly order-preserving functions $(\phi_\epsilon)_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}}$ such that for all $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$D(R + \epsilon, S) \leq \hat{D}(R + \epsilon, S) + \mathcal{R}(\epsilon). \quad (50)$$

In both cases, the interpolation functions are bounded and satisfy $0 \preceq \phi_\epsilon(t) - \epsilon \preceq +2\|S\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$ uniformly for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Corollary 11. *The approximation formula satisfies*

$$|D(R, S) - \hat{D}(R, S)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_1 \|\epsilon\|_\infty + \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\epsilon) \quad (51)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\epsilon)$ is the maximum absolute value of the remainders associated with the lower and upper bounds.

Corollary 12. *If $M \mapsto \langle S, M^{\otimes 2} \rangle$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ then the remainder terms are non-negative. Consequently,*

$$D(R, S) \geq \hat{D}(R, S). \quad (52)$$

4.2 Canceling the remainder

The absolute value of the integrand in (47) can be bounded from above as follows:

$$|\langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}^{\otimes 2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}]^{\otimes 2} \rangle| = |\mathbb{E}[\langle S, (\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}])^{\otimes 2} \rangle]| \quad (53)$$

$$\leq \|S\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\|(\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}])^{\otimes 2}\|_1] \quad (54)$$

$$= \|S\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}]\|_2^2] \quad (55)$$

where the second step follows from Jensen's inequality and the matrix Hölder inequality and the last step holds because the Shatten- p norm satisfies $\|M^{\otimes 2}\|_p = \|M\|_{2p}^2$ for any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

To bound the remainder term, we will show that there exists a probability measure μ supported on \mathcal{E} such that the averaged overlap

$$\int_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}]\|_2^2] d\mu(\epsilon) \quad (56)$$

is small uniformly for all $t \in [0, 1]$. There is a tradeoff with respect to the size of the perturbation. The larger the set \mathcal{E} , the easier it is to smooth out the variance in the overlap, but the larger the discrepancy in the first term in Corollary 11

Theorem 13 (Overlap concentration). *For all $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a probability measure μ such that $\|\epsilon\| \leq \rho(d+1)$ almost surely and*

$$\int \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{t,\epsilon}]\|_2^2] d\mu(\epsilon) \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_4^4] \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2]}{\rho}} + \min_{\delta \in [0, \rho]} d^2 \left\{ \frac{16\nu(\rho)}{\delta^2} + \frac{2\delta \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_\infty^2}{\rho} \right\} \quad (57)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ where

$$\nu(\rho) = \sup_{\tilde{R} \leq 2\rho(d+1) + \|S\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]} V_{\mathbf{X}|Z}(R + \tilde{R}, S). \quad (58)$$

4.3 Simplification of bound

To simplify the analysis, let us now assume that $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4] \leq B^4$. Further, we use C to denote a numerical constant whose value may change from place to place. Theorem 13 combined with (55) implies that

$$\int |\mathcal{R}(\epsilon)| d\mu(\epsilon) \leq C \|S\|_\infty \left(\frac{B^3}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \min_{\delta \in [0, \rho]} d^2 \left\{ \frac{\bar{V}(\rho)}{\delta^2} + \frac{\delta B^4}{\rho} \right\} \right), \quad (59)$$

where $\bar{V}(\rho)$ is given by (34). Combining this bound with Corollary 11 yields

$$\left| D(R, S) - \hat{D}(R, S) \right| \leq C \left(d\rho B^2 + \|S\|_\infty \left(\frac{B^3}{\sqrt{\rho}} + \inf_{\delta \in (0, \rho]} d^2 \left\{ \frac{\nu(\rho)}{\delta^2} + \frac{\delta B^4}{\rho} \right\} \right) \right). \quad (60)$$

5 Proof of Theorem 10

To simplify the analysis, we use a transformation that reduces a problem with general R to the problem with $R = 0$. The direct observation model with matrix $R + \phi(t)$ is equivalent to two separate observations, one with matrix R and other other with matrix $\phi(t)$. Associating the R -dependent model with the side information yields:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t := \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}\phi(t)^{1/2} + \mathbf{W} \\ \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}' \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{X}R^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}'' \\ \mathbf{Z} \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

where $\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}', \mathbf{W}''$ are independent noise matrices. By the chain rule, the relative entropy corresponding to the interpolation model satisfies

$$D_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \mathbf{Z}}(R + \phi(t), (1-t)S) = D_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} | \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}}(\phi(t), (1-t)S) + D_{\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}}(R) \quad (62)$$

where the second term on the right-hand side does not depend on t . Thus, it is sufficient to prove the stated result for the first term on the right-hand side.

5.1 Decomposition along path

The first step of the proof is a decomposition of the relative entropy associated with a generic interpolation path. Let $\phi(t) = \phi(0) + \int_0^t \phi'(u) du$ for some integrable function $\phi' : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$. By the integral form of the I-MMSE relationship (Lemma 3), the chain rule for differentiation and (46), it follows that

$$D(\phi(1), 0) - D(\phi(0), S) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \{ \langle \phi'(t), \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] \rangle - \langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t^{\otimes 2}] \rangle \} dt. \quad (63)$$

Rearranging terms leads to the decomposition $D(\phi(0), S) = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}$ where

$$\mathcal{D} := D_0(\phi(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \{ \langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t^{\otimes 2}] \rangle - \langle \phi'(t), \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] \rangle \} dt \quad (64)$$

$$\mathcal{R} := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle S, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t^{\otimes 2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]^{\otimes 2} \rangle dt. \quad (65)$$

To further simplify the first term, let $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^d$ be the unique linear operator, described in Lemma 26, which satisfies $\langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \langle S, A \otimes B \rangle$ for all $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and let \mathcal{T}^* denote the adjoint operator, which satisfies $\langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \langle A, \mathcal{T}^*(B) \rangle$. Then,

$$\mathcal{D} = D_0(\phi(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) - \phi'(t), \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] \rangle dt. \quad (66)$$

This representation is generic in the sense that it holds for any interpolation path $\phi(t)$.

Next, we note that the overlap is as a function of the interpolation path in the sense that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] = \mathcal{M}(t, \phi(t))$ where $\mathcal{M} : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}(t, r) := \text{MMO}(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{X}r^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}, \sqrt{1-t}\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2}S^{1/2} + \mathbf{W}', \mathbf{Z}). \quad (67)$$

The key idea in the adaptive interpolation method is to construct a path such that the derivative $\phi'(t)$ cancels out certain terms that depend on $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]$. In the following, we will construct paths that satisfy

$$\phi'(t) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(\psi'(t)), \quad (68)$$

for some integrable function $\psi' : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$. Evaluating (66) along this path and then using the property $\langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \langle A, \mathcal{T}^*(B) \rangle$ for all $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ leads to

$$\mathcal{D} = D_0\left(\phi(0) + \mathcal{T}\left(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] dt\right) + \mathcal{T}^*(\psi(1))\right) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \langle \psi'(t), \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) \rangle dt. \quad (69)$$

where $\psi(1) = \int_0^1 \psi'(t) dt$.

5.2 Lower bound

We begin by constructing a path that depends on an auxiliary parameter $q \in \mathcal{Q} := \{q \in \mathbb{S}_+^d : q \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\}$ that will be specified later. Consider the initial value problem defined by

$$\phi'(t) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(q), \quad \phi(0) = \epsilon. \quad (70)$$

This is a first order ordinary differential equation because $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]$ is a function $\phi(t)$. The next result shows that this problem has a unique solution satisfying certain regularity conditions.

Lemma 14. *The initial value problem (70) has a unique solution $\phi(t) = \Phi(t, \epsilon, q)$ defined on $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, for each $t \in [0, 1]$, the mapping $(\epsilon, q) \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon, q) - \epsilon$ is continuous and order-preserving.*

Proof. The initial value problem in (70) can be restated as

$$\phi'(t) = F(t, \phi(t), q), \quad \phi(0) = \epsilon, \quad (71)$$

where $F : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$ is given by $F(t, \phi, q) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}(t, \phi)) + \mathcal{T}^*(q)$. The function F is differentiable on the interior of its domain by Lemma 4 and satisfies the bounds $0 \preceq F(t, \phi, q) \preceq 2\|\mathcal{T}\|_{op}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$. Therefore, by the Picard–Lindelöf theorem [57, Chapter II, Theorem 1.1] there exists a unique solution $\phi(t) = \Phi(t, \epsilon, q)$ defined on the interval $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, $\Phi(t, \epsilon, q)$ is a continuous function of the parameters (ϵ, q) [57, Chapter V, Theorem 3.1].

Next, $r \mapsto \mathcal{M}(t, r)$ is order-preserving by the data processing inequality for MMSE (Lemma 2). Also, both \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}^* are order-preserving. Therefore, $(\phi, q) \rightarrow F(t, \phi, q)$ is order-preserving because it is the composition of order-preserving maps. For any $(\epsilon_1, q_1) \preceq (\epsilon_2, q_2)$ we can apply the comparison result in Lemma 20 with $u = \epsilon_1, v = \epsilon_2, F(t, \phi) = F(t, \phi, q_1)$ and $G(t, \psi) = F(t, \psi, q_2)$ to conclude that $\Phi(t, \epsilon_1, q_1) - \epsilon_1 \preceq \Phi(t, \epsilon_2, q_2) - \epsilon_2$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus, we have shown that $(\epsilon, q) \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon, q) - \epsilon$ is order-preserving. \square

Having established the existence of the path satisfying (71), we may consider the representation in (69), which becomes:

$$\mathcal{D} = D_0(\epsilon + \mathcal{T}(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] dt) + \mathcal{T}^*(q)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{T}(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] dt), q \rangle. \quad (72)$$

In this expression, $\mathcal{T}(\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t] dt)$ is a positive semidefinite matrix that is defined implicitly by the interpolation path parameterized by (ϵ, q) . The infimum over all possible values of this matrix provides a lower bound:

$$\mathcal{D} \geq \inf_{r \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ D_0(\epsilon + \mathcal{T}^*(q)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle r, q \rangle \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon, q \rangle + \langle S, q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(q), \quad (73)$$

where the second line follows from the definition of the convex conjugate.

The remaining step is to specify the parameter q . The greatest lower bound is obtained by any value $q^* = q^*(\epsilon)$ that attains the maximum in (73), and this approach leads to $\mathcal{D} \geq \hat{D}(\epsilon, S)$. However, a technical difficulty that arises is that the selection of q depends on ϵ and so to verify that the resulting family $(\phi_\epsilon)_\epsilon$ is strongly order-preserving, it is necessary to show that the mapping from ϵ to q is order-preserving.

For the purposes of this paper, we bypass this issue by considering a slightly weaker lower bound, where q is optimized for the case $\epsilon = 0$. Specifically, let q^* be such that:

$$q^* \in \arg \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \{ \langle S, q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(q) \}. \quad (74)$$

This set is nonempty because \mathcal{Q} is compact and $-D_0^*$ is upper-semicontinuous, and thus the extreme value theorem [56, Theorem 1.29] guarantees that the maximum is attained. Then, (73) implies that

$$\mathcal{D} \geq \hat{D}(0, S) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon, q^* \rangle. \quad (75)$$

Moreover, because q^* does not depend on ϵ , it follows from Lemma 14 that $\epsilon \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon, q^*) - \epsilon$ is order-preserving.

5.3 Upper bound

Similar to before we begin by defining a path with respect to an auxiliary parameter $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Consider the initial value problem with coupled equations:

$$\phi'(t) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}'(t)), \quad \phi(0) = \epsilon \quad (76a)$$

$$\tilde{q}'(t) = \nabla 2D_0(\epsilon + \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(q)), \quad \tilde{q}(0) = 0. \quad (76b)$$

This is a coupled system of first order ordinary differential equations because $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]$ is a function of $\phi(t)$.

Lemma 15. *The initial value problem (76) has unique solutions $\phi(t) = \Phi(t, \epsilon, q)$ and $\tilde{q}(t) = \tilde{Q}(t, \epsilon, q)$ defined on $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, for each $t \in [0, 1]$, the mappings $(\epsilon, q) \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon, q) - \epsilon$ and $(\epsilon, q) \mapsto \tilde{Q}(t, \epsilon, q)$ are continuous and order-preserving.*

Proof. The initial value problem in (76) can be expressed as

$$\phi'(t) = F_1(t, \phi(t), \epsilon, q), \quad \phi(0) = \epsilon \quad (77a)$$

$$\tilde{q}'(t) = F_2(t, \phi(t), \epsilon, q), \quad \tilde{q}(0) = 0 \quad (77b)$$

where $F_k : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_+^d$ are given by

$$F_1(t, \phi, \epsilon, q) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}(t, \phi)) + \mathcal{T}^*(F_2(t, \phi, \epsilon, q)) \quad (78a)$$

$$F_2(t, \phi, \epsilon, q) = \nabla 2D_0(\epsilon + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{M}(t, \phi)) + \mathcal{T}^*(q)). \quad (78b)$$

These function are differentiable on the interior of their domains and satisfy the bounds $0 \preceq F_1(t, \phi, q) \preceq 2\|\mathcal{T}\|_{op}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$ and $0 \preceq F_2(t, \phi, q) \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$. Therefore, by the Picard–Lindelöf theorem [57, Chapter II, Theorem 1.1 and] there exists unique solutions $\phi(t) = \Phi(t, \epsilon, q)$ and $\tilde{q}(t) = \tilde{Q}(t, \epsilon, q)$ defined on the interval $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, Φ and \tilde{Q} are continuous in (t, ϵ, q) [57, Chapter V, Theorem 3.1].

Next, for each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $k \in \{1, 2\}$, the mapping $(\phi, \epsilon, q) \mapsto F_k(t, \phi, \epsilon, q)$ is order-preserving because it is the composition of order-preserving maps. The order-preserving properties of Φ and \tilde{Q} then follow from Lemma 20. \square

To help with the following derivation we introduce the additional term

$$\tilde{r}(t) = \epsilon + \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(q). \quad (79)$$

By construction, $\tilde{q}'(t) = \nabla 2D_0(\tilde{r}'(t))$ and thus

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle \tilde{r}'(t), \tilde{q}'(t) \rangle = D_0^*(\tilde{q}'(t)) + D_0(\tilde{r}'(t)). \quad (80)$$

Starting with (69) and then adding and subtracting terms leads to

$$\mathcal{D} = D_0(\phi(1)) - \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]), \tilde{q}'(t) \rangle dt \quad (81)$$

$$= D_0(\phi(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon + \mathcal{T}^*(q), \tilde{q}(1) \rangle - \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{r}'(t), \tilde{q}'(t) \rangle dt \quad (82)$$

$$= D_0(\phi(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon + \mathcal{T}^*(q), \tilde{q}(1) \rangle - \int_0^1 \{D_0(\tilde{r}'(t)) + D_0^*(\tilde{q}'(t))\} dt \quad (83)$$

$$\leq D_0(\phi(1)) + \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon + \mathcal{T}^*(q), \tilde{q}(1) \rangle - D_0^*(\tilde{q}(1)) - \int_0^1 D_0(\tilde{r}'(t)) dt \quad (84)$$

where the last step follows from Jensen's inequality and the convexity of D^* . To proceed, we will use Jensen's inequality a second time to upper bound the term $D_0(\phi(1))$ according to

$$D_0(\phi(1)) = D_0\left(\epsilon + \int_0^1 \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) dt + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1))\right) \quad (85)$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 D_0(\epsilon + \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_t]) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1))) dt \quad (86)$$

$$= \int_0^1 D_0(\tilde{r}'(t) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1) - q)) dt. \quad (87)$$

Plugging this inequality back into (84) and then rearranging terms gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1)), \tilde{q}(1) \rangle - D_0^*(\tilde{q}(1)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \{D_0(\tilde{r}'(t) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1) - q)) + \langle \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{q}(1) - q), \nabla D(\tilde{r}'(t)) \rangle - D_0(\tilde{r}'(t))\} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is upper bounded by $\hat{D}(\epsilon, S)$. The second term is nonnegative and equal to zero when $q = \tilde{q}(1)$.

To complete the specification of the path we will show that there exists a mapping $q^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ that satisfies the following properties:

- (i) The interpolation path satisfies $\tilde{q}(1) = q^*(\epsilon)$ and thus the upper bound in (88) implies that

$$\mathcal{D} \leq \frac{1}{2} \langle \epsilon, q^*(\epsilon) \rangle + \langle S, (q^*(\epsilon))^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(q^*(\epsilon)) \leq \hat{D}(\epsilon, S). \quad (89)$$

- (ii) The mapping q^* is order-preserving, and thus by Lemma 15, $\epsilon \mapsto \Phi(t, \epsilon) = \Phi(t, \epsilon, q^*(\epsilon))$ is strongly order-preserving.

To show that such a function exists, let $Q : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ be given by $Q(\epsilon, q) = \int_0^1 \tilde{Q}(t, \epsilon, q) dt$ and define the fixed-point set $\text{FP}(\epsilon) = \{q \in \mathcal{Q} : Q(\epsilon, q) = q\}$. The next result shows that $\text{FP}(\epsilon)$ is nonempty and there exists a unique mapping $q^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \text{FP}(\epsilon)$ that is order-preserving.

Lemma 16. *For each $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, the set $\text{FP}(\epsilon)$ is nonempty and there exists a greatest element $q^*(\epsilon)$ such that $q \preceq q^*(\epsilon)$ for all $q \in \text{FP}(\epsilon)$. Furthermore, the mapping $q^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ is order-preserving.*

Proof. For each $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, the mapping $q \mapsto Q(\epsilon, q)$ is continuous by Lemma 15 and maps a convex compact subset of Euclidean space to itself. Therefore, we can apply Brouwer's fixed-point theorem to conclude that $\text{FP}(\epsilon)$ is nonempty.

Next we show that there is a greatest element. If $\text{FP}(\epsilon)$ is single-valued then we are done. Otherwise, define the set $K(\epsilon) = \bigcap_{\tilde{q} \in \text{FP}(\epsilon)} \{q \in \mathcal{Q} : q \succeq \tilde{q}\}$. This set is nonempty because \mathcal{Q} has a largest element and it is convex and compact because it is the intersection of convex and compact sets. The mapping $(\epsilon, q) \mapsto \tilde{Q}(t, \epsilon, q)$ is order-preserving by Lemma 15 and this implies that Q is order-preserving. Consequently, $q \in K$ implies that $Q(\epsilon, q) \succeq \tilde{q}$ for all $\tilde{q} \in \text{FP}(\epsilon)$, and so $q \mapsto Q(\epsilon, q)$ maps $K(\epsilon)$ to itself. By Brouwer's fixed-point theorem, there must be a solution on $K(\epsilon)$. From the definition of $K(\epsilon)$, this solution is the greatest element of $\text{FP}(\epsilon)$, which is necessarily unique.

Finally, we show that the greatest element q^* is order preserving. Fix any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\epsilon_1 \preceq \epsilon_2$ and let $q_k = q^*(\epsilon_k)$ for $k = 1, 2$. For each $q \succeq q_1$, the fact that Q is order preserving means that $Q(\epsilon_2, q) \succeq Q(\epsilon_1, q_1) = q_1$ and so $q \mapsto Q(\epsilon_2, q)$ maps the closed convex set $\{q \in \mathcal{Q} : q \succeq q_1\}$ to itself. By Brouwer's fixed-point theorem, there exists a solution on this set and by the assumption that q_2 is the greatest element it follows that $q_1 \preceq q_2$. \square

Remark 2. In comparison to earlier versions of the adaptive interpolation method for special cases of this problem, one of the main innovations of our approach is the introduction of the coupled path (76) and the auxiliary parameter q . Moreover, a crucial step in the bounding technique is that the Jensen's inequality in (84) is applied to the overlap but not the auxiliary path $\tilde{q}'(t)$, and this allows for the cancellation of the second term in (88).

6 Overlap concentration via continuous-time perturbations

6.1 Decomposition of overlap

We begin with a decomposition of the overlap matrix introduced in Section 2.4. By construction, the conditional expectation of the overlap is a $d \times d$ symmetric positive semidefinite random matrix given by (27). The following decomposition is known as the law of total variance:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}]\|_2^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} \mid \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}]\|_2^2]. \quad (90)$$

The first term in this decomposition can be bounded from above by the conditional covariance matrix.

Lemma 17. *The following holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2] \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4]} \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j \mid \mathcal{G}))^2]}. \quad (91)$$

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}]$ and observe that $\mathbf{O} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} \mid \mathcal{G}] = (\mathbf{X}^1 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mathbf{X}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{X}}^\top (\mathbf{X}^2 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})$ where the terms on the right-hand side are orthogonal in expectation. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2] = 2\mathbb{E}[\langle (\mathbf{X}^1 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mathbf{X}^2, (\mathbf{X}^1 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle] \quad (92)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E}[\langle (\mathbf{X}^1 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}^1 - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top, \mathbf{X}^2(\mathbf{X}^2)^\top \rangle] \quad (93)$$

$$= 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mid \mathcal{G}], \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \mid \mathcal{G}] \rangle] \quad (94)$$

$$\leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2]}, \quad (95)$$

where the third step follows from the conditional independence of \mathbf{X}^1 and \mathbf{X}^2 and the last step is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

To deal with the first factor, let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the rows of \mathbf{X} and observe that

$$\|\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}})^\top \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \text{tr}(\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j \mid \mathcal{G}))^2. \quad (96)$$

For the second factor, Jensen's inequality leads to $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top \mid \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top\|_2^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4]$. \square

6.2 Positive semidefinite frame for symmetric matrices

To control the variation in the conditional expectation of the overlap we need to bound the Frobenius norm of a symmetric random matrix. A useful technique for reducing the d -dimensional setting to the 1-dimensional setting is to decompose this norm in terms of inner products with a set of rank-one matrices. For example, one natural decomposition for a symmetric matrix M is given by

$$\|M\|_2^2 = \sum_i M_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i < j} 2M_{ij}^2 = \sum_{i \leq j} \langle E_{ij}, M \rangle^2, \quad E_{ij} = \begin{cases} e_i e_i^\top & i = j \\ \sqrt{2} e_i e_j^\top & i < j \end{cases} \quad (97)$$

where e_i denotes the i -th standard basis vector. This decomposition follows from the fact that the set $\{E_{ij}\}$ forms an orthogonal basis for the space of symmetric matrices.

For the purposes of our proof technique, the problem with the decomposition described above is that most of the basis elements are indefinite and thus do not correspond to order preserving perturbations. The approach used in this paper is to construct an overcomplete basis (or frame) consisting of d^2 rank-one matrices in \mathbb{S}_+^d that span \mathbb{S}^d . While there are many ways to construct such a frame, the following specification has two nice properties: 1) the lower and upper frame bounds differ by a factor that is only linear in the dimension, and 2) the norm of each frame element is either 1 or $1/\sqrt{2}$.

Definition 6 (Frame for symmetric matrices). Let $\{B_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d$ be the set of $d \times d$ rank-one positive semidefinite matrices given by $B_{ij} = a_{ij}a_{ij}^\top$ where

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} e_i, & i = j \\ 2^{-3/4}(e_i + e_j) & i < j, \\ 2^{-3/4}(e_i - e_j) & i > j \end{cases} \quad (98)$$

with e_i denoting the i -th standard basis vector in d dimensions.

Lemma 18. *The set of rank-one positive semidefinite matrices $\{B_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^d$ forms a frame for the space of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices with lower and upper frame bounds 1 and $(d+1)/2$, respectively. In other words, for each $M \in \mathbb{S}^d$,*

$$\|M\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle B_{ij}, M \rangle^2 \leq \frac{d+1}{2} \|M\|_2^2. \quad (99)$$

Furthermore, $\sum_{i,j=1}^d B_{ij} = (1 + (d-1)2^{-3/2})I_d$.

Proof. Because both B_{ij} and M are symmetric the inner product is determined by the entries on or below the diagonal and we can write $\langle B_{ij}, M \rangle = \langle \text{vech}(\tilde{B}_{ij}), \text{vech}(M) \rangle$ where $\text{vech}(\cdot)$ denotes the $d(d+1)/2$ -dimensional vector obtained by stacking the entries on and below the diagonal and $\tilde{B}_{ij} = 2B_{ij} - \text{diag}(B_{ij})$. To proceed, let C be a $d^2 \times d(d+1)/2$ matrix whose rows are in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of $\{\text{vech}(\tilde{B}_{ij})\}$. Using this notation, we can write $\sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle B_{ij}, M \rangle^2 = \|C \text{vech}(M)\|_2^2$ and thus the lower and upper frame bounds (i.e., the constants in double inequality (99)) are given by the minimum and maximum eigenvalues values of $C^\top C$. As a straightforward exercise, it can be verified that there exists permutation matrices P, Q such that

$$PCQ = \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\tilde{C} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I_{d(d-1)/2} \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\tilde{C} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I_{d(d-1)/2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (100)$$

where \tilde{C} is a $d(d-1)/2 \times d$ binary matrix that satisfies $\tilde{C}^\top \tilde{C} = (d-2) + \mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top$. Hence,

$$QC^\top CQ = \begin{bmatrix} I_d + \frac{1}{4}\tilde{C}^\top \tilde{C} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{d(d-1)/2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\frac{d+2}{4})I_d + \frac{d}{4}\mathbf{1}_d \mathbf{1}_d^\top & 0 \\ 0 & I_{d(d-1)/2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (101)$$

From here, a direct calculation reveals that the minimum and maximum eigenvalues are given by 1 and $(d+1)/2$, respectively. \square

With these results in hand, we are ready to bound the second term in (27).

Lemma 19. *Let $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{d^2}$ be the collection of d -dimensional vectors described in Definition 6. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}]\|_2^2 \right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d^2} \text{Var}(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2). \quad (102)$$

Proof. Starting with Lemma 18 gives

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}]\|_2^2 \leq \sum_k \langle B_k, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}] \rangle^2. \quad (103)$$

By (27) and the construction of B_k it follows that

$$\langle B_k, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O} | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_\epsilon] \rangle = \left\langle a_k a_k^\top, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}] \right] \right\rangle \quad (104)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]\right] \quad (105)$$

$$= \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2]. \quad (106)$$

Thus, the expectation of the square is the variance of $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}]\|_2^2$. \square

6.3 Proof of Theorem 13

Let $t \in [0, 1]$ be fixed. We consider a parameterization of the perturbation matrix in terms of vector $u \in \mathcal{U} := [0, 1]^{d^2+1}$. Given $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, define

$$R(u) = \Phi(t, \epsilon(u)), \quad \epsilon(u) = \rho \sum_{k=0}^{d^2} u_k B_k, \quad (107)$$

where $B_0 = I_d$ and $\{B_k\}_{k=1}^{d^2}$ is the collection of rank-one positive semidefinite matrices described in Definition 6. By Lemma 18 it follows that $\|\epsilon(u)\|_\infty \leq \rho(d+1)$ uniformly for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, $R(u) \preceq \rho(d+1)I_d + 2\|S\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]$.

By Lemma 17,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O}_u - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_u | \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2] \leq 2\sqrt{d} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4]} \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j | \mathcal{G}_u))^2]} \quad (108)$$

To deal with the first term, we use the identity

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(X_i, X_j | \mathcal{G}_u))^2] = 2\langle I_{d^2}, \nabla^2 D(R(u)) \rangle, \quad (109)$$

which follows from the expression for the Hessian of the relative entropy (Lemma 4). We are interested in an upper bound on the integral of this expression with respect to u_0 . Working backwards, we can write

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle I_d, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}] \rangle \geq \langle I_d, \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle \Big|_{u_0=1} - \langle I_d, \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle \Big|_{u_0=0} \quad (110)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_0} \langle I_d, \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle du_0 \quad (111)$$

$$\geq \rho \int_0^1 \langle I_{d^2}, \nabla^2 2D(R(u)) \rangle du_0 \quad (112)$$

where the last step follows from the decomposition $R(u) = u_0 \rho I_d + (R(u) - u_0 \rho I_d)$ and the fact that $u_0 \mapsto (R(u) - u_0 \rho I_d)$ is order-increasing. Combining the above displays leads to

$$\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{O}_u - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_u | \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2] du_0 \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^4] \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2]}{\rho}} \quad (113)$$

where we used Jensen's inequality to move the integral inside the square root.

We now consider the variation with respect to the conditional expectation of the overlap. Lemma 19 gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_u | \mathcal{G}_u] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_u]\|_2^2] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d^2} \text{Var}(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k | \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2). \quad (114)$$

To bound the summands on the right-hand side we will use the variance inequality in Lemma 23. To apply this result, let $F_{u,\delta}^k$ and $\mathcal{G}_{u,\delta}^k$ denote the free energy and the sigma-field associated with the observation model with matrix $R(u) + \delta B_k$. Then the variance inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2) \\ & \leq \frac{4}{\delta^2} \text{Var}(F_{u,\delta}^k - F_u) + 4\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2] (\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_{u,\delta}^k]\|_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2]). \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

To further simplify this expression, we use the bound $\text{Var}(A + B) \leq 2\text{Var}(A) + 2\text{Var}(B)$ to write

$$\text{Var}(F_{u,\delta}^k - F_u) \leq 2\text{Var}(F_{u,\delta}^k) + 2\text{Var}(F_u) \leq 4\nu(\rho). \quad (116)$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2] \leq \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_\infty$ because $\|a\|_2 \leq 1$, and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_{u,\delta}^k]\|_2^2] - \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2] = \langle B_k, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_u] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{O}_{u,\delta}^k] \rangle \quad (117)$$

$$= 2\langle B_k, \nabla D(R(u) + \delta B_k) - \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle. \quad (118)$$

Hence,

$$\text{Var}(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2) \leq \frac{16\nu(\rho)}{\delta^2} + 4\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_\infty] \langle B_k, \nabla D(R(u) + \delta B_k) - \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle. \quad (119)$$

Similar to before, we are interested in an upper bound on the integral of this expression with respect to u_k . Working backwards, we have

$$\frac{\delta}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_\infty \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \langle B_k, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}] \rangle \quad (120)$$

$$\geq D(R(u) + \delta B_k) \Big|_{u_k=1} - D(R(u)) \Big|_{u_k=1} \quad (121)$$

$$\geq D(R(u) + \delta B_k) \Big|_{u_k=1} - D(R(u)) \Big|_{u_k=1} - D(R(u) + \delta B_k) \Big|_{u_k=0} + D(R(u)) \Big|_{u_k=0} \quad (122)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} (D(R(u) + \delta B_k) - D(R(u))) du_k \quad (123)$$

$$= \int_0^\delta \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \langle B_k, \nabla D(R(u) + vB_k) \rangle du_k dv \quad (124)$$

$$\geq \rho \int_0^\delta \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \langle B_k, \nabla D(R(u) + vB_k) \rangle du_k dv \quad (125)$$

$$= \rho \int_0^1 \langle B_k, \nabla D(R(u) + \delta B_k) - \nabla D(R(u)) \rangle du_k. \quad (126)$$

Here, the crucial step is the last inequality which follows because $R(u) - \rho u_k B_k$ is order-increasing. Combining the expressions above leads to

$$\int_0^1 \text{Var}(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}a_k \mid \mathcal{G}_u]\|_2^2) du_k \leq \frac{16\nu(\rho)}{\delta^2} + \frac{2\delta \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\|_\infty^2}{\rho}. \quad (127)$$

Combining (113) and (127) with the decomposition in (90) gives the stated upper bound.

A Comparison lemma for differential equations

There exists a large literature on differential inequalities; see e.g., [57, Chapter III]. The next result is related to a result by Lasota et al. [58, Lemma 4]. A self-contained proof is provided for completeness.

Lemma 20 (Comparison Lemma). *Let $\phi(t)$ and $\psi(t)$ be \mathbb{S}^d -valued functions that are differentiable on $(0, 1)$ with*

$$\phi'(t) \preceq F(t, \phi(t)), \quad \phi(0) \preceq u \quad (128)$$

$$\psi'(t) \succeq G(t, \psi(t)), \quad \psi(0) \succeq v, \quad (129)$$

where $u, v \in \mathbb{S}^d$ satisfy $u \preceq v$ and $F, G : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^d$ satisfy $F(t, \phi) \preceq G(t, \psi)$ whenever $\phi \preceq \psi$. Furthermore, suppose that $|G(t, \phi) - G(t, \psi)| \leq L(t)\|\phi - \psi\|$ where $L(t)$ is integrable on $[0, 1]$. Then,

$$\phi(t) - u \preceq \psi(t) - v \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \quad (130)$$

Proof. The desired result can be stated equivalently as $h(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ where $h(t) = \lambda_{\max}(\phi(t) - u - \psi(t) + v)$. Using the variational representation of the maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}(M) = \sup_{\|u\| \leq 1} u^\top M u$ and then applying the envelope theorem [59, Theorem 2], it follows that $h(t)$ is absolutely continuous with $h(b) = h(a) + \int_a^b \lambda_{\max}(\phi'(t) - \psi'(t)) dt$. The integrand can be bounded from above using

$$\lambda_{\max}(\phi'(t) - \psi'(t)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(F(t, \phi(t)) - G(t, \psi(t))) \quad (131)$$

$$\leq \lambda_{\max}(G(s, \psi(t) + h(t)I_d) - G(t, \psi(t))) \quad (132)$$

$$\leq L(t)|h(t)|, \quad (133)$$

where the first inequality follows from the assumptions on $\phi(t), \psi(t)$ and the remaining steps follow from the assumptions on F, G and the basic inequality $\phi(t) \preceq \psi(t) + h(t)I_d$. Thus, we have shown that

$$h(b) \leq h(a) + \int_a^b L(t)|h(t)| dt. \quad (134)$$

Now, suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists $b \in (0, 1]$ such that $h(b) > 0$. By the continuity of h and the fact that $h(0) \leq 0$, there exists $a \in [0, b)$ such that $h(a) = 0$ and $h(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [a, b]$. Applied to this interval, the upper bound described above implies that $h(b) \leq \int_a^b L(t)h(t) dt$. By Grönwall's inequality [57, Chapter III, Theorem 1.1] it follows that $h(b) \leq 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

B Variance inequality from pointwise I-MMSE

This section considers a continuous time representation of the free energy. This approach is inspired by the pointwise I-MMSE relations in [39, 40]. Let \mathbf{X} be an $n \times 1$ vector and define the observation process

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = t\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{W}_t, \quad (135)$$

where $(\mathbf{W}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is \mathbb{R}^n -valued standard Brownian motion that is independent of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) . We use \mathcal{G}_t to denote the filtration generated by the observations $(\mathbf{Y}_s, \mathbf{Z})_{0 \leq s \leq t}$.

Using this notation, the conditional expectation of a function of \mathbf{X} can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}) | \mathcal{G}_t] = \frac{\int f(\mathbf{x}) \exp\{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}_t \rangle - \frac{t}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|^2\} dP_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{Z})}{\int \exp\{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}_t \rangle - \frac{t}{2}\|\mathbf{x}\|^2\} dP_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{Z})}. \quad (136)$$

The innovations process $(\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t := \mathbf{Y}_t - \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s] ds. \quad (137)$$

An important property of the innovations process is that it is a standard Brownian motion under $P_{\mathbf{Y}_t|\mathbf{Z}}$.

We study two different processes that are adapted to \mathcal{G}_t . The first is the free energy:

$$F_t := \log \frac{dP_{\mathbf{Y}_t|\mathbf{Z}}}{dP_{\mathbf{W}_t}} = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp \left\{ \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}_t \rangle - \frac{t}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right\} dP_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{Z}), \quad (138)$$

and the second is the conditional overlap:

$$\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t := \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_t]\|_2^2. \quad (139)$$

The means of these processes satisfy $\mathbb{E}[F_t] = D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] = \frac{d}{dt} 2D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ where $D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ is the relative entropy function. As a consequence of Girsinov's theorem, it can be shown that [40, Equation (116)]

$$F_t = \int_0^t \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s], d\mathbf{Y}_s \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \hat{\mathbf{O}}_s ds. \quad (140)$$

Writing this expression in terms of the innovations process yields

$$F_t = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \hat{\mathbf{O}}_s ds + \int_0^t \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s], d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s \rangle. \quad (141)$$

The second term is a zero-mean martingale and so taking the expectation of both sides recovers the I-MMSE relationship for the relative entropy and the overlap.

Next, we consider a further decomposition of the conditional overlap. We use the following result, which can be viewed as special case of the Kushner–Stratonovich equation.

Lemma 21. *For any function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\mathbb{E}[\|f(\mathbf{X})\|^2] < \infty$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}) | \mathcal{G}_t] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{Z}] + \int_0^t \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s) d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s. \quad (142)$$

Proof. For simplicity we derive this result in the setting where there is no side information \mathbf{Z} . The conditional expectation can be expressed as $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}) | \mathcal{G}_t] = g_t(\mathbf{Y}_t)$ where

$$g_t(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\int f(\mathbf{x}) \exp \left\{ \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \rangle - \frac{t}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right\} dP_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})}{\int \exp \left\{ \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle - \frac{t}{2} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \right\} dP_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})}. \quad (143)$$

By Itô's formula [60, Theorem 8.3],

$$g_t(\mathbf{Y}_t) = g_0(0) + \int_0^t \dot{g}_t(\mathbf{Y}_t) ds + \int_0^t \sum_i g_t^i(\mathbf{Y}_s) dY_{s,i} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_i g_t^{ii}(\mathbf{Y}_s) ds, \quad (144)$$

where $\dot{g}_t(\mathbf{y})$ denotes the time derivative, and $g_t^i(\mathbf{y})$ and $g_t^{ii}(\mathbf{y})$ denote the first and second partial derivatives with respect to the i -th entry. Some straightforward but tedious calculations show that

$$\dot{g}_t(\mathbf{Y}_t) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), \|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2 | \mathbf{Y}_t) \quad (145)$$

$$g_t^i(\mathbf{Y}_t) = \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t) \quad (146)$$

$$g_t^{ii}(\mathbf{Y}_t) = \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), X_i^2 | \mathbf{Y}_t) + 2 \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t) \mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t], \quad (147)$$

and plugging these expression back into Itô's formula, gives

$$g_t(\mathbf{Y}_t) = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X})] + \int_0^t \sum_i \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t) dY_{s,i} - \int_0^t \sum_i \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}), X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t) \mathbb{E}[X_i | \mathbf{Y}_t] ds. \quad (148)$$

Writing this expressions in terms of the innovations process gives the desired result. \square

Lemma 22. *The conditional overlap can be expressed as*

$$\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t = \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}]\|_2^2 + \int_0^t \|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s)\|_2^2 ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s], d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s \rangle. \quad (149)$$

Proof. By Lemma 21, the conditional mean satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_t] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}] + \int_0^t \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_s) d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s$. Applying Itô's formula with the mapping $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$ gives the stated result. \square

Lemma 22 can be viewed as a second-order pointwise I-MMSE relation providing a link between the first and second derivative of the free energy. Indeed, the second term in (149) is a zero-mean martingale and so taking the expectation of both sides recovers the identity $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} D_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}}(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_t)\|_2^2]$.

Using these pointwise decompositions of the free energy and conditional overlap we can derive an inequality linking the variance of the conditional overlap to the variance of the free energy.

Lemma 23 (Variance inequality). *For all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) \leq \frac{4}{\delta^2} \text{Var}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t) + 2\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \left(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_{t+\delta}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \right). \quad (150)$$

Proof. We begin with the decomposition

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) = \frac{2}{\delta} \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, F_{t+\delta} - F_t\right) - \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \frac{2}{\delta}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t) - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t\right). \quad (151)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the first covariance term satisfies

$$\text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, F_{t+\delta} - F_t\right) \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) \text{Var}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t)}. \quad (152)$$

To bound the second term, we use (141) to write

$$\frac{2}{\delta}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t) - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} (\hat{\mathbf{O}}_s - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) ds + \frac{2}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} \langle \hat{\mathbf{X}}_s, d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s \rangle. \quad (153)$$

By the martingale property, the second term on the right-hand side is uncorrelated with $\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t$ and thus

$$\text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \frac{2}{\delta}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t) - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t\right) = \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} (\hat{\mathbf{O}}_s - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) ds\right) = \frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{O}}_s - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t\right) ds, \quad (154)$$

where the second step is justified by Fubini's theorem. Next, the decomposition in Lemma 22 leads to

$$\hat{\mathbf{O}}_s - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t = \int_t^s \|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2 du + 2 \int_t^s \langle \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u], d\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_u \rangle. \quad (155)$$

Similar to before, the second term is a zero-mean martingale that is uncorrelated with $\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t$, and thus

$$\text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \hat{\mathbf{O}}_s - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t\right) = \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \int_t^s \|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2 du\right) = \int_t^s \text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2\right) du. \quad (156)$$

Now, the crux of the argument is that because both $\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t$ and $\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2$ are non-negative, the covariance satisfies

$$\text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2\right) \geq -\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} | \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2]. \quad (157)$$

Combining the above displays and recognizing that $\mathbb{E}[\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2] = \frac{d}{du}\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_u]$ leads to

$$\text{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t, \frac{2}{\delta}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t) - \hat{\mathbf{O}}_t\right) \geq -\frac{1}{\delta} \int_t^{t+\delta} \int_t^s \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2] du ds \quad (158)$$

$$\geq -\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \int_t^{t+\delta} \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathcal{G}_u)\|_2^2] du \quad (159)$$

$$= -\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \left(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_{t+\delta}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \right). \quad (160)$$

In view of (151), (152), and (160) we have shown that

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t) \text{Var}(F_{t+\delta} - F_t)} + \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \left(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_{t+\delta}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{O}}_t] \right). \quad (161)$$

The final expression follows from the fact that for nonnegative numbers x, a, b , the inequality $x \leq \sqrt{bx} + a$ implies $x \leq b + 2a$. \square

C Gradients of convex functions

Lemma 24. *Let f_n be a sequence of convex functions defined on \mathbb{S}_+^d that converges pointwise to a limit f . Then, f is convex and for all $x \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$ and $y \in \mathbb{S}^d$ such that $x + ty \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$ for small enough $t > 0$, it follows that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{u \in \partial f_n(x)} \langle u, y \rangle \leq \max_{u \in \partial f(x)} \langle u, y \rangle. \quad (162)$$

Proof. The directional derivative of a convex function satisfies $f'(x; y) = \inf_{t>0} t^{-1}(f(x + ty) - f(x))$ [56, Proposition 17.2]. For each $t > 0$, pointwise convergence implies that $\frac{1}{t}(f_n(x + ty) - f_n(x)) \rightarrow \frac{1}{t}(f(x + ty) - f(x))$ and taking the infimum over both sides yields $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x; y) \leq f'(x; y)$. To obtain the desired expression we apply the max formula [56, Theorem 17.18], which states that $f'(x; y) = \max_{u \in \partial f(x)} \langle u, y \rangle$. \square

D Properties of the approximation formula

Lemma 25. *The approximation formula $\hat{D}(R, S)$ given in (32) is convex and order-preserving on $\mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^{d^2}$. Furthermore, the supremum over Q is attained on the compact convex set $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0 := \{Q \in \mathbb{S}_+^d : Q \preceq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}]\}$, and thus*

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R, Q \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(Q) \right\}. \quad (163)$$

Proof. The approximation formula is convex because it is the supremum over a family of convex functions [56, Proposition 9.3]. Similarly, it is order-preserving because it is the supremum over a family of order-preserving functions. Next, the mapping $Q \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - D_0^*(Q)$ is upper semicontinuous and $\text{dom } D_0^* \cap \mathbb{S}_+^d$ is contained in the compact set $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$. Therefore, by the extreme value theorem [56, Theorem 1.29], the supremum is bounded and attained on $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$. \square

D.1 Alternative characterizations

The approximation formula can be expressed a number of different ways. For example, starting with (163) and recalling the definition of the convex conjugate leads to

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \inf_{\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ D_0(\tilde{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle R - \tilde{R}, Q \rangle \right\} \quad (164)$$

$$= \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \inf_{\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ D_0(R + \tilde{R}) + \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{R}, Q \rangle \right\}, \quad (165)$$

where the second line follows from the change of variables $\tilde{R} \mapsto R + \tilde{R}$.

The next result shows that $\langle S, Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rangle$ can be represented as a bilinear function. This representation is used to specify the interpolation path in the proof of Theorem 10.

Lemma 26. *For each $S \in \mathbb{S}^d$ there exists a unique linear operator $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^d$ such that*

$$\langle S, A \otimes B \rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \langle A, \mathcal{T}^*(B) \rangle, \quad (166)$$

for all $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ where \mathcal{T}^* is the adjoint operator. These operators can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k V_k M V_k^\top, \quad \mathcal{T}^*(M) = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k V_k^\top M V_k, \quad (167)$$

for any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times d_1}$ such that $S = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k \text{vec}(V_k) \text{vec}(V_k)^\top$.

Proof. By construction, $\langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k \langle V_k A V_k^\top, B \rangle$. Using vectorization, each summand can be expressed as $\langle V_k A V_k^\top, B \rangle = \langle V_k, B V_k A^\top \rangle = \langle \text{vec}(V_k), (A \otimes B) \text{vec}(V_k) \rangle = \langle \text{vec}(V_k) \text{vec}(V_k)^\top, A \otimes B \rangle$. Plugging this expression back into the summation verifies that $\langle \mathcal{T}(A), B \rangle = \langle S, A \otimes B \rangle$. The proof for \mathcal{T}^* follows using the same argument. \square

Example 5 (Multiview spiked-matrix model). The multiview spiked matrix model (5) can be represented using (6) with $S = \sum_{l=1}^L \text{vec}(B_l) \text{vec}(B_l)^\top$. In this case,

$$\mathcal{T}(M) = \sum_{l=1}^L R_l M R_l^\top, \quad \mathcal{T}^*(M) = \sum_{l=1}^L B_l^\top M B_l. \quad (168)$$

If each R is symmetric then \mathcal{T} is self-adjoint. In the case of the spiked Wigner model, $L = 1$, $B_1 = \sqrt{\lambda/n} I_d$ and so $\mathcal{T}(M) = (\lambda/n)M$.

Example 6 (Spiked Wishart model). Suppose that $d_1 = d_2 = d$. The asymmetric spiked matrix model (3) can be represented using (6) with a $2n \times 2d$ signal matrix $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_1 \otimes \mathbf{X}_2$ and $S = \text{vec}(B) \text{vec}(B)^\top$ where

$$B = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{n}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_d \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (169)$$

For each $M \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{T} \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{n} \begin{pmatrix} M_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{T}^* \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{n} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_{11} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (170)$$

Starting with (165) and writing the term $\langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle$ in terms of the linear operator \mathcal{T} leads to

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \inf_{\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ D_0(R + \tilde{R}) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{R} - \mathcal{T}(Q), Q \rangle \right\} \quad (171)$$

$$= \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \inf_{\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{S}^d} \left\{ D_0(R + \tilde{R} + \mathcal{T}(Q)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{R}, Q \rangle \right\} \quad (172)$$

where the last step follows from the change of variables $\tilde{R} \mapsto \tilde{R} + \mathcal{T}(Q)$. The next result shows that the infimum over \tilde{R} can be restricted to the compact set given by the image of $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$ under \mathcal{T}^* .

Lemma 27. *The approximation formula $\hat{D}(R, S)$ given in (32) satisfies*

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \min_{\tilde{Q} \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ D(R + \mathcal{T}(Q) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q})) - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q \otimes \tilde{Q} \rangle \right\} \quad (173)$$

where \mathcal{T} is the linear operator described in Lemma 26.

Proof. We begin with a variational representation of the inner product. For each $Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$, we can write

$$\max_{U_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \langle \mathcal{T}(U_1 - Q), Q - U_2 \rangle = 0. \quad (174)$$

Adding $\langle \mathcal{T}(Q), Q \rangle$ to both sides of this equality leads to

$$\langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}(Q), Q \rangle \quad (175)$$

$$= \max_{U_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \{ \langle \mathcal{T}(U_1), Q \rangle - \langle \mathcal{T}(U_1 - Q), U_2 \rangle \} \quad (176)$$

$$= \max_{U_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \{ \langle \mathcal{T}(U_1) + \mathcal{T}^*(U_2), Q \rangle - \langle S, U_1 \otimes U_2 \rangle \}. \quad (177)$$

Plugging this expression into (163) gives

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q, U_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R + \mathcal{T}(U_1) + \mathcal{T}^*(U_2), Q \rangle - D_0^*(Q) - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, U_1 \otimes U_2 \rangle \right\}. \quad (178)$$

The expression in the brackets is concave in Q and linear (and hence convex) in U_2 . Therefore, we can apply the minimax theorem (e.g., [61, Corollary 37.3.1]) to swap the order of the supremum and the infimum over these terms, and this leads to

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{U_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R + \mathcal{T}(U_1) + \mathcal{T}^*(U_2), Q \rangle - D_0^*(Q) - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, U_1 \otimes U_2 \rangle \right\} \quad (179)$$

$$= \max_{U_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \min_{U_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ D_0(R + \mathcal{T}(U_1) + \mathcal{T}^*(U_2)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, U_1 \otimes U_2 \rangle \right\}, \quad (180)$$

where the second step follows from the definition of the convex conjugate and the fact that $\text{dom } D_0^* \cap \mathbb{S}_+^d \subset \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$. Making the change of variables $U_1 \mapsto Q$ and $U_2 \mapsto \tilde{Q}$ gives the stated expression. \square

D.2 The role of convexity

The approximation formula can be simplified further in the special case where $M \mapsto \langle S, M^{\otimes 2} \rangle$ is convex. Necessary and sufficient conditions for convexity are given as follows:

Lemma 28. *Let $f(M) = \langle S, M^{\otimes 2} \rangle$ where $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^{d^2}$ has a decomposition of the form $S = \sum_{l=1}^L \text{vec}(B_l) \text{vec}(B_l)^\top$ with $B_l \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Then:*

(i) *f is convex on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ if and only if*

$$\sum_{l=1}^L \{ (B_l \otimes B_l) + (B_l \otimes B_l)^\top \} \succeq 0. \quad (181)$$

(ii) *f is convex on \mathbb{S}^d if and only if*

$$\sum_{l=1}^L D_n^\top \{ (B_l \otimes B_l) + (B_l \otimes B_l)^\top \} D_n \succeq 0, \quad (182)$$

where D_n is the duplication matrix, i.e., the unique $d^2 \times d(d+1)/2$ matrix such that $\text{vec}(M) = D_n \text{vech}(M)$ for all $M \in \mathbb{S}^d$ where $\text{vech}(M)$ is the $d(d+1)/2$ -dimensional vector obtained by stacking the entries on or below the diagonal in M ; see [62, Chapter 3.8].

Proof. By vectorization, we can write $f(M) = g(\text{vec}(M))$ where $g : \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $g(m) = m^\top \sum_{l=1}^L (B_l \otimes B_l)^\top m$. The function g is convex if and only if its Hessian is positive semidefinite. For the second case, we use the half vectorization operator and write $f(M) = h(\text{vech}(M))$ where $h : \mathbb{R}^{d(d+1)/2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $h(m) = m^\top D_n^\top \sum_{l=1}^L (B_l \otimes B_l)^\top D_n m$. \square

Recall that by Corollary 12, convexity on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ implies that the approximation formula is a lower bound: $D(R, S) \geq \hat{D}(R, S)$. The next result shows that convexity also allows for a variational representation involving only a single matrix variable.

Lemma 29. *If $Q \mapsto \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle$ is convex on \mathbb{S}^d , then the approximation formula $\hat{D}(R, S)$ given in (32) satisfies*

$$\hat{D}(R, S) = \max_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0} \left\{ D(R + \mathcal{T}(Q) + \mathcal{T}^*(Q)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle \right\} \quad (183)$$

where \mathcal{T} is the linear operator described in Lemma 26.

Proof. By (173) it is clear that the right-hand side of (183) is an upper bound on $\hat{D}(R, S)$. At the same time, the assumed convexity implies that for each $Q, \tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$,

$$\langle S, Q^{\otimes 2} \rangle \geq \langle S, \tilde{Q}^{\otimes 2} \rangle + \langle Q - \tilde{Q}, \mathcal{T}(\tilde{Q}) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q}) \rangle \quad (184)$$

$$= \langle Q, \mathcal{T}(\tilde{Q}) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q}) \rangle - \langle S, \tilde{Q}^{\otimes 2} \rangle. \quad (185)$$

Combining with (32) leads to

$$\hat{D}(R, S) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathbb{S}_+^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle R + \mathcal{T}(\tilde{Q}) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q}), Q \rangle - D_0^*(Q) \right\} - \langle S, \tilde{Q}^{\otimes 2} \rangle \quad (186)$$

$$= D_0(R + \mathcal{T}(\tilde{Q}) + \mathcal{T}^*(\tilde{Q})) - \langle S, \tilde{Q}^{\otimes 2} \rangle. \quad (187)$$

Taking the maximum of this lower bound with respect to \tilde{Q} in $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_0$ gives the matching lower bound. \square

References

- [1] I. M. Johnstone, “On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis,” *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 295–327, 2001.
- [2] I. M. Johnstone and A. Y. Lu, “On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 104, no. 486, pp. 682–703, 2009.
- [3] H. Zou, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, “Sparse principal component analysis,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 265–286, 2006.
- [4] T. Lesieur, C. de Bacco, J. Banks, F. Krzakala, C. Moore, and L. Zdeborová, “Phase transitions and optimal algorithms in high-dimensional gaussian mixture clustering,” in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2016, pp. 601–608.
- [5] J. Banks, C. Moore, N. Verzelen, R. Vershynin, and J. Xu, “Information-theoretic bounds and phase transitions in clustering, sparse PCA, and submatrix localization,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 4872–4894, Jul. 2018.
- [6] A. Decelle, F. Krzakala, C. Moore, and L. Zdeborová, “Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications,” *Physical Review Eq*, vol. 84, no. 6, Dec. 2011.

- [7] E. Abbe, “Community detection and stochastic block models: Recent developments,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 177, pp. 1–86, 2018.
- [8] S. B. Korada and N. Macris, “Tight bounds on the capacity of binary input random CDMA systems,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 5590–5613, Nov. 2010.
- [9] T. Lesieur, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, “Phase transitions in sparse PCA,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Hong Kong, Jun. 2015, pp. 1635–1639.
- [10] G. Reeves and H. D. Pfister, “The replica-symmetric prediction for compressed sensing with Gaussian matrices is exact,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Barcelona, Spain, Jul. 2016, pp. 665 – 669.
- [11] J. Barbier, M. Dia, N. Macris, and F. Krzakala, “The mutual information in random linear estimation,” in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, 2016.
- [12] G. Reeves and H. D. Pfister, “The replica-symmetric prediction for random linear estimation with Gaussian matrices is exact,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 2252–2283, Apr. 2019.
- [13] J. Barbier, F. Krzakala, N. Macris, L. Miolane, and L. Zdeborová, “Optimal errors and phase transitions in high-dimensional generalized linear models,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, no. 12, pp. 5451–5460, Mar. 2019.
- [14] Y. Deshpande, E. Abbe, and A. Montanari, “Asymptotic mutual information for the balanced binary stochastic block model,” *Information and Inference*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 125–170, Jun. 2017.
- [15] F. Krzakala, J. Xu, and L. Zdeborová, “Mutual information in rank-one matrix estimation,” in *Proc. IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop*, 2016.
- [16] J. Barbier, M. Dia, N. Macris, F. Krzakala, T. Lesieur, and L. Zdeborová, “Mutual information for symmetric rank-one matrix estimation: A proof of the replica formula,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, vol. 29, Barcelona, Spain, 2016, pp. 424–432.
- [17] M. Lelarge and L. Miolane, “Fundamental limits of symmetric low-rank matrix estimation,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 2018.
- [18] L. Miolane, “Fundamental limits of low-rank matrix estimation: the non-symmetric case,” 2017, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00473>.
- [19] G. Reeves, “Additivity of information in multilayer networks via additive Gaussian noise transforms,” in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, 2017, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.04580>.
- [20] A. E. Alaoui and F. Krzakala, “Estimation in the spiked Wigner model: A short proof of the replica formula,” 2018, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01593>.
- [21] J.-C. Mourrat, “Hamilton-Jacobi equations for mean-field disordered systems,” 2018, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.01432>.
- [22] —, “Hamilton-Jacobi equations for finite-rank matrix inference,” 2019, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.05294>.
- [23] G. Reeves and H. D. Pfister, “Understanding phase transitions via mutual information and mmse,” 2019, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02095>.
- [24] G. Reeves, V. Mayya, and A. Volfovsky, “The geometry of community detection via the mmse matrix,” 2019, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1907.02496.pdf>.

- [25] —, “The geometry of community detection via the mmse matrix,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Paris, France, Jul. 2019.
- [26] V. Mayya and G. Reeves, “Mutual information in community detection with covariate information and correlated networks,” in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2019, pp. 602–607.
- [27] J. Barbier and N. Macris, “0-1 phase transitions in sparse spiked matrix estimation,” 2019, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1911.05030.pdf>.
- [28] B. Aubin, B. Loureiro, A. Maillard, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, “The spiked matrix model with generative priors,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [29] J. Barbier, C. Luneau, and N. Macris, “Mutual information for low-rank even-order symmetric tensor factorization,” 2019, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.04565>.
- [30] M. Mézard and A. Montanari, *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [31] M. Talagrand, *Mean Field Models for Spin Glasses, Volume I: Basic Examples*. Springer, 2011.
- [32] —, *Mean Field Models for Spin Glasses, Volume II: Advanced Replica-Symmetry and Low Temperature*. Springer, 2011.
- [33] T. Lesieur, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, “MMSE of probabilistic low-rank matrix estimation: Universality with respect to the output channel,” in *Proc. Annual Allerton Conf. on Commun., Control, and Comp.*, 2015, pp. 680–687.
- [34] T. Lesieur, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, “Constrained low-rank matrix estimation: Phase transitions, approximate message passing and applications,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, Jul. 2017.
- [35] J. Barbier and N. Macris, “The adaptive interpolation method: a simple scheme to prove replica formulas in bayesian inference,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, Oct. 2018.
- [36] —, “The adaptive interpolation method for proving replica formulas. applications to the curie–weiss and wigner spike models,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 52, no. 29, p. 294002, jun 2019.
- [37] F. Guerra and F. Toninelli, “The thermodynamic limit in mean field spin glass models,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 230, no. 1, pp. 71–79, 2002.
- [38] F. Guerra, “Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 233, pp. 1–12, 2003.
- [39] T. Weissman, “The relationship between causal and noncausal mismatched estimation in continuous-time AWGN channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4256–4273, Sep. 2010.
- [40] K. Venkat and T. Weissman, “Pointwise relations between information and estimation in Gaussian noise,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 6264–6281, Oct. 2012.
- [41] P. Hoff, “Modeling homophily and stochastic equivalence in symmetric relational data,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 657–664, 2008.
- [42] J. Baik, G. B. Arous, and S. Péché, “Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices,” *Annals of Probability*, vol. 33, pp. 1643–1697, 2005.
- [43] A. A. Amini and M. J. Wainwright, “High-dimensional analysis of semidefinite relaxations for sparse principal components,” *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 2877–2921, 2009.

- [44] A. K. Fletcher and S. Rangan, “Iterative reconstruction of rank-one matrices in noise,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Cambridge, MA, Aug. 2012, pp. 1246–1250.
- [45] A. K. Fletcher and S. R. and, “Iterative reconstruction of rank-one matrices in noise,” *Information and Inference*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 531–562, Jan. 2018.
- [46] Y. Deshpande and A. Montanari, “Information-theoretically optimal sparse PCA,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Honolulu, HI, 2014, pp. 2197–2201.
- [47] —, “Sparse PCA via covariance thresholding,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014, pp. 334–432.
- [48] A. Perry, A. S. Wein, A. S. Bandeira, and A. Moitra, “Optimality and sub-optimality of PCA I: Spiked random matrix models,” *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 2416–2451, 2018.
- [49] J. Barbier and G. Reeves, “Information-theoretic limits of a multiview low-rank symmetric spiked matrix model,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, 2020, [Online]. Available <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.08017>.
- [50] G. Reeves, H. D. Pfister, and A. Dytso, “Mutual information as a function of matrix SNR for linear gaussian channels,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory*, Vail, CO, Jun. 2018.
- [51] O. Rioul, “Information theoretic proofs of entropy power inequalities,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 33–55, Jan. 2011.
- [52] D. Guo, S. Shamai, and S. Verdú, “Mutual information and minimum mean-square error in Gaussian channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1261–1282, Apr. 2005.
- [53] M. Lamarca, “Linear precoding for mutual information maximization in MIMO systems,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Wireless Communication Systems*, Tuscany, Italy, Sep. 2009.
- [54] M. Payaró and D. Palomar, “Hessian and concavity of mutual information, differential entropy, and entropy power in linear vector Gaussian channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 3613–3628, 2009.
- [55] D. Guo, Y. Wu, S. Shamai, and S. Verdú, “Estimation in Gaussian noise: Properties of the minimum mean-square error,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 2371–2385, Apr. 2011.
- [56] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2017.
- [57] P. Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, 2nd ed. SIAM, 2002.
- [58] A. Lasota, A. Strauss, and W. Walter, “Infinite systems of differential inequalities defined recursively,” *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 93–107, 1970.
- [59] P. Milgrom and I. Segal, “Envelope theorems for arbitrary choice sets,” *Econometrica*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 583–601, Mar. 2002.
- [60] J. M. Steele, *Stochastic Calculus and Financial Applications*. Springer, 2001.
- [61] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [62] J. R. Magnus and H. Neudecker, *Matrix Differential Calculus with Applications in Statistics and Econometrics*, 3rd ed. Wiley, 2007.