

# High-dimensional MANOVA via Bootstrapping and its Application to Functional and Sparse Count Data

Zhenhua Lin\*

Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, National University of Singapore

Miles E. Lopes

Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis

Hans-Georg Müller†

Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis

## Abstract

We propose a new approach to the problem of high-dimensional multivariate ANOVA via bootstrapping max statistics that involve the differences of sample mean vectors, through constructing simultaneous confidence intervals for the differences of population mean vectors. The proposed method is suited to simultaneously test the equality of several pairs of mean vectors of potentially more than two populations. By exploiting the variance decay property that is a natural feature in relevant applications, we are able to provide dimension-free and nearly-parametric convergence rates for Gaussian approximation, bootstrap approximation, and the size of the test. We demonstrate the proposed approach with ANOVA problems for functional data and sparse count data. The proposed methodology is shown to work well in simulations and several real data applications.

*Keywords:* Functional data analysis, Hypothesis testing, Gaussian approximation, Mean function, Physical activity, Poisson data, Simultaneous confidence intervals.

---

\*Research partially supported by NUS start-up grant R-155-001-217-133.

†Research supported by NSF grant DMS-2014626.

# 1 Introduction

The problem of detecting significant differences among the means of multivariate populations, which is the classical MANOVA problem, is of central importance in a myriad of statistical applications. However, the classical MANOVA approaches are only intended to handle low-dimensional settings where the number of covariates is much smaller than the sample size, which is a crucial limitation for modern high-dimensional data analysis. Due to the demand for methodology that provides valid inference for high-dimensional data, the challenge of finding suitable new MANOVA methods has developed into a major line of research. For example, the special case of high-dimensional two-sample testing has been investigated by [Bai and Saranadasa \(1996\)](#); [Chen and Qin \(2010\)](#); [Lopes et al. \(2011\)](#); [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#); [Xu et al. \(2016\)](#); [Zhang and Pan \(2016\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#) under the condition that populations share a common covariance matrix, while procedures designed by [Feng and Sun \(2015\)](#); [Feng et al. \(2015\)](#); [Gregory et al. \(2015\)](#); [Städler and Mukherjee \(2016\)](#); [Chang et al. \(2017\)](#); [Xue and Yao \(2020\)](#) do not require such a common covariance assumption. For the more general multiple-sample problem, methods and theory were studied by [Fujikoshi et al. \(2004\)](#); [Srivastava and Fujikoshi \(2006\)](#); [Schott \(2007\)](#); [Yamada and Srivastava \(2012\)](#); [Srivastava and Kubokawa \(2013\)](#); [Cai and Xia \(2014\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#); [Bai et al. \(2018\)](#); [Li et al. \(2018\)](#) when the populations share common covariance structure, while [Zhang and Xu \(2009\)](#); [Yamada and Himeno \(2015\)](#); [Li et al. \(2017\)](#); [Hu et al. \(2017\)](#); [Zhou et al. \(2017\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2018\)](#) eliminated the requirement of common covariance. Among these, [Chang et al. \(2017\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2018\)](#); [Xue and Yao \(2020\)](#) adopt a bootstrap approach following [Chernozhukov et al. \(2013, 2017\)](#).

A relevant observation in this context is that the variances of variables often exhibit a certain decay pattern. As an example, consider a multinomial model of  $p$  categories. Without loss of generality, assume that the probability  $\pi_j$  of the  $j$ th category is nonincreasing.

As the probabilities  $\pi_j$  are summed to one, the variance  $\sigma_j^2 = \pi_j(1 - \pi_j)$  of the  $j$ th category must decay at the rate at least  $j^{-1}$ . Additional examples that were already mentioned in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) include data for which principal component analysis is applicable and generalized Fourier coefficients of functional data. When there is such variance decay, [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) showed that the convergence rates of the Gaussian approximation and bootstrap approximation to the maximum statistic  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sqrt{n}\{\bar{X} - \mu\}(j)/\sigma_j^\tau$  are nearly parametric and free of the dimension. Here  $v(j)$  denotes the  $j$ -th component of a vector  $v$ ,  $\tau$  is a constant such that  $\tau \in [0, 1)$ , and  $\bar{X}$  is the sample mean of  $n$  independent and identically distributed random vectors whose mean is  $\mu$  and for which the variance of the  $j$ -th component is  $\sigma_j$ . Remarkably, this rate remains valid even when the decay is very weak, i.e.,  $\sigma_j \asymp j^{-\alpha}$  for an arbitrarily small  $\alpha > 0$ . The parameter  $\tau$ , strictly less than 1, is introduced to offset the explosion of  $1/\sigma_j$  caused by the decay. In this paper, we specifically harness such decay patterns to develop promising bootstrap based inference for the high-dimensional MANOVA problem.

We consider a general setting involving  $K \geq 2$  populations with mean vectors  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . For any collection of ordered pairs  $\mathcal{P}$  taken from the set  $\{(k, l) : 1 \leq k < l \leq K\}$ , the hypothesis testing problem of interest is

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \mu_k = \mu_l \text{ for all } (k, l) \in \mathcal{P} \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathbf{H}_a : \mu_k \neq \mu_l \text{ for some } (k, l) \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (1)$$

Note that this includes a very general class of null hypotheses of possible interest. The proposed strategy is to construct simultaneous confidence intervals for the differences  $\mu_k - \mu_l$  for all pairs in  $\mathcal{P}$  via bootstrapping a maximum-type statistic related to  $\mu_k - \mu_l$  across all coordinates and all pairs. In addition, we adopt the idea of partial standardization developed in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) to take advantage of the variance decay. This differs from the existing bootstrap-based methods proposed in [Chang et al. \(2017\)](#); [Xue and Yao \(2020\)](#);

Zhang et al. (2018) that do not exploit the decay. Furthermore, in the first two papers the authors consider only one- or two-sample problems, and in the last paper only the standard global null hypothesis  $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_K$ .

The proposed method has the following promising features.

- There is flexibility in the null hypothesis. In addition to the basic global null hypothesis  $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_K$ , which corresponds to choosing  $\mathcal{P} = \{(k, l) : 1 \leq k < l \leq K\}$ , we can also test more specific hypotheses such as  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  and  $\mu_3 = \mu_4$ , which corresponds to  $\mathcal{P} = \{(1, 2), (3, 4)\}$ . In general, whenever  $\mathcal{P}$  contains more than one pair, traditional methods often require that two or more separate tests are performed. This requires extra adjustments for multiple comparisons, which often have a negative impact on power. Indeed, the effect of multiplicity can be severe, because the number of pairs  $|\mathcal{P}|$  may grow quadratically as a function of  $K$ , as in the case of the global null hypothesis with  $|\mathcal{P}| = K(K - 1)/2$ .
- The proposed method performs the test via constructing simultaneous confidence intervals (SCI) for the differences  $\mu_k - \mu_l$  indexed by  $(k, l) \in \mathcal{P}$ . Such SCIs are also valuable in their own right (in addition to their utility for hypothesis testing), as they provide quantitative information about the separation of the mean vectors  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K$  that is often of interest in applications.
- When the null hypothesis is rejected, the proposed approach is able to immediately identify pairs of populations for which coordinates have significantly different means without performing additional tests, while additional testing is often necessary when one adopts and extends traditional MANOVA approaches.
- Like Chang et al. (2017); Zhang et al. (2018); Xue and Yao (2020), who essentially propose two-sample or multiple-sample comparisons based on bootstrapping, we do

not require that the ratio of the sample sizes of any pair of populations converges to a specific limit.

- In contrast to the testing procedures of [Chang et al. \(2017\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2018\)](#) (where the convergence rates for the size of the test are not established), and the method of [Xue and Yao \(2020\)](#) (for which the convergence rate is at most  $\sqrt{\log p}/n^{1/6}$ ), the proposed approach is shown to enjoy a near-parametric rate of convergence. Furthermore, this near-parametric rate is free of the dimension  $p$  and holds under mild assumptions. These improvements are achieved by exploiting the variance decay.

To demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed approach, we apply our procedure to perform ANOVA for functional data and sparse count data. Functional data are commonly encountered in practical data analysis, see the monographs [Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#); [Ferraty and Vieu \(2006\)](#); [Horváth and Kokoszka \(2012\)](#); [Zhang \(2013\)](#); [Hsing and Eubank \(2015\)](#); [Kokoszka and Reimherr \(2017\)](#) and review papers [Wang et al. \(2016\)](#); [Aneiros et al. \(2019\)](#). While sparse count data are vectors and thus directly amenable to the application of general high-dimensional tests, functional data are random functions in  $L^2$  that need to be suitably quantified to apply high-dimensional tests, typically by vectorizing the random functions. Previously proposed such quantifications include pointwise  $F$ -tests ([Ramsay and Silverman, 2005](#)) (p.227), an integrated  $F$ -test and its variants ([Shen and Faraway, 2004](#); [Zhang, 2011, 2013](#)), globalization of pointwise  $F$ -tests ([Zhang and Liang, 2014](#)), the HANOVA method([Fan and Lin, 1998](#)),  $L^2$  norm based methods ([Faraway, 1997](#); [Zhang and Chen, 2007](#)), and an empirical likelihood ratio approach ([Chang and McKeague, 2020](#)), in addition to resampling methods ([Zhang, 2013](#); [Papadoditis and Sapatinas, 2016](#)).

While the proposed approach makes use of the techniques and some results developed in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#), adapting these results to the multiple-sample setting is a major challenge. The key obstacle is that, in contrast to the situation studied in [Lopes et al.](#)

(2020), the max statistic (2) in the MANOVA setting is not the maximum of an average of independent vectors and therefore the results of Bentkus (2003, 2005) cannot be applied. These results formed the backbone of the derivations in Lopes et al. (2020) but require independence. To overcome this difficulty requires a delicate transformation of the statistic to represent it as the maximum of the average of some independent random vectors that are further transformations of the data; see Proposition ?? in the Supplement for details. In addition, unlike Lopes et al. (2020), the theory developed here, and specifically Theorem 3.4, accommodates the additional difficulty that the variances  $\sigma_j^2$  are often unknown and must be estimated from data. As these quantities appear as a denominator, this is another challenge that we overcome by establishing a nontrivial bound on the estimation error of  $\hat{\sigma}_j$  uniformly over all coordinates and groups, under a continuity assumption on the distribution of the data; see Lemma ?? in the Supplement for details.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide details about the proposed test procedure. In Section 3 we establish a general theory of bootstrapping max statistics under a multiple-sample setting and then apply it to establish consistency and to derive the convergence rate of the empirical size of the proposed test. Our signature application to functional ANOVA is described in Section 4 and a second application to sparse count data in Section 5.

## 2 High-dimensional multiple-sample test

Consider  $K$  independent groups, where we assume that for the  $k$ -th group one has  $n_k$  i.i.d.  $p$ -dimensional observations  $X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,n_k}$  with mean  $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . Our goal is to test any of the null hypotheses in (1) based on these data.

To motivate our approach, consider a two-sample test in the classical setting that corresponds to the special case  $p = 1$  and  $K = 2$ , and thus  $k = 1$  and  $l = 2$ . The common statistic

$T = \{(\bar{X}_k - \mu_k) - (\bar{X}_l - \mu_l)\} / \sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{X}_k - \bar{X}_l)}$  asymptotically follows a standard Gaussian distribution, where  $\bar{X}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} X_{k,i}$  denotes the sample mean of the  $k$ th group for  $k = 1, 2$ . This statistic can be used to construct confidence intervals for a given level  $\varrho$  for the difference  $\mu_k - \mu_l$  that can then be used to implement the standard two-sample test at level  $\varrho$ . When  $p > 1$ , one can construct a simultaneous confidence interval for  $\mu_k - \mu_l \in \mathbb{R}^p$  via the distribution of the max statistic

$$M'(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \frac{\{\bar{X}_k(j) - \mu_k(j)\} - \{\bar{X}_l(j) - \mu_l(j)\}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{X}_k(j) - \bar{X}_l(j))}},$$

where as before  $v(j)$  denotes the  $j$ th coordinate of a vector  $v$ . For the general case when  $K \geq 2$ , it is natural to consider the max statistic  $M' = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} M'(k, l)$ . One may equivalently rewrite the statistic  $M'(k, l)$  as

$$M'(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right),$$

where  $S_k = n_k^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (X_{k,i} - \mu_k)$ ,  $S_{k,j} = S_k(j)$  denotes the  $j$ th coordinate of the vector  $S_k$ , and  $\sigma_{k,l,j}^2 = \{n_l \text{var}(X_k(j)) + n_k \text{var}(X_l(j))\} / (n_k + n_l)$ . As shown in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#), when the variances  $\sigma_{k,l,j}^2$  exhibit a decay pattern, it is beneficial to adopt partial standardization, i.e.,

$$M(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad M = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} M(k, l), \quad (2)$$

where  $\tau \in [0, 1)$  is a parameter that may be tuned to maximize power.

As  $M$  is the maximum of several random variables that are in turn coordinate-wise maxima of a random vector, it is difficult to derive its distribution. This difficulty, fortunately, can be circumvented efficiently by bootstrapping, as follows. Let  $\hat{\Sigma}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (X_{k,i} - \bar{X}_k)(X_{k,i} - \bar{X}_k)^\top$  be the sample covariance of the  $k$ th group. Define the bootstrap version of  $S_k$  by  $S_k^* \sim N(0, \hat{\Sigma}_k)$ . The bootstrapped values of  $S_k$  are then used to construct the

bootstrap counterpart of  $M(k, l)$ , given by

$$M^*(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right),$$

which then leads to the bootstrap version of  $M$ , defined by

$$M^* = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} M^*(k, l),$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2$  are diagonal elements of  $\hat{\Sigma}_{k,l} = \frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l} \hat{\Sigma}_k + \frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l} \hat{\Sigma}_l$ . Specifically, conditional on the data  $X = \{X_{k,i} : 1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq i \leq n_k\}$ , we generate  $B \geq 1$  independent samples of  $(S_1^*, \dots, S_K^*)$ , and for each such sample, we obtain an observation of  $M^*$ . The quantile function  $\hat{q}_M(\cdot)$  of the thus generated sample of  $B$  observations of  $M^*$  serves as an estimate of the quantile function  $q_M(\cdot)$  of  $M$ .

Analogously, we define the min statistic

$$L(k, l) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad L = \min_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} L(k, l),$$

as well as their bootstrap counterparts,

$$L^*(k, l) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad L^* = \min_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} L^*(k, l).$$

Similarly, the quantile function of  $L^*$  can be obtained by drawing samples from the distributions  $N(0, \hat{\Sigma}_k)$ .

Finally, the  $1 - \varrho$  two-sided simultaneous confidence intervals (SCI) for the  $j$ th coordinates of  $\mu_k - \mu_l$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $(k, l) \in \mathcal{P}$  are given by

$$\text{SCI}(k, l, j) = \left[ \bar{X}_k(j) - \bar{X}_l(j) - \frac{\hat{q}_M(1-\varrho/2) \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau}{\sqrt{n_{k,l}}}, \bar{X}_k(j) - \bar{X}_l(j) - \frac{\hat{q}_L(\varrho/2) \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau}{\sqrt{n_{k,l}}} \right], \quad (3)$$



where  $n_{k,l} := n_k n_l / (n_k + n_l)$  denotes the harmonic sample size of the  $k$ th and  $l$ th groups. Given the SCIs as constructed above, we perform the test in (1) by rejecting the null hypothesis at the significance level  $\varrho$  if  $0 \notin \text{SCI}(k, l, j)$  for some  $(k, l, j)$  for which  $(k, l) \in \mathcal{P}$ . One-sided SCIs can be constructed and one-sided hypothesis test can be conducted in a similar fashion. For the testing problem (1), it is often desirable to obtain the  $p$ -value, which corresponds to the largest value of  $\varrho$  such that all SCIs in (3) contain zero and can easily be found numerically.

In practical applications, one needs to determine a value for the parameter  $\tau$ . Although in the next section it is shown that any fixed value in  $[0, 1)$  gives rise to the same asymptotic behavior of the proposed test, a data-driven method to optimize the empirical power is desirable. We propose to select the value of  $\tau$  that yields the smallest  $p$ -value while keeping the size at the nominal level  $\varrho$ . We first observe that for a given value of  $\tau$ , the above bootstrap test provides a corresponding  $p$ -value. It remains to estimate the empirical size for a given value of  $\tau$ . To this end, we propose the following resampling approach. First, the data are centered within each group, so that the null hypothesis holds for the centered data. For each group, a new sample of the same size is generated by resampling the original dataset with replacement. Then the proposed test is applied on the new samples with the nominal significance level  $\varrho$ . This process is repeated several times, for example, 100 times, and the empirical size is estimated by the proportion of the resampled datasets that lead to rejecting the null hypothesis. To tackle the incurred additional computation, one can leverage the two levels of parallelism of the proposed algorithm, by observing that each candidate value of  $\tau$  in a grid can be examined in parallel, and for a given  $\tau$ , all the subsequent computations are parallel. Therefore, the proposed method is scalable with modern cloud or cluster computing.

### 3 Theory

#### 3.1 Bootstrapping max statistics for multiple samples

We start with some remarks on notation. The identity matrix of size  $p \times p$  is denoted by  $I_p$ . For a fixed/deterministic vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , and  $r > 0$ , we write  $\|v\|_r = (\sum_{j=1}^p |v_j|^r)^{1/r}$  and for random scalars  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  let  $\|\xi\|_r = \mathbb{E}(|\xi|^r)^{1/r}$ . The  $\psi_1$ -Orlicz norm of a random variable  $\xi$  is denoted and defined by  $\|\xi\|_{\psi_1} = \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\exp(|\xi|/t)] \leq 2\}$ . If  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  are two sequences of non-negative real numbers, then  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  represents that there is a constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $n$ , such that  $a_n \leq cb_n$  for all  $n$ . Also, the notation  $a_n \asymp b_n$  means that  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $b_n \lesssim a_n$  simultaneously. In addition,  $a_n \wedge b_n = \min\{a_n, b_n\}$  and  $a_n \vee b_n = \max\{a_n, b_n\}$ . We allow symbols such as  $c$  to denote positive absolute constants whose value may change at each occurrence.

The main results developed in the sequel are formulated in terms of a sequence of models indexed by the integer  $n := \min\{n_1, \dots, n_K\}$ . In particular, each of the  $K$  populations may depend on  $n$ , and we allow  $p = p(n)$  to grow with  $n$ .

**Assumption 1** (Data-generating model).

(i) For each  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , there exists a vector  $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and a positive semi-definite matrix  $\Sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ , such that the observations  $X_{k,1}, \dots, X_{k,n_k} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  are generated as  $X_{k,i} = \mu_k + \Sigma_k^{1/2} Z_{k,i}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n_k$ , where the random vectors  $Z_{k,1}, \dots, Z_{k,n_k} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  are i.i.d.

(ii) There is an absolute constant  $c_0 > 0$ , such that for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , the random vector  $Z_{k,1}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}Z_{k,1} = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}(Z_{k,1}Z_{k,1}^\top) = I_p$ , as well as  $\sup_{\|u\|_2=1} \|Z_{k,1}^\top u\|_{\psi_1} \leq c_0$ .

In the above assumption, the mean vectors  $\mu_k$  and covariance matrices  $\Sigma_k$  are allowed to vary with the sample size  $n_k$ . The random vectors  $Z_{1,1}, \dots, Z_{1,n_1}, \dots, Z_{K,1}, \dots, Z_{K,n_K}$  across different populations are independent, and  $Z_{1,1}, \dots, Z_{K,1}$  may have different distributions.

To state the next assumption, for  $d \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , we use  $\mathcal{J}_k(d)$  to denote a set of indices corresponding to the  $d$  largest values among  $\sigma_{k,1}, \dots, \sigma_{k,p}$ . In addition, let  $R_k(d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  denote the correlation matrix of the random variables  $\{X_{k,1}(j) : j \in \mathcal{J}_k(d)\}$ . Lastly, let  $a \in (0, 1/2)$  be a fixed constant, and define the integers  $\ell_k$  and  $m_k$  according to

$$\ell_k = \lceil (1 \vee \log^3 n_k) \wedge p \rceil,$$

$$m_k = \lceil (\ell_k \vee n_k^{\frac{1}{\log(n_k)^a}}) \wedge p \rceil.$$

In the following,  $K$  and  $p$  may depend on  $n$ , where the dependence is specified later.

**Assumption 2** (Structural assumptions).

- (i) The parameters  $\sigma_{k,1}, \dots, \sigma_{k,p}$  are positive, and there are positive constants  $\alpha$ ,  $c_1$ , and  $c_o \in (0, 1)$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ ,

$$\sigma_{k,(j)} \leq c_1 j^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for all } j \in \{m_k, \dots, p\},$$

$$\sigma_{k,(j)} \geq c_o j^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, m_k\},$$

where  $\sigma_{k,(j)}$  denotes the  $j$ th largest values of  $\sigma_{k,1}, \dots, \sigma_{k,p}$ .

- (ii) There exists a constant  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ ,

$$\max_{i \neq j} R_{k,i,j}(\ell_k) \leq 1 - \epsilon_0,$$

where  $R_{k,i,j}(\ell_k)$  denotes the  $(i, j)$  entry of the matrix  $R_k(\ell_k)$ . Also, for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , the matrix  $R_k^+(\ell_k)$  with  $(i, j)$  entry given by  $\max\{R_{k,i,j}(\ell_k), 0\}$  is positive semi-definite. Moreover, there is a constant  $C_0 > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such

that for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ ,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell_k} R_{k,i,j}^+(\ell_k) \leq C_0 \ell_k.$$

The above two assumptions are multiple-sample analogs of assumptions in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#), where examples of correlation matrices satisfying the above conditions are given. The following assumption imposes constraints on  $\tau$  in conjunction with  $n$  and on the sample sizes  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ .

**Assumption 3.**  $(1 - \tau)\sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim 1$  and  $c_2 \leq \frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l} \leq c_3$  for all  $k, l \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and for some absolute constants  $0 < c_2 \leq c_3 < 1$ , where  $n = \min\{n_1, \dots, n_K\}$ . Also,  $\max\{K, |\mathcal{P}|\} \lesssim e^{\sqrt{\log n}}$ .

In the above assumption, different choices of  $\tau$  can be made for different pairs of indices  $(k, l)$ . For simplicity, here we only consider the case that  $\tau$  is the same for all pairs. In addition,  $\tau$  is allowed to approach to 1 at a slow rate. We emphasize that, although  $n_1, \dots, n_K$  are required to be of the same order, their ratios do not have to converge to certain limits. Such convergence conditions are required by some of the test procedures surveyed in [Section 1](#) that are based on asymptotic limit distributions of test statistics rather than bootstrap. Also, it is notable that the current setting allows  $K \rightarrow \infty$  and  $|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Overall, [Assumptions 1–3](#) are quite mild and are satisfied for many relevant applications, for which we give examples in [Sections 4](#) and [5](#).

Let  $\tilde{S}_k \sim N(0, \Sigma_k)$  and define the Gaussian counterparts of the partially standardized statistics  $M(k, l)$  and  $M$ ,

$$\tilde{M}(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{\tilde{S}_{k,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{\tilde{S}_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{M} = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{M}(k, l).$$

The following two theorems, with proofs provided in the Supplement, extend the Gaussian and bootstrap approximation results in [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) to the multiple-sample setting as encountered in MANOVA, where  $d_K$  denotes the Kolmogorov distance, defined

by  $d_K(\mathcal{L}(U), \mathcal{L}(V)) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(U \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(V \leq t)|$  for generic random variables  $U$  and  $V$  with probability distributions  $\mathcal{L}(U)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(V)$ . As discussed in the introduction, this extension from the one- to the multi-sample case is nontrivial. The key theoretical results are the following Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, which provide strong theoretical justifications for the proposed bootstrap procedure.

**Theorem 3.1** (Gaussian approximation). *Fix any number  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ , and suppose that Assumptions 1–3 hold. Then*

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(M), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M})) \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}.$$

**Theorem 3.2** (Bootstrap approximation). *Fix any number  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ , and suppose that Assumptions 1–3 hold. Then, there is a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the event*

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}), \mathcal{L}(M^*|X)) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{2} + \delta}$$

*occurs with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}(M^*|X)$  represents the distribution of  $M^*$  conditional on the observed data.*

## 3.2 High-dimensional MANOVA

We first analyze the power of the test procedure in Section 2, which depends on the size of the constructed SCIs. All proofs are deferred to the Supplement.

**Theorem 3.3.** *If Assumptions 1–3 hold, then*

- (i) *for any fixed  $\varrho \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $|q_{M^*}(\varrho)| \leq c \log^{1/2} n$  with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ , where  $c$  is a constant not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , and*

(ii) for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , one has

$$\Pr \left( \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 < 2\sigma_{\max}^2 \right) \geq 1 - cn^{-1},$$

where  $\sigma_{\max} = \max\{\sigma_{k,j} : 1 \leq j \leq p, 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ .

Consequently, if  $\mu_o = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\mu_k(j) - \mu_l(j)| \gtrsim \sigma_{\max} n^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n$ , then the null hypothesis will be rejected with probability tending to one.

To analyze the size, we observe that when we construct the SCIs, we use  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}$  instead of  $\sigma_{k,l,j}$ . This requires us to quantify the distance of the distributions of  $M$  and

$$\hat{M} = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \hat{M}(k, l), \quad (4)$$

where

$$\hat{M}(k, l) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{n_l}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{k,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} - \sqrt{\frac{n_k}{n_k + n_l}} \frac{S_{l,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right). \quad (5)$$

With  $F_{k,j}$  denoting the cumulative distribution function of the standardized random variable  $\{X_{k,1}(j) - \mu_k(j)\}/\sigma_{k,j}$ , we require the following mild condition on the distribution of the standardized observations.

**Assumption 4.** *There is a constant  $\nu \in (0, \infty)$ , such that, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , for all  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $F_{k,j}(x+r) - F_{k,j}(x-r) \leq \epsilon r^\nu$  for all  $r \in [0, r_\epsilon)$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $r_\epsilon < \infty$  is dependent only on  $\epsilon$ .*

The above condition is essentially equivalent to common Hölder continuity of the distribution functions  $F_{k,j}$ , i.e., there is a common Hölder constant  $\nu$  that is fixed but could be arbitrarily small. The assumption is satisfied if each of the distributions  $F_{k,j}$  has a density function that is collectively bounded. However, the condition is much weaker than this,

as it may hold even when the distributions do not have a density function or the density function is unbounded.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Fix any number  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ , and suppose that Assumptions 1–4 hold. Then*

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}), \mathcal{L}(M)) \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}.$$

With the triangle inequality, the above theorem together with Theorem 3.1 and 3.2 implies that, with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ ,  $d_K(\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}), \mathcal{L}(M^* | X)) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ , for some constant not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . This eventually allows us to quantify the convergence rate of the size of the test, as follows. Let  $\text{SIZE}(\varrho)$  be the probability that  $\mathbf{H}_0$  is rejected at the level  $\varrho$  when it is true. The following result is a direct consequence of Theorems 3.1–3.4 and it asserts that the size of the test is asymptotically correctly controlled at the rate  $n^{-1/2+\delta}$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *Fix any number  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ , and suppose that Assumptions 1–4 hold. Then, for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , it holds that*

$$|\text{SIZE}(\varrho) - \varrho| \leq cn^{-1/2+\delta}.$$

We note that in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, Assumption 4 can be replaced with the condition  $n^{-1/2} \log^3 p \ll 1$  which then imposes an upper bound on the growth rate of  $p$  relative to  $n$ . In conjunction with the consistency of the general test as in Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.5 provides strong justification for the application of the proposed test for a large class of null hypotheses that are typically all of interest in MANOVA in addition to the main global null hypothesis that all means are equal.

## 4 Application to functional ANOVA

Since functional data are usually considered to be random elements in a space  $L^2(\mathcal{T})$ , we consider a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and second-order random elements  $Y$  with mean element  $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}\|Y\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 < \infty$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  denotes the norm of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . In our context, the random element  $Y$  represents an observed functional data atom drawn from a population of functional data. Commonly considered Hilbert spaces in the area of functional data analysis include reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and the space  $L^2(\mathcal{T})$  of squared integrable functions defined on a domain  $\mathcal{T}$ . In one-way functional ANOVA one aims to test the hypothesis

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \mu_1 = \cdots = \mu_K \quad (6)$$

given data  $Y_{k,1}, \dots, Y_{k,n_k}$  i.i.d. sampled from  $Y_k$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , where  $\mu_k \in \mathcal{H}$  is the mean element of  $Y_k$ .

Given an orthonormal basis  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ , each  $\mu_k$  may be represented in terms of this basis, i.e.,  $\mu_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} u_{k,j} \phi_j$ , where  $u_{k,j}$  are generalized Fourier coefficients. Then the null hypothesis (6) is equivalent to the statement that  $u_{k,j} = u_{l,j}$  for all  $j \geq 1$  and all  $1 \leq k < l \leq K$ . This suggests that in empirical situations we choose a large integer  $p \geq 1$  and test whether the vectors  $u_k \equiv (u_{k,1}, \dots, u_{k,p})$  are equal for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , which is precisely the hypothesis testing problem introduced in Section 2. Below we assess this method in terms of its finite sample performance by numerical simulations and compare it with three popular methods in the literature, namely, the  $L^2$  based method (L2) (Faraway, 1997; Zhang and Chen, 2007), the  $F$ -statistic based method (F) (Shen and Faraway, 2004; Zhang, 2011) and the global pointwise  $F$  test (GPF) (Zhang and Liang, 2014); these were briefly reviewed in the introduction and numerical implementations are available from Górecki and Smaga (2019), see also Górecki and Smaga (2015).



In the simulation study, we set  $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, 1])$ , and consider four families of mean functions, parameterized by  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , as follows,

$$\textbf{(M1)} \quad \mu_k(t) = 1/2 + \theta k \sum_{j=1}^{10} j^{-2} \{\sin(2j\pi t) + \cos(2j\pi t)\}/40,$$

$$\textbf{(M2)} \quad \mu_k(t) = 1 + \theta k/40,$$

$$\textbf{(M3)} \quad \mu_k(t) = \theta k \{1 + (10t - 2)(10t - 5)(10t - 8)\}/40,$$

$$\textbf{(M4)} \quad \mu_k(t) = \theta k \exp\{-(x - 1/2)^2/100\},$$

for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ . Obviously  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3$  are identical when  $\theta = 0$ , and differ from each other when  $\theta \neq 0$ . These families are shown in Figure 1. Mean function families (M1) and (M2) represent “sparse alternatives” in the frequency domain in the sense that the Fourier coefficients of the mean functions differ most in the first few leading terms under the alternative when  $\theta \neq 0$ , while the function family (M3) represents a “dense alternative” in the frequency domain. When  $\theta \neq 0$ , the families (M1)–(M3) are “dense” in the time domain. In particular, the alternatives in (M2) are uniformly dense in the time domain, in the sense that the differences of the mean functions between the groups are nonzero and uniform in  $t \in \mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$ . Thus, families (M1)–(M3) favor the integral-based methods such as the L2, F and GPF tests, as these methods integrate certain statistics over the time domain. In contrast, the alternatives in the last family (M4) are “sparse” in the time domain.

We sample functional data of the form  $\mu_k(\cdot) + W_k(\cdot)$ , for certain choices of centered random processes  $W_k(\cdot)$  in two different settings. In the first “common covariance” setting, the random processes of all groups are Gaussian with the following common Matérn covariance function

$$\mathcal{C}(s, t) = \sigma^2 \frac{25}{10} \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} (\sqrt{2\nu}|s - t|)^\nu B_\nu(\sqrt{2\nu}|s - t|), \quad (7)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the gamma function,  $B_\nu$  is the modified Bessel function of the second kind,  $\sigma$  is set to 1/4, and  $\nu$  is set to 1/2. In the second “group-specific covariance” setting, the groups




Figure 1: Mean functions  $\mu_1$  (solid),  $\mu_2$  (dashed) and  $\mu_3$  (dotted) with  $\theta = 0.5$  for mean function families (M1)-(M4), from left to right.

have different covariance functions, as follows. For the first group, the random process is the Gaussian process with the Matérn covariance function (7). For the second group, the process is the Wiener process with dispersion  $\sigma = 0.1$ , i.e., the Gaussian process with the covariance function  $\mathcal{C}(s, t) = \sigma^2 \min(s, t)$ . For the third group, we set  $W_3(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{51} \xi_j \phi_j(\cdot)/20$ , where  $\phi_1(t) \equiv 1$ ,  $\phi_{2j} = \sin(2j\pi t)$  and  $\phi_{2j+1} = \cos(2j\pi t)$ , and  $\xi_j$  follows a uniform distribution on  $[-j^{-2}\sqrt{3}, j^{-2}\sqrt{3}]$ , providing a non-Gaussian case.

We set the significance level at  $\varrho = 0.05$  and consider balanced sampling with  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 50$  and also unbalanced sampling with  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (30, 50, 70)$  and use the aforementioned basis  $\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_p(t)$  with  $p = 51$ . The parameter  $\tau$  is selected by the method described in Section 2. Each simulation setup is replicated 1000 times independently. The results for the size of the global test are summarized in Table 1. It emerges that the empirical size of all methods is fairly close to the nominal level. The performance in terms of power is depicted in Figure 2 for the scenario with common covariance structure.

We observe that when the alternatives are sparse in the frequency domain but not uniformly dense in the time domain, as for family (M1), or when the alternatives are sparse in the time domain, as for family (M4), the proposed method clearly outperforms the existing methods in terms of power by a large margin. For families (M2) and (M3), all methods have

Table 1: Empirical size of functional ANOVA

		$(n_1, n_2, n_3)$	proposed	L2	F	GPF
common	M1	50,50,50	.047	.053	.046	.049
		30,50,70	.054	.053	.049	.052
	M2	50,50,50	.052	.064	.058	.062
		30,50,70	.056	.050	.044	.050
	M3	50,50,50	.050	.052	.046	.048
		30,50,70	.055	.061	.056	.060
	M4	50,50,50	.047	.056	.055	.054
		30,50,70	.038	.044	.038	.040
group-specific	M1	50,50,50	.050	.050	.042	.050
		30,50,70	.057	.041	.039	.058
	M2	50,50,50	.043	.052	.046	.049
		30,50,70	.051	.042	.038	.047
	M3	50,50,50	.042	.048	.045	.048
		30,50,70	.052	.048	.042	.052
	M4	50,50,50	.052	.046	.042	.040
		30,50,70	.052	.041	.037	.048

nearly indistinguishable power performance. Similar observations emerge for the scenario of group-specific covariance functions with results shown in Figure 3, except that the power of GPF is slightly larger when the sampling is unbalanced and the family is (M2), where the alternatives are uniformly dense in the time domain. In conclusion, the proposed test is powerful against both dense and sparse alternatives in either time or frequency domain, and provides strong improvements over existing methods in the important case where the alternative is sparse in the time domain or in the frequency domain (but not uniformly dense in the time domain).

Now we apply the proposed method to analyze the data described in Müller et al. (1997)




Figure 2: Empirical power of the proposed functional ANOVA (solid), L2 (dashed), F (dotted) and GPF (dot-dashed) for a common covariance function. Top: from left to right the panels display the empirical power functions for families (M1), (M2), (M3) and (M4), when  $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 50$ . Bottom: from left to right the panels display the empirical power functions for families (M1), (M2), (M3) and (M4) for unbalanced designs when  $n_1 = 30, n_2 = 50$  and  $n_3 = 70$ . The power functions of L2, F and GPF are nearly indistinguishable.




Figure 3: Same as Figure 2 but for the case of covariance functions that differ between groups.

for the egg-laying of female Mediterranean fruit flies (*Ceratitis capitata*). Four thousands of cages of female flies were evenly divided into four cohorts that correspond to different environmental conditions. For each cage, the total number of eggs laid by flies was recorded in each day, and the observed numbers form a trajectory that characterizes the dynamic pattern of egg laying of the female flies in the cage. Our goal is to investigate whether the environmental conditions impacted the egg laying patterns reflected in the recorded trajectories. As most cages have zero eggs laid in the first few days and the last few days, we only focus on the trajectories recorded between day 10 and day 50. By excluding trajectories with missing data, we then obtain four samples of sizes  $n_1 = 146, n_2 = 178, n_3 = 151$  and  $n_4 = 121$ , respectively. To stabilize the variance, we apply square-root transformations for the egg counts.

Our proposed method with the Fourier basis rejects the null hypothesis with a  $p$ -value




Figure 4: Mean trajectories of the number of eggs laid by female fruit flies in four cohorts.

of less than  $10^{-4}$ , which provides strong evidence that the mean egg-laying trajectories for the four cohorts are not identical. Specifically, the proposed method shows that the mean trajectories of the first cohort (represented by the solid line in Figure 4) and the fourth cohort (represented by the dot-dashed line in Figure 4) are respectively significantly different from the other three. Moreover, we note that the first Fourier coefficient is the daily average of the number of eggs laid. The constructed SCIs suggest that the daily average of the first cohort is different from its counterparts of the other cohorts, and similarly, that the daily averages of the second and the fourth cohorts are different. This valuable extra information is obtained without performing additional hypothesis tests and thus no requirement for adjustments for multiple comparisons that might lower the power of the test.

## 5 Application to sparse count data

Count data, often modeled by multinomial or Poisson distributions, are common in practice. For the multinomial model, the decay in variance is an inherent feature due to the requirement that the sum of the probabilities of all categories is one. For the Poisson distribution, since the variance is equal to the mean, sparseness in the mean induces decay in the variance. Here, sparseness refers to the situation that either there are only a few nonzero coordinates or the ordered coordinate mean is decreasing to zero. For instance, in the field of text mining or information retrieval in which word frequency is an important feature, words in a vocabulary often have drastically different frequencies. In addition, the frequency of words decreases rapidly when moving from frequent to rare words. For example, for the English language, the ordered word frequency is found to approximately follow Zipf’s law (Zipf, 1949). To assess the performance of the proposed method for sparse Poisson data, we conducted the following simulation study.

We considered three groups, represented by the  $p$ -dimensional random vectors  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $X_3$ . Each random vector  $X_k$  follows a multivariate Poisson distribution (Inouye et al., 2017) and is represented by  $(W_{k0} + W_{k1}, \dots, W_{k0} + W_{kp})$ , where for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $W_{k0}, \dots, W_{kp}$  are independent Poisson random variables with mean  $\eta_{k0}, \dots, \eta_{kp} \in \mathbb{R}$ , respectively. Then the  $j$ th coordinate of  $X_k$  follows also a Poisson distribution with mean  $\eta_{k0} + \eta_{kj}$ . In addition, all coordinates are correlated due to the shared random variable  $W_{k0}$ . In our study, we set  $\eta_{k0} = 1$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , and consider two settings for  $\eta_{k1}, \dots, \eta_{kp}$ . In the first “sparse” setting,  $\eta_{kj} = (1 + \theta k)j^{-1}$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . In this setting, when  $\theta \neq 0$ , the difference of the mean in the  $j$ th coordinate decays as  $j^{-1}$ . In the second “dense” setting, we set  $\eta_{kj} = j^{-1} + \theta k/2$ , so that the difference of the mean in each coordinate is equal. Note that the setting with  $\theta = 0$  corresponds to the null hypothesis, under which the mean vectors of all groups are identical. For the dimension, we consider two cases, namely,  $p = 25$  and

$p = 100$ , and for sample size the balanced case  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (50, 50, 50)$  and an unbalanced case with  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (30, 50, 70)$ . The parameter  $\tau$  is selected by the method described in Section 2. Each simulation is repeated 1000 times.

For comparison purposes, we implemented the methods of Schott (2007) and Zhang et al. (2018) that are reviewed in the introduction. The former is based on the limit distribution of a test statistic that is composed by inter-group and within-group sum of squares, while the latter utilizes an adjusted  $\ell_p$ -norm-based test statistic whose distribution is approximated by a multiplier bootstrap. The former is favored by the testing problems with a dense alternative, while the latter has been reported to be powerful against different patterns of alternatives (Zhang et al., 2018). The empirical sizes in Table 2 demonstrate that those of the proposed method and Schott (2007) are rather close to the nominal level, while the size of Zhang et al. (2018) seems slightly inflated. The empirical power function for the sparse case  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (30, 50, 70)$  is shown in Figure 5; that for  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (50, 50, 50)$  is very similar to the case of  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (30, 50, 70)$  (details not shown). One finds that in the sparse case, the proposed method has substantially more power than Zhang et al. (2018), while the latter in turn has more power than Schott (2007). In the dense setting which does not favor the proposed method, it is seen to have rather comparable power behavior with that of the methods of Schott (2007) and Zhang et al. (2018). In addition to testing hypotheses, the proposed method can also simultaneously identify the pairs of groups, as well as coordinates, that have significantly different means, as demonstrated below for two real data.

As the first application, we apply the proposed method to analyze the CLASSIC3 dataset<sup>1</sup> (Dhillon et al., 2003) that has been studied in information retrieval. The data consist of 3891 document abstracts from three different domains, specifically,  $n_1 = 1460$  from

---

<sup>1</sup>Originally available from <ftp://ftp.cs.cornell.edu/pub/smart>, and now available publicly on the Internet, e.g., <https://www.dataminingresearch.com/index.php/2010/09/classic3-classic4-datasets/>



Table 2: Empirical size of ANOVA on Poisson data

	$p$	$n$	proposed	Schott (2007)	Zhang et al. (2018)
sparse	25	50,50,50	.055	.042	.065
		30,50,70	.052	.053	.069
	100	50,50,50	.056	.045	.054
		30,50,70	.056	.055	.065
dense	25	50,50,50	.050	.051	.065
		30,50,70	.045	.066	.062
	100	50,50,50	.057	.054	.064
		30,50,70	.051	.049	.067




Figure 5: Empirical power of the proposed high-dimensional ANOVA (solid), the method (dashed) of Zhang et al. (2018) and the method (dotted) of Schott (2007), when  $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (30, 50, 70)$ , for the sparse setting with  $p = 25$  (the first panel) and  $p = 100$  (the second panel) and for the dense setting with  $p = 25$  (the third panel) and  $p = 100$  (the last panel).

information retrieval (CISI),  $n_2 = 1398$  from aeronautical systems (CRAN) and  $n_3 = 1033$  from medical research (MED). Standard text preprocessing was applied to these abstracts, including removal of high-frequency common words (commonly referred to as stop words, such as “the”, “is”, “and”, etc), punctuation and Arabic numbers. In addition, we follow common practice in the field of information retrieval to reduce inflected words to their word stem, base or root form by using a stemmer, such as the Krovetz stemmer (Krovetz, 1993). Each document is then represented by a vector of word counts. These vectors are naturally sparse, as the number of distinct words appearing in a document is in general far less than the size of the vocabulary. Intuitively, vocabularies from different domains are different. Our goal is to examine this intuition and to find the words that are substantially different among the three domains. To this end, we focus on words with at least 50 occurrences in total to eliminate the randomness caused by rare words. This results in  $p = 1296$  distinct words under consideration. Then we applied the proposed test to the processed data and found that the vocabularies used in these three domains are not the same among any pair of the domains, with  $p$ -value less than  $10^{-4}$ . In particular, the proposed method simultaneously identifies the words that have significantly different frequency among the domains, which are shown in Table 3, where the numbers represent the average frequency of the words within each domain. The results for CISI and CRAN match our intuition about these two domains. For the domain of medical research, the word “normal” is often used to refer to healthy patients or subjects, while the word “increase” is used to describe the change of certain biological metrics, such as protein metabolism.

Next, we apply the proposed method to study physical activity using data collected by wearable devices, as available in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2005–2006. In the survey, each participant of age 6 years or above was asked to wear a physical activity monitor (Actigraph 7164) for seven consecutive days, with

Table 3: The average frequency of words that are significantly different among all categories

	use	data	pressure	effect	theory	problem	body	increase	normal	group
CISI	<b>0.715</b>	<b>0.401</b>	0.011	0.060	0.167	0.301	0.017	0.089	0.007	0.129
CRAN	0.515	0.239	<b>1.004</b>	<b>0.759</b>	<b>0.684</b>	<b>0.456</b>	<b>0.607</b>	0.271	0.112	0.011
MED	0.265	0.082	0.139	0.338	0.024	0.069	0.162	<b>0.437</b>	<b>0.351</b>	<b>0.304</b>

bedtime excluded. Also, as the device is not waterproof, participants were advised to remove it during swimming or bathing. The monitor detected and recorded the magnitude of acceleration of movement of the participant. For each minute, the readings were summarized to yield one single integer in the interval  $[0, 32767]$  that signifies the average intensity within that minute. This results in  $m = 60 \times 24 \times 7 = 10080$  observations per participant. Demographic characteristics of the participants are also available, and in our analysis we focused on two age groups and two marital categories. The two age groups are young adulthood with age ranging from 18 to 44, and middle-age adulthood with age ranging from 45 to 65. The two marital groups are “single” (including the widowed, divorced, separated and never-married categories in the original data) and “non-single” (including married and living-with-partner categories). These groups induce four cohorts: young non-single adults, young single adults, middle-age non-single adults and middle-age single adults. Our goal is to examine whether the physical activity patterns are different among these cohorts.

From Figure 6 which presents the activity trajectories of three randomly selected participants from the dataset, we see that the participants have different circadian rhythms. To address this problem, we adopt the strategy proposed by Chang and McKeague (2020), who studied physical activity of elder veterans from the perspective of functional data analysis, by transforming each activity trajectory  $A(t)$  into an activity profile  $X(j) = \text{Leb}(\{t \in [0, 7] : A(t) \geq j\})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 32767$ , where  $\text{Leb}$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . This

is essentially equivalent to accumulated  $F_A(j)/m$ , where  $F_A(j)$  denotes the frequency of  $j$ , i.e., the number of occurrences of the intensity value  $j$ , in the trajectory  $A$ . Therefore, the activity profile  $X(j)$  can be viewed as count data normalized by  $m$ . As over 95% of the physical activity has low to moderate intensity, i.e., with intensity value below 1000, we focus on the intensity spectrum  $[1, 1000]$ . In addition, we exclude subjects with readings that are missing, unreliable or from a monitor not in calibration. This results in four cohorts of size  $n_1 = 1027$ ,  $n_2 = 891$ ,  $n_3 = 610$  and  $n_4 = 339$ , respectively.

The mean activity profiles and their standard deviations are depicted in the top panels of Figure 7, from which we observe that both the mean and standard deviation decay quite fast. In addition, the mean profiles from the young single and middle-age non-single cohorts are almost indistinguishable in the plot, while the mean profile of the middle-age single cohort is visibly different from the others. These visual impressions are in line with the results obtained with the proposed test, which rejects the null hypothesis with an approximate  $p$ -value of 0.004 and thus suggests that some mean activity profiles are likely to be substantially different. Moreover, the method identifies two pairs of cohorts whose mean activity profiles are different and the intensity spectrum on which the differences are significant, namely, the young single cohort and the middle-age single cohort on the spectrum  $[1, 87]$ , and the middle-age non-single cohort and middle-age single cohort on the spectrum  $[1, 86]$ . These findings are visualized in the bottom panels of Figure 7. Furthermore, the proposed method provides SCIs for the differences of mean activity profiles among all pairs of cohorts. For instance, in Figure 8 we present the 95% SCIs for the pairs with differences in the mean activity profiles over the spectrum on which the differences are statistically significant. In summary, comparing to the young single and middle-age non-single cohorts, the middle-age single cohort is found to have less activity on average in the low-intensity activity spectrum.




Figure 6: Activity intensity trajectories of three randomly selected participants from the NHANES data 2005–2006.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

**Supplement:** The Supplement contains the proofs for the results in Section 3. (PDF)

**R-package:** A user friendly R package that implements the proposed method is being developed and will be released upon publication of the paper.

## References

- Aneiros, G., Cao, R., Fraiman, R., Genest, C., and Vieu, P. (2019). Recent advances in functional data analysis and high-dimensional statistics. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 170:3–9.
- Bai, Z., Choi, K. P., and Fujikoshi, Y. (2018). Limiting behavior of eigenvalues in high-dimensional manova via rmt. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2985–3013.
- Bai, Z. and Saranadasa, H. (1996). Effect of high dimension: By an example of a two sample problem. *Statistica Sinica*, 6(2):311–329.




Figure 7: Top: the coordinate-wise mean activity (left) and its standard deviation (right) of young non-single cohort (dash-dotted), young single cohort (dotted), middle-age non-single cohort (dashed) and middle-age single cohort (solid); bottom-left: mean activity profiles of the young single cohort (dotted) and the middle-age single cohort (solid) shown for the intensity spectrum on which the differences in the means are significant among the two cohorts; bottom-right: mean activity profiles of the middle-age non-single cohort (dashed) and the middle-age single cohort (solid) over the spectrum on which the differences in the means are significant among the two cohorts.




Figure 8: The empirical simultaneous confidence intervals (dashed) for the difference (solid) of mean activity profiles over  $[1, 87]$  for the pair (left) of young single and middle-age single cohorts and the pair (right) of middle-age non-single and middle-age single cohorts. The light gray solid lines are differences of activity profiles of some pairs of participants from the corresponding pairs of cohorts, included to illustrate the variability of the differences in the individual level.

- Bentkus, V. (2003). On the dependence of the Berry–Esseen bound on dimension. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 113:385–402.
- Bentkus, V. (2005). A Lyapunov-type bound in  $R^d$ . *SIAM Journal on Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 49(2):311–323.
- Cai, T. T., Liu, W., and Xia, Y. (2014). Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(2):349–372.
- Cai, T. T. and Xia, Y. (2014). High-dimensional sparse MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 131:174–196.
- Chang, H.-W. and McKeague, I. W. (2020). Nonparametric comparisons of activity profiles from wearable device data. *preprint*.
- Chang, J., Zheng, C., Zhou, W.-X., and Zhou, W. (2017). Simulation-based hypothesis testing of high dimensional means under covariance heterogeneity. *Biometrics*, 73(4):1300–1310.
- Chen, S. X. and Qin, Y.-L. (2010). A two-sample test for high-dimensional data with applications to gene-set testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(2):808–835.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., , and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41:2786–2819.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., , and Kato, K. (2017). Central limit theorems and bootstrap in high dimensions. *The Annals of Probability*, 45:2309–2352.
- Dhillon, I., Mallela, S., and Modha, D. (2003). Information-theoretic co-clustering. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 89–98.



- Fan, J. and Lin, S.-K. (1998). Test of significance when data are curves. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(443):1007–1021.
- Faraway, J. J. (1997). Regression analysis for a functional response. *Technometrics*, 39(3):254–261.
- Feng, L. and Sun, F. (2015). A note on high-dimensional two-sample test. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 105:29–36.
- Feng, L., Zou, C., Wang, Z., and Zhu, L. (2015). Two-sample Behrens-Fisher problem for high-dimensional data. *Statistica Sinica*, 25:1297–1312.
- Ferraty, F. and Vieu, P. (2006). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Fujikoshi, Y., Himeno, T., and Wakaki, H. (2004). Asymptotic results of a high dimensional MANOVA test and power comparison when the dimension is large compared to the sample size. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society*, 34(1):19–26.
- Górecki, T. and Smaga, L. (2015). A comparison of tests for the one-way ANOVA problem for functional data. *Computational Statistics*, 30(4):987–1010.
- Górecki, T. and Smaga, L. (2019). fdANOVA: an R software package for analysis of variance for univariate and multivariate functional data. *Computational Statistics*, 34(2):571–597.
- Gregory, K. B., Carroll, R. J., Baladandayuthapani, V., and Lahiri, S. N. (2015). A two-sample test for equality of means in high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(510):837–849.
- Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for Functional Data with Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer.
- Hsing, T. and Eubank, R. (2015). *Theoretical Foundations of Functional Data Analysis, with an Introduction to Linear Operators*. Wiley.

- Hu, J., Bai, Z., Wang, C., and Wang, W. (2017). On testing the equality of high dimensional mean vectors with unequal covariance matrices. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 69(2):365–387.
- Inouye, D. I., Yang, E., Allen, G. I., and Ravikumar, P. (2017). A review of multivariate distributions for count data derived from the poisson distribution. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 9(3):e1398.
- Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2017). *Introduction to Functional Data Analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Krovetz, R. (1993). Viewing morphology as an inference process. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 191–202. ACM Press.
- Li, H., Aue, A., and Paul, D. (2018). High-dimensional general linear hypothesis tests via non-linear spectral shrinkage. *arxiv*.
- Li, H., Hu, J., Bai, Z., Yin, Y., and Zou, K. (2017). Test on the linear combinations of mean vectors in high-dimensional data. *Test*, 26:188–208.
- Lopes, M. E., Jacob, L., and Wainwright, M. J. (2011). A more powerful two-sample test in high dimensions using random projection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1206–1214.
- Lopes, M. E., Lin, Z., and Müller, H.-G. (2020). Bootstrapping max statistics in high dimensions: Near-parametric rates under weak variance decay and application to functional data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1214–1229.
- Müller, H.-G., Wang, J.-L., Capra, W. B., Liedo, P., and Carey, J. R. (1997). Early mortality surge in protein-deprived females causes reversal of sex differential of life expectancy in Mediterranean fruit flies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 94(6):2762–2765.

- Paparoditis, E. and Sapatinas, T. (2016). Bootstrap-based testing of equality of mean functions or equality of covariance operators for functional data. *Biometrika*, 103(3):727–733.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2nd edition.
- Schott, J. R. (2007). Some high-dimensional tests for a one-way MANOVA. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98(9):1825–1839.
- Shen, Q. and Faraway, J. (2004). An F test for linear models with functional responses. *Statistica Sinica*, 14(4):1239–1257.
- Srivastava, M. S. and Fujikoshi, Y. (2006). Multivariate analysis of variance with fewer observations than the dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 97(9):1927 – 1940.
- Srivastava, M. S. and Kubokawa, T. (2013). Tests for multivariate analysis of variance in high dimension under non-normality. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 115:204–216.
- Städler, N. and Mukherjee, S. (2016). Two-sample testing in high dimensions. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(1):225–246.
- Wang, J.-L., Chiou, J.-M., and Müller, H.-G. (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 3:257–295.
- Xu, G., Lin, L., Wei, P., and Pan, W. (2016). An adaptive two-sample test for highdimensional means. *Biometrika*, 103(3):609–624.
- Xue, K. and Yao, F. (2020). Distribution and correlation free two-sample test of high-dimensional means. *The Annals of Statistics*.
- Yamada, T. and Himeno, T. (2015). Testing homogeneity of mean vectors under heteroscedasticity in high-dimension. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 139:7 – 27.
- Yamada, T. and Srivastava, M. S. (2012). A test for multivariate analysis of variance in high

- dimension. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 41(13-14):2602–2615.
- Zhang, J. and Pan, M. (2016). A high-dimension two-sample test for the mean using cluster subspaces. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 97:87 – 97.
- Zhang, J. and Xu, J. (2009). On the k-sample Behrens-Fisher problem for high-dimensional data. *Science in China, Series A: Mathematics*, 52(6):1285–1304.
- Zhang, J.-T. (2011). Statistical inferences for linear models with functional responses. *Statistica Sinica*, 21(3):1431–1451.
- Zhang, J.-T. (2013). *Analysis of Variance for Functional Data*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Zhang, J.-T. and Chen, J. (2007). Statistical inferences for functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(3):1052–1079.
- Zhang, J.-T., Guo, J., and Zhou, B. (2017). Linear hypothesis testing in high-dimensional one-way manova. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 155:200 – 216.
- Zhang, J.-T., Guo, J., Zhou, B., and Cheng, M.-Y. (2019). A simple two-sample test in high dimensions based on  $l^2$ -norm. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- Zhang, J.-T. and Liang, X. (2014). One-way ANOVA for functional data via globalizing the pointwise F-test. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 41(1):51–71.
- Zhang, M., Zhou, C., He, Y., , and Liu, B. (2018). Data-adaptive test for high-dimensional multivariate analysis of variance problem. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 60(4):447–470.
- Zhou, B., Guo, J., and Zhang, J.-T. (2017). High-dimensional general linear hypothesis testing under heteroscedasticity. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 188:36–54.
- Zipf, G. K. (1949). *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort: An Introduction to Human Ecology*. Addison-Wesley Press.

# Supplementary Materials to “High-dimensional MANOVA via Bootstrapping and its Application to Functional and Sparse Count Data”

*General remarks and notation.* Throughout we refer to the notations introduced in the main text and define  $m_o = \min\{m_1, \dots, m_K\}$ ,  $m_{\max} = \max\{m_1, \dots, m_K\}$ ,  $\ell_o = \min\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_K\}$ , and  $\ell_{\max} = \max\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_K\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l) = \mathcal{J}_k(m_k) \cup \mathcal{J}_l(m_l)$  and  $2m_o \leq m_{k,l} = |\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)| \leq m_k + m_l \leq 2m_{\max}$ . Define  $\ell_{k,l}$  analogously. Define  $\lambda_{k,l}^2 = n_l/(n_k + n_l)$  and

$$M_m(k, l) = \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left( \lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,g} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau \right),$$

and define  $\tilde{M}_m(k, l)$  and  $M_m^*(k, l)$  analogously. Let  $N = |\mathcal{P}|$  and suppose we enumerate the pairs in  $\mathcal{P}$  by  $(k_1, l_1), \dots, (k_N, l_N)$ . Let  $\mathbf{m} = (m_{k_1, l_1}, \dots, m_{k_N, l_N})$ . Define

$$M_{\mathbf{m}} = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} M_m(k, l),$$

and  $\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$  and  $M_{\mathbf{m}}^*$  analogously. In addition, define

$$\kappa = \alpha(1 - \tau).$$

Lastly, the constant  $c > 0$  used in the proofs below might vary from place to place; however, it does not depend on  $K, N, p$  or  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ .

*Remark.* Under Assumption 3, all  $\ell_k$  and thus all  $\ell_{k,l}$  are of the same order as  $\ell_o$  and  $\ell_{\max}$ , and similarly, all  $m_k$  and  $m_{k,l}$  are of the same order as  $m_o$  and  $m_{\max}$ .

*Remark.* It is sufficient to show that the results in the theorems hold for all large values of  $n$ . The proofs below implicitly assume  $p > m_o$  (unless otherwise stated), because the low-dimensional case where  $p \leq m_o$  is a direct consequence.

## A Proof of Theorem 3.1

*Proof.* Consider the inequality

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(M), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M})) \leq \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III},$$

where we define

$$\text{I} = d_K(\mathcal{L}(M), \mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}})),$$

$$\text{II} = d_K(\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}})),$$

$$\text{III} = d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M})).$$

Then the conclusion of the theorem follows from Propositions A.1 and A.2.  $\square$

**Proposition A.1.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, we have  $\Pi \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Pi$  denote the projection onto the coordinates indexed by  $\mathcal{J} = \bigcup_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$ . Let  $J = |\mathcal{J}|$ . Define the diagonal matrix  $D_{k,l} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{k,l,j} : j \in \mathcal{J})$ . By convention, we set  $D_{k,l} = D_{l,k}$ . It follows that

$$M_m(k, l) = \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}(k,l)} e_j^\top D_{k,l}^{-\tau} \Pi(\lambda_{k,l} S_k - \lambda_{l,k} S_l),$$

where  $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^J$  is the standard vector, and  $\mathcal{I}(k, l)$  denotes the row indices involving  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$  in the projection  $\Pi$ . Let  $\mathfrak{C}_{k,l}^\top = \lambda_{k,l} D_{k,l}^{-\tau} \Pi \Sigma_k^{1/2}$ , which is of size  $J \times p$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{C}_{k,l}^\top \neq \mathfrak{C}_{l,k}^\top$ . Consider the QR decomposition  $\Sigma_k^{1/2} \Pi^\top = Q_k V_k$  so that

$$\mathfrak{C}_{k,l} = Q_k V_k (\lambda_{k,l} D_{k,l}^{-\tau}) \equiv Q_k R_{k,l},$$

where the columns of  $Q_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times J}$  are an orthonormal basis for the image of  $\mathfrak{C}_{k,l}$  and  $R_{k,l} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times J}$ . Define the random vectors

$$\check{Z}_k = n_k^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Q_k^\top Z_{k,i}.$$

Then

$$D_{k,l}^{-\tau} \Pi(\lambda_{k,l} S_k - \lambda_{l,k} S_l) = R_{k,l}^\top \check{Z}_k - R_{l,k}^\top \check{Z}_l.$$

Let  $R^\top$  be a  $JN \times JK$  block matrix with  $N \times K$  blocks of size  $J \times J$  such that, for  $j = 1, \dots, N$  and  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , the  $(j, k)$ -block is  $R_{k_j, l_j}^\top$  if  $k = k_j$ , is  $-R_{l_j, k_j}^\top$  if  $k = l_j$ , and is  $\mathbf{0}$  otherwise. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} D_{k_1, l_1}^{-\tau} \Pi(\lambda_{k_1, l_1} S_{k_1} - \lambda_{l_1, k_1} S_{l_1}) \\ D_{k_2, l_2}^{-\tau} \Pi(\lambda_{k_2, l_2} S_{k_2} - \lambda_{l_2, k_2} S_{l_2}) \\ \vdots \\ D_{k_N, l_N}^{-\tau} \Pi(\lambda_{k_N, l_N} S_{k_N} - \lambda_{l_N, k_N} S_{l_N}) \end{pmatrix} = R^\top \check{Z}.$$

It can be checked that for any fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a Borel convex set  $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathbb{R}^r$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(M_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(\check{Z} \in \mathcal{A}_t)$ , where  $r = JK$ . By the same reasoning, we also have  $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t) = \gamma_r(\mathcal{A}_t)$ , where  $\gamma_r$  is the standard Gaussian distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^r$ . Thus,

$$\Pi \leq \sup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}} |\mathbb{P}(\check{Z} \in \mathcal{A}) - \gamma_r(\mathcal{A})|,$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the collection of all Borel convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^r$ .

Now we apply Theorem 1.2 of (Bentkus, 2005). Let  $n_{1:k} = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j$ . Define  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$  in the following way: For  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $i' = 1, \dots, n_k$ , set  $i = n_{1:k} - n_k + i'$  and set all coordinates of  $Y_i$  to zero except that  $Y_{i, (Jk-J+1):(Jk)} = n_k^{-1/2} Q_k^\top Z_{k,i'}$ , i.e., the subvector of  $Y_i$  at coordinates  $Jk - J + 1, \dots, Jk$  is equal to the vector  $n_k^{-1/2} Q_k^\top Z_{k,i'}$ .

Then  $\check{Z} = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ , i.e.,  $\check{Z}$  is a sum of  $n = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k$  independent random vectors. We also observe that

$$\mathbf{C} = \text{cov}(\check{Z}) = \mathbf{I}_r.$$

For  $n_{1:k} - n_k + 1 \leq i \leq n_{1:k}$ ,  $\beta_i = \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{C}^{-1} Y_i\|^3 = \mathbb{E} \|Y_i\|^3 = n_k^{-3/2} \mathbb{E} \|Q_k^\top Z_{k,1}\|^3 \leq n_k^{-3/2} [\mathbb{E} (Z_{k,1}^\top Q_k Q_k^\top Z_{k,1})^2]^{3/4}$ , where the inequality is due to Lyapunov's inequality. Let  $v_j$  be the  $j^{\text{th}}$  column of  $Q_1$ . If we put  $\zeta_j = Z_{1,1}^\top v_j$ , then

$$\mathbb{E} (Z_{1,1}^\top Q_1 Q_1^\top Z_{1,1})^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^J \zeta_j^2 \right\|_2^2 \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^J \|\zeta_j^2\|_2 \right)^2 \lesssim J^2,$$

where we used the fact that  $\|Z_{1,1}^\top v_j\|_4^2 \leq c$  based on Assumption 1, where  $c > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $c_0$  of Assumption 1. The same argument applies to the quantity  $\mathbb{E} (Z_{k,1}^\top Q_k Q_k^\top Z_{k,1})^2$  for a generic  $k$  with the same constant  $c$ . This implies that  $\beta_i \leq c n_k^{-3/2} J^{3/2}$  for all  $n_{1:k} - n_k + 1 \leq i \leq n_{1:k}$ , and some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . Therefore,

$$\Pi \lesssim J^{1/4} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1 + \dots + n_K} \beta_i \lesssim J^{7/4} \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-1/2} \lesssim N^{7/4} m_{\max}^{7/4} K n^{-1/2} \lesssim n^{-1/2+\delta},$$

where the third inequality is due to  $J \leq 2N m_{\max}$ , and the last one follows from  $\max\{K, N\} \lesssim e^{\sqrt{\log n}} \lesssim n^\delta$  and  $m_{\max} \lesssim n_{\max}^\delta \asymp n^\delta$  for any fixed  $\delta > 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition A.2.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, we have  $\text{I} \lesssim n^{-1/2+\delta}$  and  $\text{III} \lesssim n^{-1/2+\delta}$ .*

*Proof.* We only establish the bound for I, since the same argument applies to III. For any fixed  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(M \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(M_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t)| = \mathbb{P}(A(t) \cap B(t)),$$

where

$$A(t) = \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t \right\},$$

$$B(t) = \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) > t \right\},$$

and  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)$  denotes the complement of  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$  in  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . Also, if  $t_1 \leq t_2$ , it is seen that

$$A(t) \cap B(t) \subset A(t_2) \cup B(t_1)$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . By a union bound, we have

$$I \leq \mathbb{P}(A(t_2)) + \mathbb{P}(B(t_1)).$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= cm_o^{-\kappa} \log n \\ t_2 &= c_2 c_o \ell_{\max}^{-\kappa} \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}} \end{aligned}$$

for a certain constant  $c > 0$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(A(t_2))$  and  $\mathbb{P}(B(t_1))$  are at most of order  $n^{-1/2+\delta}$ , according to Lemma A.3. Moreover, the inequality  $t_1 \leq t_2$  holds for all large  $n$ , due to the definitions of  $\ell_{\max}$ ,  $m_o$ , and  $\kappa$ , as well as the condition  $(1 - \tau)\sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.3.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there is positive constant  $c$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , that can be selected in the definition of  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , so that*

$$\mathbb{P}(A(t_2)) \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}, \quad (1)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(B(t_1)) \lesssim n^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

*Proof of (1).* Let  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l}$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(\ell_k, \ell_l)$  constructed in the following way: if  $\mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l(m_l)$  contains at least  $\ell_o/2$  elements, then  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} = \mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l(m_l)$ , and otherwise,  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} = \mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l^c(m_l)$ . According to Proposition A.1 and the fact that  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} \subset \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A(t_2)) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2\right) + \Pi \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2\right) + cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\sigma_{k,l,j} = \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \geq \lambda_{k,l} \sigma_{k,j}$  and  $\sigma_{k,(j)} \geq c_o j^{-\alpha}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m_k\}$ , and due to Assumption 2 with  $c_o \in (0, 1)$  and Assumption 3 with  $c_2 \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $\sigma_{k,l,j}^{\tau-1} \leq \lambda_{k,l}^{\tau-1} \sigma_{k,j}^{\tau-1} \leq c_2^{\tau-1} \ell_k^{\alpha(1-\tau)} c_o^{\tau-1} \leq \ell_{\max}^\kappa / (c_2 c_o)$  for  $j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}$ . With an argument similar to that of Lemma B.1 of Lopes et al. (2020), we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}) \leq \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}) \leq \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}}\right). \end{aligned}$$



Note that the cardinality of  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l}$  is at least  $\ell_o/2$ . Based on Assumption 3, for all sufficiently large  $n$ , for all  $1 \leq k < j \leq K$ , we have  $\log(\ell_{\max}) \leq 1.01 \log \ell_o \leq 1.01^2 \log(2|\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|) \leq 1.1^2 \log |\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}) \leq \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}) \leq 1.1 \sqrt{\log |\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To apply Lemma B.2 of Lopes et al. (2020), let  $Q$  denote the correlation matrix of the random variables  $\{\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} : 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ . When  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} = \mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l(m_l)$ , for  $j, k \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{j,k} &= \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^2 R_{k,j,k}(p) \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,k} + \lambda_{l,k}^2 R_{l,j,k}(p) \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,k}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,k}^2}} \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,k} + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,k}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,k}^2}} \\ &\leq 1 - \epsilon_0, \end{aligned}$$

since the construction of  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l}$  implies that  $\max\{R_{k,j,k}, R_{l,j,k}\} \leq 1 - \epsilon_0$ . When  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} = \mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l^c(m_l)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{j,k} &\leq 1 - \epsilon_0 + \frac{\lambda_{l,k}^2 (R_{l,j,k}(p) - 1 + \epsilon_0) \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,k}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,k}^2}} \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon_0) + \epsilon_0 \frac{\lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,k}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,k}^2}} \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon_0) + \epsilon_0 c_3^2 \frac{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,k} + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,k}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,k}^2}} \\ &\leq 1 - \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_0 c_3^2 / (\eta_2^2 + c^2 c_2^2), \end{aligned}$$

due to Assumption 3 and since  $\sigma_{l,j} \leq c \sigma_{k,j}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{I}_{k,l}$  when  $\mathcal{I}_{k,l} = \mathcal{J}_k(\ell_k) \cap \mathcal{J}_l^c(m_l)$ , where  $c = c_1/c_o$ , and  $c_1$  and  $c_o$  are defined in Assumption 2. To apply Lemma B.2 of Lopes et al. (2020), we note that  $\sqrt{\log |\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|}$  is required instead of  $1.1 \sqrt{\log |\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|}$ . However, by carefully examining the proof of Lemma B.2 of Lopes et al. (2020), we find that the lemma is still valid for  $1.1 \sqrt{\log |\mathcal{I}_{k,l}|}$ , potentially with constants different from  $C$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  in (B.19) of Lopes et al. (2020). This shows that (3) is bounded by  $cn^{-1}$  for some constant  $c$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . Then  $N \lesssim n^\delta$  for any  $\delta > 0$  implies (1).  $\square$

*Proof of (2).* The following argument is similar to the proof for part (b) of Lemma B.1 in Lopes et al. (2020). Define the random variable

$$V = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau)$$

and let  $q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$ . To bound  $\|V\|_q$ , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\|V\|_q^q &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau \right| \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \mathbb{E} |\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}|^q.\end{aligned}$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \max\{\sigma_{k,j}, \sigma_{l,j}\}^{q(1-\tau)} \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \max\{\sigma_{k,j}^{q(1-\tau)}, \sigma_{l,j}^{q(1-\tau)}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\sigma_{k,j}^{q(1-\tau)} + \sigma_{l,j}^{q(1-\tau)}) \\ &\leq c_1^{q(1-\tau)} \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \left( \sum_{j=m_k+1}^p j^{-\alpha q(1-\tau)} + \sum_{j=m_l+1}^p j^{-\alpha q(1-\tau)} \right) \\ &\leq c_1^{q(1-\tau)} \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \left( 2 \int_{m_o}^p x^{-q\kappa} dx \right) \\ &\leq c_1^{q(1-\tau)} N \frac{m_o^{-q\kappa+1}}{q\kappa-1},\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

where we recall  $\kappa = \alpha(1-\tau)$ , and note that  $q\kappa \geq 2$ . Then, with  $\|\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}\|_q \leq cq$  according to Lemma E.3, we deduce that

$$\|V\|_q^q \leq c_1^{q(1-\tau)} (cq)^q N \frac{m_o^{-q\kappa+1}}{q\kappa-1},$$

and with  $C = \frac{c}{(q\kappa-1)^{1/q}} m_o^{1/q} N^{1/q} \lesssim 1$  that

$$\|V\|_q \leq C q m_o^{-\kappa}.$$

Also, the assumption that  $(1-\tau)\sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim 1$  implies that  $q \lesssim \log n$ . Therefore, with  $t = e\|V\|_q$  so that  $t \leq c m_o^{-\kappa} \log n$  for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , by Chebyshev's inequality  $\mathbb{P}(V \geq t) \leq t^{-q} \|V\|_q^q$ , we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(V \geq c m_o^{-\kappa} \log n) \leq \mathbb{P}(V \geq t) \leq e^{-q} \leq n^{-1},$$

completing the proof. □

## B Proof of Theorem 3.2

*Proof.* Consider the inequality

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}), \mathcal{L}(M^*|X)) \leq \text{I}' + \text{II}'(X) + \text{III}'(X),$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I}' &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}})), \\ \text{II}'(X) &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)), \\ \text{III}'(X) &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X), \mathcal{L}(M^*|X)). \end{aligned}$$

The first term is equal to III in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and requires no further treatment. The second term is addressed in Proposition B.2.

To derive the bound for  $\text{III}'(X)$ , we partially reuse the proof of Proposition A.2. For any real numbers  $t'_1 \leq t'_2$ , the following bound holds

$$\text{III}'(X) \leq \mathbb{P}(A'(t'_2)|X) + \mathbb{P}(B'(t'_1)|X),$$

where we define the following events for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A'(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t \right\}, \\ B'(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau) > t \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.1 ensures that  $t'_1$  and  $t'_2$  can be chosen so that the random variables  $\mathbb{P}(A'(t'_2)|X)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(B'(t'_1)|X)$  are at most  $cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$  with probability at least  $1-cn^{-1}$ . Under Assumption 2, it can be checked that the choices of  $t'_1$  and  $t'_2$  given in Lemma B.1 satisfy  $t'_1 \leq t'_2$  when  $n$  (and hence all  $n_k$ ) is sufficiently large.  $\square$

**Lemma B.1.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.2, there are positive constants  $c'_1$ ,  $c'_2$ , and  $c$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , for which the following statement is true: If  $t'_1$  and  $t'_2$  are chosen as*

$$\begin{aligned} t'_1 &= c'_1 m_o^{-\kappa} \log^{3/2} n \\ t'_2 &= c'_2 \ell_{\max}^{-\kappa} \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}}, \end{aligned}$$

*then the events*

$$\mathbb{P}(A'(t'_2)|X) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(B'(t'_1)|X) \leq n^{-1} \quad (6)$$

each hold with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality and the definition of Kolmogorov distance,

$$\mathbb{P}(A'(t'_2)|X) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j}) / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau \leq t'_2\right) + \Pi'(X).$$

Taking  $t'_2 = t_2$  as in the proof of Proposition A.2, the proof of Lemma A.3 shows that the first term is of order  $n^{-1/2+\delta}$ . Proposition B.2 shows that the second term is bounded by  $cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$  with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$  for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . This establishes (5).

To deal with (6), we define the random variable

$$V^* = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau),$$

and let  $q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$ . We shall construct a function  $b(\cdot)$  such that the following bound holds for every realization of  $X$ ,

$$(\mathbb{E}[|V^*|^q | X])^{1/q} \leq b(X),$$

and then Chebyshev's inequality gives the following inequality for any number  $b_n$  satisfying  $b(X) \leq b_n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(V^* \geq eb_n | X) \leq e^{-q} \leq n^{-1}.$$

We will then find  $b_n$  so that the event  $\{b(X) \leq b_n\}$  holds with high probability. Finally, we will see that  $t'_1 \asymp b_n$ .

To construct  $b$ , we adopt the same argument of the proof of Lemma B.1(b) of Lopes et al. (2020) and show that for any realization of  $X$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(|V^*|^q | X) \leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \mathbb{E}(|\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau|^q | X).$$

By Lemma E.3, for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , the event

$$\mathbb{E}(|\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^* / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau|^q | X) \leq (cq)^q$$

holds with probability 1. Consequently, if we set  $s = q(1 - \tau)$  and consider the random variable

$$\hat{s} = \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^s \right)^{1/s},$$

as well as

$$b(X) = cq\hat{\mathbf{s}}^{(1-\tau)},$$

we obtain the bound

$$[\mathbb{E}(|V^*|^q | X)]^{1/q} \leq b(X),$$

with probability 1. Now, Lemma E.2 implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(b(X) \geq q \frac{(c\sqrt{q})^{1-\tau}}{(q\kappa - 1)^{1/q}} m_{\circ}^{-\kappa+1/q} (2N)^{1/(q(1-\tau))}\right) \leq e^{-q} \leq n^{-1}$$

for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . By weakening this tail bound slightly, it can be simplified to

$$\mathbb{P}(b(X) \geq C' q^{3/2} m_{\circ}^{-\kappa}) \leq n^{-1},$$

where  $C' = cm_{\circ}^{1/q} (q\kappa - 1)^{-1/q} (2N)^{1/(q(1-\tau))}$ . Since  $C' \lesssim 1$  and  $(1-\tau)\sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim 1$  gives  $q \lesssim \log n$ , it follows that there is a constant  $c'_1$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that if  $b_n = c'_1 m_{\circ}^{-\kappa} \log^{3/2} n$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(b(X) \geq b_n) \leq n^{-1}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition B.2.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there is a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the event*

$$\Pi'(X) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$$

*holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Define the random variable

$$\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^* = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^*) / \sigma_{k,l,j}^{\tau} \quad (7)$$

and consider the triangle inequality

$$\Pi'(X) \leq d_K(\mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)) + d_K(\mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X), \mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)). \quad (8)$$

*Addressing the first term of (8).* Let  $S$  be the vector obtained by stacking column vectors  $\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^* - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^*$  for  $(k,l) = (k_1, l_1), \dots, (k_N, l_N)$ . As in the proof of Proposition A.1,  $\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*$  can be expressed as coordinate-wise maximum of  $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}} R^{\top} \zeta$  with  $\zeta \sim N(0, \check{\mathfrak{S}})$ , where  $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}}$  denotes the projection matrix onto the superindices  $\mathcal{I} = \{(k, l, j) : k, l \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)\}$ ,  $R$  is a matrix, and

$$\check{\mathfrak{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi \hat{\Sigma}_1 \Pi^{\top} & & & \\ & \Pi \hat{\Sigma}_2 \Pi^{\top} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Pi \hat{\Sigma}_K \Pi^{\top} \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $\Pi$  being defined in the proof of Proposition A.1. Similarly,  $\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$  can be expressed as coordinate-wise maximum of  $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}} R^\top \xi$ , where  $\xi \sim N(0, \mathfrak{S})$  with

$$\mathfrak{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \Pi \Sigma_1 \Pi^\top & & & \\ & \Pi \Sigma_2 \Pi^\top & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Pi \Sigma_K \Pi^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

For  $\mathfrak{C}_k^\top = \Pi \Sigma_k^{1/2}$  consider the singular value decomposition

$$\mathfrak{C}_k = U_k \Lambda_k V_k^\top,$$

where  $r_k \lesssim J \equiv |\mathcal{I}|$  denotes the rank of  $\mathfrak{C}_k$ . We may assume that  $U_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r_k}$  has orthonormal columns,  $\Lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k \times r_k}$  to be invertible, and  $V_k^\top$  to have orthonormal rows. Define

$$W_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_k)(Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_k)^\top,$$

where  $\bar{Z}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Z_{k,i}$ , and

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} W_1 & & & \\ & W_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & W_K \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{C}^\top \mathfrak{C}$  and  $\check{\mathfrak{S}} = \mathfrak{C}^\top W \mathfrak{C}$  with

$$\mathfrak{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{C}_1 & & & \\ & \mathfrak{C}_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathfrak{C}_K \end{pmatrix}.$$

Define  $r_k$ -dimensional vectors  $\tilde{\xi}_k = V_k^\top \xi_k$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}_k = V_k^\top \zeta_k$ , where  $\xi_k$  and  $\zeta_k$  are respectively the subvectors of  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  corresponding to the  $k^{th}$  sample. It can be shown that the columns of  $\Pi \hat{\Sigma}_k \Pi^\top$  and  $\Pi \Sigma_k \Pi^\top$  span the same subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^J$  with probability at least  $1 - cn_k^{-2}$  (due to Lemma D.5 of [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) and noting that the probability bound there can be strengthened to  $1 - cn^{-2}$ ). Therefore, the event  $E = \{\text{the columns of } \mathfrak{S} \text{ and } \hat{\mathfrak{S}} \text{ span the same subspace}\}$  holds with probability at least  $1 - c \sum_{k=1}^K n_k^{-2} \geq 1 - cn^{-1}$ , and furthermore,

conditionally on  $E$ , the random vector  $\xi$  lies in the column-span of  $V$ , where

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_1 & & & \\ & V_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & V_K \end{pmatrix},$$

since  $\check{\mathfrak{S}} = V\Lambda(U^\top WU)\Lambda V^\top$  with

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} U_1 & & & \\ & U_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & U_K \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & & & \\ & \Lambda_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Lambda_K \end{pmatrix}.$$

The argument below is conditional on the event  $E$ .

Given  $E$ , the random vector  $\xi$  lies in the column-span of  $V$  almost surely, which means  $V\tilde{\xi} = \xi$  almost surely. The same argument applies to  $\zeta$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}$ . It follows that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the events  $\{\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t\}$  and  $\{\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^* \leq t\}$  can be expressed as  $\{\tilde{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}_t\}$  and  $\{\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathcal{A}_t\}$ , respectively. Hence  $d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X))$  is upper-bounded by the total variation distance between  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\xi})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\zeta})$ , and in turn, Pinsker's inequality implies that this is upper-bounded by  $c\sqrt{d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\zeta}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\xi}))}$ , where  $c > 0$  is an absolute constant, and  $d_{\text{KL}}$  denotes the KL divergence. Since the random vectors  $\tilde{\xi} \sim N(0, V^\top \mathfrak{S} V)$  and  $\tilde{\zeta} \sim N(0, V^\top \check{\mathfrak{S}} V)$  are Gaussian (conditional on  $X$ ), the following exact formula is available if we let  $H = (V^\top \mathfrak{S} V)^{1/2}$  (so that  $H^\top H = V^\top \mathfrak{S} V$ ) and  $\tilde{C} = H^{-\top}(V^\top \check{\mathfrak{S}} V)H^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\zeta}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\xi})) &= \frac{1}{2} \{\text{tr}(\tilde{C}) - \log \det(\tilde{C} + \mathbf{I}_r)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \{\theta_j(\tilde{C}) - \log(\theta_j(\tilde{C}) + 1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $r = \sum_{k=1}^K r_k \leq KJ$  and  $\theta_j(\tilde{C})$  denotes the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{C}$ . Note that  $\|\tilde{C}\|_{\text{op}} \leq cKn^{-1/2}J \log n_{\max}$  by utilizing Lemma D.5 of [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#) and the diagonal block structure of  $\tilde{C}$ . Using the inequality  $|x - \log(x+1)| \leq x^2/(1+x)$  that holds for any  $x \in (-1, \infty)$ , as well as the condition  $|\lambda_j(\tilde{C})| \leq \|\tilde{C}\|_{\text{op}} \leq cKn^{-1/2}J \log n_{\max} \leq 1/2$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , we have

$$d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\zeta}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\xi})) \leq cr\|\tilde{C}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq cKJ(Kn^{-1/2}J \log n_{\max})^2,$$

for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ . Thus,

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)) \leq cJ^{3/2}K^{3/2}n^{-1/2} \log n_{\max}$$

with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ . With  $J \leq Km_{\max}$  and observing

$$cJ^{3/2}K^{3/2}n^{-1/2}\log n_{\max} \lesssim K^3m_{\max}^{3/2}n^{-1/2}\log n_{\max} \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta},$$

the first term of (8) is bounded by  $cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$  with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ .

*Addressing the second term of (8).* We proceed by considering the general inequality

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\xi), \mathcal{L}(\zeta)) \leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\zeta - t| \leq \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|\xi - \zeta| > \varepsilon),$$

which holds for any random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ , and any real number  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We will let  $\mathcal{L}(\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)$  play the role of  $\mathcal{L}(\xi)$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)$  play the role of  $\mathcal{L}(\zeta)$ . Thus we need to establish an anti-concentration inequality for  $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}^*|X)$ , as well as a coupling inequality for  $M_{\mathbf{m}}^*$  and  $\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*$ , conditionally on  $X$ .

For the coupling inequality, we put

$$\varepsilon = cn^{-1/2} \log^{5/2} n_{\max}$$

for a suitable constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . Then Lemma E.6 shows that the event

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^* - M_{\mathbf{m}}^*| > \varepsilon \mid X) \leq cn^{-1}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ .

For the anti-concentration inequality, we use Nazarov's inequality (Lemma G.2, Lopes et al., 2020). Let

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}} = \min_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}.$$

Then Nazarov's inequality implies that the event

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|M_{\mathbf{m}}^* - t| \leq \varepsilon \mid X) \leq c\varepsilon \hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\tau-1} \sqrt{\log m} \leq c\varepsilon \hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\tau-1} \sqrt{\log(2Nm_{\max})}$$

holds with probability 1, where  $m = \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} m_{k,l} \leq 2Nm_{\max}$ . Meanwhile, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{k,l,j} &= \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2} \geq \max\{\lambda_{k,l} \sigma_{k,j}, \lambda_{l,k} \sigma_{l,j}\} \\ &\geq \eta_1 \max\{\sigma_{k,j}, \sigma_{l,j}\} \geq \eta_1 c_{\circ} \max\{m_k^{-\alpha}, m_l^{-\alpha}\} \geq cm_{\max}^{-\alpha} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

for all  $(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$ . Then, Lemma E.4 and Assumption 2 imply that the event

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\tau-1} \leq cm_{\max}^{\kappa}$$



holds with probability at least  $1 - Nn^{-2} \geq 1 - cn^{-1}$ . Given the above, we conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|M_{\mathbf{m}}^* - t| \leq \varepsilon \mid X) \leq cm_{\max}^{\kappa} \sqrt{\log(2Nm_{\max})} n^{-1/2} \log^{5/2} n_{\max} \leq cn^{-1/2+\delta}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

## C Proof of Theorem 3.4

Define

$$\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}} = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \hat{M}_{m_{k,l}}(k,l), \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* We first observe that

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}), \mathcal{L}(M)) \leq \text{I}'' + \text{II}'' + \text{III}'',$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I}'' &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}), \mathcal{L}(\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}})), \\ \text{II}'' &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}})), \\ \text{III}'' &= d_K(\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(M)). \end{aligned}$$

The last term  $\text{III}''$  requires no further consideration, as it is equal to  $\text{I}$  in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The second term is handled in Proposition C.1, while the first term is handled in Proposition C.2.  $\square$

**Proposition C.1.** *Let  $\delta$  be as in Theorem 3.4. Under Assumptions 1–3, one has  $\text{II}'' \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ .*

*Proof.* We again proceed by considering the general inequality

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\xi), \mathcal{L}(\zeta)) \leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\zeta - t| \leq \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|\xi - \zeta| > \varepsilon),$$

which holds for any random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ , and any real number  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We will let  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}})$  play the role of  $\mathcal{L}(\xi)$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}})$  play the role of  $\mathcal{L}(\zeta)$ . As before, we then need to establish an anti-concentration inequality for  $\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}})$ , as well as a coupling inequality for  $\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$  and  $M_{\mathbf{m}}$ .

For the coupling inequality, we put

$$\varepsilon = cn^{-1/2} \log^{5/2} n_{\max}$$

for a suitable constant  $c$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ . Then Lemma E.7 shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}} - M_{\mathbf{m}}| > \varepsilon) \lesssim n^{-1}.$$

For the anti-concentration inequality, we utilize  $d_K(\mathcal{L}(M_{\mathbf{m}}), \mathcal{L}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}})) \lesssim n^{-1/2+\delta}$ , which was established in the proof of Theorem 3.1, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|M_{\mathbf{m}} - t| \leq \varepsilon) &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\mathbb{P}(M_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t + \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(M_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t - \varepsilon)\} \\ &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t + \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} \leq t - \varepsilon)\} + cn^{-1/2+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}} = \min_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}.$$

Then Nazarov's inequality implies that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} - t| \leq \varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon \underline{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\tau-1} \sqrt{\log m} \lesssim \varepsilon \underline{\sigma}_{\mathbf{m}}^{\tau-1} \sqrt{\log(2Nm_{\max})} \lesssim \varepsilon m_{\max}^{\alpha(1-\tau)} \sqrt{\log(2Nm_{\max})},$$

where  $m = \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} m_{k,l}$ , and the last inequality is due to (9). Given the above, we conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{M}_{\mathbf{m}} - t| \leq \varepsilon) \leq cn^{-1/2} (\log^{5/2} n_{\max}) m_{\max}^{\alpha(1-\tau)} \sqrt{\log(2Nm_{\max})} \leq cn^{-1/2+\delta}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition C.2.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.4, one has  $\mathbf{I}'' \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$\begin{aligned} A''(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{\tau} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{\tau}) \leq t \right\}, \\ B''(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{\tau} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{\tau}) > t \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)$  denotes the complement of  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)$  in  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . Also, if  $t_1'' \leq t_2''$ , it is seen that

$$A''(t) \cap B''(t) \subset A''(t_2'') \cup B''(t_1'')$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . By a union bound, we have

$$\mathbf{I}'' \leq \mathbb{P}(A''(t_2'')) + \mathbb{P}(B''(t_1'')).$$

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} t_1'' &= cm_{\circ}^{-\kappa} \log n \\ t_2'' &= c_{\circ} \ell_{\max}^{-\kappa} \sqrt{\log \ell_{\max}} \end{aligned}$$

for a constant  $c > 0$ , we proceed to show that  $\mathbb{P}(A''(t_2''))$  and  $\mathbb{P}(B''(t_1''))$  are bounded by  $cn^{-1/2+\delta}$ . We note the inequality  $t_1'' \leq t_2''$  holds for all large  $n$ , due to the definitions of  $\ell_{\max}$ ,  $m_\circ$ , and  $\kappa$ , as well as the condition  $(1-\tau)\sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim 1$ . Specifically we will establish that

$$\mathbb{P}(A''(t_2'')) \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}, \quad (11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(B''(t_1'')) \lesssim n^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

According to Propositions C.1 and A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A''(t_2'')) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2''\right) + \Pi'' \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2''\right) + \Pi + \Pi'' \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} (\lambda_{k,l} \tilde{S}_{k,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau - \lambda_{l,k} \tilde{S}_{l,j} / \sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau) \leq t_2''\right) + cn^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (11) follows from a similar argument as given in the proof of Lemma A.3.

To derive (12), consider

$$U = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau}.$$

We first observe that

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|^q \leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \|V_{k,l,j}\|_{2q}^{1/2} \|Y_{k,l,j}\|_{2q}^{1/2}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k,l,j} &= \left| \frac{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|, \\ Y_{k,l,j} &= \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.10, we further have

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq c \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \|Y_{k,l,j}\|_{2q}^{1/2}.$$

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq c \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \|Y_{k,l,j}\|_{2q}^{1/2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \left( \sigma_{k,l,j}^{2q(1-\tau)} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right|^{2q} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq c \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \left( \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right|^{2q} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq c(cq)^{q/2} \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \\
&\leq c(cq)^{q/2} c_1^{q(1-\tau)} N \frac{m_o^{-q\kappa+1}}{q\kappa-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (4). If we put  $C = \frac{c}{(q\kappa-1)^{1/q}} k^{1/q} N^{1/q} \lesssim 1$ , then

$$\|U\|_q \leq Cqk^{-\kappa}.$$

Since  $q \lesssim \log n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(U \geq ck^{-\kappa} \log n) \leq e^{-q} \leq \frac{1}{n},$$

as needed.  $\square$

*Remark.* If Assumption 4 is replaced with the condition  $n^{-1/2} \log^3 p \ll 1$ , then (12) can be established in the following way. With the same notations in the proof of Proposition C.2, we first observe that

$$U \leq \left( \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right| \right) V$$

with

$$V = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|.$$

Under the condition  $n^{-1/2} \log^3 p \ll 1$ ,

$$\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right| \asymp 1$$

with probability at least  $1 - cNn^{-2}$ , according to Lemma E.8. With the aid of Lemma E.3, the term  $V$  then can be handled by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma A.3.

*Remark.* The above proofs relied on the condition  $p > m_o$  and this implies  $m_o \geq n^{\log^{-a} n}$  and  $\ell_o \geq \log^3 n$ . These conditions are used in the analysis of I and III, as well as I', III'(X), I'' and III''. If  $p \leq m_o$ , then the definition of  $m_o$  implies that  $p = m_1 = \dots = m_K$ , and the quantities I, III, I', III'(X), I'' and III'' become exactly 0. In this case, the proofs of Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 reduce to bounding II, II'(X) and II'', and these arguments can be repeated as before.

## D Proof of Theorem 3.3

*Proof.* Part (ii) is handled in Proposition D.1. Below we establish part (i).

By Theorem 3.1 and 3.2, the event  $E = \{d_K(M, M^*) \leq ca_n\}$  holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ , where  $a_n = n^{-1/2+\delta}$ . Below we condition on the event  $E$  and observe that  $q_M(\varrho - ca_n) \leq q_{M^*}(\varrho) \leq q_M(\varrho + ca_n)$  conditional on  $E$ .

In the derivation of Proposition A.2, with the notation there, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq t) &= \mathbb{P}(A(t) \cap B^c(t)) = P(A(t)) - \mathbb{P}(A(t) \cap B(t)) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(A(t)) - \mathbb{P}(A(t_2)) - \mathbb{P}(B(t_1)) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(A(t)) - cn^{-1/2+\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

By an argument similar to Lemma A.3, one can show that if

$$V = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau},$$

then  $\|V\|_Q^Q \leq (cQ)^Q m_{\max} N$  if we define  $Q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \sqrt{\log n}\}$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(A(t)) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(V > t) \geq 1 - \frac{\|V\|_Q^Q}{t^Q} \geq 1 - e^{-Q} \rightarrow 0$$

if  $t \geq e\|V\|_Q \gtrsim \log^{1/2} n$ . Therefore,  $q_M(\varrho + ca_n) \lesssim \sqrt{\log n}$ , otherwise  $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{M} \leq t) \rightarrow 1 > \varrho$ . Similar arguments show that  $q_M(\varrho - ca_n) \lesssim \sqrt{\log n}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition D.1.** *Under Assumptions 1–3, for some constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , one has*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 < 2\sigma_{\max}^2\right) \geq 1 - cn^{-1},$$

where  $\sigma_{\max} = \max\{\sigma_{k,j} : 1 \leq j \leq p, 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ .

*Proof.* Define

$$\begin{aligned} A^\circ(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(n,n)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 > t \right\}, \\ B^\circ(t) &= \left\{ \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 > t \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where as before  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)$  denotes the complement of  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}(n,n)$  in  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . With  $t^\circ = 2\sigma_{\max}^2$  we will establish that

$$\mathbb{P}(A^\circ(t^\circ)) \lesssim n^{-1}, \tag{13}$$

and when  $\mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n) \neq \emptyset$  for some  $(k,l)$  that

$$\mathbb{P}(B^\circ(t^\circ)) \lesssim n^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

For (13), we first observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 > t^\circ) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 - \sigma_{k,l,j}^2| > t^\circ - \sigma_{\max}^2).$$

With the above inequality, by using Lemma E.5 and a union bound, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A^\circ(t^\circ)) &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2 - \sigma_{k,l,j}^2| > t^\circ - \sigma_{\max}^2) \\ &\leq cNn \cdot n^{-3} \lesssim n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

To derive (14), consider

$$U = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2.$$

For  $q = \max\{\alpha^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$ , we first observe that

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} \mathbb{E} |\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2|^q$$

By Lemma E.1, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \|U\|_q^q &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}\|_{2q}^{2q} \\ &\leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} (c\sigma_{k,l,j} \sqrt{2q})^{2q} \\ &\leq c(cq)^q \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(n,n)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{2q} \\ &\leq c(cq)^q N n^{-2q\alpha+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is derived analogously to (4), and this implies

$$\|U\|_q \lesssim q n^{-2\alpha+1/q} N^{1/q} \ll \sigma_{\max}^2.$$

Since  $q \lesssim \log n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(U > 2\sigma_{\max}^2) \leq \mathbb{P}(U \geq e\|U\|_q) \leq e^{-q} \leq \frac{1}{n}$$

for all sufficiently large  $n$ . □

## E Technical Lemmas

**Lemma E.1.** *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold. For any fixed  $b > 0$ , if  $3 \leq q \leq \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log^b n\}$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  not depending on  $q, K, N, p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that for any  $g \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , we have  $\|\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}\|_q \leq c\sigma_{k,j}\sqrt{q}$ .*

*Proof.* According to Lemma D.1 of Lopes et al. (2020) (which still holds when  $q = \log^b n \geq 3$ ), we have  $\|\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}\|_q \leq c\sigma_{k,j}\sqrt{q}$ . Therefore, due to  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j} = \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{l,j}^2} \leq \lambda_{k,l} \hat{\sigma}_{k,j} + \lambda_{l,k} \hat{\sigma}_{l,j}$ , and using the fact that  $\|Y\|_q^2 = \|Y^2\|_{q/2}$  for any random variable  $Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}\|_q^2 &= \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^2\|_{q/2} = \|\lambda_{k,l}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \hat{\sigma}_{l,j}^2\|_{q/2} \\ &\leq \lambda_{k,l}^2 \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}^2\|_{q/2} + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \|\hat{\sigma}_{l,j}^2\|_{q/2} = \lambda_{k,l}^2 \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}\|_q^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \|\hat{\sigma}_{l,j}\|_q^2 \\ &\leq c^2 q (\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2) = c^2 q \sigma_{k,l,j}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma E.2.** *Let  $q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$  and  $s = q(1 - \tau)$ . Consider the random variables  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$  defined by*

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^s \right)^{1/s}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{t}} = \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^s \right)^{1/s}.$$

*Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there is a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $q, K, N, p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathbf{s}} \geq \frac{c\sqrt{q}}{(q\kappa - 1)^{1/s}} m_o^{-\alpha+1/s} (2N)^{1/s}\right) \leq e^{-q} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathbf{t}} \geq \frac{c\sqrt{q}}{(q\kappa - 1)^{1/s}} (2N)^{1/s}\right) \leq e^{-q}. \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma E.1, this lemma follows from similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma D.2 in Lopes et al. (2020). For further details, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{s}}\|_q &= \left\| \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^s \right\|_{q/s}^{1/s} \leq \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^s\|_{q/s} \right)^{1/s} \\ &= \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \|\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}\|_q^s \right)^{1/s} \leq \sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^s \right)^{1/s} \\ &\leq \sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^s \right)^{1/s} \leq c\sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}^c(m_k, m_l)} \max\{\sigma_{k,j}, \sigma_{l,j}\}^s \right)^{1/s} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c\sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c(m_k, m_l)} (\sigma_{k,j}^s + \sigma_{l,j}^s) \right)^{1/s} \leq c\sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c(m_k)} \sigma_{k,j}^s + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c(m_l)} \sigma_{l,j}^s \right\} \right)^{1/s} \\
&\leq c\sqrt{q} \left( \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \int_{m_k}^p x^{-s\alpha} dx + \int_{m_l}^p x^{-s\alpha} dx \right\} \right)^{1/s} \leq c\sqrt{q} \left( 2N \int_{m_o}^p x^{-s\alpha} dx \right)^{1/s} \\
&\leq c\sqrt{q} (2N)^{1/s} \frac{m_o^{-\alpha+1/s}}{(s\alpha-1)^{1/s}},
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last step, we use  $s\alpha = q\kappa > 1$ . The proof for  $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$  can be obtained by the same argument, except that the bound becomes  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(m_k)} \sigma_{k,j}^s \lesssim 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma E.3.** Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold, and for any fixed  $b > 0$ , let  $q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, \log^b n, 3\}$ . Then for a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $q, K, N, p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that for any  $(k, l) \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , it holds that

$$\left\| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} - \frac{\lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right\|_q \leq cq, \quad (17)$$

and the following event holds with probability 1,

$$\left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}} - \frac{\lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}} \right|^q \mid X \right] \right)^{1/q} \leq cq. \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $(k, l) = (1, 2)$ , and set  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{k,l}$ ,  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_{l,k}$ , and  $\sigma_j = \sigma_{k,l,j}$ . We reuse the notation  $k$  for some index from  $\{1, 2\}$ , i.e.,  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  in what follows.

Since  $q > 2$ , by Minkowski's inequality and Lemma G.4 of Lopes et al. (2020), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\lambda_1 S_{1,j}/\sigma_j - \lambda_2 S_{2,j}/\sigma_j\|_q &\leq \|\lambda_1 S_{1,j}/\sigma_j\|_q + \|\lambda_2 S_{2,j}/\sigma_j\|_q \\
&\leq q \max\{\|\lambda_1 S_{1,j}/\sigma_j\|_2, \lambda_1 n_1^{-1/2+1/q} \|(X_{1,1,j} - \mu_{1,j})/\sigma_j\|_q\} \\
&\quad + q \max\{\|\lambda_2 S_{2,j}/\sigma_j\|_2, \lambda_2 n_2^{-1/2+1/q} \|(X_{2,1,j} - \mu_{1,j})/\sigma_j\|_q\},
\end{aligned}$$

and furthermore

$$\|S_{k,j}\|_2^2 = \text{var}(S_{k,j}) = \sigma_{k,j}^2.$$

Thus  $\|\lambda_k S_{k,j}/\sigma_j\|_2 = \lambda_k \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_j^{-1} \leq 1$ , where we note that  $\lambda_k^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 \sigma_j^{-2} = \lambda_k^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 / (\lambda_1^2 \sigma_{1,j}^2 + \lambda_2^2 \sigma_{2,j}^2) \leq 1$ . Also, if we define the vector  $u_k = \sigma_{k,j}^{-1} \sum_k^{1/2} e_j$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , which satisfies  $\|u\|_2 = 1$ , then

$$\lambda_k \|(X_{k,1,j} - \mu_{k,j})/\sigma_j\|_q = \lambda_k \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_j^{-1} \|(X_{k,1,j} - \mu_{k,j})/\sigma_{k,j}\|_q \leq \|Z_{k,1}^\top u\|_q \lesssim q,$$

proving (17). Inequality (18) follows from the same argument, conditioning on  $X$ .  $\square$

Define the correlation

$$\rho_{k,l,j,j'} = \frac{\Sigma_{k,l}(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,l,j} \sigma_{k,l,j'}},$$



and its sample version

$$\hat{\rho}_{k,l,j,j'} = \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_{k,l}(j,j')}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j'}},$$

for any  $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ .

**Lemma E.4.** *Under Assumption 1 and 3, there is a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the following events*

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} - 1 \right| \leq ca_n,$$

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^{1-\tau} \geq \left( \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{1-\tau} \right) (1 - ca_n),$$

and

$$\max_{j, j' \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} |\hat{\rho}_{j,j'} - \rho_{j,j'}| \leq ca_n$$

each hold with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-2}$ , where  $a_n = n^{-1/2} \log n_{\max}$ .

*Proof.* These conclusions are direct consequences of Lemma E.5. □

**Lemma E.5.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 3 hold, and fix any  $1 \leq k < l \leq K$  and any two (possibly equal) indices  $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . Then, for any number  $\vartheta \geq 1$ , there are positive constants  $c$  and  $c_1(\vartheta)$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the event*

$$\left| \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_{k,l}(j,j')}{\sigma_{k,l,j}\sigma_{k,l,j'}} - \rho_{k,l,j,j'} \right| \leq c_1(\vartheta) n^{-1/2} \log n_{\max}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-\vartheta}$ .

*Proof.* It is equivalent to showing that

$$|\widehat{\Sigma}_{k,l}(j,j') - \Sigma_{k,l}(j,j')| \leq c_1(\vartheta) n^{-1/2} (\log n_{\max}) \sigma_{k,l,j} \sigma_{k,l,j'}.$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\Sigma}_{k,l}(j,j') - \Sigma_{k,l}(j,j')| &= |\lambda_{k,l}^2 \widehat{\Sigma}_k(j,j') - \lambda_{k,l}^2 \Sigma_k(j,j') + \lambda_l^2 \widehat{\Sigma}_l(j,j') - \lambda_{l,k}^2 \Sigma_l(j,j')| \\ &\leq \lambda_{k,l}^2 |\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j,j') - \Sigma_k(j,j')| + \lambda_{l,k}^2 |\widehat{\Sigma}_l(j,j') - \Sigma_l(j,j')| \\ &\leq c_1(\vartheta) (n_k^{-1/2} \lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'} \log n_k + n_l^{-1/2} \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,j'} \log n_l) \\ &\leq 2c_1(\vartheta) (\log n_{\max}) n^{-1/2} (\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'} + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j} \sigma_{l,j'}), \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - cn_k^{-\vartheta} - cn_l^{-\vartheta} \geq 1 - 2cn^{-\vartheta}$ , where the second inequality is due to Lemma D.7 of

Lopes et al. (2020). Now, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$2\sigma_{k,j}\sigma_{k,j'}\sigma_{l,j}\sigma_{l,j'} \leq \sigma_{k,j}^2\sigma_{l,j'}^2 + \sigma_{l,j}^2\sigma_{k,j'}^2,$$

and further

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{k,l}^2\sigma_{k,j}\sigma_{k,j'} + \lambda_{l,k}^2\sigma_{l,j}\sigma_{l,j'} &= \sqrt{(\lambda_{k,l}^2\sigma_{k,j}\sigma_{k,j'} + \lambda_{l,k}^2\sigma_{l,j}\sigma_{l,j'})^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{(\lambda_{k,l}^2\sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2\sigma_{l,j}^2)}\sqrt{(\lambda_{k,l}^2\sigma_{k,j'}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2\sigma_{l,j'}^2)} \\ &= \sigma_{k,l,j}\sigma_{k,l,j'}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark.* In the above proof, we note that Lemma D.7 of Lopes et al. (2020) does not depend on Assumption 2 of Lopes et al. (2020).

**Lemma E.6.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, there is a constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^* - M_{\mathbf{m}}^*| > r_n | X) \leq cn^{-1}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ , where  $\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^*$  is defined in (7) and  $r_n = cn^{-1/2} \log^{5/2} n_{\max}$ .

*Proof.* Using a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma D.8 of Lopes et al. (2020), we find that

$$|\check{M}_{\mathbf{m}}^* - M_{\mathbf{m}}^*| \leq \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \left( \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right)^\tau - 1 \right| \cdot \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{S_{k,l,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|.$$

It follows from Lemma E.4 that the event

$$\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \left( \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} \right)^\tau - 1 \right| \leq cn^{-1/2} \log n_{\max}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cNn^{-2} \geq 1 - cn^{-1}$ . Now consider

$$U^* = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{S_{k,l,j}^*}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|.$$

Showing that

$$\mathbb{P}(U^* \geq c \log^{3/2} n_{\max} | X) \leq cn^{-1}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$  will complete the proof.

Using Chebyshev's inequality with  $q = \{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}(U^* \geq e[\mathbb{E}(|U^*|^q | X)]^{1/q} | X) \leq e^{-q}.$$

Now it suffices to show that the event

$$[\mathbb{E}(|U^*|^q \mid X)]^{1/q} \leq c \log^{3/2} n_{\max}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cn^{-1}$ . This is done by repeating the argument in Lemma B.1 with the aid of (16) from Lemma E.2.  $\square$

**Lemma E.7.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.4, for some constant  $c > 0$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}} - M_{\mathbf{m}}| > r_n) \leq cn^{-1},$$

where  $\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$  is defined in (10) and  $r_n = cn^{-1/2} \log^{5/2} n_{\max}$ .

*Proof.* A similar argument as in the proof of Lemma D.8 of Lopes et al. (2020) leads to

$$|\hat{M}_{\mathbf{m}} - M_{\mathbf{m}}| \leq \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \left( \frac{\sigma_{k,l,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}} \right)^\tau - 1 \right| \cdot \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|.$$

It follows from Lemma E.4 that the event

$$\max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \left( \frac{\sigma_{k,l,j}}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}} \right)^\tau - 1 \right| \leq cn^{-1/2} \log n_{\max}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cNn^{-2} \geq 1 - cn^{-1}$ . Now consider

$$U = \max_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \left| \frac{\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}^\tau} \right|.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(U \geq c \log^{3/2} n_{\max}) \leq cn^{-1}$$

will complete the proof.

Using Chebyshev's inequality with  $q = \max\{2\kappa^{-1}, 3, \log n\}$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}(U \geq e(\mathbb{E}|U|^q)^{1/q}) \leq e^{-q}.$$

Now it suffices to show that

$$\|U\|_q = (\mathbb{E}|U|^q)^{1/q} \lesssim \log^{3/2} n_{\max}.$$

Observe that

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \mathbb{E} |\sigma_{k,l,j}^{-1} (\lambda_{k,l} S_{k,j} - \lambda_{l,k} S_{l,j})|^q.$$

By Lemma E.3, and noting that  $q\alpha(1-\tau) = q\kappa \geq 2$ , we further have

$$\|U\|_q^q \leq (cq)^q \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}, j \in \mathcal{J}_{k,l}(m_k, m_l)} \sigma_{k,l,j}^{q(1-\tau)} \lesssim N(cq)^q,$$

or equivalently,

$$\|U\|_q \lesssim qN^{1/q} \lesssim \log^{3/2} n_{\max},$$

where we use the fact that  $N^{1/q} \lesssim 1$  given the choice of  $q$ . □

Define the correlation

$$\rho_{k,j,j'} = \frac{\Sigma_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}},$$

and its sample version

$$\hat{\rho}_{k,j,j'} = \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,j} \hat{\sigma}_{k,j'}},$$

for any  $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ .

**Lemma E.8.** *Under Assumption 1 and 3, for any number  $\theta \geq 2$ , there are positive constants  $c$  and  $c_\theta$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the event*

$$\sup_{1 \leq g \leq K} \sup_{1 \leq j, j' \leq p} \left| \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'} \right| \leq c_\theta (\log n_{\max} + \log^3 p) n^{-1/2}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cKn^{-\theta}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that

$$\sup_{1 \leq j, j' \leq p} \left| \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'} \right| \leq \frac{c_\theta (\log n_k + \log^3 p)}{\sqrt{n_k}}$$

with probability at least  $1 - cn_k^{-\theta}$ . Consider  $\ell_2$ -unit vectors  $u = \Sigma_k^{1/2} e_j \sigma_{k,j}^{-1}$  and  $v = \Sigma_k^{1/2} e_{j'} \sigma_{k,j'}^{-1}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Define

$$W_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_k)(Z_{k,i} - \bar{Z}_k)^\top,$$

where  $\bar{Z}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Z_{k,i}$ . Observe that

$$\frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'} = u^\top (W_k - \mathbf{I}_p) v. \tag{19}$$

For each  $1 \leq i \leq n_k$ , define the random variable  $\zeta_{i,u} = Z_{k,i}^\top u$  and  $\zeta_{i,v} = Z_{k,i}^\top v$ . In this notation, the relation (19) becomes

$$\frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'} = \Delta(u, v) + \Delta'(u, v)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(u, v) &= \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \zeta_{i,u} \zeta_{i,v} - u^\top v, \\ \Delta'(u, v) &= \left( \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \zeta_{i,u} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \zeta_{i,v} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}(\zeta_{i,u} \zeta_{i,v}) = u^\top v$ . Also, if we let  $q = \max\{\theta(\log n_k + \log^3 p), 3\}$ , then

$$\|\zeta_{i,u} \zeta_{i,v} - u^\top v\|_q \leq 1 + c \|\zeta_{i,u} \zeta_{i,v}\|_q \leq 1 + c \|\zeta_{i,u}\|_{2q} \|\zeta_{i,v}\|_{2q} \leq cq^2,$$

where the second inequality is due to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and the third to Assumption 1. The constant  $c$ , although it varies from place to place, does not depend on  $n_k$  or  $p$ . Then, Lemma G.4 of Lopes et al. (2020) gives the following bound for  $q > 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta(u, v)\|_q &\leq cq \max \left\{ \|\Delta(u, v)\|_2, n_k^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \|\zeta_{i,u} \zeta_{i,v} - u^\top v\|_q^q \right)^{1/q} \right\} \\ &\leq cq \max \{ n_k^{-1/2}, n_k^{-1+1/q} q^2 \} \\ &\leq c(\log n_k + \log^3 p) n_k^{-1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

By the Chebyshev inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(|\Delta(u, v)| \geq e \|\Delta(u, v)\|_q) \leq e^{-q},$$

whence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Delta(u, v)| \geq \frac{c\theta(\log n_k + \log^3 p)}{\sqrt{n_k}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^\theta p^\theta}.$$

Similar arguments apply to  $\Delta'(u, v)$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'}\right| \geq \frac{c_\theta(\log n_k + \log^3 p)}{\sqrt{n_k}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^\theta p^\theta}$$

and furthermore by a union bound

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j, j' \leq p} \left| \frac{\widehat{\Sigma}_k(j, j')}{\sigma_{k,j} \sigma_{k,j'}} - \rho_{k,j,j'} \right| \geq \frac{c_\theta(\log n_k + \log^3 p)}{\sqrt{n_k}}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j, j' \leq p} \frac{1}{n_k^\theta p^\theta} = \frac{1}{n_k^\theta} \frac{p^2}{p^\theta} \leq \frac{1}{n_k^\theta}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Observing that  $\sigma_{k,l,j} = \sqrt{\lambda_{k,l}^2 \sigma_{k,j}^2 + \lambda_{l,k}^2 \sigma_{l,j}^2}$ , one obtains the following corollary.

**Corollary E.9.** *Under Assumption 1 and 3, for any number  $\theta \geq 2$ , there are positive constants  $c$  and  $c_\theta$ ,*

not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , such that the event

$$\sup_{(k,l) \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{k,l,j}}{\sigma_{k,l,j}} - 1 \right| \leq c_\theta (\log n_{\max} + \log^3 p) n^{-1/2}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - cNn^{-\theta}$ .

**Lemma E.10.** *Suppose Assumptions 1–4 hold. Then, for any fixed  $\theta \in [0, \infty)$  and  $Q \lesssim \log n$ , for some constant  $c$ , not depending on  $K$ ,  $|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $p$  and  $n_1, \dots, n_K$ , one has*

$$\sup_{1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq j \leq p} \left\| \frac{\sigma_{k,j}^\theta}{\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}^\theta} \right\|_Q \leq c.$$

*Proof.* Below we suppress the subscripts from  $\hat{\sigma}_{k,j}$ ,  $\mu_k$  and  $n_k$ . Also, the constant  $c$  might change its value from place to place and depend on  $\theta$ . In addition, observing that

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{\hat{\sigma}^2} = \frac{1}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [\{(X_i - \mu) - (\bar{X} - \mu)\}/\sigma]^2} = \frac{1}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}$$

with  $Y_i = (X_i - \mu)/\sigma$  and  $\bar{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ , without loss of generality, we assume  $\mathbb{E}X = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}X^2 = 1$ .

Let  $\omega = Q\theta \asymp \log n$  and  $c_1 = 1/2$ . We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\hat{\sigma}^{-\omega} &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^{-\omega} > t) dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt \\ &= \int_0^{c_1} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt + \int_{c_1}^{n^\omega} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt + \int_{n^\omega}^\infty \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \leq t^{-2/\omega}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq n : (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \leq nt^{-2/\omega}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq n : |X_i - \bar{X}| \leq \sqrt{nt^{-1/\omega}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1 : |X_i - X_n| \leq 2\sqrt{nt^{-1/\omega}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1 : |X_i - X_n| \leq 2\sqrt{nt^{-1/\omega}} \mid X_n) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{P}(|X_1 - X_n| \leq 2\sqrt{nt^{-1/\omega}} \mid X_n)\}^{n-1} \\ &\leq (c\sqrt{nt^{-1/\omega}})^{(n-1)\nu} \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant  $c > 0$  and for all sufficiently large  $n$ , where the last inequality is due Assumption 4, and the last equality is due to the conditional independence of the random variables  $|X_1 - X_n|, \dots, |X_{n-1} - X_n|$

given  $X_n$  and that these variables have identical conditional distributions. Therefore,

$$\int_{n^\omega}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt \leq (-(n-1)\nu/\omega + 1) c^{\nu(n-1)} n^{(n-1)\nu/2} t^{-(n-1)\nu/\omega+1} \Big|_{n^\omega}^{\infty} \leq \nu c^{\nu(n-1)} n^{\omega - \frac{(n-1)\nu}{2} + 1} \omega^{-1} \ll 1.$$

Let  $c_1 = 1/2$ . When  $t \geq c_1^{-\omega/2}$  or equivalently  $t^{-2/\omega} \leq 1/2$ , noting that  $\mathbb{E}\hat{\sigma}^2 = 1$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 - 1 < t^{-2/\omega} - \sigma^2) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 - 1 < -1/2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\sigma}^2 - 1| \geq 1/2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\sigma}^2 - 1| \geq 2n^{-1/2}(\log n)^2) \\ &\leq cn^{-2\log n} = cn^{-2\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by an argument identical to that in the proof of Lemma D.7 of [Lopes et al. \(2020\)](#), except that the number  $q = \max\{\kappa \log(n), 3\}$  there is replaced by  $q = \max\{2(\log n)^2, 3\}$ . This implies that

$$\int_{c_1^{-\omega/2}}^{n^\omega} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t^{-2/\omega}) dt \leq n^\omega \cdot cn^{-2\omega} = cn^{-\omega} \ll 1.$$

Note that when  $t \leq c_1^{-\omega/2}$ , we have the trivial bound  $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}^2 < t) \leq 1$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{\sigma}^{-\omega} \leq c_1^{-\omega/2} + cn^{-\omega} + c^{\nu n} n^{\omega - \frac{n}{2}} \leq cc_1^{-\omega/2} = c2^{\omega/2},$$

or  $\|\hat{\sigma}^{-\theta}\|_Q \leq c$ . □

## References

- Bentkus, V. (2005). A Lyapunov-type bound in  $R^d$ . *SIAM Journal on Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 49(2):311–323.
- Lopes, M. E., Lin, Z., and Müller, H.-G. (2020). Bootstrapping max statistics in high dimensions: Near-parametric rates under weak variance decay and application to functional data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1214–1229.