Consider a two-class classification problem where we observe samples
\((X_i, Y_i)\) for \(i = 1, \cdots, n\), \(X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p\) and \(Y_i \in \{0, 1\}\). Given \(Y_i = k\), \(X_i\) is assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean \(\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^k\) and covariance matrix \(\Sigma_k\), \(k = 0, 1\). Supposing a new sample \(X\) from the same mixture is observed, our goal is to estimate its class label \(Y\). The difficulty lies in the rarity and weakness of the differences in the mean vector and in the covariance matrices.

By incorporating the quadratic terms \(\Omega_k = \Sigma_k^{-1}\) from the two classes, we formulate the likelihood-based classification as a Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA) problem. Hence, we propose the QDA classification method with feature-selection step. Compared with recent work on the linear case (LDA) with \(\Omega_k\) assumed to be either an identity matrix [5, 6, 16] or a common sparse \(\Omega_k\) estimated by Partial Correlation Screening [14], the current setting is much more general. The numerical results from real datasets support our theories and demonstrate the necessity and superiority of using QDA over LDA for classification under the rare and weak model.

We set up a rare and weak model for both the mean vector and the precision matrix. With the model parameters, we clearly depict the boundary separating the region of successful classification from the region of unsuccessful classification of the newly proposed QDA with feature-selection method, for the two cases that \(\mu_k\) is either known or unknown. We also explore the region of successful classification of the QDA approach when both \(\mu_k\) and \(\Omega_k\) are unknown. The results again suggest that the quadratic term has major influence over the LDA for the classification decision and classification accuracy.

When \(\mu_k\) and \(\Omega_k\) are both known, we find the region where all the classifiers will fail. It is exactly the same as the region where QDA will fail,
under the same modelling and parameterization, and thus the QDA classifier achieves the optimal classification results.

1. Introduction. In recent years, high-dimensional data have flooded almost all fields of science and technology. These types of data are being generated in massive quantities and share a common high-throughput mechanism. Generally speaking, a prominent number of measurements of features, often in the millions, are gathered for a single subject. The goal of the inherent analysis for these large datasets is to make useful inferences for each subject or a future subject. The tools for solving the problems in this area play particularly important roles, especially in this “data science” era.

One of the fundamental problems in large-scale inference [7] is classification. Consider a two-class classification problem, where we have \( n \) labeled training samples \((X_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\). Here, \( X_i \)'s are \( p \)-dimensional feature vectors and \( Y_i \in \{0, 1\} \) are the corresponding class labels. The goal is to estimate the label of a new observation \( X \). A significant amount of work has been done in this field: see [1, 12, 18].

In modern analytical approaches, usually the number of features is huge but only a small portion of them are regarded as relevant to the classification decision, although these are not known in advance. In this sense, the methods will lose power because of the large amount of noise. A common way to solve this problem is to perform dimension reduction such that the number of features is greatly reduced, and then use only the resultant features for classification; see [8, 14, 24].

Fisher’s Linear Determinant Analysis (LDA) in [10] utilizes a weighted average of the features of the test sample to make a prediction. In the traditional setting where \( n \gg p \), the optimal weight vector for LDA where the two classes are assumed to share the same correlation structure \( \Omega \) satisfies

\[
(1.1) \quad w \propto \Omega(\mu_1 - \mu_0)
\]

where the mean vectors \( \mu_0 \) and \( \mu_1 \), as well as \( \Omega \), can be easily estimated, and therefore Fisher’s LDA is approachable.

However, for the high-dimensional setting where \( p \gg n \), LDA faces immediate problems:

- It is practically infeasible to estimate \( \Omega \) due to the limited sample size \( n \).
- It is difficult to account for the information from different \( \Omega_0 \) and \( \Omega_1 \). The difference affects two areas: the difference in the covariance matrix term and the estimation of \( \omega \). The classification criteria have to be improved to combine these two parts.
- The analysis for error rate is quite complicated even in the simplest case, where \( \Omega_0 = \Omega_1 = I_p \), as the signals are rare and weak. An extensive discussion may be found in [5, 6, 8, 16, 17].

With recent developments in the estimation of the precision matrix in high dimensions [14], the first problem has been alleviated; that is, Partial Correlation Screening (PCS) is computationally efficient in estimating a row of \( \Omega \), and it needs only a few rows of the empirical covariance matrix. PCS has been demonstrated to be capable of executing the estimation of a large precision matrix \((p = 10K)\), and has been applied with evident success in classification.

For the second problem, one variant of LDA that incorporates the covariance-matrix information is proposed as Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA) in [13]; with extensions for the high-dimensional data; see [2, 26, 27]. When the signals are sparse, the original QDA method is modified accordingly with sparsity assumptions of the difference of the precision matrices and \( \mu_1 - \mu_0 \); see [9, 15, 20]. However, to the best of our knowledge, the theoretical
discussions for the error rate for the high-dimensional QDA with rare and weak signals have not been thoroughly discussed.

Therefore, this paper primarily focuses on addressing the second and third problems. Starting from the classical QDA, we propose a new QDA with the feature-selection approach, where we estimate \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) with PCS and \( \mu \) with sample mean for the quadratic term (second-order information), and estimate the linear term (first-order information) with \( d^\top X \), where \( d \) is found by thresholding \( \Omega_2 \mu_2 - \Omega_1 \mu_1 \). Numerical analysis of a real data set suggests that our new approach should incorporate the second-order information, as it will then perform better than the optimal high-dimensional LDA method.

For the third problem, we propose the rare and weak model on both the mean vector and the precision matrix, tying their rareness and weakness to the parameter \( p \). Based on the model, we carefully quantify the possibility and impossibility regions for the two-class classification by simultaneously exploiting both the difference in \( \mu \) and the difference in \( \Omega \). In addition, we carefully analyze how the errors in QDA may affect the classification results, which has not been done previously in the rare and weak signal model.

We calibrate the effect of quadratic terms on classification, in terms of

- the possibility and impossibility region under the ideal case, where both \( \mu_k \) and \( \Sigma_k \) \((k = 0, 1)\) are known;
- the possibility and impossibility region for the newly proposed QDA with feature selection, under other alternative cases where \( \mu_k \) and \( \Sigma_k \) \((k = 0, 1)\) are only partially known;
- the successful classification region for the newly proposed QDA with feature selection, when both \( \mu_k \) and \( \Omega_k \) are unknown.

To highlight our findings, we show that the QDA classification rule achieves a misclassification rate of 0 asymptotically \((p \to \infty)\) in some parameter regions, and for other regions has asymptotic constant error in the ideal case (Theorems 1-2). The results for other alternative cases are subsequently analyzed in Theorems 3-4.

1.1. Quadratic Discriminant Analysis. Consider the two-class classification problem mentioned above, where we observe \( n \) training samples \((X_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\). Given \( Y_i = k \), we assume the feature vector \( X_i \in \mathcal{R}^p \) follows a multivariate normal distribution with mean \( \mu_k \) and covariance matrix \( \Omega_k^{-1} \). Let \( X \) denote an independent test sample from the same population; then,

\[
X|Y \sim (1-Y)N(\mu_0, \Omega_0^{-1}) + YN(\mu_1, \Omega_1^{-1}).
\]

We would like to classify \( X \) as being from either \( Y = 0 \) or \( Y = 1 \).

For two-population classification problems, the QDA method is commonly used to exploit both the mean and covariance information; see [21]. Similarly, when \( \mu_k \) and \( \Omega_k \) are all known, \( k = 0, 1 \), we derive the likelihood function of the two populations, and the ratio gives the criteria for the current problem. The classification rule is that

\[
\hat{Y} = I \left\{ X^\top (\Omega_0^{-1} - \Omega_1^{-1}) X - 2 (\mu_0^\top \Omega_0^{-1} - \mu_1^\top \Omega_1^{-1}) X \\
+ (\mu_0^\top \Omega_0 \mu_0 - \mu_1^\top \Omega_1 \mu_1 + \ln |\Omega_1| - \ln |\Omega_0|) > 0 \right\},
\]

where \( I(A) \) is the indicator function of event \( A \). If \( P(Y_i = 1) = q \neq 0.5 \), an additional term \( 2 \ln \frac{1}{1-q} \) on the right-hand side of the inequality will improve the accuracy. However, as this does not have a significant effect on possibility and impossibility regions, our analysis applied to this case (i.e. \( q = 0.5 \)) will suffice.

When \( \mu_k \) and \( \Omega_k \) are unknown in reality, we have to use the estimated parameters instead. When \( p \ll n \), the sample mean and covariance are accurate. However, in the high-dimensional setting with \( p \gg n \) and the signals being rare and weak, the estimation becomes difficult.
1.2. Rare and Weak Signal Model. In the high-dimensional setting, the number of features \( p \to \infty \) and the signals are rare and weak. We need a model to catch the rareness and weakness in both the mean part and the covariance part. Since both parts include the rareness and weakness, the general model is complicated. Here, we consider them separately and make some simplifications.

In [8], the case that \( \mu_0 \neq \mu_1 \) but \( \Omega_0 = \Omega_1 \) has been studied. We start with the model from there, and assume \( \mu_0 = -\mu \) and \( \mu_1 = \mu \). If not, we could simply do a location shifting of the distance \( \frac{1}{2} |\mu_1 - \mu_0| \) to the left or the right. We model the contrast mean vector \( \mu \) as

\[
\mu_i \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} (1-\epsilon)M_0 + \epsilon M_\tau, \quad i = 1, \ldots, p,
\]

where \( M_0 \) and \( M_\tau \) are the point mass at 0 and \( \tau > 0 \) respectively. Here, we assume the signals have the same signs and strengths. This is largely for simplicity, and, as discussed in [8] and our remarks following Theorem 1, \( M_\tau \) can be replaced by a random variable with support \([-\tau, \tau]\); all the results discussed in this paper will still hold. The signals are rare and weak in the sense that, when the sample size \( n \) approaches infinity, we assume that the strength and density of the signals converges to 0, i.e.,

\[
\epsilon \to 0, \quad \tau \to 0.
\]

To examine the effect of the quadratic term, we also model the difference between \( \Omega_0 \) and \( \Omega_1 \). Here we use the precision matrix instead of the correlation matrix because the estimations of the two matrices are totally different in the high-dimensional setting, and the former one has a direct effect on the classification results. We are interested in the difference between \( \Omega_0 \) and \( \Omega_1 \), and so we assume \( \Omega_0 \) is known and focus on the parameterization of \( \Omega_1 - \Omega_0 \). Without loss of generality, we assume \( \Omega_0 = I \). Hence, we write \( \Omega = \Omega_1 \) and \( \Sigma = \Sigma_1 \) in the following context for notational simplicity.

We introduce a characterization of rareness and weakness for \( \Omega \). Let \( W(\nu) \) denote a \( p \)-dimensional Wigner matrix with parameter \( \nu \). Specifically, let \( W(\nu) \) be symmetric with 0’s on the diagonals and \( w_{ij} \) on the off-diagonals, following the distribution

\[
w_{ji} = w_{ij} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} (1-\nu)M_0 + \frac{\nu}{2}M_1 + \frac{\nu}{2}M_{-1}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq p,
\]

where \( M_1 \) and \( M_{-1} \) are the point masses at 1 and \(-1\), respectively. Then, we model \( \Omega \) as

\[
\Omega = \Sigma^{-1} = cI + \eta W
\]

for some constant \( c = c(n, p) \) close to 1. Here, the parameters \( 1-c \) and \( \eta \) represent the signal weakness, and \( \nu \) represents the signal rareness. We assume \( \nu \to 0, \eta \to 0 \) and \( c \to 1 \) when the sample size \( n \) goes to infinity.

Now, with a realization of \( W \), the model under consideration is the mixture model

\[
X_i|(W,Y_i) \sim (1-Y_i)N(-\mu,I) + Y_iN(\mu,[cI+\eta W]^{-1}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

We are interested in the possibility and impossibility regions under the current model and successful and unsuccessful classification regions of QDA classifier.

We tie all the parameters to \( p \) by some constant parameters, as follows, and explore how these parameters influence the classification results. For the mean vector, the parameters \( \epsilon \) and \( \tau \) depict the signal sparsity and weakness, respectively. We define them as

\[
\epsilon = p^{-\zeta}, \quad \tau = g_p p^{-\theta}, \quad 0 < \zeta, \theta < 1,
\]

where \( g_p \) can be 1 or a \( \ln p \) term, which will be discussed in Section 2. For the precision matrix \( \Omega \), we take the following parameterization in a similar manner to that of the mean part:

\[
\eta = f_p p^{-\alpha}, \quad \nu = p^{-\beta}, \quad \xi = 1 - c = p^{-\gamma}, \quad 0 < \alpha, \gamma < 1, 0 < \beta < 2,
\]
where $f_p$ can be 1 or a $\ln p$ term. Details are provided in Section 2. Here, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \zeta,$ and $\theta$ are all constants. It is of interest to explore the performance diagram of the QDA classifier on the space formed by these parameters.

To guarantee that $\hat{\Omega}$ is a precision matrix, $\eta W$ must be weak enough for $\Omega = cI + \eta W$ to be positive definite. According to Lemma 3.1 in Section 3, this requirement is satisfied with high probability under the condition

$$\beta > 1 - 2\alpha.$$  

Hence, we discuss only the classification possibility and impossibility regions under this condition.

Finally, we tie the sample size $n$ to $p$ by

$$n = p^\delta, \quad 0 < \delta < 1.$$  

When $p \to \infty$, $n$ goes to infinity at a much slower rate.

### 1.3. **QDA with Feature Selection.**

For the high-dimensional setting, we have to incorporate feature selection in the proposed QDA classifier. Consider a new observation $X$ from the mixture population (1.8); i.e., $X \sim N(-\mu, I)$ when $Y = 0$ and $X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1})$ when $Y = 1$. Under the current model, the classification rule (1.3) is reduced to

$$\hat{Y} = I\{X^\top (I - \Omega)X + 2\hat{\mu}^\top (I + \Omega)X + \hat{\mu}^\top (I - \Omega)\mu + \ln |\Omega| > 0\}.$$  

In this rule, the unknown $\mu$ and $\Omega$ need to be estimated. We propose the following algorithm for QDA classification with feature selection:

#### Algorithm 1.

0. Find the corresponding precision matrix $\hat{\Omega}$ with a precision-matrix-estimation method. Calculate the average vector of the two classes as $\hat{\mu}_0 = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i:Y_i = 0} X_i$ and $\hat{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i:Y_i = 1} X_i$, where $n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ and $n_0 = n - n_1$.

1. Let $d_0 = \hat{\mu}_0$, $d_1 = \hat{\Omega} \hat{\mu}_1$ and $d = d_1 - d_0 = (d(1), \ldots, d(p))^\top$.

2. With a threshold $t$, let $d^{(t)}$ denote the indicator vector of feature selection, i.e. for $j = 1, \ldots, p$,

$$d^{(t)}(j) = \begin{cases} 1, & |d(j)| > t, \\ 0, & |d(j)| < t. \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)}$ be the hard-thresholded mean difference vector $d$, i.e. $\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)} = d \circ d^{(t)}$.

3. Let $C = \mu^\top (I - \Omega)\mu + \ln |\Omega|$. When $C$ is unknown, we use grid search to figure out $C$ with best performance.

4. (Prediction step) For any fresh data vector $X$, calculate the QDA score

$$Q = X^\top (I - \hat{\Omega})X + 2(\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)})^\top X + C$$

and estimate the label of $X$ as $\hat{Y}$ with $\hat{Y} = I\{Q > 0\}$.

In this procedure, Step 0 can adopt any estimation method for the high-dimensional sparse precision matrix, such as the one in [14]. The theoretical limit of the proposed method depends on the estimation method applied.

In Steps 1–2, we propose a feature-selection component for $d = \hat{\Omega} \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0$. This step is quite standard in high-dimensional data analysis, and yet is different from the high-dimensional LDA approach in two aspects. First, we consider $\Omega \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0$ instead of $\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0$ directly, since the latter provides less information. Second, we apply the hard-thresholding method instead of the clipping method, which also provides the estimation of quantity that helps when we calculate the term $X^\top \Omega X$. 


1.4. A Real Data Example. We use a quick example to demonstrate how this works on the real data. We consider the rats dataset with summaries given in Table 1. The original rats dataset was collected in a study of gene expressions of live rats in response to different drugs and a toxicant; we use the cleaned version by [28]. This dataset consists of 181 samples measured on the same set of 8491 genes, with 61 samples labeled by [28] as toxicants and the other 120 as other drugs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n (# of subjects)</th>
<th>p (# of genes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rats</td>
<td>Yousefi et al. (2010)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This dataset has been carefully studied in [14], with the performance of the two-class classification compared among a sequence of popular classifiers, including SVM, Random Forest, and HCT-PCS. The HCT-PCS, which achieves optimal classification when it adapts LDA [5, 8] in the rare and weak signal setting, was shown to have very promising classification results with this data.

That said, in HCT-PCS, all samples of the two classes are assumed to share the same precision matrix, leaving room for improvement. We now focus on how to use the difference in precision matrix between the two classes to improve the classification of this data and compare the results here with those from the LDA setting. Here, we leave out all the implementation details, which will be introduced in Section 4, and only highlight our findings for this rats data:

• QDA further outperforms LDA in terms of both best error rate and average errors, and produces better results than those other methods in [14], including SVM and Random Forest, suggesting that QDA gives a better separation by taking into account the second-order difference between the two classes.

As illustrated in Figure 1 (below, left), we can see that the performances (in terms of test error) of LDA are all above those of QDA at every data splitting of 15 splittings for the rats data, given that their precision matrices were estimated by PCS separately. In fact, this finding holds for both the best error rate and average error of the two classifiers. Figure 1 (below, right) demonstrates the surface of the test error between LDA and QDA, by varying the estimated covariance matrices. This Zoom-in plot shows the error rates of the two classifiers in great detail, and supports our finding that the QDA does bring necessary improvement over LDA when the precision matrices are appropriately estimated.

1.5. Main results. This paper considered several scenarios, from the simplest case, in which both the mean vector and precision matrix are known, to the most general case, in which both are unknown. The results for the unknown precision matrix (Theorem 4) make use of current advances in the area of precision-matrix estimation. To avoid discussing these advances (which are beyond the scope of this paper) and focus on the main results of our research, we now examine the case in which the mean vector is unknown while the precision matrix is known (i.e., Theorem 3).

When $\gamma < 1/2$, the signal in variances is so large that even for a uninformative mean vector the QDA classifier can achieve successful classification (Theorem 1). Thus we consider the non-trivial case that $\gamma \geq 1/2$ (i.e., (2.18)). On the other hand, since the mean vector is unknown, its estimation accuracy depends on the sample size $n$. Let

$$\kappa = \max \{ \kappa_1, \kappa_2 \},$$
Our results show that $\kappa$ is a key quantity in the phase transition whether the mean vector is known or unknown. Here, $\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_2$ are the synchronized indexes of signal weakness and sparsity in the mean difference and the covariance matrix difference, respectively. In detail, $p^{\kappa_1} \sim p^2 \eta^2 \nu$, which is the order of the squared $L_2$-norm of the eigenvalues of $\eta W$, while $p^{\kappa_2} \sim p^2 \epsilon$, which is the order of the squared $L_2$-norm of the mean vector $\mu$. Under model (1.8) with balanced sample ($\eta = 1/2$) and the parameterization (1.4), (1.7)–(1.12), and (2.18), we examine two cases:

(i) When $\theta < \delta/2$, the signals in the mean difference of the two populations are so strong that the QDA classifier achieves the same classification results for the unknown mean vector as for the known mean vector (Theorem 2). More specifically, the QDA misclassification rate converges to 0 when $\kappa > 0$, converges to positive values (between 0 and 1/2) when $\kappa < 0$, and converges to either 0 or positive values on the boundary $\kappa = 0$ depending on whether a $\ln p$ term is introduced in the signal strength. Thus the boundary $\kappa = 0$ partitions the phase space into successful and unsuccessful classification regions of QDA classifier, which are further proved the respective possibility and impossibility regions. In another word, the QDA classifier achieves the largest successful classification region.

(ii) When $\theta \geq \delta/2$, the signals in the mean difference of the two populations are weak, and so the unknown mean vector reduces the QDA classification successful region for the case of the known mean vector (Theorem 2). More specifically, the QDA misclassification rate converges to 0 when $\kappa > (1 - \delta)/2$, converges to 1/2 when $\kappa < (1 - \delta)/2$, and converges to either 0 or positive values on the boundary $\kappa = (1 - \delta)/2$ depending on whether a $\ln p$ term is introduced in the signal strength.

In summary, when the sample size is large enough relative to signal strength in the mean difference ($\theta < \delta/2$), the QDA classification result when the mean vector is unknown is the same as when it is known (‘oracle’ property) and QDA achieves the possibility region; otherwise, the QDA successful classification region will be reduced roughly from $\kappa > 0$ to $\kappa > (1 - \delta)/2$.

To visualize the relationships among these parameters and the possibility/impossibility and QDA classification successful/unsuccessful regions, some of the results in Theorem 3 are given in Figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 depicts those regions in terms of $\kappa_1$ and $\kappa_2$ values, with subfigure (a) for $\theta < \delta/2$ and (b) for $\theta \geq \delta/2$. Note that $\kappa_2 > 1 - \delta - \zeta > -\delta$ when
\( \theta < \delta/2, \kappa_2 \leq 1 - \delta - \zeta < 1 - \delta \) when \( \theta \geq \delta/2, \) and \( \kappa_1 < 1 \) by (1.11). In Figure 2, we observe that, when the two cases \( \theta < \delta/2 \) and \( \theta \geq \delta/2 \) are compared, although the QDA successful region is reduced from \( \kappa > 0 \) to \( \kappa > (1 - \delta)/2 \), the region is not simply shrunk in size. Instead, some of the successful region is actually removed while another area is added to it, when we switch from the case of \( \theta < \delta/2 \) to the case of \( \theta \geq \delta/2 \). The added area in the case of \( \theta \geq \delta/2 \) is the green area over \( \kappa_2 \in [-2, -\delta] \). This added area is simply due to the fact that \( \theta \geq \delta/2 \) imposes only an upper bound \( 1 - \delta \) on \( \kappa_2 \) and lower bound is still \( -2 \), while \( \theta < \delta/2 \) imposes a lower bound \( -\delta \) on \( \kappa_2 \).

![Figure 2. The possibility/impossibility regions and QDA successful/unsuccessful classification regions derived in Theorem 3 and defined in terms of \( \kappa_1 = 2 - 2\alpha - \beta \) and \( \kappa_2 = 1 - 2\theta - \zeta \) for fixed \( \delta \) and for the two cases: (a) strong signal region \( (\theta < \delta/2) \) and (b) weak signal region \( (\theta \geq \delta/2) \).](image)

To provide a sense of the relationship between the two parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) from the covariance matrix and, separately, the relationship between the two parameters \( \theta \) and \( \zeta \) from the mean vector, for fixed \( \delta \) Figure 3 displays the QDA successful and unsuccessful classification regions of one set of parameters when the other set of parameters is fixed. Subfigures (a) and (b) are for fixed \( \theta \) and \( \zeta \) (and thus \( \kappa_2 \)) values, while (c) and (d) are for fixed \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) (and thus \( \kappa_1 \)) values. Note that we consider only the cases in which \( \kappa_2 \leq 0 \) in (a) and \( \kappa_2 \leq (1 - \delta)/2 \) in (b), since otherwise the QDA successful region of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) will be the collection of all possible values. Similarly, we do not consider the case \( \kappa_1 > (1 - \delta)/2 \), which would make the QDA successful region of \( \theta \) and \( \zeta \) be the whole square. Note that (a) and (b) are under the constraint (1.11). From (a) and (b) we can see that, when \( \theta \) increases from less than \( \delta/2 \) to greater than \( \delta/2 \), the QDA successful region of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) decreases. From (c) and (d) we observe that, when \( \kappa_1 \) decreases (i.e., \( 2\alpha + \beta \) increases) from a positive value to a negative value, the QDA successful region of \( \theta \) and \( \zeta \) decreases.

The methods employed and results obtained in this work are unique compared with other literatures on QDA methods for high dimensional data with sparse signals. In [20], sparsity assumptions are made on the covariance matrices \( \Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \) and \( \Sigma_0 - \Sigma_1 \), instead of on the precision matrices in our work. In [26] and [9], sparsity assumptions are made on the precision matrices. However, [26] requires a stronger signal that \( \max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} \geq 1 \) while we only need \( \max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\} > 0 \). In [9], sparsity condition is expressed as the number of rows in \( \Omega_i \) that have non-zero off-diagonal entries are at the order of \( o(\min(n, p)) \). In our work, we allow each entry to be independently symmetrically distributed, which is more general.

1.6. Content and Notations. The main results for the phase diagram of the QDA method and the one with feature selection are discussed in Section 2. In Section 3, we show the proofs of the main theorems. Next, numerical results of the proposed methods and algorithms on real data are presented in Section 4. In Section 5, some concluding remarks and potential directions of future work are discussed. The details of the proofs are provided in the appendices.
Here we list the notations used throughout the paper. Let the eigenvalues of $W$ be denoted by $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_p$. For a matrix $M$, we use $\|M\|$ and $\|M\|_F$ to denote its spectral normal and Frobenius norm, respectively, and $\text{Tr}(M)$ to denote its trace which equals the summation of the eigenvalues of $M$. We use $\text{diag}(c_1, \ldots, c_p)$ to denote a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $c_1, \ldots, c_p$, and use $I(A)$ to denote an indicator function over event $A$. For two vectors or matrices $a$ and $b$ of same dimension, $a \circ b$ denotes the Hadamard (entrywise) product.

2. Phase transition for QDA. The theoretical analysis consists of three parts. First, in Section 2.1, we discover the possibility and impossibility regions in the ideal case where all the parameters $\mu$ and $\Omega$ are known, and show that QDA achieves the largest successful classification region. Second, in Section 2.2, we further characterize the QDA successful and unsuccessful classification regions when $\mu$ have to be estimated but $\Omega$ are known. Last, in Section 2.3, we analyze the QDA successful region when both $\mu$ and $\Omega$ are unknown.

2.1. Ideal case. In the ideal case, we assume that $\mu$ and $\Omega$ are known. We begin with the position in which $\mu = 0$ to examine the effect of the quadratic terms on classification. In the general case, it means that the mean vectors from both classes are the same. Hence, the rare and weak signal model (1.8) is reduced to the mixture model

$$X_i(W, Y_i) \sim (1 - Y_i)N(0, I) + Y_iN \left(0, [cI + \eta W]^{-1}\right).$$
For any classifier $T$, we denote the estimated class label of a fresh data $X$ as $\hat{Y}^T(X)$. The misclassification rate of $T$ is defined as

$$
(2.17) \quad MR(T) = \frac{1}{2} P_{c,\tau,\eta,\nu,\xi}(\hat{Y}^T(X) = 0 | Y = 1) + \frac{1}{2} P_{c,\tau,\eta,\nu,\xi}(\hat{Y}^T(X) = 1 | Y = 0).
$$

Under the current model, we identify the regions where the QDA method succeeds and fails. The results are given in the following theorem.

For notation simplicity, we use $C_p$ to denote any constant term satisfying $\liminf_{p \to \infty} C_p > 0$ and use $L_p$ to denote any $\ln p$ term such that $\liminf_{p \to \infty} \frac{L_p}{(\ln p)^r} > 0$ for some constant $r > 0$.

**Theorem 1** Consider model (2.16) with the parameterizations (1.7)–(1.11).

(i) If one of the following conditions is satisfied,

1. $\gamma < 1/2$, $f_p = C_p$;
2. $\gamma \geq 1/2$, $\beta < 2 - 2\alpha$, $f_p = C_p$;
3. $\gamma \geq 1/2$, $\beta = 2 - 2\alpha$, $f_p = L_p$;

the QDA classification rule (1.13) under model (2.16) has a misclassification rate (MR) that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$.

(ii) If $\gamma > 1/2$ and $\beta > 2 - 2\alpha$, then for any classifier $L$, the misclassification rate $2.17$ of $L$ converges to $1/2$ when $p \to \infty$.

**Theorem 1** depicts an exact phase diagram of the QDA method when $f_p$ is a $\ln p$ term. When $\gamma < 1/2$ or $\beta \leq 2 - 2\alpha$, the QDA method achieves a misclassification rate of 0 asymptotically. Otherwise ($\gamma > 1/2$ and $\beta > 2 - 2\alpha$), all classifiers, including the QDA method, will fail. Note that, when $\gamma < 1/2$, the deviation in diagonal elements of the precision matrices is large enough for successful classification. Hence, the interesting case is when

$$
(2.18) \quad \gamma > 1/2,
$$

and the following analysis is predicated under this assumption. On the boundary $\gamma = 1/2$, the analysis of the possibility and impossibility regions is much more complicated and one needs to zoom in and may introduce more parameters. Given that we already have six parameters, we would put aside this special case and only consider the case of $\gamma > 1/2$.

**Theorem 1** tells us that under (2.18), the QDA classifier succeeds in the region $\beta \leq 2 - 2\alpha$ while all classifiers fail in the region $\beta > 2 - 2\alpha$. This indicates that the possibility and impossibility regions are $\beta \leq 2 - 2\alpha$ and $\beta > 2 - 2\alpha$ respectively and QDA succeeds in the whole possibility region and thus is optimal in this sense.

In the proof (see Appendix A in Supplementary Material), it may be observed that the result in Theorem 1 depends on $\xi^2 = (c - 1)^2$ instead of $\xi$ itself. Thus, if we set

$$
\Omega = I + diag(\pm \xi) + \eta W,
$$

Theorem 1 still holds. This makes more sense since now we allow either a $\xi$ or a $-\xi$ deviation from 1 for any of the $p$ diagonal elements. Even more generally, $\xi$ can be replaced by a random variable with support $[-\xi, \xi]$. For example, $\Omega = I + diag(U_1, \ldots, U_p) + \eta W$ with $U_i$ being i.i.d. uniform random variables over $[-\xi, \xi]$.

We next consider the case where the means are unequal but still known, i.e., $\mu \neq 0$. In such a case, the mixture model is back to (1.8). The regions of possibility and impossibility under (2.18) and the optimality of QDA are characterized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** Consider model (1.8) with the parameterizations (1.4), (1.7)–(1.11), and (2.18).

(i) If one of the following conditions is satisfied,

1. $\beta < 2 - 2\alpha$, $f_p = C_p$;
(2) $\beta = 2 - 2\alpha$, $f_\mu = L_p$;
(3) $0 < \zeta < 1 - 2\theta$, $g_\mu = C_p$;
(4) $\zeta = 1 - 2\theta$, $g_p = L_p$.

The QDA classification rule (1.13) has a misclassification rate that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$.

(ii) If $\beta > 2 - 2\alpha$ and $\zeta > 1 - 2\theta$, then, for any classifier $L$, the misclassification rate (2.17) of $L$ converges to $1/2$ when $p \to \infty$.

Remark 1. Theorem 2 demonstrates that under the assumptions stated therein, the possibility and impossibility regions are $\{\beta \leq 2 - 2\alpha\} \cup \{\zeta \leq 1 - 2\theta\}$ and $\{\beta > 2 - 2\alpha, \zeta > 1 - 2\theta\}$ respectively. More importantly, Theorem 2 shows that the QDA classifier achieves the possibility region and thus is optimal in this sense.

Remark 2. Note that conditions (3) and (4) in Theorem 2 on the parameters modelling the difference in mean vectors are weaker than the phase diagram of the LDA in [8]. This makes sense, as here we assume $\mu$ is known when applying the QDA classification rule (1.13), whereas [8] considered trained LDA classifiers with $\mu$ unknown.

Remark 3. From the results in Theorem 2, we observe that the possibility region for the mean part, $0 < \zeta < 1 - 2\theta$, and that for the precision matrix part, $1 - 2\alpha < \beta < 2 - 2\alpha$, are independent. This again could be explained by the fact that the classification rule (1.13) assumes known $\mu$ and $\Omega$. When we consider data-trained classifiers, the two possibility regions will interact and there will be a phase diagram over the two regions showing a balance between the two sets of sparsity/weakness indices.

Remark 4. In model (1.8), we can also introduce the sparsity and weakness in the diagonals of the precision matrix $\Omega$. However, the model thus raised will have six sparsity and weakness indices in total: 2 for means, 2 for diagonals, and 2 for off-diagonals of the precision matrix. We can readily obtain the possibility region for this model, but it will be difficult to visualize and is thus omitted here.

2.2. Unknown Mean Vector. In this section, we discuss the case in which $\mu$ is unknown but $\Omega$ is known. Again, without loss of generality, we assume $\Omega_0 = I$, and consider the model (1.8). Furthermore, since the estimation accuracy is closely related to the sample size $n$, we employ the relationship $n = p^\beta$ in (1.12). Hence, the sample size is always smaller than $p$ by an order.

When $\Omega$ is known but $\mu$ is unknown, we modify Algorithm 1 to adopt the current setting, as follows:

Algorithm 2.
0. Calculate the average vector of the two classes as $\hat{\mu}_0 = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i: Y_i = 0} X_i$ and $\hat{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i: Y_i = 1} X_i$, where $n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ and $n_0 = n - n_1$.
1. Let $d_0 = \hat{\mu}_0$, $d_1 = \Omega \hat{\mu}_1$ and $d = d_1 - d_0 = (d(1), \ldots, d(p))^\top$.
2. Define $t = \frac{2n \ln p}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot 1\{\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |d(j)| > 2 \ln p / \sqrt{n}\}$ and let $d^{(t)}$ denote the indicator vector of feature selection, i.e. for $j = 1, \ldots, p$,

$$d^{(t)}(j) = \begin{cases} 1, & |d(j)| > t, \\ 0, & |d(j)| < t. \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\mu}_0^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)}$ be the hard-thresholded vectors $\hat{\mu}_0$ and $d$ respectively with feature selection, i.e.

$$\hat{\mu}_0^{(t)} = \hat{\mu}_0 \circ d^{(t)}, \quad \hat{\mu}_d^{(t)} = d \circ d^{(t)}.$$

3. Define $C = (\hat{\mu}_0^{(t)})^\top (I - \Omega) \hat{\mu}_d^{(t)} + \ln |\Omega|$.
4. (Prediction step) For any fresh data vector $X$, calculate the QDA score

$$Q = X^\top(I - \Omega)X + 2(\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)})^\top X + C$$

and estimate the label of $X$ as $\hat{Y}$ with $\hat{Y} = I\{Q > 0\}$.

**Theorem 3** Under model (1.8) and the parameterization (1.4), (1.7)–(1.12), and (2.18),

(i) When $\theta \geq \delta / 2$, i.e., the signals are weak,

1. If $\max\{2 - 2\alpha - \beta, 1 - 2\theta - \zeta\} > (1 - \delta) / 2$, the QDA classification rule (1.13) with feature selection in Algorithm 2 has a misclassification rate that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$.
2. If $\max\{2 - 2\alpha - \beta, 1 - 2\theta - \zeta\} < (1 - \delta) / 2$, then $MR(QDA) \geq \Phi(-1/2)/16$ when $p \to \infty$.
3. If $\max\{2 - 2\alpha - \beta, 1 - 2\theta - \zeta\} = (1 - \delta) / 2$, the misclassification rate depends on $f_p$ or $g_p$ in the following ways:
   - (A) If $2 - 2\alpha - \beta = (1 - \delta) / 2$ and $f_p = L_p$, then $MR(QDA) \to 0$;
   - (B) If $1 - 2\theta - \zeta = (1 - \delta) / 2$ and $g_p = L_p$, then $MR(QDA) \to 0$;
   - (C) If $2 - 2\alpha - \beta = (1 - \delta) / 2$ and $f_p = C_p$, then $MR(QDA) \geq c$ for a constant $c > 0$;
   - (D) If $1 - 2\theta - \zeta = (1 - \delta) / 2$ and $g_p = C_p$, then $MR(QDA) \geq c$ for a constant $c > 0$.

(ii) When $\theta < \delta / 2$, i.e., the signals are strong, the results in Theorem 2 hold.

When the estimated mean is introduced, the parameterization of the sample size $n$ also has an effect on the QDA successful classification region. Comparing the results in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, there are two differences. First, the signal strength parameter $\theta$ becomes an important factor in characterizing the region. When $\theta > \delta / 2$, the signals are weak and impossible to identify, so $\beta$ or $\zeta$ must be small enough (so the signals are dense) for the classification to be successful. On the other hand, when $\theta < \delta / 2$, the signals are so strong that can afford to be relatively sparse. Second, the QDA successful classification region is reduced by $1 - \delta / 2$ for both parameters $\beta$ and $\zeta$ when signals are weak, unlike when the signals are strong. The reduction of the successful classification region is a result of the estimation error for the mean vectors.

2.3. **Unknown mean and unknown covariance.** In this section, we discuss the case in which $\mu$ are unknown, $\Sigma_0 = I$, and $\Sigma_1$ is also unknown. The estimation of the precision matrix in the high-dimensional case is still restricted to the sparse case for now. Hence, here we still assume $\Sigma = I$ and $\Omega - I = (c - 1)I + \eta W$, so that both of them are sparse. Under model (1.8), we modify Algorithm 1 to adopt the current setting, as follows:

**Algorithm 3.**

0. Calculate the estimated mean vector for the two classes as $\hat{\mu}_0 = \frac{1}{n_0}\sum_{i=1}^{n_0} X_i$ and $\hat{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{n_1}\sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} X_i$, where $n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$ and $n_0 = n - n_1$. Estimate the precision matrix $\Omega$ with some method and let $\hat{\Omega}$ denote the estimation.
1. Let $d_0 = \hat{\mu}_0$, $d_1 = \hat{\Omega}\hat{\mu}_1$, and $d = d_1 - d_0 = (d(1), \ldots, d(p))^\top$.
2. Define $t = \frac{2\ln p}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot 1\{\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |d(j)| > 2 \ln p / \sqrt{n}\}$ and let $d^{(t)}$ denote the indicator vector of feature selection, i.e. for $j = 1, \ldots, p$,

$$d^{(t)}(j) = \begin{cases} 1, & |d(j)| > t, \\ 0, & |d(j)| < t. \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\mu}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\mu}_d^{(t)}$ be the hard-thresholded vectors $\hat{\mu}_0$ and $d$ respectively with feature selection, i.e.

$$\hat{\mu}^{(t)} = \hat{\mu}_0 \circ d^{(t)}, \quad \hat{\mu}_d^{(t)} = d \circ d^{(t)}.$$
3. Define $C = (\hat{\mu}^{(t)} (I - \hat{\Omega}) \hat{\mu}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{n_i} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - I) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}|.$

4. (Prediction step) For any fresh data vector $X$, calculate the QDA score

$$Q = X^T (I - \hat{\Omega}) X + 2(\hat{\mu}^{(t)} d) X + C$$

and estimate the label of $X$ as $\hat{Y}$ with $\hat{Y} = I\{Q > 0\}$.

In Step 0, the estimation of the sparse precision matrix can be performed via any suitable approach. This has been discussed in numerous publications in the literature, such as [4, 8, 11, 14]. Here, our goal is to develop the QDA approach with feature-selection step, instead of designing a new precision-matrix-estimation approach. In the following theorem, we consider a general precision-matrix-estimation approach, and let $\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}$ denote the estimation error. We give the region that $MR(QDA) \to 0$ based on $\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}$.

**Theorem 4** Consider model (1.8) and the parameterization (1.4), (1.7)–(1.11), (2.18), and (1.12). Assume $1 < \beta < 2$. For the employed precision-matrix-estimation approach, let $\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} = \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|$ be the spectral norm of the error. Suppose $\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \to 0$ when $p \to \infty$, and it satisfies that

$$\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\eta + pr^2 \epsilon + \sqrt{p} \ln p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + p/n \ll p\zeta^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + r^2 p\epsilon.$$

Then, the QDA classification rule (1.13) with feature selection in Algorithm 3 has a misclassification rate that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 4 can be found in Appendix C.1. Here, we develop the general rule for the QDA classification with feature selection method. For the weak signal case that $\theta > \delta/2$, the condition can be relaxed by replacing $p/n$ to be $p\xi/n$. However, the term $p/n$ is not the dominating term when we apply the PCS method and the CLIME method in Algorithm 3. Therefore, we didn’t differentiate the two cases.

Compared to Theorems 2 and 3, a big difference here is that the condition is an inequality that containing both the precision matrix parameters and the mean vector parameters. In the following two corollaries, we can see that the condition $\zeta < \alpha + \delta/2 - 2\theta$ indicates an intervention between the precision matrix weakness parameter $\alpha$, the mean vector sparsity and weakness parameters $\zeta$ and $\theta$, and the sample size parameter $\theta$. Under this situation, the dominating error term comes from $X(\Omega - I)X$, which contains both $\Omega$ and $\mu$ (in $X$).

We apply the PCS approach in [14] and the CLIME approach in [4] to be the precision-matrix-estimation approach. The results can be found in the following corollaries.

**Corollary 2.1** Under the conditions of Theorem 4 and that $\alpha < \delta/2$, and PCS is employed for precision-matrix estimation. Consider the conditions that

(i) $\beta < 1 - \alpha + \delta/2$ and $f_p = C_p$;

(ii) or, $\zeta < \alpha + \delta/2 - 2\theta$ and $g_p = C_p$.

If one of the above conditions is satisfied, then the QDA classification rule (1.13) with feature selection in Algorithm 3 has a misclassification rate that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$.

**Corollary 2.2** Under the conditions of Theorem 4, and that CLIME is employed for precision-matrix estimation. Assume $\alpha < \delta/2$, and consider the conditions that

(i) $\beta < 1 - \alpha + \delta/2$ and $f_p = C_p$;

(ii) $\zeta < \alpha + \delta/2 - 2\theta$ and $g_p = C_p$.

If one of the above conditions is satisfied, then the QDA classification rule (1.13) with feature selection in Algorithm 3 has a misclassification rate that converges to 0 as $p \to \infty$. 
3. Proofs. In this section, we present the proof of Theorems 2–3. Theorem 1 is a special case of Theorem 2, and the proof can be found in the Appendix.

We first write out the misclassification rate. Given \( \mu \) and \( W \) (and thus \( \Omega \)), the two types of misclassification rates are defined as

\[
(3.19) \quad p_{0,\mu,W} = P_{Y=0}(Q > 0|\mu,W), \quad p_{1,\mu,W} = P_{Y=1}(Q < 0|\mu,W).
\]

Then, the population misclassification rate (MR) is

\[
(3.20) \quad MR = \frac{1}{2} E_{\mu,W}[p_{0,\mu,W}] + \frac{1}{2} E_{\mu,W}[p_{1,\mu,W}].
\]

We wish to find a boundary that divides the parameter space into two regions. In one region, \( MR \) converges to 0. In the other region, \( MR \) is always larger than some positive constant.

This section is structured as follows. In Section 3.1, we present some mathematical results as the preparations, and the proof can be found in the Appendix. Based on these preparations, Theorem 2 is then proved in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3, we proceed to discuss the proof of Theorem 3, where \( \mu \) is unknown and we have to analyze the difference term \( Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W) - Q(X, \mu, W) \).

3.1. Preparation. To prove the theorems, we need the following propositions and lemmas for \( \mu \) and \( W \). The propositions can be easily proved, and so we have omitted their proofs. The proofs of the lemmas can be found in the Appendix.

For a fixed \( W \), let the eigenvalue decomposition of \( W \) be

\[ W = U \Lambda U^\top, \]

where \( U^\top U = U U^\top = I \) and \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_p) \). Here, \( \lambda_i = \lambda_i(W) \) are the eigenvalues of \( W \) such that \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_p \). Let the spectral norm of \( W \) be denoted by \( \|W\| \).

Since \( \Omega = c I + \eta W \), \( \Omega = U (c I + \eta \Lambda) U^\top \). Therefore, \( \Omega - I = \xi I + \eta W \), where the eigenvalues are defined as

\[ m_i = \xi + \eta \lambda_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p. \]

Let \( \hat{\mu} = U^\top \mu = (\hat{\mu}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_p)^\top \) and \( \hat{X} = U^\top X = (\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_p)^\top \). Note that here we use the subscripts to denote the vector elements.

**Proposition 3.1** \( \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i = Tr(W) = 0. \)

**Proposition 3.2** \( \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^2 = Tr(W^\top W) \sim 2\text{Binomial}(p(p-1)/2, \nu). \)

**Lemma 3.1** Under models (1.7) and (1.10), when \( p \to \infty \), with probability \( 1 - o(1) \),

\[ \|W\| \leq b(p, \beta) = \begin{cases} 3\sqrt{p}\beta = 3p^{(1-\beta)/2}, & 0 < \beta < 1, \\ 2\sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}, & \beta = 1, \\ \beta^{-1}, & 1 < \beta \leq 2. \end{cases} \]

Let \( R_W \) be a function of the \( \lambda_i \)'s defined by \( R_W = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i|^\beta \); then, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \),

\[ R_W \leq r(p, \beta) = \begin{cases} 216, & 0 < \beta < 1, \\ 4\sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}, & \beta = 1, \\ \frac{1}{\beta-1}p^{(\beta-1)/2}, & 1 < \beta \leq 2. \end{cases} \]
Now, we consider $\Omega = cI + \eta W$. In view of the result of $\|W\|$ and the fact that $m_i = \xi + \eta \lambda_i$ under model (1.7), when the condition (1.11) holds, with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| = \|\xi I + \eta W\| = \xi + \eta \|W\| \to 0.$$  

(3.21) According to basic matrix theory,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = Tr((\Omega - I)^\top (\Omega - I)) = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2,$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \sim 2 Binomial(p(p-1)/2, \nu)$, according to Proposition 3.2.

Finally, we consider the signals in the mean part. For $\mu$, we have

$$\mu^\top \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mu_i^2 = \tau^2 B_p, \quad \text{where} \ B_p \sim Binomial(p, \epsilon).$$  

(3.23) As we frequently use these terms in the following analysis, we provide a summary of the magnitude of these terms in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2** Consider model (1.8) with the parameterizations (1.4), (1.7)–(1.11), and (2.18). With probability $1 + o(1)$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 = \eta^2 p^2 \nu(1 + o(1)),$$

(3.24) $$\sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p \nu(1 + o(1)), \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| = o(1),$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} \mu_i^2 = p \tau^2 \epsilon(1 + o(1)).$$

In addition, there is a lemma about $\tilde{\mu} = U^\top \mu$, which is proved in Appendix B.4.

**Lemma 3.3** As $p \to \infty$, under models (1.4), (1.9), (1.10), and (1.11),

$$R_{\mu} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3 \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^2 \right)^{3/2} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Finally, we state a lemma about $\Phi(x_p)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative density function (c.d.f.) of the standard normal distribution.

**Lemma 3.4** Consider a random variable $x_p$ and $\mathbb{E} [\Phi(x_p)]$:

- If $x_p \to -\infty$ in probability as $p \to \infty$, i.e., $P(x_p > -M) \to 0$ for any constant $M > 0$ when $p \to \infty$, then $\mathbb{E} [\Phi(x_p)] \to 0$ when $p \to \infty$.

- If $x_p \to \infty$ in probability as $p \to \infty$, i.e., $P(x_p < M) \to 0$ for any constant $M > 0$ when $p \to \infty$, then $\mathbb{E} [\Phi(x_p)] \to 1$ when $p \to \infty$.

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.** There are two parts of the proof. For the region of possibility, we want to show that $MR(QDA)$ converges to 0 in this region. For the region of impossibility, we want to show any classifier $L$ has $MR(L)$ that achieves $1/2$ if the parameters fall in this region.

We first work on the region of possibility. For this region, we want to find out $MR(QDA)$. Recall that QDA estimates the label by

$$Q = Q(X, \mu, W) = -X^\top (\Omega - I)X + 2\mu^\top (\Omega + I)X - \mu^\top (\Omega - I)\mu + \ln |\Omega|.$$
Therefore, we should analyze $Q$.

According to (3.20), we first find the misclassification rate when $\mu$ and $W$ are given, and then take the expectation. It indicates only $X$ is the random variable, and the random part is

$$S = -X^T(\Omega - I)X + 2\mu^T(\Omega + I)X.$$  

(3.25)

$S$ can be viewed as a summation of squared normal random variables. Actually, we have the lemma about the asymptotic distribution of $S$.

**Lemma 3.5** Given $Y = i$, $i = 0, 1$, let $\mu_S = E[S|Y = i]$ and $\sigma_S^2 = \text{Var}(S|Y = i)$. Define $Z = \frac{S - \mu_S}{\sigma_S}$, then

$$\sup_{x} |F_{Z|Y=i}(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq C\left(\frac{1 + R_W}{\sqrt{p}} + R_\mu\right),$$

where $F_{Z|Y=i}(x) = P(Z \leq x|Y = i)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the c.d.f. of the standard normal distribution.

Here, $\mu_S$ may differ when $Y = 0$ and $Y = 1$. Since $Y$ is given here and afterwards, we use $\mu_S$ to denote this conditional expectation without confusion. For $\sigma_S^2$, the situation is the same.

According to Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, $C(\frac{1 + R_W}{\sqrt{p}} + R_\mu) = o(1)$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. Therefore, we only need to consider the event that $C(\frac{1 + R_W}{\sqrt{p}} + R_\mu) = o(1)$, which means $Z|Y = i$ converges to the standard normal distribution in distribution. Therefore, we have that

$$p_{0,\mu,W} = P_{Y=0}(Q > 0|\mu, W) = P_{Y=0}(S - \mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu + \ln |\Omega| > 0|\mu, W) = P_{Y=0}(\sigma_S Z + \mu_S - \mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu + \ln |\Omega| > 0|\mu, W) = 1 - \Phi(\frac{\mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu - \ln |\Omega| - \mu_S}{\sigma_S}) + o(1)$$

$$= \Phi(-\frac{\mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu - \ln |\Omega| - \mu_S}{\sigma_S}) + o(1).$$

(3.26)

Similarly, for $p_{1,\mu,W}$, we have that

$$p_{1,\mu,W} = P_{Y=1}(Q < 0|\mu, W) = \Phi(\frac{\mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu - \ln |\Omega| - \mu_S}{\sigma_S}) + o(1).$$

(3.27)

Hence, we need to derive the performance of $p_{0,\mu,W}$ and $p_{1,\mu,W}$. To derive them, we should check the term that

$$T = \frac{\mu^T(\Omega - I)\mu - \ln |\Omega| - \mu_S}{\sigma_S}.$$ 

(3.28)

We figure out $T$ for the two cases.

- Case 0: $Y = 0$. We first figure out $\mu_S$ and $\sigma_S$. According to Property 1 in Appendix B.1.

$$\mu_S = Tr(I - \Omega) - \mu^T(3\Omega + I)\mu, \sigma_S^2 = 2Tr((\Omega - I)^2) + 16\mu^T\Omega^2\mu.$$ 

(3.29)

Introduce (B.94) into the formula of $T$ in (3.28), then

$$T_0 := T|Y = 0 = \frac{4\mu^T\Omega\mu - \ln |\Omega| + Tr(\Omega - I)}{\sqrt{2Tr((\Omega - I)^2) + 16\mu^T\Omega^2\mu}}.$$ 

Recall that $\Omega = U((1 + \xi)I + \eta\Lambda)U^T$ with eigenvalues $1 + m_i = 1 + \xi + \eta\lambda_i$, and $\bar{\mu} = U^T\mu$. Introduce the terms into the above equation and there is

$$T_0 = \frac{-\sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln \left[ e^{m_i} + \frac{1 + m_i}{\bar{\mu}_i} \right]}{\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^{p} [m_i^2 + 8(1 + m_i)^2\bar{\mu}_i^2]}}.$$ 

(3.30)
From Lemma 3.2, \( \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| = o(1) \) with high probability. Hence,

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{1 + m_i}{e^{m_i + 4(1 + m_i)\tilde{\mu}_i^2}} \right] = -\frac{1}{2} m_i^2 (1 + o(1)) - 4(1 + m_i)\tilde{\mu}_i^2.
\]

Plugging (3.31) into (3.30), we have

\[
T_0 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1)).}
\]

- Case 1: \( Y = 1 \). Similarly, we first derive the mean and variance of \( S \), then figure out \( T|Y = 1 \). According to Lemma 3.2, with probability \( \epsilon \), we have

\[
\mu_S = \text{Tr}(\Omega^{-1} - I) + \mu^\top(\Omega + 3I)\mu, \quad \sigma_S^2 = 2\text{Tr}((\Omega^{-1} - I)^2) + 16\mu^\top\Omega^{-1}\mu.
\]

Introduce (B.95) into the formula of \( T \) in (3.28), then

\[
T_1 := T|Y = 1 = \frac{-4\mu^\top\mu - \ln |\Omega| + \text{Tr}(I - \Omega^{-1})}{\sqrt{2\text{Tr}((\Omega^{-1} - I)^2) + 16\mu^\top\Omega^{-1}\mu}}.
\]

Introducing in the terms \( m_i \)'s and \( \tilde{\mu}_i \)'s and combining the results with Lemma 3.2, similarly we have

\[
T_1 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1)).}
\]

Introducing (3.32) and (3.34) into (3.26) and (3.27) with (3.28), there is

\[
p_{0,\mu,W} = \Phi(-T_0) + o(1) = \Phi(-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1))}) + o(1),
\]

\[
p_{1,\mu,W} = \Phi(T_1) + o(1) = \Phi(-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1))}) + o(1).
\]

Therefore, for the misclassification rate, there is

\[
MR = \frac{1}{2} E[p_{0,\mu,W}] + \frac{1}{2} E[p_{1,\mu,W}] = E[\Phi(-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1))})] + o(1).
\]

According to Lemma 3.2, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu(1 + o(1)) \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \tilde{\mu}_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mu_i^2 = p\tau^2 \epsilon(1 + o(1)) \). Therefore, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \),

\[
-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (m_i^2 + 8\tilde{\mu}_i^2)(1 + o(1))} = \left[ -\sqrt{\frac{p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8\tau^2 \epsilon}{2\sqrt{2}}} \right] (1 + o(1)).
\]

Now we consider the term

\[
p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8\tau^2 \epsilon = p^{1 - 2\gamma} + f_p p^{2 - 2\alpha} - \beta + g_p p^{1 - \zeta - 2\theta}.
\]

Recall that \( \gamma > 1/2 \) so that \( p^{1 - 2\gamma} \to 0 \). Now recall the region of possibility:

1. \( \beta < 2 - 2\alpha, f_p = C_p; \)
2. \( \beta = 2 - 2\alpha, f_p = L_p; \)
3. \( 0 < \zeta < 1 - 2\theta, g_p = C_p; \)
4. \( \zeta = 1 - 2\theta, g_p = L_p. \)
When one of the above conditions hold, obviously \( p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8\tau^2 p \to \infty \) when \( p \to \infty \). According to (3.36) and Lemma 3.4, \( MR \to 0 \).

Next we consider the impossibility. To show that the classification error goes to 1/2 for any classifier \( L \) in this region, we have to introduce a new lemma. Let \( f \) be the density function of \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \) and \( g \) be the density function of \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \). The Hellinger affinity between \( f \) and \( g \) is defined as \( H(f, g) = \int \sqrt{f(x)g(x)} dx \). We have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6** For any classifier \( L = L(X|\mu, \Omega) \),

\[
|MR(L) - 1/2| \leq C(1 - H(f, g))^{1/2}.
\]

This lemma is well known, and so we omit the proof. According to this lemma, to prove the impossibility, we only need to prove that \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \).

Next, we check \( H(f, g) \). According to the definition of multivariate normal distribution,

\[
H(f, g) = \int \frac{\Omega^{1/4}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \left[ (x + \mu)^\top (x + \mu) + (x - \mu)^\top \Omega (x - \mu) \right] \right\} dx
\]

\[
= \frac{\Omega^{1/4}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \mu^\top (I + \Omega - (I - \Omega)(I + \Omega)^{-1} (I - \Omega)) \right\} \times \int \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \left[ (x - (I + \Omega)^{-1} (I - \Omega)\mu)^\top \Omega (x - (I + \Omega)^{-1} (I - \Omega)\mu) \right] \right\} dx
\]

\[
= \frac{\Omega^{1/4}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \mu^\top (I + \Omega - (I - \Omega)(I + \Omega)^{-1} (I - \Omega)) \right\}
\]

\[
= \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{4(1+m_i)}{2+m_i} \tilde{\mu}_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{(1+m_i/2)^2}{4(1+m_i)} \right] \right\}.
\]

To show that \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \), we only need to prove \( R = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{4(1+m_i)}{2+m_i} \tilde{\mu}_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{(1+m_i/2)^2}{4(1+m_i)} = o(1) \). Now, we have

\[
R = 2 \sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{\mu}_i^2 (1 + o(1)) + \sum_{i=1}^p \ln(1 + \frac{m_i^2}{4(1+m_i)})
\]

\[
= 2\|\mu\|^2 (1 + o(1)) + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{m_i^2}{4(1+m_i)} (1 + o(1))
\]

\[
= 2\|\mu\|^2 (1 + o(1)) + \frac{1}{4} \|\Omega - I\|^2.
\]

Therefore, when \( \|\mu\|^2 = o(1) \) and \( \|\Omega - I\|^2 = o(1) \), the misclassification error from any classifier will be close to 1/2.

According to Lemma 3.2, with probability \( 1 + o(1) \), \( \|\mu\|^2 = \rho \tau^2 \epsilon(1 + o(1)) \) and \( \|\Omega - I\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p m_i^2 = p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p \nu(1 + o(1)) \). In the region of impossibility, \( \rho \tau^2 \epsilon + p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p \nu \to 0 \), and so \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \). As a result, \( MR(L) \to 1/2 \) for any classifier \( L \).

Combining the results of the regions of possibility and impossibility, Theorem 2 is proved. \( \square \)

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 3: the weak signal region.** In this section, we focus on the algorithm for QDA with feature selection, when \( \mu \) is unknown. To estimate \( \mu \), we use \( \hat{\mu} = -\hat{\mu}_0 \) for the quadratic part and \( d \) for the linear part:

\[
d = \Omega \hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 \sim N((I + \Omega)\mu, \frac{1}{n_0} I + \frac{1}{n_1} \Omega).
\]

For a threshold \( t \), we let \( \hat{d}_j = d_j * I(|d_j| \geq t) \). When \( \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |d_j| \leq 2\ln p/\sqrt{n} \), we take \( t = 0 \); otherwise we take \( t = 2\sqrt{\ln p/\sqrt{n}} \). Therefore, our discussion includes the case in which \( t = 0 \) and the case in which \( t \neq 0 \).

In Appendix B.7, it is shown that \( t = 0 \) happens with probability \( 1 - o(1) \) in the weak signal region, and \( t \neq 0 \) happens with probability \( 1 - o(1) \) in the strong signal region. For the latter case, the signals can be exactly recovered with probability \( 1 - o(1) \).
3.3.1. The region of successful classification. Consider the event \( \{ t = 0 \} \). It happens with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), so we focus on this event only.

When \( t = 0 \), the estimated label is \( I(Q > 0) \) where
\[
Q = Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W) = X^\top (I - \Omega) X + 2d^\top X + \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega) \mu_0 + \ln |\Omega|.
\]

According to the definition of \( Z, \mu_S \) and \( \sigma_S \) in Lemma 3.5, we rewrite it as
\[
(3.38) \quad Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W) = \sigma_S Z + \frac{\mu_S}{\sigma_S} - \mu^\top (\Omega - I) \mu + \ln |\Omega| + \Delta Q,
\]
where
\[
(3.39) \quad \Delta Q = 2(d^\top - \mu^\top (I + \Omega)) X + \left[ \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega) \mu_0 - \mu^\top (I - \Omega) \mu \right].
\]

According to Lemma 3.5, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), \( Z \) uniformly converges to the standard normal distribution. Therefore, with the same definition of \( T_i \) in (3.28), (3.30), and (3.34), we have
\[
p_{i, \mu, W} = \Phi((-1)^i * (-T_i + \frac{\Delta Q}{\sigma_S})) + o(1), \quad i = 0, 1.
\]

Note that the QDA successful region in Theorem 3 is a subset of that in Theorem 2. According to Section 3.2, \( \sigma_S = \sqrt{p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe} \), and \( -T_0 = T_1 = -C \sqrt{p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe} \).

Further, later we will show that
\[
(3.40) \quad \Delta Q = o(p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe).
\]
Therefore, noting that \( p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe \to \infty \) in the successful region, we have that
\[
p_{i, \mu, W} = \Phi(-C \sqrt{p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe(1 + o(1))}) \to 0, \quad i = 0, 1.
\]

The misclassification rate now is that
\[
(3.41) \quad MR(QDA) = \frac{1}{2} E_{\mu, W} p_{0, \mu, W} + \frac{1}{2} E_{\mu, W} p_{1, \mu, W} \to 0.
\]

Now, we only need to show (3.40) holds in the successful region. We first introduce a lemma about \( \Delta Q \), where the proof can be found in Appendix.

**Lemma 3.7** Under the model assumptions and the definition of \( \Delta Q \) in (3.39), there is
\[
(3.42) \quad \Delta Q \lesssim \sqrt{p^2 \eta^2 \nu \ln p/n} + \sqrt{p/n \ln \ln p}.
\]

We compare (3.42) with (3.40) in the successful region in Theorem 3, that
\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} = \max\{2 - 2\alpha - \beta, 1 - 2\theta - \zeta\}, \\
\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} = 2 - 2\alpha - \beta > 1 - 2\theta - \zeta, f_p = L_p, \\
\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} = 1 - 2\theta - \zeta > 2 - 2\alpha - \beta, g_p = L_p.
\end{array} \right.
\]

Note that \( p \xi^2 + p^2 \eta^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe = p^{1 - 2\gamma} + f_p \beta^2 - 2\alpha - \beta + g_p^2 p^{1 - 2\theta - \zeta} \to \infty \) in this region.

The first term \( \sqrt{p^2 \eta^2 \nu \ln p/n} \ll \sqrt{p^2 \eta^2 \nu} \). When \( p^2 \eta^2 \nu \to 0 \), this term converges to 0, which is at a lower order of \( p^2 \xi^2 + p^2 \eta^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe \). When \( p^2 \eta^2 \nu \to \infty \), then \( \sqrt{p^2 \eta^2 \nu \ln p/n} \ll p^2 \eta^2 \nu \). Hence, it is always at \( o(p \xi^2 + p^2 \eta^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe) \) in this region. The second term \( \sqrt{p/n \ln \ln p} = \sqrt{p/n \ln \ln p} \ll L_p p^{\max\{2 - 2\alpha - \beta, 1 - 2\theta - \zeta\}} \) according to the definition of \( L_p \). Combining the analysis of these two terms, \( \Delta Q = o(p \xi^2 + p^2 \eta^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 pe) \). Hence, (3.40) is proved.

Combining the results, in the successful classification regions described in part (i) of Theorem 3, \( MR(QDA) \to 0 \).
3.3.2. The region of unsuccessful classification. Again, we consider the event \( \{ t = 0 \} \) only. According to the definition that \( d = \Omega \hat{\mu}_{1} - \hat{\mu}_{0} \), there is

\[
Q = X^{\top} (I - \Omega) X + 2 X^{\top} (\Omega \hat{\mu}_{1} - \hat{\mu}_{0}) + \hat{\mu}_{0}^{\top} (I - \Omega) \hat{\mu}_{0} + \ln |\Omega| \tag{3.44}
\]

We discuss the case when \( X \) is given first, and then add in the randomness of \( X \). When \( X \) is given, we have the following lemma, which is proved in Appendix.

**Lemma 3.8** With probability at least \( \Phi(-1/2)/4 \), there is

\[
Q \geq S + \sqrt{X^{\top} \Omega X / n + \mu^{\top} (I - \Omega) \mu + \ln |\Omega|} + \frac{1}{n_{0}} Tr(I - \Omega), \tag{3.45}
\]

where \( S \) is defined in (3.25).

Now we consider the randomness of \( X \). We focus on the case that \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \), and the case that \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \) is very similar. Consider the case that \( X \sim N(\mu, I) \). According to Lemma 3.5, \( \frac{S - E[S]}{\sigma_{s}} \) converges to the standard normal distribution uniformly. Therefore, \( P(S \geq E[S]) = 1/2 + o(1) \). According to (B.94), \( E[S] = Tr(I - \Omega) - \mu^{\top} (3 \Omega + I) \mu \). Hence, we have that

\[
P(S + \mu^{\top}(I - \Omega) \mu \geq -4 \mu^{\top} \Omega \mu + Tr(I - \Omega)) = 1/2 + o(1). \tag{3.46}
\]

The other term including \( X \) is that \( \sqrt{X^{\top} \Omega X / n} \). According to the properties of non-central chi-square distribution, \( E[X^{\top} \Omega X / n] = \mu^{\top} \Omega \mu / n + Tr(\Omega) / n \) and \( \text{Var}(X^{\top} \Omega X / n) = 4 \mu^{\top} \Omega^{2} \mu / n^{2} + 2 Tr(\Omega^{2}) / n^{2} = p / n^{2}(1 + o(1)) \). By Markov inequality,

\[
P(X^{\top} \Omega X / n \geq \mu^{\top} \Omega \mu / n + Tr(\Omega) / n - 2 \sqrt{p / n^{2}}) \geq 3/4. \tag{3.47}
\]

Combining (3.46) and (3.47), the probability that both inequality holds is no smaller than \( 1/4 \). Introducing them into (3.45), with probability at least \( c/4 \), there is

\[
Q \geq \frac{1}{n_{0}} Tr(I - \Omega) \tag{3.48}
\]

\[
+ \sqrt{\frac{4 \mu^{\top} \Omega \mu}{n} + Tr(\Omega) / n} - 2 \sqrt{p / n^{2}} + \ln |\Omega| + \frac{1}{n_{0}} Tr(I - \Omega)
\]

\[
\geq -4 \eta^{2} p r^{2} \nu + \sqrt{p / n} - f_{p} \eta^{2} p^{2} \nu. \tag{3.49}
\]

Now we consider the region defined in Theorem 3.

- \( \max \{ 2 - 2 \alpha - \beta, 1 - 2 \theta - \zeta \} < (1 - \delta) / 2 \);
- or, \( 2 - 2 \alpha - \beta = (1 - \delta) / 2 \) and \( f_{p} = C_{p} \);
- or, \( 1 - 2 \theta - \zeta = (1 - \delta) / 2 \) and \( g_{p} = C_{p} \).

In the first region, there is \( \tau^{2} p e + \eta^{2} p^{2} \nu \ll \sqrt{p / n} \), then the misclassification rate when \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \) is \( P(Q > 0) \geq c / 4 \) according to (3.48). In the second and third region, the coefficient of \( \sqrt{p / n} \) can be adjusted with a smaller probability. Therefore, the misclassification rate is still no smaller than a constant. When \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \), the same result can be got. Hence, in this region, \( MR(QDA) \geq c \) where \( c > 0 \) is a constant.

3.4. Proof of Theorem 3: the strong signal region. When the signals are strong, with the threshold \( t = \sqrt{2 \log p / n} \), all the signals \( \mu_{k} \neq 0 \) are exactly recovered with probability \( 1 + o(1) \). Hence, we only consider the event that \( \{ t = \sqrt{2 \log p / n} \} \) and all the signals are exactly recovered.

For the case that \( t \neq 0 \), \( \hat{\mu}_{1} = \hat{\mu}_{0} \circ d^{(t)} \) and \( \hat{\mu}_{d}^{(t)} = d \circ d^{(t)} \). For simplicity, in this section, we use \( \hat{\mu}_{0} \) and \( d \) to denote \( \hat{\mu}_{0} \circ d^{(t)} \) and \( \hat{\mu}_{d}^{(t)} \), respectively. Note that since all the signals are
We want to show that in the region of success, MR holds, and hence analysis is the same. Therefore, noting that
\[ Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W) = \sigma_S Z + \mu_S - \mu^\top (\Omega - I)\mu + \ln |\Omega| + \Delta Q, \]
where
\[ \Delta Q = 2(d - (I + \Omega)\mu)^\top X + \left[ \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega)\hat{\mu}_0 - \mu^\top (I - \Omega)\mu \right]. \]
We want to show that in the region of success,
\[ \Delta Q = o(p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8\tau^2 pe). \]
Therefore, noting that \( p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8\tau^2 pe \to \infty \) in the region of possibility, we have \( MR(QDA) \to 0 \).

To prove (3.52), we introduce a lemma about \( \Delta Q \) for the strong signal case, where the proof can be found in Appendix.

**Lemma 3.9** Under the model assumptions and the definition of \( \Delta Q \) in (3.51), there is
\[ \Delta Q \leq cpe\xi/n + O(p\epsilon\sqrt{\eta^2 \nu}/n) + \sqrt{p\epsilon\tau \ln p}(1 + o(1)). \]
Consider the three terms in (3.53). The first term is \( cn^{-1}p\epsilon\xi \ll \sqrt{p\epsilon}/n \ll \tau^2 \sqrt{p\epsilon} \), since \( \xi \ll p^{-1/2} \) and \( 1/\sqrt{n} \ll \tau \). The second term is \( n^{-1}p\epsilon\sqrt{\eta^2 \nu} = \frac{\xi}{n}\sqrt{\eta^2 p^2 \nu} \). Hence, it is at a smaller order if \( \eta^2 p^2 \nu \to \infty \). If \( \eta^2 p^2 \nu \to 0 \), \( p\xi^2 + p\tau^2 \epsilon \to \infty \) in the region of possibility, so that \( \frac{\xi}{n}\sqrt{\eta^2 p^2 \nu} \) is still at a smaller order. For the last term \( \sqrt{p\epsilon\tau \ln p} = \sqrt{p\tau^2 \epsilon \ln p} \), the analysis is the same.

Therefore, in the region of possibility identified by part (ii) of Theorem 3, (3.52) always holds, and hence MR converges to 0.

**3.4.1. The region of Impossibility.** When the mean vector \( \mu \) is unknown, the region of impossibility is no smaller than the case that the mean vector \( \mu \) is already known ([19]). For the latter, the region of impossibility is depicted in Theorem 2.

When the signals are strong, the region of impossibility is the same with that in Theorem 2. Hence, when the mean vector is unknown, any classifier \( L \) has \( MR(L) \to 1/2 \) in this region.

**4. Real Data Analysis.** In this paper, we consider the rats dataset present in [28]. As we introduced in Section 1.4, this data set record the gene expressions of live rats in response to different drugs and toxicant. There are 181 samples and 8491 genes, where 61 samples are labeled as toxicant and the other 120 are labeled as other drugs. We compare QDA with LDA, where the latter one is shown to enjoy the best performance compared to classifiers such as SVM, RandomForest, GLasso and FoBa. The QDA with feature selection for the real data is discussed in Section 4.1 and the implementation details and results are in Section 4.2.
4.1. Procedure for the real data. Here, we present a procedure for the classification based on QDA for the real data. For the real data, we have to estimate $\hat{\Omega}_0$, $\hat{\Omega}_1$, $\hat{\mu}_0$ and $\hat{\mu}_1$ separately. Further, we need to eliminate the effect of the feature variances. Hence, there is an additional scaling step in the following algorithm.

0. Find the corresponding precision matrix ($\hat{\Omega}_0$, $\hat{\Omega}$). Find the sample mean vectors $\hat{\mu}_0$ and $\hat{\mu}_1$ for groups 0 and 1.
1. Estimate the difference $\Omega_0 - \Omega_1$ by $\Omega_{\text{diff}} = \hat{\Omega}_0 - \hat{\Omega}_1$. Set the diagonals of $\Omega_{\text{diff}}$ to be zeros.
2. Let $\hat{d}_0 = \hat{\Omega}_0 \hat{\mu}_0$ and $\hat{d}_1 = \hat{\Omega} \hat{\mu}_1$. Scale them by standard deviation and sample size, i.e.,
   \[ d_0 = \hat{\Omega}_0 \hat{\mu}_0 / s_0, \quad d_1 = \hat{\Omega} \hat{\mu}_1 / s_1, \]
where $s_i$ are the standard deviation vector of the train data from class $i$, $i = 0, 1$, and the division means element-wise deviation.
3. Let $d = d_1 - d_0$. For a threshold $t$, define the vector $d^{(t)}$ where $d^{(t)}_j = d_j \times I(|d_j| \geq t)$.
4. For any fresh data vector $X$, compute the scaled test vector
   \[ x_j = (X_j - \hat{\mu}_j) / s_j, \]
where $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}_1 + \hat{\mu}_0 / 2$ and $s$ is the standard error of the pooled data
   \[ s_j = \sqrt{\frac{(n_0 - 1)(s_0)_j^2 + (n_1 - 1)(s_1)_j^2}{(n_0 + n_1 - 2)}}. \]
5. Calculate the Z-score
   \[ Z = x^\top \hat{\Omega}_{\text{diff}} x + 2(d^{(t)})^\top x + C \]
and classify $X$ to be in class 0 if $Z < 0$ (or in class 1 if $Z > 0$).

There are two tuning parameters in the algorithm, $t$ in Step 3 and $C$ in Step 5. In the implementations, we use a grid search to find the optimal values. Details in Section 4.2.

In Step 1, we set all the diagonals of $\Omega_{\text{diff}}$ to be 0. The reason is that the sample size is limited. The training data has 90 samples for class 0 and 46 samples for class 1 only, so the elementary-wise error for $\hat{\Omega}_0$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ are $\sim 1/\sqrt{50}$. It will cause a comparatively large error on the diagonals of $\hat{\Omega}_0 - \hat{\Omega}$, and hence the classification criteria. So for this data set, we set all the diagonals of $\Omega_{\text{diff}}$ to be 0. It is not necessary for large data sets.

4.2. Implementation and Results. Following the setup of the data analysis in [14], we apply 4-fold data splitting to the sample. For each class, we randomly draw one fourth of the samples, and then combine them to be the test data while using the leftover to be the training data. We do the splitting for 15 times independently and record the error with QDA and LDA for each splitting. The data (sample indices for the 15 splittings is available at https://zhigang-yao.github.io/research.html.

In the real data analysis section, we focus on comparing QDA and LDA. The LDA is implemented within the setting of QDA, where in Step (3) of the algorithm in Section 4.1 we use clipping thresholding instead of hard thresholding, and in Step (5) we set $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{diff}} = 0$ for LDA. The clipping threshold is employed since it gives much more satisfactory results than hard thresholding for LDA; details in [14]. For QDA, the two ways give similar results. Since the calculation of $\hat{d}$ involves the calculation of $\hat{\Omega}_0$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ and the thresholding, LDA algorithm has exactly the same tuning parameters with QDA. The procedure of determining these tuning parameters are the same for both algorithms, so that the results are comparable.

There are two set of parameters in the algorithm. One is in the estimation of PCS, and the other are $C$ and $t$ in the algorithm. For PCS, there are four tuning parameters ($q_1, q_2, \delta, L$). Here we use the same set of tuning parameters for the estimation of both $\hat{\Omega}_0$ and $\hat{\Omega}$, since
the two classes are from the same data set and the performance of PCS is not sensitive to the choice of these parameters ([14]). Following the setting in [14], we set \((\delta, L) = (0.1, 30)\), and also tried \((\delta, L) = (0.1, 50)\). The selection of \((q_1, q_2)\) is done with \(C\) and \(t\) by grid search.

In Step (3) and Step (5) of the algorithm, there are two tuning parameters \(t\) and \(C\). We set the ranges \([t_{\text{min}}, t_{\text{max}}] = [0, \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |d_j|]\) with an increment of .1 and \([C_{\text{min}}, C_{\text{max}}] = [-50, 50]\) with an increment of 1. For \((q_1, q_2)\), we consider \(1 \leq q_k \leq 1\), with an increment of .1, \(k = 0, 1\). The smallest error is obtained over a grid search of \(t\), \(C\), and \((q_1, q_2)\). This step is the same for both QDA and LDA to be fair. We compare the smallest error that LDA and QDA can achieve.

![Graph showing comparison of testing error rate (y-axis) of LDA and QDA for the rats data with \((\delta_1, L_1) = (\delta_2, L_2) = (0.1, 30)\) and 15 data splittings.](image)

Both the LDA test error (the best error) and the QDA test error (the best error) over all 15 data splittings are reported in Figure 4. In the left panel of Figure 4, we can see that the error rates of LDA are all above QDA at every data splitting. To better show the difference between them, we also plot the testing error rate in the right panel of Figure 4 for a wider grid-search range that \([C_{\text{min}}, C_{\text{max}}] = [-100, 100]\). When \(L\) changes from 30 to 50, the results are summarized in Figure 6, which is similar. This comparison clearly demonstrates the expected superiority of QDA over LDA. The results suggest that, for rats data, QDA outperforms LDA in terms of both best error rate and average error; with the results in [14] for other methods, where the authors have shown that HCT-based LDA significantly outperforms all other HCT-based methods as well as SVM and RF, our findings also suggest that the QDA gives a better separation than the LDA by taking into account the second order difference between the two classes.

5. Discussion. This paper focuses on the classification problem associated with the use of QDA and feature selection for data of rare and weak signals. We derived the successful and unsuccessful classification regions, by using first the case of a known mean vector and covariance matrix, then the case of an unknown mean vector but known covariance matrix, and finally the case in which both mean vector and covariance matrix were unknown. We also proved that these regions were actually the possibility and impossibility regions under the same modelling, which indicates that QDA achieves the optimal classification results in this manner. In addition, we developed computing and classification algorithms that incorporated feature selection for rare and weak data. With these algorithms, our real data analysis showed that QDA had much improved performance over LDA.
FIG 5. Zoom-in errors for the rats data for varying choices of \((q_1, q_2) \in (1, 1) \times (1, 1)\) for one splitting of 15 splittings in Figure 4(a)-(b) and Figure 6(a)-(b).

Our theoretical results showed that the two sets of signal weakness and sparsity parameters, one set from the mean vector and the other set from the covariance matrix, influence the possibility/impossibility regions or QDA successful/unsuccesful regions almost independently (except for a max operator over the two sets of parameters) when the covariance matrix is known. When both the mean vector and covariance matrix are unknown, the two sets of parameters interact with each other as indicated in Theorem 4. For the latter case, the analysis of the misclassification rate is very complicated and we only obtained partial results.

FIG 6. Comparison of testing error rate (y-axis) of LDA and QDA for the rats data with \((\delta_1, L_1) = (\delta_2, L_2) = (1, 50)\) and 15 data splittings.
for this most general case; further study is therefore warranted. Also, for the precision matrix \( \Omega \) given in (1.7), we can introduce sparsity and weakness in the diagonal elements of \( I - \Omega \), the difference in precision matrices, instead of using a constant \( \xi = 1 - c \) for all diagonal elements.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2 but with less complexity and fewer index parameters. Below, we follow the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 2 and give only the calculations that are different under this simplified model.

Given \( W \) (and thus \( \Omega \)), the two types of misclassification rates are defined as

\[
p_{0,W} = P_{Y=0}(Q(X,W) > 0|W), \quad p_{1,W} = P_{Y=1}(Q(X,W) < 0|W).
\]

Then, the population misclassification rate (MR) is

\[
MR(QDA) = \frac{1}{2} E_W[p_{0,W}] + \frac{1}{2} E_W[p_{1,W}].
\]

We wish to find a boundary that divides the parameter space into two regions. In one region, \( MR \) converges to 0. In the other region, \( MR \) is always larger than some positive constant.

We first introduce some notations. For a fixed \( W \), let the eigenvalue decomposition of \( W \) be \( W = U \Lambda U^\top \), where \( U^\top U = UU^\top = I \) and \( \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_p) \). Here, \( \lambda_i = \lambda_i(W) \) are the eigenvalues of \( W \) such that \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_p \). Let the spectral norm of \( W \) be denoted by \( \| W \| \).

Since \( \Omega = cI + \eta W \), \( \Omega = (cI + \eta \Lambda)U^\top \). In \( Q(X,W) \), the quadratic part is related to \( \Omega - I = \xi I + \eta W \), where the eigenvalues are defined as

\[
m_i = \xi + \eta \lambda_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p.
\]

A.1. Proof of Theorem 1. There are two parts of the proof. The proof of the region of possibility where \( MR(QDA) \to 0 \) and the region of impossibility that the classification error goes to a constant for any classifier \( T \).

For the region of possibility, we need a conclusion for which we prove in the next section, that

\[
p_{0,W} = p_{1,W} = \Phi(-C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) + o(1),
\]

where \( C > 0 \) is a constant. Then, we figure out an estimation of the probability on the right hand side. Therefore, the misclassification rate can be represented as

\[
MR = 2\Phi(-C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) + o(1).
\]

According to Lemma 3.2, there is

\[
Tr((\Omega - I)^2) = \sum_{i=1}^p m_i^2 = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p\nu(1 + o(1)).
\]

Therefore, when \( p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p\nu(1 + o(1)) \to \infty \), \( MR \to 0 \), which means QDA will achieve classification error 0.

Recall that \( p\xi^2 = p^{1-2\gamma} \) and \( \eta^2 p\nu = f_p p^{1-2\alpha-\beta} \), there is

\[
Tr((\Omega - I)^2) = p^{1-2\gamma} + f_p p^{1-2\alpha-\beta}(1 + o(1)).
\]

Hence, we consider the three conditions,
(1) \( \gamma < 1/2, \beta > 1 - 2\alpha, f_p = 1; \)
(2) \( \gamma \geq 1/2, 1 - 2\alpha < \beta < 2 - 2\alpha, f_p = 1; \)
(3) \( \gamma \geq 1/2, \beta = 2 - 2\alpha, f_p = L_p \) (a \( \ln p \) term).

If one of the above conditions is satisfied, then \( Tr((\Omega - I)^2) \to \infty \), hence the QDA has a misclassification rate that converges to 0. We have finished the proof of the possibility part in Theorem 1.

Now we consider the region of impossibility. We still apply Lemma 3.6 to prove the impossibility. Let \( f \) be the density function of \( X \sim N(0, I) \) and \( g \) be the density function of \( X \sim N(0, \Omega^{-1}) \). The Hellinger affinity between \( f \) and \( g \) is defined as \( H(f, g) = \int \sqrt{f(x)g(x)}dx \).

According to Appendix B.1, and the mean and variance can be found through the distribution. According to Lemma 3.6, to prove the impossibility, we only need to prove that \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \).

Next, we check \( H(f, g) \). According to the definition of multivariate normal distribution,

\[
H(f, g) = \int \frac{|\Omega|^{1/4}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^p} \exp\{-x^\top(I + \Omega)x/4\}dx = \frac{|\Omega|^{1/4}}{|(\Omega + I)/2|^{1/2}}\exp\{-\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i=1}^p \ln \frac{(1 + m_i^2)^2}{4(1 + m_i)}\}.
\]

To show that \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \), we only need to prove \( R = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{(1 + m_i^2)^2}{4(1 + m_i)} = o(1) \). Now, we have

\[
R = \sum_{i=1}^p \ln(1 + \frac{m_i^2}{4(1 + m_i)}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{m_i^2}{4(1 + m_i)}(1 + o(1)) = \frac{1}{4}||\Omega - I||^2_F.
\]

Therefore, when \( ||\Omega - I||^2_F = o(1) \), the misclassification error from any classifier will be close to 1/2.

According to Lemma 3.2, with probability \( 1 + o(1) \), \( ||\Omega - I||^2_F = \sum_{i=1}^p m_i^2 = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu \rightarrow 1 + o(1) \). When \( \gamma > 1/2 \) and \( \beta > 2 - 2\alpha \), \( p\xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu \rightarrow 0 \), and so \( H(f, g) = 1 + o(1) \). Therefore, in the region that \( \gamma > 1/2 \) and \( \beta > 2 - 2\alpha \), the misclassification rate of any classifier \( T \) goes to 1/2.

Combining the region of possibility and the region of impossibility, Theorem 1 is proved.

A.2. Proof of (A.56). In this section, we show that (A.56) holds. Since the derivations are very similar, we first discuss the term \( p_{0,W} \) in details, and then give the results about \( p_{1,W} \).

Recall that

\[
p_{0,W} = P(Q(X, W) > 0|W, Y = 0) = P(X^\top(I - \Omega)X + \ln|\Omega| > 0|W, Y = 0).
\]

When \( Y = 0, X \sim N(0, I) \). Therefore, \( X^\top(I - \Omega)X \) follows a non-central chi-square distribution. According to Appendix B.1, and the mean and variance can be found through the properties therein.

\[
(A.57) \quad E[X^\top(I - \Omega)X] = -\sum_{i=1}^p m_i, \quad \text{Var}(X^\top(I - \Omega)X) = 2\sum_{i=1}^p m_i^2.
\]

Define

\[
(A.58) \quad Z = \frac{X^\top(I - \Omega)X - E[X^\top(I - \Omega)X]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X^\top(I - \Omega)X)}} = \frac{X^\top(I - \Omega)X + \sum_{i=1}^p m_i}{\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^p m_i^2}}.
\]

Now we consider the relationship between \( Z \) and a normal distribution. Let \( F_Z(x) = P(Z < x) \) denote the c.d.f. of \( Z \), and \( \Phi(\cdot) \) denote the c.d.f. of the standard normal distribution.
According to Property 3 of the generalized chi-square distribution in Section B.1,

\[
(A.59) \quad \sup_{x} |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \frac{13}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 \right)^{-3/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |m_i|^3.
\]

Note that \( m_i = \xi + \eta \lambda_i \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = p \xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \) in (3.22). Let \( \omega = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| \to 0 \). Then, we have

\[
(A.60) \quad \sup_{x} |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \frac{13 \sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{4p|\xi|^3 + 4\eta^3 \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\lambda_i|^3}{\left( p \xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{3/2}} \\
\leq 26 \sqrt{2} \frac{p^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{-3/2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\lambda_i|^3}{\left( p \xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{3/2}} = \frac{26 \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + R_W).
\]

According to Lemma 3.1, \( R_W / \sqrt{p} \to 0 \) with probability \( 1 - o(1) \). Therefore, the distance converges to 0 uniformly with probability \( 1 - o(1) \).

Now that we have the \( Z \) part, we want to check the current threshold. According to the definition of \( Z \) and that \( \ln |\Omega| = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1 + m_i) \), now

\[
Q(X,W) = \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 * Z - \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1 + m_i)}.
\]

Therefore,

\[
P(Q(X,W) > 0) = P(\sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 * Z} > \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i - \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1 + m_i)) = P(Z > T),
\]

where

\[
(A.61) \quad T = \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i - \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1 + m_i) \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2}.
\]

From Lemma 3.2, \( \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| = o(1) \) with high probability. Hence,

\[
(A.62) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i - \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1 + m_i) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 (1 + o(1)).
\]

Plugging (A.62) into (A.61), we have

\[
(A.63) \quad T = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 (1 + o(1))}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2}} = \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2} = C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}.
\]

The second equivalence comes from the results \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mu_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mu_i^2 \) in Lemma 3.2.

Combining (A.63) and (A.60), we get

\[
(A.64) \quad p_{0,W} = P(Z > C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) = \Phi(-C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) + o(1).
\]

For the case \( Y = 1 \), the analysis is similar. In this case, \( X \sim N(0, \Omega^{-1}) \), hence \( E[X^\top (I - \Omega) X] = -\sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i}{1+m_i} \) and \( \operatorname{Var}(X^\top (I - \Omega) X) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i^2}{(1+m_i)^2} \). Define

\[
Z = \frac{X^\top (I - \Omega) X + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i}{1+m_i}}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i^2}{(1+m_i)^2}}}.
\]
Therefore, 

\[
\sup_x |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \frac{26\sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{|m_i|^2}{1+|m_i|^2}}{2\sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{13\sqrt{2}}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^3 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} |m_i|^3}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2\right)^{3/2}}
\]

(A.65)

where \(\delta = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i|\). According to Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3, the difference between \(F_Z\) and \(\Phi\) uniformly converges to 0 in probability.

Next we check the right-hand side. Now we have that

\[
Q(X,W) = \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i^2}{(1+m_i)^2} - \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i}{1+m_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1+m_i)}.
\]

Therefore, \(P(Q(X,W) < 0) = P(Z < T)\), where

\[
T = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i}{1+m_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{p} \ln(1+m_i)}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i^2}{(1+m_i)^2}}}.
\]

(A.66)

According to Lemma 3.2, \(\max |m_i| = o(1)\).

(A.67) \(T = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{m_i^2 (1 + o(1))}{\sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2}} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = -C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}\).

As a result, we have

\[
p_{1,W} = P(Z < -C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) = \Phi(-C \sqrt{Tr((\Omega - I)^2)}) + o(1).
\]

(A.68)

Combine (A.64) and (A.68), (A.66) is proved.

**APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF LEMMAS**

**B.1. Non-central chi-square distribution.** In the proofs, we use some properties of the generalized chi-square distribution. A summary of those properties is provided here.

**Definition B.1** Suppose \(x \sim N_p(\mu, I)\). Then, for a symmetric matrix \(A\), \(x^\top Ax\) is called a generalized chi-square distribution, with parameters \(\mu\) and \(A\), denoted by \(\chi^2(\mu, A)\).

According to the analysis of quadratic forms (Page 55, ??), we have the mean and variance of the generalized chi-square distribution. The proof is ignored here.

**Property 1.** If \(z \sim \chi^2(\mu, A)\),

\[
E[z] = Tr(A) + \mu^\top A\mu, \quad Var(z) = 2Tr(A^2) + 4\mu^\top A^2\mu.
\]

**Property 2.** If \(x \sim N_p(\mu, \Sigma)\), \(z = x^\top Ax \sim \chi^2((\Sigma^{-1/2}\mu, \Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma A\Sigma^{1/2}))\), with

\[
E[z] = Tr(A\Sigma) + \mu^\top A\mu, \quad Var(z) = 2Tr((A\Sigma)^2) + 4\mu^\top A\Sigma A\mu.
\]

**Proof.** When \(x \sim N_p(\mu, \Sigma)\), \(y = \Sigma^{-1/2}x \sim N(\Sigma^{-1/2}\mu, I)\). Hence,

\[
x^\top Ax = (\Sigma^{-1/2}x)^\top \Sigma^{1/2} A \Sigma^{1/2} (\Sigma^{-1/2}x) \sim \chi^2((\Sigma^{-1/2}\mu, \Sigma^{1/2}A\Sigma^{1/2}))
\]

With Property 1, the mean and variance can be found. \(\square\)
Property 3. Suppose $x \sim N_p(\mu, I)$, $z = x^\top A x$, $A = U^\top \Lambda U$, where $U$ is an orthogonal matrix and $\Lambda$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonals $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_p$. Let $W = \frac{z - E[z]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(z)}}$ with cumulative density function $F_W(x)$. Then,

\[ \sup_x |F_W(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq 36^2 \sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i|^3 \right) + \frac{36^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i \bar{\mu}_i|^3}{\sqrt{2} (\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^2 \bar{\mu}_i^2)^{3/2}}, \]

where $\bar{\mu} = U^\top \mu$.

Proof. Since $A = U^\top \Lambda U$, we have

\[ z = (U x)^\top \Lambda (U x) = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i (U x)_i^2, \]

where $U x \sim N_p(\mu I)$, which is the same as $N_p(\bar{\mu}, I)$. Let $y = U x - \bar{\mu}$. Then, $y \sim N_p(0, I)$ and $z = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (y_i - \bar{\mu}_i)^2$. Since

\[ |\lambda_i|^3 E[(y_i - \bar{\mu}_i)^2] - E[(y_i - \bar{\mu}_i)^2]^3 \leq |\lambda_i|^3 \left( 9 E[y_i] - 1 \right)^3 \]

\[ = |\lambda_i|^3 \left( 9(15) + 72 |\bar{\mu}_i|^3 \left( 2 \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{3}} \right) + 9 \right) \]

\[ = 144 |\lambda_i|^3 + 144 \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{3}} |\lambda_i|^3 |\bar{\mu}_i|^3, \]

due to the Berry-Esséen theorem, for given $\mu$ and $W$,

\[ \sup_x |F_W(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq 36^2 \sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i|^3 \right) + \frac{36^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i \bar{\mu}_i|^3}{\sqrt{2} (\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^2 \bar{\mu}_i^2)^{3/2}}. \]

The result is thus proved, and we have control over the distribution of $z$. □


• Not very sparse region ($0 < \beta < 1$).

Refer to Theorem 1.5 in [23]. Note that, in our setting, the off-diagonal entries $|w_{ij}| \leq 1$, $E[w_{ij}] = 0$, and $\text{Var}(w_{ij}) = \nu \geq p^{-1} \log^4 p$. Then, almost surely,

\[ \|W\| \leq 2\sqrt{pv} + C(pv)^{1/4} \ln p. \]

In this region, $pv \to \infty$, so $\sqrt{pv} \gg (pv)^{1/4} \ln p$ when $p \to \infty$. Therefore, almost surely,

\[ (B.69) \quad \|W\| \leq 2\sqrt{pv}(1 + o(1)) \leq 3\sqrt{pv}. \]

Now we analyze $R_W$. Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^2$; then, $S \sim 2\text{Binomial}(p(p-1)/2, \nu)$. According to the Chernoff lower tail bound, let $\mu = E[S/2] = p(p-1)/2$; then, we have

\[ (B.70) \quad P(S \leq p(p-1)/2) = P(S/2 \leq \mu/2) \leq \exp(-\mu/8) = e^{-p(p-1)/16}. \]

Therefore, with high probability (larger than $1 - e^{-p(p-1)/16}$), $S > p(p-1)^{1/2}$.

Combining this with the result for $\|W\|$, with probability tending to 1, we have

\[ (B.71) \quad R_W \leq \frac{(3\sqrt{pv})^3}{[p(p-1)/2/p]^{3/2}} = 54\sqrt{2} \frac{(pv)^{3/2}}{[(p-1)p]^{3/2}} \leq 216. \]
• Sparse region \((1 \leq \beta < 2)\).
In this region, we apply theorems in random graph theory to prove our results.
Let \(U\) be the matrix where the sign is removed for the entries of \(W\), i.e., \(u_{ij} = |w_{ij}|\), \(1 \leq i, j \leq p\). Therefore, \(U\) is also a Wigner matrix, with diagonals 0, and off-diagonals

\[ u_{ij} = u_{ji} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\nu). \]

Clearly, \(\lambda_1(W) \leq \lambda_1(U)\), and \(\lambda_n(W) \geq -\lambda_1(U)\). Therefore, \(\|W\| \leq \|U\|\). To control \(\|W\|\), we only need to control \(\|U\|\).

Recall the Erdos–Renyi random-graph model in graph theory. For a graph \(G = (V, E)\), where \(V\) is the vertex set and \(E\) is the edge set, the Erdos–Renyi undirected random-graph model \(G = G(p, \nu)\) denotes a graph with \(V = \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}\), and \((i, j) \in E\) with probability \(\nu\). Therefore, the adjacency matrix of \(G\) is a Wigner matrix with the same distribution of \(U\). The results for the largest eigenvalue of \(G\) also apply to \(\|U\|\).

- When \(\beta = 1\) \((\nu = p^{-1})\).
  
  With Corollary 1.2 in Krivelevich and Sudakov (2003), almost surely,
  
  \[ \lambda_1(G(p, 1/p)) = (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}. \]

  Therefore, almost surely,

  \[(B.72) \quad \|U\| \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}. \]

  Now consider \(R_W\). Note that

  \[(B.73) \quad R_W = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\lambda_i|^3 \leq \frac{1}{p} S \cdot 2 \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}} = 2(S/p)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}. \]

  Since, according to \((B.70)\), \(S > p(p - 1)\nu/2\) with high probability (larger than \(1 - e^{-p(p - 1)\nu/16}\)), there is high probability that

  \[(B.74) \quad R_W \leq 2[(p - 1)\nu/2]^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}} \leq 4 \sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{\ln \ln p}}. \]

- When \(1 < \beta \leq 2\) \((p^{-2} \leq \nu < p^{-1})\).
  
  Let \(\|U\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^{p} |u_{ij}|\) denote the 1-norm of \(U\), and \(\|U\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |u_{ij}|\) denote the infinity norm of \(U\). Since \(U\) is symmetric, \(\|U\|_1 = \|U\|_\infty\). According to the relationships between matrix norms, we have

  \[ \|U\| \leq \sqrt{\|U\|_1 \|U\|_\infty} = \|U\|_1. \]

  Thus we only need to control \(\|U\|_1\), the maximal degree of nodes.

  According to Lemma 2.2 in Krivelevich and Sudakov (2003), the maximum degree of the graph almost surely satisfies the following:

  \[ \text{maximum degree} = (1 + o(1)) \max \{ k : p \binom{p - 1}{k} \nu^k (1 - \nu)^{p-k} \geq 1 \}. \]

  Now we want to have an upper bound for \(k\). Note that

  \[ p \binom{p - 1}{k} \nu^k (1 - \nu)^{p-k} \leq p^k p^k \nu^k \leq p(p\nu)^k. \]
Combining the results, when any one of the following four conditions holds,

(B.75) \[ \|U\| \leq 2/(\beta - 1). \]

Now we consider \( R_W \). Let \( S = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \). Then, \( S \) is the number of all non-zero entries. Therefore, the rank of \( W \) is no larger than \( S \), and the number of non-zero eigenvalues is also no larger than \( S \). Similar to (B.73),

(B.76) \[ R_W = \frac{\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\lambda_i|^3}{\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2\right)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{\beta} \cdot S \cdot \beta^{-2}}{\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \cdot S^2\right)^{3/2}} = \frac{2}{\beta - 1} \left(\frac{S}{p}\right)^{-1/2}. \]

Since, according to (B.70), \( S > p(p - 1)\nu/2 \) with high probability (larger than \( 1 - e^{-p(p-1)\nu/16} \)), there is high probability that

(B.77) \[ R_W \leq \frac{2}{\beta - 1} \left(\frac{p - 1}{\nu/2}\right)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{4}{\beta - 1} \left(\frac{p\nu}{2}\right)^{-1/2}. \]

**B.3. Proof of Lemma 3.2.** We want to analyze three terms: \( p\xi^2 \), \( \eta^2 B_p \), and \( \tau^2 B'_p \).

- The term \( p\xi^2 = p^{1 - 2\gamma} \). Hence, under the condition that \( \gamma \geq 1/2 \), clearly we have
  \[
  p\xi^2 \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1, & \gamma = 1/2, \\ 0, & \gamma > 1/2. \end{cases}
  \]

- The term \( \eta^2 B_p \), where \( B_p \sim \text{Binomial}(\frac{p(p - 1)}{2}, \nu) \). According to Bernstein’s inequality,
  \[
  P(|B_p - \frac{p(p - 1)}{2} - \nu| \geq \sqrt{p^2\nu \ln p}) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{p^2\nu \ln p})^2/2}{\frac{p(p - 1)}{2}(1 - \nu) + (\sqrt{p^2\nu \ln p})/3}\right\} = o(p^{-1}).
  \]

Note that \( p^2 \nu \rightarrow \infty \). Hence, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), \( B_p = p^2\nu/2(1 + o(1)) \), and

\[ \eta^2 B_p = \eta^2 p^2\nu/2(1 + o(1)). \]

Therefore, under the condition \( \beta < 2 - 2\alpha \), \( f_p = 1 \), or the condition \( \beta = 2 - 2\alpha \), \( f_p = L_p \) (a \( \ln p \) term), we have \( \eta^2 p^2\nu \rightarrow \infty \), which means that \( \eta^2 B_p \rightarrow \infty \). Under the condition that \( \beta > 2 - 2\alpha \), we have \( \eta^2 p^2\nu \rightarrow 0 \), which indicates that \( \eta^2 B_p \rightarrow 0 \).

- The term \( \tau^2 B'_p \), where \( B'_p \sim \text{Binomial}(\nu, \epsilon) \). According to Bernstein’s inequality,
  \[
  P(|B'_p - \nu\epsilon| \geq \sqrt{\nu\epsilon \ln p}) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{(\sqrt{\nu\epsilon \ln p})^2/2}{\nu\epsilon(1 - \epsilon) + (\sqrt{\nu\epsilon \ln p})/3}\right\} = o(p^{-1}).
  \]

Since \( \nu\epsilon \rightarrow \infty \), we get, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \),

\[ \tau^2 B'_p = \tau^2 \nu\epsilon(1 + o(1)). \]

Under the condition \( 0 < \zeta < 1 - 2\theta \), \( g_p = 1 \), or the condition \( \zeta = 1 - 2\theta \), \( g_p = L_p \), we have \( \tau^2 \nu\epsilon \rightarrow \infty \); hence, \( \tau^2 B'_p \rightarrow \infty \). Under the condition \( \zeta > 1 - 2\theta \), \( \tau^2 \nu\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \), we have \( \tau^2 B'_p \rightarrow 0 \).

Combining the results, when any one of the following four conditions holds,

1. \( \beta < 2 - 2\alpha \), \( f_p = 1 \);
2. \( \beta = 2 - 2\alpha \), \( f_p = L_p \) (a \( \ln p \) term);
3. \( 0 < \zeta < 1 - 2\theta \), \( g_p = 1 \);
4. \( \zeta = 1 - 2\theta \), \( g_p = L_p \);
\[ \eta^2 B_p \to \infty \text{ or } \tau^2 B'_p \to \infty \] with probability \(1 - o(1)\). Therefore, we have
\[ p\epsilon^2 + \eta^2 B_p + c\tau^2 B'_p \to \infty, \quad c > 0. \]
If \( \beta > 2 - 2\alpha \) and \( \zeta > 1 - 2\theta \), \( \eta^2 B_p \to 0 \) or \( \tau^2 B'_p \to 0 \). Hence the summation of them also converges to 0.

Combining the results, the lemma is proved. \( \square \)

**B.4. Proof of Lemma 3.3.** Recall that \( \tilde{\mu} = U^T \mu \) and \( \tilde{\mu}_i = u_i^T \mu \), where \( U \) is the orthonormal matrix from the eigendecomposition \( W = U\Lambda U^T \).

First, we figure out the bound for fixed \( \mu \) and \( U \). Note that the entries of \( \mu \) are either 0 or \( \tau \). Let \( S(\mu) = \{ i : \mu_i \neq 0 \} \), and \( |S(\mu)| \) be the cardinality of \( S(\mu) \). Hence,
\[ (B.80) \]
\[ \tilde{\mu}_i = u_i^T \mu = \tau \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij}. \]

We introduce it in our target and rewrite it as
\[ (B.81) \]
\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^2 \right)^{3/2} = \frac{\tau^3 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij}^3}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij}^2 \right)^{3/2}}. \]

(B.79)

Let \( a_i = \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij} \). Then, \( \sum |a_i|^3 \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |a_i| \cdot \sum a_i^2 \). Hence, we can further revise the equation as follows:
\[ (B.80) \]
\[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^2 \right)^{3/2} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |a_i|}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}} = \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |a_i|}{|S(\mu)|^{1/2}}. \]

That last equation (above) comes from
\[ (B.81) \]
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^2 = \| \mu \|_2^2 = \| U^T \mu \|_2^2 = \| \mu \|_2^2 = \tau^2 |S(\mu)|. \]

Now, we apply the randomness of \( \mu \) to control the upper bound in (B.80). Fix a constant \( 0 < c < \min\{ \beta/4, 1-\beta/2 \} \). Since \( \beta < 1 \), a positive constant always exists. We define \( 0 < b_0 < b_1 < \cdots < b_K \), where
\[ b_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} p^{-c} = p^{\frac{1-\beta}{2} - c}, \quad b_i = b_{i-1} \cdot p^{-2c}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, \]
and \( K = \min\{ k; b_k \geq 1 \} \). Note that \( b_i \) increases by \( p^{-2c} \to \infty \), such that \( k \) always exists and does not change with respect to \( p \). The increasing step also indicates that there is at most one \( k \), so \( p^{-\beta/2} < b_k < 1 \). If such a \( k \) exists, \( b_{k+1} = 1 \).

With the definition of vector \( a \), we define a matrix \( V = (v_{ij}) \) as follows:
\[ (B.82) \]
\[ v_{ij} = \begin{cases} b_0, & |u_{ij}| \leq b_0; \\ b_i, & b_{i-1} < |u_{ij}| \leq b_i. \end{cases} \]

Since \( 0 \leq |u_{ij}| \leq 1 \), \( V \) is well defined. Clearly, \( v_{ij} \geq u_{ij} \) holds for each entry, which indicates that
\[ (B.83) \]
\[ \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |a_i| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} u_{ij} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} v_{ij}. \]
The bound in (B.80) is correspondingly replaced by $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} v_{ij} / |S(\mu)|^{1/2}$. According to the definitions of $V(i,j)$, the bound can be decomposed into $k + 1$ parts.

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \frac{\sum_{j \in S(\mu)} v_{ij}}{|S(\mu)|^{1/2}} \leq \frac{b_0 \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{|u_{ij}| \leq b_0\}}{|S(\mu)|^{1/2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} b_k \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} < |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \quad \text{(B.84)}
\]

Consider term $I$. Note that $\sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{|u_{ij}| \leq b_0\} \leq |S(\mu)|$ holds for any $1 \leq i \leq p$, and therefore

\[
I \leq \frac{b_0 |S(\mu)|}{|S(\mu)|^{1/2}} = b_0 |S(\mu)|^{1/2} = p^{-1/2} - c |S(\mu)|^{1/2}.
\]

Let $\nu_i = 1\{|\mu_i| \neq 0\} - \epsilon$. Then, $E[\nu_i] = 0$, $Var(\nu_i) = \epsilon(1 - \epsilon)$, and $\max(\{|\nu_i|\}) < 1$. Hence, $E[\sum \nu_i] = |S(\mu)| - p\epsilon$. According to Bernstein’s inequality (22),

\[
P(|S(\mu)| \geq p\epsilon^2) = P(|S(\mu)| - p\epsilon \geq p\epsilon^2) \leq \exp\left\{ -\frac{p\epsilon^2(1 - p^{-1})^2}{2p\epsilon^2(1 - \epsilon) + 2/3p\epsilon^2(1 - 1)} \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \exp\left\{ -3p\epsilon^2(1 - 1) / 4 \right\} = o(p^{-1}).
\]

Hence, with probability $1 - o(p^{-1}),$

\[
I \leq p^{-1/2} - c |p\epsilon^2|^{1/2} = p^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0.
\]

Now we consider term $IIk$. Since $U$ is an orthonormal matrix, $\|u_i\|^2 = 1$, and, hence,

\[
b_{k-1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{p} 1\{|u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{p} u_{ij}^2 = 1 \Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{p} 1\{|b_{k-1} - 1 \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \leq 1/b_{k-1}^2.
\]

Therefore, there are at most $1/b_{k-1}^2$ elements in the region $[b_{k-1}, b_k]$. Since $1\{|b_{k-1} - 1 \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \leq \epsilon(1 - \epsilon)$, in addition, let $Y_i + \epsilon \sim Bernoulli(1, \epsilon)$, with mean 0 and variance $\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)$, and let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{1/b_{k-1}^2} Y_i$.

We discuss the control of $IIk$ according to the magnitude of $b_{k-1}$.

- **Case 1.** $b_{k-1} < p^{-\beta/2} = \sqrt{\epsilon}$. With Bernstein’s inequality,

\[
P\left( \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{|b_{k-1} - 1 \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq P(Y > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2} b_{k-1}^{c/4}) = P(Y > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2} b_{k-1}^{c/4} - 1) \leq \exp\left\{ -\epsilon^2(p^{c/4} - 1)^2 / 2b_{k-1}^4 \right\}
\]

\[
\leq \exp\left\{ -\epsilon(p^{c/4} - 1) / b_{k-1}^2 \right\} \quad \text{(since} \quad p^{c/4} \rightarrow \infty)\]
If $b_{k-1} < p^{-\beta/2} = \sqrt{c}$, $\epsilon(p^c/4 - 1)/b_{k-1}^2 \geq p^c/4 - 1 \to \infty$, and the result is reduced to (B.87)
\[
P(\sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}p^{c/4}) \leq \exp\{-\epsilon(p^c/4 - 1)/b_{k-1}^2\} = o(p^{-2}).
\]

Therefore,
\[
P(\max_i \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}p^{c/4})
\]
\[
\leq pP(\sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}p^{c/4}) = o(p^{-1}).
\]

Hence, with probability $1 - o(p^{-1})$,
\[
b_k \max_i \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \leq b_k \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}p^{c/4}
\]
\[
\leq b_{k-1} \cdot p^{(\beta - 2c)} \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}p^{c/4}
\]
\[
= \frac{p^{7c/4}}{b_{k-1}} \leq p^{-7c/4}/b_0
\]
\[
= \sqrt{pe}p^{-3c/4}.
\]

- **Case 2.** $b_{k-1} > p^{-\beta/2} = \sqrt{c}$. Note that, in this case, $\epsilon/b_{k-1}^2 \leq 1$ and $b_{k+1} = 1$. As with the derivative in case 1, using Bernstein’s inequality, we have
\[
P(\sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \sqrt{pe}p^{-2c})
\]
\[
\leq P(Y - \epsilon/b_{k-1}^2 > \sqrt{pe}p^{-2c} - \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2})
\]
\[
\leq \exp\left\{\frac{-\left(\sqrt{pe}p^{-2c} - \frac{\epsilon}{b_{k-1}^2}\right)^2}{2\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)/b_{k-1}^2 + 2(\sqrt{pe}p^{-2c} - \epsilon/b_{k-1})/3}\right\}
\]
\[
\leq \exp\{-\left(\sqrt{pe}p^{-2c} - \epsilon/b_{k-1}^2\right)\} = o(p^{-2}) \quad \text{(since $pep^{-2c} \to \infty$)}
\]

Introducing the result into the following maximum question, we get
\[
P(\max_i \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} > \sqrt{pe}p^{-2c}) = o(p^{-1}).
\]

Hence, with probability $1 - o(p^{-1})$,
\[
b_k \max_i \sum_{j \in S(\mu)} 1\{b_{k-1} \leq |u_{ij}| \leq b_k\} \leq \sqrt{pe}p^{-2c} \leq \sqrt{pe}p^{-3c/4}.
\]

According to Bernstein’s inequality,
\[
P(|S(\mu)| \leq pe^{-c}) = P(|S(\mu)| - pe \leq pe(p^{-c} - 1))
\]
\[
\leq \exp\left\{\frac{-p^2c^2(p^{-c} - 1)^2}{2pe(1 - \epsilon) + 2/3pe(1 - p^{-c})}\right\}
\]
\[
\leq \exp\{-\frac{p^2c^2(p^{-c} - 1)^2}{3pe}\} = \exp\{-pe(p^{-c} - 1)^2/3\} = o(p^{-1})
\]
Introducing (B.89), (B.91), and (B.92) into $I/k$, with probability $1 - o(p^{-1})$,

\[(B.93)\]
\[I/k \leq \sqrt{\frac{p c}{(p c)^{3/4}}} = p^{-c/4} \to 0.\]

Introducing (B.86) and (B.93) into (B.84), with probability $1 - o(1)$,

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j \in S(i)} v_{ij} \leq \frac{\sqrt{p c}}{(p c)^{1/2}}.
\]

Combining it with (B.80) and (B.83), Lemma 3.3 is proved. \(\square\)

**B.5. Proof of Lemma 3.4.** There are three items to prove for this lemma.

- **The case $x_p \to -\infty$.** For any $\epsilon > 0$, let $M = \Phi^{-1}(\epsilon/2)$. Since $P(x_p > M) \to 0$, $N$ exists such that, when $p > N$, we have

  \[P(x_p > M) < \epsilon/2.\]

  Note that $\Phi(x)$ is non-decreasing with an upper bound of 1. Hence, we have

  \[E[\Phi(x_p)] \leq \Phi(M) P(x_p \leq M) + 1 \times P(x_p > M) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \times 1 + \epsilon/2 < \epsilon.\]

  Therefore, as $p \to \infty$, $E[\Phi(x_p)] \to 0$.

- **The case $x_p \to \infty$.** For any $\epsilon > 0$, let $M = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon/2)$. Since $P(x_p < M) \to 0$, $N$ exists such that, when $p > N$, we get

  \[P(x_p < M) < \epsilon/2.\]

  Note that $0 \leq \Phi(x) \leq 1$ for any $x$, and is non-decreasing. Hence, we have

  \[E[\Phi(x_p)] \geq \Phi(M) P(x_p \geq M) + 0 \times P(x_p < M) \leq (1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}) \times (1 - \epsilon/2) + 0 > 1 - \epsilon.\]

  Therefore, as $p \to \infty$, $E[\Phi(x_p)] \to 1$.

- **The case $x_p \to c$.** Consider the interval $I = (c - \delta, c + \delta)$. Since $x_p \to c$, $N$ exists such that, when $p > N$, we get

  \[P(x_p \in I) > 1 - \epsilon/2.\]

  For any point $x \in I$, according to Taylor’s expansion and $\phi(x) \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}$ for any $x$, we have

  \[\Phi(x) = \Phi(c) + \phi(c + \delta') \delta \in (\Phi(c) - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}, \Phi(c) + \frac{\delta}{2\pi}).\]

  Note that $\Phi(x)$ is non-decreasing with an upper bound of 1. Hence, we have

  \[E[\Phi(x_p)] \leq (\Phi(c) + \frac{\delta}{2\pi}) P(x_p \in I) + 1 \times P(x_p \in I) = (\Phi(c) + \frac{\delta}{2\pi})(1 - \epsilon/2) + \epsilon/2\]

  and

  \[E[\Phi(x_p)] \geq (\Phi(c) - \frac{\delta}{2\pi}) P(x_p \in I) + 0 \times P(x_p \in I) = (\Phi(c) - \frac{\delta}{2\pi})(1 - \epsilon/2).\]

  Taking $\delta = \pi \epsilon$, we have

  \[|E[\Phi(x_p)] - \Phi(c)| < \epsilon.\]

  Since it holds for any $\epsilon$, we have $E[\Phi(x_p)] \to \Phi(c)$. 
B.6. **Proof of Lemma 3.5.** Recall that \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \) when \( Y = 0 \) and \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \) when \( Y = 1 \). Hence, \( X - (\Omega - I)^{-1}(\Omega + I)\mu \) also follows a multivariate normal distribution with the same covariance matrix but different mean vector. According to Appendix B.1, \( S \) follows a non-central chi-square distribution, and the mean and variance can be found through the properties therein.

- When \( Y = 0 \),
  \[
  E[S] = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left( m_i + \frac{4(1 + m_i^2)\tilde{\mu}_i^2}{m_i} \right), \quad \text{Var}(S) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left( m_i^2 + 8(1 + m_i^2)\tilde{\mu}_i^2 \right). 
  \]

- When \( Y = 1 \),
  \[
  E[S] = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left( \frac{m_i}{1 + m_i} + \frac{4}{m_i} \tilde{\mu}_i^2 \right), \quad \text{Var}(S) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left( \frac{m_i^2}{(1 + m_i)^2} + \frac{8}{1 + m_i} \tilde{\mu}_i^2 \right). 
  \]

Now we consider the relationship between \( S \) and a normal distribution. Since \( E[S] \) and \( \text{Var}(S) \) are both known, we want to find the distance between \( (S - E[S])/\sqrt{\text{Var}(S)} \) and \( N(0, 1) \). Let \( Z = (S - E[S])/\sqrt{\text{Var}(S)} \), and let \( F_S(x) = P(S < x) \) denote the c.d.f. of \( S \), and \( \Phi(\cdot) \) denote the c.d.f. of the standard normal distribution.

First, consider the case \( Y = 0 \). In this case, \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \), and hence \( S \sim \chi^2(-2(\Omega - I)^{-1}\Omega\mu, \Omega - I) \). According to Property 3 of the generalized chi-square distribution in Section B.1,

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq 36\sqrt{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} [\lambda_i^2/p + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2]/p}{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2/p} \right]^{3/2} + \frac{36^2}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{3/2}
\]

Note that \( m_i = \xi + \eta\lambda_i \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = p\xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \) in (3.22). Let \( \omega = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |m_i| \rightarrow 0 \). Then, we have

\[
\sup_{x} |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq 36\sqrt{2} \frac{4p\xi^3 + 4p^3 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2}{(p\xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{36^2}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{3/2}
\]

For the case \( Y = 1 \), the analysis is similar. In this case, \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \), and so \( S \sim \chi^2(-2\Omega^{1/2}U^{\top}(\Omega - I)^{-1}U\mu, \Omega^{-1/2}(\Omega - I)\Omega^{-1/2}) \). Hence, using Property 3 of the generalized chi-square distribution in Section B.1, we get

\[
\sup_{x} |F_Z(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq 36\sqrt{2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} [\lambda_i^2/p + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2]/p}{(p\xi^2 + \eta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{36^2}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i^2 \right)^{3/2}
\]

So, the result is proved. \( \square \)
B.7. Effectiveness of the feature-selection step. In this short section, we provide the reasons we use \( d \) for feature selection. According to (3.37), each entry \( d_i \sim N(\mu_i + (\Omega \mu)_i, 1/n_0 + 1/(n_1)) \). For the mean term, note that

\[
(\Omega \mu)_i = ((1 + \xi)\mu + \eta W \mu)_i = (1 + \xi)\mu_i + \eta \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \mu_j.
\]

Under model (1.4), \( |w_{ij} \mu_j| \leq \tau \) and \( E[w_{ij} \mu_j] = 0 \). Let \( \sigma_2 = \sum_{j \neq i} E[w_{ij}^2 \mu^2] = (p - 1)\tau^2 \nu \); then, according to Bennett’s inequality [3],

\[
P \left( \left| \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \mu_j \right| > t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left[ -\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\tau^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\tau t}{\sigma_2} \right) \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\tau t}{\sigma_2} \right) - \frac{\tau t}{\sigma_2} \right].
\]

So, with probability \( 1 - O(p^{-2}), \left| \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \mu_j \right| \leq 2\tau (\sqrt{p\nu} + 1) \ln p \). Under (1.11), \( 2\eta\tau (\sqrt{p\nu} + 1) \ln p \leq (1 + \xi)\tau = (1 + \xi)\mu_i \) when \( \mu_i \neq 0 \). Hence, the feature-selection step would depend on \( (1 + \xi)\mu_i = \mu_i(1 + o(1)) \).

We consider the weak signal case in which \( \theta < \delta/2 \) and the strong signal case in which \( \theta > \delta/2 \). In the former case, the signal strength \( \tau = p^{-\theta} \ll L_p/\sqrt{n} \). Hence, \( \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |d_i| \leq 2\ln p/\sqrt{n} \) with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), and the threshold will be 0. For the latter case, in which \( \theta < \delta/2, \tau \gg 1/\sqrt{n} \). Hence, with probability \( 1 - o(1) \), we have \( t = 2\sqrt{\ln p}/\sqrt{n} \), and the set \( \{ i : \mu_i \neq 0 \} \) is recovered with zero error.

B.8. Proof of Lemma 3.7. Define

\[
\Delta Q = 2(d^\top - \mu^\top (I + \Omega))X + \left[ \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega) \hat{\mu}_0 - \mu^\top (I - \Omega) \mu \right] = 2I_p + II_p,
\]

where \( I_p = (d - (I + \Omega))^\top X \) and \( II_p = \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega) \hat{\mu}_0 - \mu^\top (I - \Omega) \mu \). Let \( \hat{\mu} = U^\top \mu \) and \( \hat{x} = U^\top X \), where \( W = U\Lambda U^\top \) is the eigenvalue decomposition of \( W \).

- Consider \( I_p = (d - (I + \Omega) \mu)^\top X \).

Since \( d - (I + \Omega)^\top \mu \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0} I + \frac{1}{n_1} \Omega) \) and independent with \( X \), the expectation \( E[I_p] = 0 \).

Next we show that

\[
\text{Var}(I_p) = \frac{1}{n_0} E[X^\top X] + \frac{1}{n_1} E[X^\top \Omega X] \lesssim 4n^{-1} p.
\]

The equality comes the law of total variance. We need to check the inequality.

When \( Y = 0, X \sim N(-\mu, I) \). According to Property 1 of the non-central chi-square distribution in Appendix B.1,

\[
\text{Var}(I_p) = \frac{1}{n_0} (p + \| \mu \|^2) + \frac{1}{n_1} (p(1 + \xi) + \mu^\top \Omega \mu)
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1} \right) p(1 + o(1)) + \frac{1}{n_0} \| \Omega \| \| \mu \|^2 \lesssim 4n^{-1} p,
\]

where the last inequality comes from \( \| \Omega \| = 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} m_i = 1 + o(1) \) and \( \| \mu \|^2 = \tau^2 p(1 + o(1)) \) with probability \( 1 - o(1) \).

When \( Y = 1, X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \). Noting \( Tr(\Omega^{-1}) = p(1 + o(1)) \),

\[
\text{Var}(I_p) = \frac{1}{n_0} (Tr(\Omega^{-1}) + \| \mu \|^2) + \frac{1}{n_1} (p + \mu^\top \Omega \mu) \lesssim 4n^{-1} p.
\]

Therefore, for both cases, \( \text{Var}(I_p) \lesssim 4n^{-1} p \) with probability \( 1 - o(1) \).
Finally, we give an asymptotic distribution for $I_p$. Element-wise, $I_p = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \tilde{x}_i (\tilde{d}_i - (2 + m_i) \tilde{\mu}_i)$. Hence, when $X \sim N(-\mu, I)$,

$$\begin{align*}
&[\text{Var}(I_p)]^{-3/2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{p} E|\tilde{x}_i|^3 E|\tilde{d}_i - (2 + m_i) \tilde{\mu}_i|^3 \\
&\leq [\text{Var}(I_p)]^{-3/2} \cdot 4 \sum_{i=1}^{p} (E|\tilde{x}_i + \tilde{\mu}_i|^3 + |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3) E|\tilde{d}_i - (2 + m_i) \tilde{\mu}_i|^3 \\
&\leq [\text{Var}(I_p)]^{-3/2} \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{i=1}^{p} (2\sqrt{2/\pi} + |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3) \left[ \frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1 + m_i}{n_1} \right]^{3/2} \\
&\leq C \frac{p + \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\tilde{\mu}_i|^3}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{p} (1 + \tilde{\mu}_i^2) \right)^{3/2}} \quad \text{(for some constants $C > 0$)} \\
&\leq C(p^{-1/2} + R_\mu).
\end{align*}$$

As a consequence, the Berry-Esséen theorem gives $\sup_x |F_{I_p/\sqrt{\text{Var}(I_p)}}(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq C(p^{-1/2} + R_\mu) \to 0$, by Lemma 3.3. The case is the same when $X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1})$. Hence, in both cases, with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$I_p \leq C \sqrt{\ln \ln(p)} \sqrt{4n^{-1}p}. \quad \text{(B.100)}$$

Consider $II_p = \tilde{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega) \tilde{\mu}_0 - \mu^\top (I - \Omega) \mu$. Let $R = \tilde{\mu}_0 + \mu$, then $R \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0} I_p)$. Therefore, $II_p$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{align*}
III_p &= (R - \mu)^\top (I - \Omega) (R - \mu) - \mu^\top (I - \Omega) \mu \\
&= R^\top (I - \Omega) R - 2\mu^\top (I - \Omega) R \\
&= III_a + 2IIb.
\end{align*}$$

$IIa$ follows a non-central chi-square distribution. Hence, according to Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{align*}
E[IIa] &= \frac{1}{n_0} Tr(I - \Omega) = -\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i = -cn^{-1}p\xi, \\
\text{Var}(IIa) &= \frac{2}{n_0^2} Tr((I - \Omega)^2) = \frac{2}{n_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i^2 = 2c^2 n^{-2} (p\xi^2 + p^2\eta^2 \nu),
\end{align*}$$

where $c = n/n_0$. Further, we can find $\sup_x |F_{IIIa/\sqrt{\text{Var}(IIIa)}}(x) - \Phi(x)| \to 0$ by theBerry-Esséen theorem, so $|IIa| \leq cn^{-1}p\xi + \sqrt{\ln p} (\sqrt{n^{-2} (p\xi^2 + p^2\eta^2 \nu)})$.

Now we consider $IIb \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0} \mu^\top (I - \Omega)^2 \mu)$. Furthermore, $\mu^\top (I - \Omega)^2 \mu \leq \|I - \Omega\|^2 \|\mu\|^2 \ll \|\mu\|^2 = p\tau^2 \epsilon$. Therefore,

$$|IIb| \leq \sqrt{\ln p} \sqrt{p\tau^2 \epsilon/n}.$$

Combining the results about $IIa$ and $IIb$, with probability $1 + o(1)$,

$$|II_p| \leq |IIa| + |IIb| \leq cp\xi/n + \sqrt{\ln p} (\sqrt{p\xi^2 + p^2\eta^2 \nu/n} + \sqrt{p\tau^2 \epsilon/n}). \quad \text{(B.102)}$$

Combining the results for $I_p$ and $II_p$ in (B.100) and (B.102), we have

$$\Delta Q = 2I_p + II_p \leq cp\xi/n + \sqrt{\ln p} (\sqrt{p\xi^2 + p^2\eta^2 \nu/n} + \sqrt{p\tau^2 \epsilon/n} + \sqrt{\ln p} \sqrt{p/n}).$$

Recall that $\xi \leq p^{-1/2} \gamma \geq 1/2$ in (2.18)); then $cp\xi/n \leq \sqrt{p}/n = o(\sqrt{p/n})$. Since $\xi^2 = o(1)$, $\sqrt{p\xi^2}/n = o(\sqrt{p/n})$. Similarly, $\sqrt{p\tau^2 \epsilon/n} = o(\sqrt{p/n})$. Therefore, in short, we have

$$\Delta Q \leq \sqrt{p^2\eta^2 \nu \ln p/n + \sqrt{p/n} \ln \ln p}.$$

So, the result is proved. \qed

\[
\Delta Q = 2(d - (I + \Omega)\mu)\top X + \left[\hat{\mu}_0\top (I - \Omega)\hat{\mu}_0 - \mu\top (I - \Omega)\mu\right]
= 2I_k + II_k.
\]

Now we analyze \(I_k\) and \(II_k\); the result will include \(k\). Recall that \(k\) is the number of non-zeros in \(\mu\), where \(k \sim \text{Binomial}(p, \epsilon)\). According to Bernstein’s inequality,

\[
P(|k - pe| \geq \sqrt{pe \ln p}) \leq 2 \exp\{-\frac{(\sqrt{pe \ln p})^2}{2pe(1 - \epsilon) + (\sqrt{pe \ln p})/3}\} = o(p^{-1}).
\]

Since \(pe \to \infty\), with probability \(1 - o(1)\), we have \(k = pe(1 + o(1))\).

- We consider \(I_k\) first. Since \(d = (d^{(k)}_0 - \mu^{(k)})\top X(k)\), and \(X = (X^{(k)}_k\top)\), where \(0_{p-k}\) is a zero vector with length \(p-k\),

\[
I_k = \left(d^{(k)}\top\right) (X^{(k)}_k - \left(\mu^{(k)}\right)\top 0_{p-k}) (I + \Omega) \left(X^{(k)}_k\top\right) - \left(\mu^{(k)}\right)\top 0_{p-k}\top \left(I + \Omega\right)(X^{(k)}_k\top)
= (d^{(k)})\top X(k) - (\mu^{(k)})\top (I + \Omega) 11\top X(k) - (\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 12\top X(p-k)
= (d^{(k)} - (I + \Omega 11\top \mu^{(k)})\top X(k) - (\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 12\top X(p-k)
= Ia + Ib.
\]

Consider \(I_a\) first. Let \(\hat{d} = d^{(k)} - (I + \Omega 11\top \mu^{(k)})\top X(k)\), then \(Ia = \hat{d}\top X(k)\), and

\[
\hat{d} \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0} I + \frac{1}{n_1} \Omega 11), \quad X(k) \sim N(-\mu^{(k)}, I).
\]

Noting that \(\hat{d}\) is independent with \(X(k)\), there is \(E[Ita] = 0\). With the same analysis in Section 3.3.1,

\[
\text{Var}(Ia) = \frac{k}{n_0} (k + \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2) + \frac{k}{n_1} (k(1 + \xi) + (\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 11\top \mu^{(k)})
\leq \left(\frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1}\right) k(1 + o(1)) + \frac{1}{n_0} \|\Omega 11\| k \tau^2
\leq 4n^{-1} k = 4pe/n(1 + o(1)),
\]

For the case in which \(X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1})\), the same result is obtained.

We also prove the asymptotic normality according to Lemma 3.3 and the Berry-Esséen theorem. Therefore, \(\sup_x |F_{Ia/\sqrt{\text{Var}(Ia)}}(x) - \Phi(x)| \to 0\), and, hence, \(Ia = O_p(\sqrt{4n^{-1}pe})\).

Next, consider \(Ib\). Recall that \(X^{(p-k)} \sim N(0, I)\). Therefore,

\[
Ib = (\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 12\top X^{(p-k)} \sim N(0, (\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 12\top \Omega 12\top \mu^{(k)}).
\]

For the variance term, since \(\Omega 12 = \Omega 21\), we have \((\mu^{(k)})\top \Omega 12\top \Omega 21\top (\mu^{(k)}) \leq \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2 \|\Omega 12\| \|\Omega 21\| = \|\Omega 12\|^2 \times k \tau^2\). By \(\Omega = cI + \eta W\), we have \(\Omega 12 = \eta W 12\), and hence \(\|\Omega 12\| = \|\eta W 12\| \leq \|W\|\). According to Lemma 3.1 and the condition \(c^2 \nu^2 \to 0\), with probability \(1 - o(1)\), \(\|\eta W\|^2 \leq \eta^2 \ln p \to 0\) when \(\beta \geq 1\) and \(\|\eta W\|^2 \leq C \eta^2 \nu^2 \to 0\) when \(\beta < 1\). As a result, with probability \(1 - o(1)\),

\[
\|\mu^{(k)}\top \Omega 12\top \Omega 21\top \mu^{(k)}\| \leq k \tau^2 \|\Omega 12\|^2 \leq k \tau^2 \|\eta W\|^2 = o(k \tau^2).
\]

So, with probability \(1 - o(1)\),

\[
|Ib| \leq \sqrt{k \tau \ln p} = \sqrt{pe \ln p}.
\]
For the case in which \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \), the analysis is similar.

To conclude, and noting that \( \tau \gg 1/\sqrt{n} \) in this region, we have

\[ |I_k| \leq |Ia| + |Ib| \lesssim \sqrt{pe\tau \ln p} + O_p(\sqrt{4n^{-1}pe}) = \sqrt{pe\tau \ln p(1 + o(1))}. \]

Next, we analyze \( II_k \). Removing the zero part, we can find

\[ II_k = -(\hat{\mu}_0^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})\hat{\mu}_0^{(k)} + (\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})\mu^{(k)}. \]

Let \( R = \hat{\mu}_0^{(k)} + \mu^{(k)} \), then \( R \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0}I_k) \). Rewrite \( II_k \) as

\[ II_k = R^\top (I - \Omega_{11})R + 2(\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})R = IIa + 2IIb. \]

We first consider \( IIa = R^\top (I - \Omega_{11})R \). This follows a non-central chi-square distribution. Hence,

\[
E[IIa] = \frac{1}{n_0}\text{Tr}(I - \Omega_{11}) = cn^{-1}k\xi = cn^{-1}pe\xi(1 + o(1)),
\]

\[
\text{Var}(IIa) = \frac{1}{n_0^2}\text{Tr}((I - \Omega_{11})^2) = 2c^2(k^2\xi^2 + k^2\eta^2\nu)/n^2
= 2c^2pe(\xi^2 + p\eta^2\nu)/n^2(1 + o(1)),
\]

where \( c = n/n_0 \). Furthermore, we can prove that \( \sup_x |F_{IIa/\sqrt{\text{Var}(IIa)}}(x) - \Phi(x)| \overset{P}{\to} 0 \), and so

\[ IIa = cn^{-1}pe\xi + O(n^{-1}\sqrt{pe(\xi^2 + p\eta^2\nu)}) = cn^{-1}pe\xi + O(pe\sqrt{\eta^2\nu}/n). \]

Then, we consider \( IIb = (\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})R \). Since \( Z \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0}I) \), it is clear that \( IIb \sim N(0, \frac{1}{n_0}(\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})^2\mu^{(k)}) \). According to Lemma 3.2, \( \|I - \Omega_{11}\| \leq \|I - \Omega\| = o(1) \). Therefore, \( (\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})^2\mu^{(k)} \leq \|\mu^{(k)}\|^2\|I - \Omega\|^2 = o(k\tau^2) \). As a result, with \( k = pe(1 + o(1)) \),

\[ |IIb| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_0}((\mu^{(k)})^\top (I - \Omega_{11})^2\mu^{(k)}) \ln p = o(\sqrt{n^{-1}pe\tau^2}). \]

Combining the results for \( IIa \) and \( IIb \), we have

\[ |II_k| \leq |IIa| + |IIb| \lesssim cpe\xi/n + O(pe\sqrt{\eta^2\nu}/n) + o(\sqrt{pe\tau^2}/n). \]

Combining the results for \( I_k \) and \( II_k \) in (B.106) and (B.108),

\[
\Delta Q \leq \sqrt{pe\tau \ln p(1 + o(1)) + cpe\xi/n + O(pe\sqrt{\eta^2\nu}/n) + o(\sqrt{pe\tau^2}/n)
= cpe\xi/n + O(pe\sqrt{\eta^2\nu}/n) + \sqrt{pe\tau \ln p(1 + o(1))}. \]

The result is proved. \( \square \)

**B.10. Proof of Lemma 3.8.** According to the definition that \( d = \Omega\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 \), there is

\[
Q = X^\top (I - \Omega)X + 2X^\top (\Omega\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0) + \hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega)\hat{\mu}_0 + \ln |\Omega|
= 2[X^\top \Omega\hat{\mu}_1] + [\hat{\mu}_0^\top (I - \Omega)\hat{\mu}_0 - 2X^\top \hat{\mu}_0] + [X^\top (I - \Omega)X + \ln |\Omega|]
= 2Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X) + Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) + Q_3(X).
\]

Given \( X \), then \( Q_3(X) \) is a constant, and \( Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X) \) is independent with \( Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) \).

Consider \( Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X) \), that \( Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X)|X = X^\top \Omega\hat{\mu}_1|X \sim N(\mu^\top \Omega X, \frac{X^\top \Omega X}{n_1}) \). Therefore, given \( X \),

\[
P(Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X) \geq \mu^\top \Omega X + \sqrt{X^\top \Omega X/4n_1}) \geq \Phi(-1/2) = c_1.
\]
Next we consider $Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) | X$. Rewrite it as

$$Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) = (\hat{\mu}_0 - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X)^\top(I - \Omega)(\hat{\mu}_0 - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X) - X^\top(I - \Omega)^{-1}X$$

(B.111)  

$$= Q_0 - X^\top(I - \Omega)^{-1}X.$$

Consider $Q_0$. Note that $\hat{\mu}_0 - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X \sim N(-\mu - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X, \frac{1}{n_0} I)$. Let $\mu_X = \sqrt{n_0}[-\mu - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X]$ and $z = \sqrt{n_0}[\hat{\mu}_0 - (I - \Omega)^{-1}X - \mu_X] \sim N(0, I)$, then there is

$$Q_0 = Q_0(z) = (\mu_X + z)^\top(I - \Omega)(\mu_X + z)/n_0.$$

Simple calculations show that $Q_0(z) + Q_0(-z) = 2\mu_X^\top(I - \Omega)\mu_X/n_0 + 2z^\top(I - \Omega)z/n_0$, so $
\max\{Q_0(z), Q_0(-z)\} \geq \mu_X^\top(I - \Omega)\mu_X/n_0 + z^\top(I - \Omega)z/n_0$ for any $z$. Since $z$ is symmetric about $0$, with probability at least $1/2$, $Q_0(z) \geq \mu_X^\top(I - \Omega)\mu_X/n_0 + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)$.

Further, according to Property 3 of non-central chi-square distribution and Lemma 3.1, $P(z^\top(I - \Omega)z/n_0 \geq \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1)$ when $p \to \infty$. Therefore, we have that

(B.112)  

$$P(Q_0(z) \geq \mu_X^\top(I - \Omega)\mu_X/n_0 + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1).$$

Combining the above equation (B.112) with (B.111), then we have,

(B.113)  

$$P(Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) \geq \mu^\top(I - \Omega)\mu + 2\mu^\top X + X^\top(I - \Omega)^{-1}X + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)) \geq 1/4 + o(1).$$

Since $Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X)$ is independent with $Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X)$ when $X$ is given. Hence, combining (B.10) and (B.113), with probability at least $c = c_1/4$, there is

$$Q = 2Q_1(\hat{\mu}_1, X) + Q_2(\hat{\mu}_0, X) + Q_3(X)$$

$$\geq 2\mu^\top \Omega X + \sqrt{X^\top \Omega X/n_1 + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)}$$

$$+ \mu^\top(I - \Omega)\mu + 2\mu^\top X + X^\top(I - \Omega)X + \ln |\Omega|$$

$$\geq 2\mu^\top(I + \Omega)X + X^\top(I - \Omega)X + \mu^\top(I - \Omega)\mu + \sqrt{X^\top \Omega X/n}$$

$$+ \ln |\Omega| + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega)$$

(B.114)  

$$= S + \sqrt{X^\top \Omega X/n} + \mu^\top(I - \Omega)\mu + \ln |\Omega| + \frac{1}{n_0}Tr(I - \Omega),$$

where $S$ is defined in (3.25).

The result is proved.

APPENDIX C: PROOF OF THEOREM 4

C.1. Proof. Similar as the proof of Theorem 3, now we want to find the difference between $Q(X, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta})$ and $Q(X, \mu, W)$. Let $\Delta Q = Q(X, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta}) - Q(X, \mu, W)$, then

$$Q(X, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\theta}) = Q(X, \mu, W) + \Delta Q.$$ 

Hence,

$$p_i,\mu,\theta = \Phi((-1)^i \cdot (-T_i + \frac{\Delta Q}{\sigma_S})) + o(1), \quad i = 0, 1,$$
where $\sigma^2 = 2(p\xi^2 + \eta^2p^2\nu + 8\tau^2pe)$, and $T_i = (-1)^i \times \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{p\xi^2 + \eta^2p^2\nu + 8\tau^2pe(1 + o(1))}$. Therefore, we need that

\[(C.115) \quad \Delta Q \ll \frac{1}{2}(p\xi^2 + \eta^2p^2\nu + 8\tau^2pe).
\]

Once it holds, then $MR(QDA) \to 0$.

Therefore, we want to show that

\[(C.116) \quad |\Delta Q| \leq C\Delta_{\hat{Q}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{p}\ln p) + p\Delta_{\hat{Q}}^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1}.
\]

Once it is proved, then according to (C.115) and the condition in Theorem 4, we have $MR(QDA) \to 0$. Now we try to prove (C.116).

The main term to use in the proof is the spectral norm of $\hat{\Omega} - \Omega$, denoted by $\Delta_{\hat{Q}}$. For different algorithms to estimate the precision matrix, the resultant $\Delta_{\hat{Q}}$ is different. Hence, in this part, we derive the result based on $\Delta_{\hat{Q}}$, and explain the results when we choose PCS or CLIME in the next two subsections.

In the proof of Theorem 3, we introduce $Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W)$. Now, when the precision matrix is also unknown, the classification criteria change to

\[
\Delta Q = Q(X, \hat{\mu}, \hat{W}) - Q(X, \hat{\mu}, W)
\]

\[
= X^\top(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})X + 2(\hat{\mu} \circ \hat{d})^\top(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(\hat{\mu} \circ \hat{d})
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - I) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega|
\]

\[
= (X - \hat{\mu}_1 \circ \hat{d})^\top(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(X - \hat{\mu}_1 \circ \hat{d})
\]

\[
+ (\hat{\mu}_0 \circ \hat{d})^\top(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(\hat{\mu}_0 \circ \hat{d}) - (\hat{\mu}_1 \circ \hat{d})^\top(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(\hat{\mu}_1 \circ \hat{d})
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - I) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega|
\]

\[(C.117) \quad = A + B + C.
\]

Hence, we have to find proper bounds for the terms $A$, $B$, and $C$ under the sparse case and the dense case.

Before we discuss this, we have to introduce the following lemma and results as prepartation.

**Lemma C.1** Consider two symmetric matrices $A$ and $B$, where the eigenvalues of $B$ are $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_p$; then,

\[
Tr(AB) \leq \|A\| \times \sum_{i=1}^p |\lambda_i|.
\]

Furthermore, if $B$ is a positive semi-definite matrix,

\[
Tr(AB) \leq Tr(B)\|A\|.
\]

According to Lemma C.1 and Lemma 3.2, we have the following conclusion:

\[(C.118) \quad Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(\Omega^{-1} - I)) \leq p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\|\Delta_{\hat{Q}}, \quad Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})^{-1}) \lesssim p\Delta_{\hat{Q}}.
\]

Let the eigenvalues of $\Omega - I$ be $m_1, \cdots, m_p$, and those of $\hat{\Omega} - I$ be $\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2, \cdots, \hat{m}_p$. According to Weyl’s inequality ([25]),

\[(C.119) \quad |m_i - \hat{m}_i| \leq \Delta_{\hat{Q}}.
\]
With these preparations, we begin to consider the three terms.

**Weak signal region** $\theta > \delta/2$. With such conditions, the signals are too weak to discover. Hence, the thresholding vector $\hat{d}$ is not helpful at all. We choose $t = 0$.

- Consider the part $A$. In this case, it is
  \[
  A = (X - \hat{\mu}_1)^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(X - \hat{\mu}_1).
  \]
  Obviously, it depends on the distribution of $X$.

When $Y = 0$, then $X \sim N(-\mu, I)$ and hence $X - \hat{\mu}_1 \sim N(-2\mu, I + \frac{1}{n_1}\Omega^{-1})$. Consider the randomness of $\hat{\mu}_1$ first. According to Property 2 in Appendix B.1, we have

\[
E[A] = Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) + \frac{1}{n_1}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1}) + 4\mu^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu.
\]

The variance of $A$ is given as

\[
\text{Var}(A) = 2Tr(((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(I + \frac{1}{n}\Omega^{-1}))^2) + 16\mu^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(I + \frac{1}{n}\Omega^{-1})(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu.
\]

Further, the Berry-Esséen theorem gives $\sup_x |P(A - E[A])/\sqrt{\text{Var}(A)}(x) - \Phi(x)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. So, with probability $1 - o(1/p)$, $|A - E[A]| \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(A)}\ln p$.

According to (C.118), rearrange the expectation, we have

\[
|E[A] - \frac{1}{n_1} + 1 + n_1 Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq \frac{1}{n_1} p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \Omega^{-1} - I|| + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_\Omega^2,
\]

and $\text{Var}(A) = 2p\Delta_\Omega^2 (1 + o(1))$. Therefore, combining with the result that $|A - E[A]| \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(A)}\ln p$, with probability $1 - o(1/p)$,

\[
|A - \frac{1}{n_1} + 1 + n_1 Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq \frac{1}{n_1} p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \Omega^{-1} - I|| + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_\Omega + \sqrt{2p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \ln p}.
\]

When $Y = 1$, then $X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1})$. Therefore, $X - \hat{\mu}_1 \sim N(0, \frac{1+n_1}{n_1}\hat{\Omega}^{-1})$. Again, according to Property 2 in Appendix B.1, we have

\[
E[A] = \frac{1}{n_1} + n_1 Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1}) + 4\mu^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu
= \frac{1}{n_1} + n_1 Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1} - I)) + 4\mu^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu.
\]

According to (C.118), rearrange it, and we have

\[
|E[A] - \frac{1}{n_1} + n_1 Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \Omega^{-1} - I|| + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_\Omega^2.
\]

The variance of $A$ is given as

\[
2\left(\frac{1+n_1}{n_1}\right)^2 Tr(((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1})^2) + 16 \frac{1+n_1}{n_1}\mu^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu \lesssim 2p\Delta_\Omega^2.
\]

Therefore, we have that

\[
|A - \frac{1}{n_1} + n_1 Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \Omega^{-1} - I|| + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_\Omega + \sqrt{2p\Delta_\hat{\Omega}^2 \ln p}.
\]

- Consider $B$. Let $B_1 = \hat{\mu}_0^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu_0$ and $B_2 = \hat{\mu}_1^T (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu_1$, then $B = B_1 - B_2$. Note that
  \[
  \hat{\mu}_0 \sim N(-\mu, \frac{1}{n_0}I), \quad \hat{\mu}_1 \sim N(\mu, \frac{1}{n_1}\Omega^{-1}).
  \]
With the same analysis as in $A$, we have

$$E[B_1] = Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})/n_0 + \mu^T(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu, \quad E[B_2] = Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1})/n_1 + \mu^T(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu.$$  

The variance of them is

$$\text{Var}[B_1] = 2Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})^2)/n_0^2 + 4\mu^T(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})^2\mu/n_0 \leq 2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2 + 4\|\mu\|^2\Delta^2_\Omega/n.$$  

Note that $\tau^2 \ll 1/n$, so $\|\mu\|^2 \ll p/n$. Therefore, $\text{Var}(B_1) \lesssim 2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2$. Similarly, we have

$$\text{Var}(B_2) \lesssim 2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2.$$  

In all, for part $B$, we have, with probability $1 - o(1/p)$,

$$|B| = |B_1 - B_2| \lesssim |E[B_1] - E[B_2]| + 2\sqrt{2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2} \ln p$$

$$\lesssim |Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})/n_0 - Tr((\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1})/n_1| + 2\sqrt{2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2} \ln p$$

$$(C.127) \lesssim p\Delta^2_\Omega/n + 2\sqrt{2p\Delta^2_\Omega/n^2} \ln p.$$  

Finally, we consider $C$. Note that

$$C = \frac{1 + n_1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \frac{1}{n_1} Tr(\Omega - I) + Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega|$$

$$(C.128) = \frac{1 + n_1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + II,$$  

where

$$(C.129) \quad I = \frac{1}{n_1} Tr(\Omega - I) = \frac{p\xi}{n_1}$$

and $II = Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega|$.  

For Part $II$, note that, when $\Delta_\Omega = o(1)$,

$$\ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega| = \sum_{i=1}^p \ln \frac{1 + \hat{m}_i}{1 + m_i}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \ln \left(1 + \frac{\hat{m}_i - m_i}{1 + m_i}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \left[\frac{\hat{m}_i - m_i}{1 + m_i} - \left(\frac{\hat{m}_i - m_i}{1 + m_i}\right)^2/2 + \left(\frac{\hat{m}_i - m_i}{1 + m_i}\right)^3/3 + \cdots\right]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{m}_i - m_i - p\Delta^2_\Omega/2(1 + o(1))$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{m}_i - m_i - p\Delta^2_\Omega/2(1 + o(1))$$

$$(C.130) = \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{m}_i - m_i - p\Delta^2_\Omega/2(1 + o(1)).$$
Noting \( \sum_{i=1}^{p} (\hat{m}_i - m_i) = -Tr(\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) \), therefore,
\[
II = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{(\hat{m}_i - m_i)(-m_i)}{1 + m_i} - p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/2(1 + o(1)).
\]

Combining (C.129) and (C.131), we have
\[
C = \frac{1 + n_1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{(\hat{m}_i - m_i)(-m_i)}{1 + m_i} - p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/2(1 + o(1))
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1 + n_1}{n_1} Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| - p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/2(1 + o(1)),
\]
where the last part comes from that \( \|\Omega^{-1} - I\| = \max_{i} \left| \frac{-m_i}{1 + m_i} \right| \).

Combining (C.123), (C.127), (C.132), and (C.119), when \( Y = 0 \), we have
\[
|\Delta| \leq \left( \frac{1}{n_1} p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + \sqrt{2p}\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \ln p \right) + \left( p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}/n + 2 \sqrt{2p}\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/n^2 \ln p \right)
\]
\[
+ \left( \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 + \sqrt{2p}\ln p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\]

Combining (C.126), (C.127), (C.132), and (C.119), and with \( \|\Omega^{-1} - I\| = \max_{i} \left| \frac{-m_i}{1 + m_i} \right| \), when \( Y = 1 \), we have
\[
|\Delta| \leq \left( p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + \sqrt{2p}\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \ln p \right) + \left( p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}/n + \sqrt{2p}\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/n^2 \ln p \right)
\]
\[
+ \left( \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 + \sqrt{2p}\ln p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\]

Combine (C.133) and (C.134), and we can see that, when \( \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} = o(1) \), with probability \( 1 - o(1) \),
\[
|\Delta Q| \leq \frac{p\xi}{n_1} + \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 + \sqrt{2p}\ln p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\]

**Strong signal region** \( \theta < \delta/2 \). We consider the case in which the signals are strong. With such a condition, all the signals can be recovered exactly (see the analysis in the proof for Theorem 3). The threshold \( d \) guarantees that the true signals are non-zero, and the noises are all zero.

For simplicity, we rearrange the features so that all the features with \( \mu(j) \neq 0 \) rank first, and those with \( \mu(j) = 0 \) rank last. Hence, the top \( k \) features have non-zero means. We use \( \mu^{(k)} \) to denote the sub-vector of \( \mu \) that contains the first \( k \) elements only, and do the same for \( \hat{\mu}_0, \hat{\mu}_1 \). We also decompose the precision matrix \( \Omega \), as follows:
\[
\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{11} & \Omega_{12} \\ \Omega_{12} & \Omega_{22} \end{pmatrix},
\]
where \( \Omega_{11} \in \mathcal{R}^{k \times k} \). We perform the same decomposition on \( \hat{\Omega} \) and \( \Omega^{-1} \), correspondingly.

For the sub-matrices, we have that \( \|\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11}\| \leq \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \). According to Lemma C.1 and Lemma 3.2, we have the following conclusion:

(C.136) \[
\text{Tr}((\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\Omega^{-1})_{11}) \lesssim k \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}.
\]

With the new notations, the three terms of interest now become

\[
A = (X - \hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})(X - \hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)}), \\
B = (\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)}) - (\hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)}), \\
C = \frac{1}{n_1} \text{Tr}(\hat{\Omega} - I) + \ln |\hat{\Omega}| - \ln |\Omega|.
\]

Again, the analysis of \( A \) depends on the distribution of the new input \( X \), yet \( B \) and \( C \) do not rely on \( X \). Now we analyze them one by one.

- For Part \( A \), we first consider the case note that \( X \sim N(-\mu, I) \). According to Property 2 in Appendix B.1, we have

(C.137) \[
E[A] = \text{Tr}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) + \frac{1}{n_1} \text{Tr}((\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\Omega^{-1})_{11}) + 4\mu^\top (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu.
\]

Rearrange it, and we have

(C.138) \[
|E[A] - \text{Tr}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq \frac{2k}{n_1} \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}.
\]

The variance of \( A \) is given as

(C.139) \[
2\text{Tr}((\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\hat{\Sigma})^2) + 16\mu^\top (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\hat{\Sigma}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\mu \approx 2p \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\]

Then, with probability \( 1 - o(1/p) \),

(C.140) \[
|A - \text{Tr}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq 2k \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}/n_1 + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + \sqrt{2p} \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \ln p.
\]

For the case \( X \sim N(\mu, \Omega^{-1}) \), with similar derivations, we have that

(C.141) \[
|A - \text{Tr}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})| \leq p \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + 2k \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}/n_1 + 4\|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + \sqrt{2p} \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} \ln p.
\]

- Now we consider Part \( B \).

With Property 2 in Appendix B.1, we have

\[
E[(\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)})] = \frac{1}{n_0} \text{Tr}(\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11}) + (\mu^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\mu^{(k)}),
\]

\[
E[(\hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_{1}^{(k)})] = \frac{1}{n_1} \text{Tr}((\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\Omega^{-1})_{11}) + (\mu^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\mu^{(k)}).
\]

Therefore, the difference between the two terms is that

(C.142) \[
E[B] = \frac{1}{n_0} \text{Tr}(\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11}) - \frac{1}{n_1} \text{Tr}((\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\Omega^{-1})_{11}) \leq \left( \frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1} \right) k \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}.
\]

The variance is

\[
\text{Var}[(\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_{0}^{(k)})] = \frac{2}{n_0} \text{Tr}((\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})^2) + \frac{4}{n_0} (\mu^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})^2 (\mu^{(k)})
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{2}{n_0} k \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + \frac{4}{n} \|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{6}{n} \|\mu\|^2 \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\]
where the last inequality comes from $\|\mu\|^2 = k\tau^2$ and $\tau^2 > 1/n$ in the sparse region.

The variance for $(\hat{\mu}_1^{(k)})^\top (\Omega_{11} - \hat{\Omega}_{11})(\hat{\mu}_1^{(k)})$ can be calculated in the same way, and the result is the same. Therefore, we have

\begin{equation}
|B| \lesssim (\frac{1}{n_0} + \frac{1}{n_1})k\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{n}}\|\mu\|\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}.
\end{equation}

For Part $C$, note that it does not change in the strong signal case. Therefore, (C.132) still works. Here we revise it as

\begin{equation}
C = Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \frac{1}{n_1}Tr(\hat{\Omega} - I) + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\left(\hat{m}_i - m_i\right)(\frac{-m_i}{1 + m_i}) - p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/2(1 + o(1))
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq Tr(\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) + \frac{1}{n_1}Tr(\hat{\Omega} - I) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2/2(1 + o(1)).
\end{equation}

Combining (C.140), (C.141), (C.143), and (C.144), we have

\begin{equation}
|\Delta Q| \leq (p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + 2k\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}/n + 4\|\mu\|^2\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + \sqrt{2p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\ln p})
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\quad + \left(\frac{k}{n_1}\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} + 8\sqrt{\frac{\ln p}{n}}\|\mu\|\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\right) + \left(\frac{2p}{n_1} + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2\right)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq \Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(7\|\mu\|^2 + \sqrt{2p\ln p} + 2p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\|) + \frac{2p}{n_1} + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2.
\end{equation}

As a conclusion, combining (C.135) and (C.145), we have that

\begin{equation}
|\Delta Q| \leq C\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| + \|\mu\|^2 + \sqrt{\ln p}p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1}.
\end{equation}

Further, according to Lemma 3.3, that $\|\mu\|^2 = \tau^2 p\epsilon(1 + o(1))$, and $\|\Omega^{-1} - I\| \leq 2(\eta + \xi)$ when $1 < \beta < 2$, we have that

\begin{equation}
|\Delta Q| \leq C\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{\ln p}p) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1}.
\end{equation}

Therefore, (C.116) is proved. Combining it with (C.115), we have that when $C\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{\ln p}) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1} < p\xi^2 + n^2\sqrt{p}\nu + 8\tau^2 p\epsilon$, $MR(QDA) \to 0$. Theorem 4 is proved.

**C.2. PCS.** Consider the PCS algorithm. Note that there is $1 < \beta < 2$ and $\alpha < \delta/2$. Under such conditions, PCS can recover the exact support with probability $1 - o(1/p)$, and

$$\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_{\max} \leq \sqrt{\ln p/n}.$$ 

Since $1 < \beta < 2$, with probability $1 - o(1/p)$, each row has at most two non-zero elements. Hence, we have

$$\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\ln p/n}, \quad \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_\infty \leq 2\sqrt{\ln p/n}.$$ 

Therefore, we have the spectral norm,

\begin{equation}
\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}} = \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\| \leq 2\sqrt{\ln p/n}.
\end{equation}

Therefore, introduce the term $\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}$ into Theorem 4; we then have

\begin{equation}
C\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{\ln p}) + p\Delta_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 + \frac{2p}{n} \leq \frac{2p}{n} + C\frac{2\sqrt{\ln p}}{\sqrt{n}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{\ln p}) + \frac{4p}{n}\ln p
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq C\frac{2\sqrt{\ln p}}{\sqrt{n}}(p\eta + p\tau^2\epsilon + \sqrt{\ln p}) + \frac{6p}{n}\ln p.
\end{equation}
Recall that $\eta \gg \sqrt{\ln p}/\sqrt{n}$ and $\tau \ll 1/\sqrt{n}$ under the current conditions. Hence, we further reduce the terms to $C \ln p / \sqrt{n} p \eta (1 + o(1))$.

According to Theorem 4, to make sure $MR(QDA) \to 0$, we need that,

$$\frac{C \ln p}{\sqrt{n}} p \eta (1 + o(1)) \ll p \xi^2 + \eta^2 p^2 \nu + 8 \tau^2 p \epsilon.$$  

It is equivalently with one of the following conditions, that

$$\beta < 1 - \alpha + \delta/2,$$

or

$$\zeta < \alpha + \delta/2 - 2\theta.$$  

Hence, Corollary 2.1 is proved.

C.3. CLIME: Constrained $\ell_1$-Minimization for Inverse Matrix Estimation. In this section, we consider the CLIME method in [4].

[4] has proved that, when $\lambda_1(\Omega)/\lambda_n(\Omega)$ is finite, and $s$, the maximum number of off-diagonal entries in each row, is bounded by the $o(\sqrt{n})$ term, the CLIME algorithm can achieve the following rate:

$$\sup_{\theta_n(s,M_n,s)} E[\Delta_{\Omega}^2] \asymp (1 - \xi + \eta s)^2 s^2 \frac{\ln p}{n}.$$  

To make sure the results hold, we need $\beta > 1 - \delta/2$ and $\alpha < \delta/2$.

- When $1 - \delta/2 < \beta < 1$, according to Chebyshev’s inequality, we have

$$(C.150) \quad P(\Delta_{\Omega} > p^{(1-\beta-\delta/2)+\epsilon} \ln p) \leq \frac{(1 - \xi + \eta s)^2 s^2 \ln p}{p^{2-\beta-\delta+2\epsilon} \ln^2 p} \leq \frac{1}{p^{\delta/2} \ln p} \to 0,$$

where the last inequality comes from $n = p^\delta$, $s \leq 2p^{1-\beta}$, and $0 < \epsilon < \beta - (1 - \delta/2)$ can be any constant.

We introduce the result into Theorem 4 and find that there is no successful region.

- When $1 < \beta < 2$, according to Chebyshev’s inequality, we have

$$(C.151) \quad P(\Delta_{\Omega} > \ln p / \sqrt{n}) \leq \frac{(1 - \xi + \eta s)^2 s^2 \ln p}{\ln^2 p / \ln n} \leq \frac{1}{\ln p} \to 0.$$  

It is the same with the result in PCS, and hence the successful region is also the same.
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