

Online Policy Learning and Inference by Matrix Completion

Congyuan Duan¹, Jingyang Li and Dong Xia¹

Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

(April 29, 2024)

Abstract

Making online decisions can be challenging when features are sparse and orthogonal to historical ones, especially when the optimal policy is learned through collaborative filtering. We formulate the problem as a matrix completion bandit (MCB), where the expected reward under each arm is characterized by an unknown low-rank matrix. The ε -greedy bandit and the online gradient descent algorithm are explored. Policy learning and regret performance are studied under a specific schedule for exploration probabilities and step sizes. A faster decaying exploration probability yields smaller regret but learns the optimal policy less accurately. We investigate an online debiasing method based on inverse propensity weighting (IPW) and a general framework for online policy inference. The IPW-based estimators are asymptotically normal under mild arm-optimality conditions. Numerical simulations corroborate our theoretical findings. Our methods are applied to the San Francisco parking pricing project data, revealing intriguing discoveries and outperforming the benchmark policy.

1 Introduction

Recent decades have seen a rapidly growing demand for personalized policy design, with applications across a wide range of domains, including clinical trials and healthcare services [Murphy, 2003, Kim et al., 2011, Bertsimas et al., 2017], online advertising and marketing [Bottou et al., 2013, He et al., 2012, Bertsimas and Kallus, 2020], revenue management [Chen et al., 2022b], and online news recommendation [Li et al., 2010, Ban and Rudin, 2019]. Personalized policies incorporate covariate heterogeneity into decision-making by exploiting individual-level characteristics, such as assigning medicine dosages according to patients' lab test results [Murphy, 2003] and recommending news

¹Congyuan Duan and Dong Xia's research was partially supported by Hong Kong RGC Grant GRF 16302323.

based on users’ profiles [Li et al., 2010]. Policy learning is often challenging due to its inherent online learning nature, where data or requests arrive sequentially. An online learning algorithm endeavors to make informed decisions to achieve larger rewards and to refine the estimated policy, that is, the decision rules.

The contextual bandit (CB, Langford and Zhang [2007]) model provides a convenient framework for examining online policy learning algorithms and studying their statistical limitations. A decision maker is equipped with a finite set $\mathcal{A}$ of available actions (called *arms*). At every time t , a request (e.g., a patient) with context x_t arrives, and the decision maker must choose an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ which returns a reward r_t with expectation $\mathbb{E}r_t = f_{a_t}(x_t)$. If the reward functions $f_a(x)$, for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, are known, the *optimal policy* that maximizes the reward is simply to take action $a_t := \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} f_a(x_t)$ at time t . Oftentimes, the reward functions are unknown and need to be learned from history. The decision maker may endeavor to achieve several goals separately or simultaneously, such as maximizing the overall reward [Bastani and Bayati, 2020, Li et al., 2010, Zhang et al., 2021], learning the optimal policy [Agarwal et al., 2014, Perchet and Rigollet, 2013, Bastani et al., 2021, Gur et al., 2022, May et al., 2012], and making inferences regarding the optimal policy [Hadad et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2022a, 2021, Zhang et al., 2021]. Once a decision a_t is made, the counterfactual outcomes $\{f_a(x_t) : a \in \mathcal{A}, a \neq a_t\}$ cannot be observed. To achieve the aforementioned goals, the decision maker should accumulate sufficient data (*exploration*) for each arm to accurately learn the reward functions and make greedy decisions (*exploitation*) whenever appropriate to maximize cumulative rewards under uncertainty. This balance is known as the exploration-exploitation dilemma [Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020].

The special case of CB where the reward functions are linear (subject to stochastic noise) is known as the linear contextual bandit (LCB Li et al. [2010]). The linearity assumption simplifies the estimation of reward functions, allowing the decision maker to focus on balancing exploration and exploitation to minimize *regret*—the *expected* difference between the rewards received and the maximum possible rewards. The success of LCB has been empirically observed in a variety of applications, including news recommendation [Li et al., 2010] and online advertising [Bottou et al., 2013, Miao and Chao, 2022]. Popular LCB algorithms include the Linear Upper Confidence Bound (LinUCB, Chu et al. [2011]), Thompson Sampling [Agrawal and Goyal, 2013], and the ε -greedy approach [Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020]. A regret lower bound of $\Omega((Td)^{1/2})$ was established for LCB [Chu et al., 2011], where T is the time horizon and d represents the dimension of covariate x_t ’s. It was shown there that LinUCB achieves a regret upper bound of $O((Td)^{1/2} \log^{3/2}(T \log(T)))$. These rates demonstrate that the optimal regret in LCB grows on the order of $O(d^{1/2})$ with respect

to the covariate dimension. This growth makes the aforementioned algorithms particularly vulnerable in high-dimensional problems [Zhang et al., 2017, Zhou et al., 2018]. In fact, the covariate dimension can sometimes be much larger than the time horizon in certain applications. This situation is especially common in personalized medicine or treatment scenarios where a patient’s medical history and genetic profile are commonly used as covariates [Bayati et al., 2014, Ozer et al., 2020]. Similarly, most e-commerce and streaming platforms base their recommendations on users’ click and browse history from past months. This observation motivates the study of *structured* high-dimensional LCB. Even though the covariate space may have a high ambient dimension, it is often the case that only a few features are relevant, indicating that the reward functions are *sparse* [Wang et al., 2018, Kim and Paik, 2019, Bastani and Bayati, 2020, Hao et al., 2020, Oh et al., 2021, Ren and Zhou, 2023]. By integrating the classical LASSO estimator with an ε -greedy bandit algorithm, Kim and Paik [2019] proposed a doubly-robust method that achieves a regret of $O(sT^{1/2} \log(dT))$, where s denotes the sparsity of the reward functions. Under an extra *gap* condition – that is, the difference in rewards between the optimal and sub-optimal arm – and a *forced sampling scheme*, Bastani and Bayati [2020] and Wang et al. [2018] showed that UCB-type algorithms can achieve a regret of $O(s^2(\log T + \log d)^2)$. Recently, LCB with high-dimensional *matrix-valued* covariates has been investigated by Johnson et al. [2016], Jun et al. [2019], Lu et al. [2021], Han et al. [2022], Li et al. [2022]. Assuming that the reward functions are parameterized by a $d_1 \times d_2$ matrix with a *small* rank r , Johnson et al. [2016] and Lu et al. [2021] studied UCB-type bandit algorithms, achieving regret upper bounds of $O((d_1 + d_2)(rT)^{1/2})$ and $O((d_1 + d_2)^{3/2}(rT)^{1/2})$, respectively. The *explore-then-commit* algorithm was explored in Jun et al. [2019] and Li et al. [2022], achieving regret upper bounds of $O((d_1 + d_2)^{3/2}(rT)^{1/2})$ and $O(r^{1/3}T^{2/3} \log(d_1 + d_2))$, respectively, with the latter imposing an additional restricted eigenvalue condition.

Policy inference, such as that regarding reward functions or maximum cumulative reward, has drawn tremendous attention in recent years. This area is technically challenging due to the non-i.i.d. nature of data generated by adaptive bandit algorithms. Most existing works focus on low-dimensional LCB [Bibaut et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2021, Shen et al., 2021, Zhan et al., 2021, Zhang et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2022a], where explicit forms of parametric estimators are accessible, providing analytical convenience for distributional studies. For example, Chen et al. [2021] and Chen et al. [2022a] explored the ε -greedy algorithm and investigated the asymptotic normality of the least squares estimator (LSE) and averaged stochastic gradient descent (SGD) estimator, respectively. These estimators can achieve $\sqrt{T}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality if the tuning parameter ε is kept constant, which, however, results in a trivial $O(T)$ regret upper bound.

Conversely, if ε decreases at a certain rate, one can achieve non-trivial regret; but the resulting estimators, while being asymptotically normal, are not $\sqrt{T}$ -consistent, as described in Chen et al. [2021]. This is because a diminishing ε significantly increases the variance of the estimator. Policy inference becomes even more challenging in high-dimensional LCB, where estimators typically are biased and lack an explicit representation formula. Inverse probability weighting (IPW) is a common technique to correct for the different sampling probabilities in non-i.i.d. data and to reduce estimator bias. However, IPW may inflate estimator variance. One notable example is Han et al. [2022], which introduced an online debiased estimator for the low-rank matrix regression bandit using the ε -greedy algorithm. Under an isotropic Gaussian design, their estimator is asymptotically normal, albeit not $\sqrt{T}$ -consistent.

Most existing LCB frameworks and methods share a fundamental assumption: the feature vector x_t representing the request at time t is dense and typically correlated with historical features. This suggests that the features cannot be sparse or $\langle x_s, x_t \rangle \neq 0$ with high probability for all $s < t$. This assumption is supported by several conditions in the literature, such as the *compatibility condition* [Bastani and Bayati, 2020, Kim and Paik, 2019], the *restricted eigenvalue condition* [Oh et al., 2021, Li et al., 2022], the *diverse covariate condition* [Ren and Zhou, 2023, Han et al., 2020], and the *(sub-)Gaussian sampling distribution* [Lu et al., 2021, Han et al., 2022]. This inherent correlation provides a link between current requests and historical ones, which is one of the primary reasons why past actions and feedback can inform and enhance current predictions.

The aforementioned approaches encounter difficulties when the features are sparse and sampled from an orthonormal basis, such that the currently observed feature may be orthogonal to all historical ones with high probability. Let us consider a scenario in which we compare two marketing strategies for recommending d_2 products to d_1 users on an online shopping platform. Let M_0 and M_1 be two $d_1 \times d_2$ *unknown* matrices representing the expected amount of money users will spend on products under each of the two marketing strategies. At each time t , a user $i_t \in [d_1]$ arrives intending to buy an item $j_t \in [d_2]$ (e.g., based on her search keyword on Amazon); the platform must then choose one of the marketing strategies (e.g., low-price first or high-ratings first). The preferred strategy, which maximizes the expected revenue, is determined by the (i_t, j_t) -th entries of M_0 and M_1 , respectively. This problem can be conveniently formulated as an LCB with reward functions parameterized by M_0 and M_1 , and a matrix-valued covariate X_t sampled randomly from an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{X} := \{e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top : j_1 \in [d_1], j_2 \in [d_2]\}$, where e_j denotes the j -th canonical basis vector (whose actual dimension may vary in different appearances). Here, $[d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$. More

precisely, if the strategy (action) $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$ is chosen, the observed reward r_t satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}r_t = f_{a_t}(X_t) := \langle M_{a_t}, X_t \rangle. \quad (1)$$

Basically, at each time, the decision maker can only observe one noisy entry from either M_0 or M_1 . Two additional examples are as follows:

Parking pricing (SFpark, SFMTA [2013]). The San Francisco government plans to implement dynamic pricing for parking lots across d_1 blocks during d_2 different time periods (hourly, each week). For simplicity, suppose the government has two pricing options: high and low. High prices are intended to discourage parking in overcrowded blocks, while low prices aim to attract more drivers to under-occupied blocks. The goal is to achieve moderate occupancy rates across more blocks throughout the majority of time periods. Let M_1 and M_0 represent two $d_1 \times d_2$ unknown matrices that express the deviation (in absolute value) from the target occupancy rate under high and low pricing strategies, respectively. The optimal policy is then determined by comparing the corresponding entries of M_0 and M_1 . If $M_1(i, j) < M_0(i, j)$, a high price should be set for block i at time period j , and vice versa. Learning the optimal policy involves estimating these two underlying matrices. To mitigate the impact of sudden changes on drivers' experiences, an adaptive experiment with sequential observations has been designed. At each time step, a block and a time period are randomly selected, a high or low pricing decision is made, and the subsequent occupancy rate is observed. The authorities aim to learn the optimal policy from as few pricing experiments as possible, while minimizing the cumulative regret during these experiments and quantifying the uncertainty of the learned policy.

Supermarket discount (Walmart sales, Kaggle [2020]). A supermarket manager aims to decide whether to offer discounts on d_1 products during d_2 different time periods (weekly, throughout the year). Offering discounts might reduce per-unit profits but could potentially increase overall revenue, depending on seasonal demand. The objective is to devise a policy that determines the optimal times and products for discounting in order to maximize annual total profits. Let M_1 and M_0 represent two $d_1 \times d_2$ unknown matrices that indicate sales profits with and without discounts, respectively. The optimal policy is characterized by comparing the entries of M_0 and M_1 . If $M_1(i, j) > M_0(i, j)$, a discount should be offered for product i during time period j , and vice versa. Therefore, it is necessary to estimate these two underlying matrices. An adaptive experiment could be implemented over the course of one or more years. At each time, a random product is chosen, the manager decides whether to apply a discount, and the resulting sales profit is recorded. Similarly, the manager's goal is to rapidly learn the optimal policy, maximize total profit during

the experimental phase, and assess the uncertainty of the policy outcomes.

These problems are, in essence, *covariate free*, as the observed covariates do not capture the similarity between the current request and historical ones. Instead, a more appropriate measure of similarity can be derived from the observed rewards. When determining which marketing strategy to apply to user i_t for product j_t , the platform can identify numerous users with potentially similar preferences to user i_t and base the decision on historical rewards. This approach is known as *collaborative filtering* [Su and Khoshgoftaar, 2009], a widely-used technique in recommender systems. The fundamental assumption is that both matrices M_0 and M_1 are low-rank, indicating that users and products can be represented by low-dimensional latent features. Consequently, we refer to the policy that exploits this assumption as the collaborative filtering policy, or the covariate-free policy (CF-policy). From a technical standpoint, the problem can be conceptualized as a matrix completion bandit (MCB).

Learning and inference for CF-policy are challenging for several reasons. First, most of the existing matrix completion literature has focused on independent and offline observations, whereas the observations in MCB arrive sequentially and depend on historical data. Second, regret analysis for MCB hinges on developing sharp upper bounds for the entrywise error of low-rank estimators, which are technically challenging, even for offline i.i.d. observations. Lastly, the adaptively collected data also pose significant challenges for the statistical inference, where the tradeoff between bias and variance must be carefully managed.

1.1 Main contributions

We study the problem of online decision-making when features are sparse and orthogonal to historical ones, and we propose learning the optimal policy through collaborative filtering. We formulate the problem as a matrix completion bandit. Our contributions are summarized as follows.

General convergence of ε -greedy bandit and online gradient descent algorithms. The optimal policy under MCB is characterized by low-rank matrices. We propose an online gradient descent algorithm with an ε -greedy bandit strategy to learn the MCB parameters. The convergence performance of the algorithm is established under general conditions on the schedule of step sizes and exploration probabilities. One of our key contributions is that we have derived a sharp entry-wise error rate of the estimated MCB parameters, showing that error is delocalized over all the matrix entries. By setting a constant exploration probability and step size (assuming a known horizon T), and under the classical conditions of offline matrix completion, the algorithm delivers estimators

that are statistically optimal (up to logarithmic factors) in both the matrix Frobenius norm and the sup-norm. The sup-norm error rates play a crucial role in regret analysis and policy inference. We achieve these sharp error rates by sophisticated spectral analysis and martingale techniques.

Tradeoff between policy learning and regret performance. A constant exploration probability yields trivial regret performance. We study an *exploration-then-commit* (ETC) style schedule for exploration probabilities, which decay geometrically fast in the later stages of the algorithm. A trade-off is observed between policy learning and regret performance. For instance, if the exploration probabilities decay as $\varepsilon_t \asymp t^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \in [0, 1)$, the algorithm achieves a regret upper bound $O(T^{1-\gamma} + d_1^{1/2} T^{(1+\gamma)/2})$, and the final estimators attain an error rate $\tilde{O}_p(rd_1/T^{1-\gamma})$ in the sup-norm. The parameter γ also affects the horizon and signal strength conditions. A non-trivial regret requires $\gamma > 0$. The minimal regret achievable by the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3} d_1^{1/3})$. The $O(T^{2/3})$ regret performance has been widely observed in online high-dimensional bandit algorithms [Hao et al., 2020, Ma et al., 2023b].

Online inference framework by IPW-based debiasing. We introduce a general framework for the online statistical inference of the optimal policy. The estimators produced by gradient descent algorithms are usually biased due to implicit regularizations. The IPW-based online debiasing method was initially proposed by Han et al. [2022] for the low-rank matrix regression bandit and investigated under a schedule of constant exploration probability. We extend the IPW-based debiasing method to MCB, allowing the exploration probability to diminish over time. Asymptotic normality is established for the studentized IPW-based estimator, based on which valid confidence intervals are constructed.

Real data analysis. We evaluate the managerial merit of MCB using the SFpark dataset, which has been widely studied in the transportation and operations management literature. This dataset presents a pricing decision problem aimed at implementing dynamic pricing for various parking lots during different time periods to reduce the rates of over-occupancy and under-occupancy. We apply our algorithm to learn the optimal parking prices for each block at every time period and make inferences to evaluate the effectiveness of the learned policy. Our method outperforms the benchmark policy used in practice, resulting in a higher percentage of blocks and time periods that achieve the target occupancy rate.

1.2 Related works

Our work intersects with multiple disciplines, including statistics, machine learning, and operations research.

Policy evaluation and inference with adaptively collected data. A closely related area is policy evaluation with adaptively collected data. The problem is challenging because estimators constructed from such data typically suffer from potential bias and inflated variance. These issues are addressed by some general approaches in the existing literature, all sharing the common idea of de-biasing and reweighting. For instance, Bottou et al. [2013], Wang et al. [2017], Su et al. [2020] use importance sampling to explore the trade-off between bias and variance, while Luedtke and Van Der Laan [2016], Hadad et al. [2021], Zhan et al. [2021] design specific weights and apply them to IPW-based unbiased estimator to stabilize the variance. Policy inference and regret performance are not simultaneously studied in these works. Most of the aforementioned works focused on the scenarios with low-dimensional and dense contexts.

Matrix completion and inference. The literature on matrix completion is extensive. The seminal work by Candes and Plan [2010] laid the foundation for exact matrix completion through convex programming. Keshavan et al. [2010] proposed a computationally efficient non-convex method based on matrix factorization, which delivers a statistically optimal estimator when entries are observed with sub-Gaussian noise. In the past decade, numerous methods, including computationally efficient optimization algorithms and their statistical performance, have been investigated. See, for example, Koltchinskii et al. [2011a], Hastie et al. [2015], Ge et al. [2016], Ma et al. [2018], and the references therein. Online matrix completion and regret analysis have been explored by Jin et al. [2016] and Cai et al. [2023]. The statistical inference for noisy matrix completion is technically challenging and has been recently investigated by Chen et al. [2019], Xia and Yuan [2021], Yan et al. [2021], Chernozhukov et al. [2023]. The methods introduced by Chen et al. [2019] and Yan et al. [2021] are based on the sophisticated leave-one-out analysis framework and can provide entry-wise inference, while Xia and Yuan [2021] utilized double-sample debiasing and low-rank projection, offering a general framework for the statistical inference of linear forms. More recently, Ma et al. [2023a] developed a method based on symmetric data aggregation to control the false discovery rate for multiple tests in noisy matrix completion. The aforementioned works mostly assume that observations are mutually independent. In this paper, we develop inferential methods for matrix completion that can handle adaptively collected data.

Causal inference by matrix completion. Our work is partially inspired by the matrix completion

methods for estimating average treatment effect in the causal inference literature [Athey et al., 2021, Bai and Ng, 2021, Xiong and Pelger, 2023, Choi and Yuan, 2023]. The $d_1 \times d_2$ matrices M_1 and M_0 represent the potential outcomes with/without treatments of d_1 patients during a period of d_2 time intervals. However, these causal inference studies are usually offline and the entries are missing not at random.

2 Collaborative Filtering Policy and Matrix Completion Bandits

We begin by introducing some notations that will be used throughout this paper. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the ℓ_2 -norm for vectors and the spectral norm for matrices. The matrix Frobenius norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_F$. We use $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ to represent the sup-norm for matrices or vectors, which is defined as the maximum absolute value of their entries. The 2-max norm of a matrix is defined by $\|A\|_{2,\max} := \max_j \|e_j^\top A\|$, representing the maximum row-wise ℓ_2 -norm. Let $\mathbb{O}^{d \times r} := \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r} : U^\top U = I_r\}$, where I_r is the identity matrix of size r . For a matrix $U \in \mathbb{O}^{d \times r}$, we denote by $U_\perp \in \mathbb{O}^{d \times (d-r)}$ its orthogonal complement, such that the concatenation $(U, U_\perp)$ forms a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix.

The collaborative filtering (CF) policy can be viewed as a strategy for making decisions with missing values. Let us assume there are $d_1 d_2$ distinct possible requests (states) organized in a $d_1 \times d_2$ grid, indexed by (j_1, j_2) , where $j_1 \in [d_1]$ and $j_2 \in [d_2]$ for simplicity. There are K arms (actions), and each is associated with a reward function represented by a $d_1 \times d_2$ matrix M_k , where $k \in [K]$. Given the (j_1, j_2) -th request, selecting the k -th action yields an expected reward denoted by $[M_k]_{j_1 j_2}$. The optimal CF policy, which achieves the maximum expected reward, is given by

$$a^*(j_1, j_2) := \arg \max_{k \in [K]} [M_k]_{j_1 j_2}, \quad \forall j_1 \in [d_1], j_2 \in [d_2]. \quad (2)$$

The matrices M_k are unknown and must be estimated to learn the optimal policy. Requests arrive in sequence, and only a single (noisy) entry from one of the M_k matrices can be observed each time after a decision is made. A fundamental assumption of collaborative filtering is that the matrices M_k are low-rank, implying the existence of a low-dimensional embedding of their row and column spaces. In the SFpark parking pricing example, the rows and columns of M_k represent distinct city blocks and weekly time periods, respectively. It is not uncommon to see that a city block can be mainly characterized by a few features such as location and neighborhood style, and weekly time periods can be primarily summarized by day/night and weekday/weekend distinctions.

We formulate the problem as a matrix completion bandit (MCB) under the trace regression model [Koltchinskii et al., 2011b]. Without loss of generality, we focus on the two-arm setting where

$K = 2$. Let $\{(X_t, a_t, r_t) : t \in [T]\}$ denote a sequence of observations where the $d_1 \times d_2$ matrices X_t 's are independently sampled *uniformly* from the orthonormal basis $\mathcal{X} = \{e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top : j_1 \in [d_1], j_2 \in [d_2]\}$. The action $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$, and the observed reward satisfies

$$r_t = \langle M_{a_t}, X_t \rangle + \xi_t, \quad (3)$$

where the noise ξ_t is assumed sub-Gaussian and independent of X_t . The noise may have unequal variances under different arms. We assume that, conditioned on $a_t = 1$, the noise ξ_t has mean zero, variance σ_1^2 , and a variance proxy $O(\sigma_1^2)$; if the action $a_t = 0$ is taken, the noise has variance σ_0^2 and a variance proxy $O(\sigma_0^2)$. Denote $\mathcal{F}_t := \mathfrak{S}(\{(X_\tau, a_\tau, r_\tau) : \tau \in [t]\})$ the sigma-algebra that contains all information available up to time t , which defines the filtration $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}_T$ with $\mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset$. Since the action a_t is usually made based on $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, the observed data is thus adaptively collected, i.e., $(X_t, a_t, r_t), t \in [T]$ are neither independent nor identically distributed. Without loss of generality, we assume $d_1 \geq d_2$, and that M_1 and M_0 have a common rank $r \ll d_2$.

Let $\widehat{M}_{1,t-1}$ and $\widehat{M}_{0,t-1}$ denote the estimated MCB parameters after time $t-1$. Given the new request $X_t \in \mathcal{X}$ at time t , a *greedy* decision rule is to choose the action $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $\langle \widehat{M}_{a_t, t-1}, X_t \rangle$ is larger than $\langle \widehat{M}_{|a_t-1|, t-1}, X_t \rangle$. If the estimates $\widehat{M}_{0,t-1}$ and $\widehat{M}_{1,t-1}$ are sufficiently accurate, the greedy approach can maximize the expected cumulative reward. However, the greedy approach may yield a sub-optimal total reward if the uncertainties in the estimated MCB parameters are significant. Therefore, a prudent strategy is to introduce a certain amount of randomness (*exploration*) into decision-making, ensuring that each arm is pulled with a non-zero probability, allowing the MCB parameters to be estimated more accurately over time. A well-known example is the ε -greedy algorithm [Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Sutton and Barto, 2018]. Let $\varepsilon_t, t \in [T]$ be a sequence of small positive numbers representing the exploration probabilities. At each time t , the ε -greedy algorithm makes a decision by randomly sampling an arm according to the Bernoulli distribution:

$$a_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_t),$$

where $\pi_t := \mathbb{P}(a_t = 1 | X_t, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = (1 - \varepsilon_t) \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0) + \varepsilon_t/2$. Essentially, the algorithm will choose the greedy decision with probability $1 - \varepsilon_t/2$ (*exploitation*) and the less preferable decision with probability $\varepsilon_t/2$. The sequence $\varepsilon_t, t = 1, \dots, T$ is usually non-increasing, suggesting that the algorithm tends to make more greedy decisions as time progresses. The rationale is that as more data is accumulated, the estimated MCB parameters become more accurate, meaning that the greedy action is more likely to be the optimal one. Consequently, the decision maker will increase the probability of exploitation and decrease the likelihood of exploration.

Most existing LCB methods estimate the bandit parameters in an offline nature, i.e., the parameters are re-estimated using all the observed data at each time step. Offline learning brings technical convenience to regret analysis but faces challenges in finite-sample error analysis and inferential studies, since the data are not mutually independent. Bastani and Bayati [2020] and Kim and Paik [2019] explored the forced-sampling scheme to mitigate the dependence issue, but its efficacy in providing valid inferential results remains unclear. Offline learning is computationally intensive since it requires frequently re-solving optimization programs with increasing problem sizes. Meanwhile, Chen et al. [2022a] and Ma et al. [2023b] investigated online gradient descent algorithms for learning bandit parameters. Online learning enables the application of martingale techniques for finite-sample error analysis and inferential studies. However, Hao et al. [2020] noted that online learning may result in sub-optimal regrets due to “data scarcity”. For technical convenience and inferential purposes, we employ online methods [Jin et al., 2016, Han et al., 2022, Cai et al., 2023] to estimate the MCB parameters M_0 and M_1 .

3 Policy Learning by Online Gradient Descent

We begin by introducing some useful notations and common assumptions. For each $i = 0, 1$, denote by $M_i = L_i \Lambda_i R_i^\top$ the singular value decomposition (SVD), where $L_i \in \mathbb{O}^{d_1 \times r}$ and $R_i \in \mathbb{O}^{d_2 \times r}$ contain the left and right singular vectors, respectively. The diagonal matrix $\Lambda_i = \text{diag}(\lambda_{i,1}, \dots, \lambda_{i,r})$ represents the singular values of M_i , arranged in non-increasing order. The signal strength is defined by $\lambda_{\min} := \min\{\lambda_{0,r}, \lambda_{1,r}\}$. Denote by $\lambda_{\max} := \max\{\lambda_{0,1}, \lambda_{1,1}\}$ the largest singular value among two matrices. We define the condition number of the two matrices as $\kappa := \lambda_{\max}/\lambda_{\min}$. The balanced decomposition of M_i is written as $M_i = U_i V_i^\top$, where $U_i^\top U_i = V_i^\top V_i = \Lambda_i$. This is attainable by setting $U_i = L_i \Lambda_i^{1/2}$ and $V_i = R_i \Lambda_i^{1/2}$. Matrix completion becomes an ill-posed problem if the underlying matrix is spikied, meaning that one or a few entries significantly dominate the others. The *incoherence* parameter [Candes and Recht, 2012] of M_i is defined by

$$\mu(M_i) := \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{d_1}{r}} \|L_i\|_{2,\max}, \sqrt{\frac{d_2}{r}} \|R_i\|_{2,\max} \right\}.$$

We assume that $\max\{\mu(M_0), \mu(M_1)\} \leq \mu_0$. For cleanness of presentation, we treat μ_0 and κ as bounded constants in the main theories, meaning that majority entries of M_0 (M_1 , similarly) have comparable magnitudes and M_0, M_1 are well-conditioned. Nevertheless, the explicit dependence of our theoretical results on μ_0 and κ can be found in the proofs.

At time t , a classical offline matrix completion method [Keshavan et al., 2009] is to estimate

M_1 by minimizing the sum of squares $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{1,t}(U, V) := \sum_{\tau=1}^t \ell_{1,\tau}(U, V) := \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbb{1}(\{a_\tau = 1\})(r_\tau - \langle X_\tau, UV^\top \rangle)^2$ subject to $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2 \times r}$. This is a non-convex program and can be locally optimized by gradient descent algorithms with guaranteed convergence and statistical performance [Burer and Monteiro, 2003, Zheng and Lafferty, 2016] if the observations are i.i.d. However, since data are adaptively collected under MCB, the probabilities $\pi_\tau = \mathbb{P}(a_\tau = 1)$ are unequal. The impact to this can be easily seen in the conditional expected loss $\mathbb{E}[\ell_{1,t}(U, V) | \{\mathcal{F}_{t-1}, X_t, r_t\}] = \pi_t(r_t - \langle X_t, UV^\top \rangle)^2$, which likely places more significant weight on the entries where M_1 is larger than M_0 . To mitigate the bias issue, we consider using the weighted sum of squares

$$\min_{U, V} \mathcal{L}_{1,t}^\pi(U, V) = \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \cdot (r_\tau - \langle X_\tau, UV^\top \rangle)^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad U^\top U = V^\top V, \quad (4)$$

where the last constraint enforces a balanced factorization and is for algorithmic stability [Jin et al., 2016]. When estimating M_0 , we define the loss $\mathcal{L}_{0,t}^\pi$ as in (4), but replace the weight $\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)/\pi_\tau$ with $\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 0)/(1 - \pi_\tau)$. One possible approach is to re-solve the program (4) each time a new observation arrives, which is computationally costly. For computational efficiency and inferential purposes, we apply online gradient descent to update the estimated MCB parameters when only one new observation becomes available.

Let $\widehat{M}_{1,t-1} = \widehat{U}_{1,t-1} \widehat{V}_{1,t-1}^\top$ be the estimate of M_1 before time t . Suppose that a new observation X_t arrives and the ε -greedy algorithm selects an action $a_t = 1$, which yields a reward r_t . The online gradient descent algorithm updates the estimates via $\widetilde{U}_{1,t} := \widehat{U}_{1,t-1} - \eta_t \cdot \nabla_U \ell_{1,t}^\pi(\widehat{U}_{1,t-1}, \widehat{V}_{1,t-1})$ and $\widetilde{V}_{1,t} := \widehat{V}_{1,t-1} - \eta_t \cdot \nabla_V \ell_{1,t}^\pi(\widehat{U}_{1,t-1}, \widehat{V}_{1,t-1})$, where η_t is the step size and the one-point loss is defined by $\ell_{1,t}^\pi(U, V) := \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)\pi_t^{-1}(r_t - \langle X_t, UV^\top \rangle)^2$. The updated estimate of M_1 is thus $\widehat{M}_{1,t} := \widetilde{U}_{1,t} \widetilde{V}_{1,t}^\top$, and its balanced factorization can be written as $\widehat{M}_{1,t} = \widehat{U}_{1,t} \widehat{V}_{1,t}^\top$. The detailed implementations of ε -greedy bandit and online gradient decent can be found in Algorithm 1. The general convergence and statistical performance of Algorithm 1 are guaranteed by Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that the horizon $T \leq d_1^{100}$ and the initializations are incoherent, satisfying $\|\widehat{M}_{0,0} - M_0\|_F + \|\widehat{M}_{1,0} - M_1\|_F \leq c_0 \lambda_{\min}$ for some small constant $c_0 > 0$. Let $\widehat{M}_{0,t}, \widehat{M}_{1,t}, t \in [T]$ denote the output of Algorithm 1. There exist absolute constants $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ such that if, for any $t \in [T]$,*

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_1^2}, d_1 d_2 \log d_1 \right\} \geq C_1 \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{(\eta_\tau \lambda_{\max})^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \cdot \frac{r \log^2 d_1}{d_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\tau \in [t]} \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \leq C_2 \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau}, \quad (5)$$

Algorithm 1 ε -greedy two-arm MCB with online gradient descent

Input: exploration probabilities $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \geq 1}$; step sizes $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 1}$; initializations with balanced factorization $\widehat{M}_{0,0} = \widehat{U}_{0,0}\widehat{V}_{0,0}^\top$, $\widehat{M}_{1,0} = \widehat{U}_{1,0}\widehat{V}_{1,0}^\top$

Output: $\widehat{M}_{0,T}$, $\widehat{M}_{1,T}$.

for $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**

 Observe a new request X_t

 Calculate $\pi_t = (1 - \varepsilon_t)\mathbb{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0) + \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}$

 Sample an action $a_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_t)$ and get a reward r_t

if $a_t = 1$ **then**

 Update by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{U}_{1,t} \\ \widetilde{V}_{1,t} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{U}_{1,t-1} \\ \widehat{V}_{1,t-1} \end{pmatrix} - \frac{\eta_t}{\pi_t} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (\langle \widehat{U}_{1,t-1}\widehat{V}_{1,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t)X_t\widehat{V}_{1,t-1} \\ (\langle \widehat{U}_{1,t-1}\widehat{V}_{1,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - t_t)X_t^\top\widehat{U}_{1,t-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

 Set $\widehat{U}_{1,t} = \widehat{L}_{1,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,t}^{1/2}$ and $\widehat{V}_{1,t} = \widehat{R}_{1,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,t}^{1/2}$, where $\widehat{L}_{1,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,t}\widehat{R}_{1,t}^\top$ is the thin SVD of $\widehat{M}_{1,t} = \widetilde{U}_{1,t}\widetilde{V}_{1,t}^\top$.

else

 Update by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{U}_{0,t} \\ \widetilde{V}_{0,t} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{U}_{0,t-1} \\ \widehat{V}_{0,t-1} \end{pmatrix} - \frac{\eta_t}{1 - \pi_t} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} (\langle \widehat{U}_{0,t-1}\widehat{V}_{0,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t)X_t\widehat{V}_{0,t-1} \\ (\langle \widehat{U}_{0,t-1}\widehat{V}_{0,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - t_t)X_t^\top\widehat{U}_{0,t-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

 Set $\widehat{U}_{0,t} = \widehat{L}_{0,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,t}^{1/2}$ and $\widehat{V}_{0,t} = \widehat{R}_{0,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,t}^{1/2}$, where $\widehat{L}_{0,t}\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,t}\widehat{R}_{0,t}^\top$ is the thin SVD of $\widehat{M}_{0,t} = \widetilde{U}_{0,t}\widetilde{V}_{0,t}^\top$.

end if

end for

then with probability at least $1 - 8td^{-200}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{M}_{i,t} - M_i\|_F^2 &\leq C_3 \|\widehat{M}_{i,0} - M\|_F^2 \cdot \prod_{\tau=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\eta_\tau \lambda_{\min}}{4d_1 d_2}\right) + C_4 \sigma_i^2 \frac{r \log^2 d_1}{d_2} \cdot \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{(\eta_\tau \lambda_{\max})^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \\ \|\widehat{M}_{i,t} - M_i\|_{\max}^2 &\leq C_3 \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2 r^3}{d_1 d_2} \prod_{\tau=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{\eta_\tau \lambda_{\min}}{4d_1 d_2}\right) + C_4 \sigma_i^2 \frac{r^3 \log^2 d_1}{d_1 d_2^2} \cdot \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{(\eta_\tau \lambda_{\max})^2}{\varepsilon_\tau},\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 0, 1$.

The upper bounds in both Frobenius and sup-norms are characterized by two terms: the first concerns the computational convergence of Algorithm 1, which contracts over time; the second is the cumulative statistical error due to stochastic noise and random sampling. The first term depends only on the step sizes: a larger η_τ facilitates a more aggressive gradient descent learning rate, allowing Algorithm 1 to reach a local minimum faster. The second error term depends on both the step sizes and exploration probabilities. A more aggressive learning rate enlarges the stochastic noise, and a smaller exploration probability increases the variance. The condition (5) implies that the exploration probabilities cannot decrease too fast compared with the learning rates. Selecting appropriate learning rates and exploration probabilities is crucial to attaining statistically optimal estimators for MCB parameters.

The general performance guaranteed by Theorem 1 can be greatly simplified by considering specific schedules for learning rates and exploration probabilities. Suppose that the horizon T is known beforehand, e.g., based on the schedule of a parking pricing experiment or the promotion periods of supermarket discounts. More precisely, we divide the entire learning process into two phases. In the first phase, we fix a constant step size and exploration probability to attain reasonably accurate estimators. However, a constant exploration probability will result in trivial regret performance. Therefore, the first phase should be relatively short compared to the full horizon. In the second phase, we choose a geometrically decaying schedule for learning rates and exploration probabilities. Since the estimated MCB parameters from phase one are sufficiently accurate, they will guarantee non-trivial regret in the second phase. The whole learning procedure bears resemblance to the ‘‘Explore-Then-Commit’’ (ETC) algorithm [Garivier et al., 2016, Lattimore and Szepesvári, 2020, Perchet et al., 2016]. Typical ETC algorithms usually make the greedy decision during the second phase, i.e., by setting a zero exploration probability. In sharp contrast, our proposed method still performs exploration during the second phase.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that the horizon $T \leq d_1^{100}$ and the initializations are incoherent satisfying $\|\widehat{M}_{0,0} - M_0\|_F + \|\widehat{M}_{1,0} - M_1\|_F \leq c_0 \lambda_{\min}$ for some small constant $c_0 > 0$. Fix some $\gamma \in [0, 1)$,*

$\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, and set $T_0 := C_0 T^{1-\gamma} \log[\lambda_{\min}/(\sigma_0 \wedge \sigma_1)]$ for a large constant $C_0 > 0$ depending on ε . When $t \leq T_0$, set $\varepsilon_t \equiv \varepsilon$ and $\eta_t \equiv \eta := c_1 d_1 d_2 / (T^{1-\gamma} \lambda_{\max})$; when $T_0 < t \leq T$, set $\varepsilon_t = c_2 t^{-\gamma}$ and $\eta_t = \varepsilon_t \eta$, where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are numerical constants. Suppose that the horizon and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) satisfy

$$T \geq C_1 r^3 d_1^{1/(1-\gamma)} \log^2 d_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_1^2} \geq C_2 \frac{r d_1^2 d_2 \log^2 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}},$$

for some large constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending on C_0, c_0, c_1, c_2 only. There exists a numerical constant $C_3 > 0$ such that, with probability at least $1 - 8Td^{-200}$, the output $\widehat{M}_{0,T}$ and $\widehat{M}_{1,T}$ by Algorithm 1 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{M}_{i,T} - M_i\|_F^2 &\leq C_3 \sigma_i^2 \frac{r d_1^2 d_2 \log^4 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \\ \|\widehat{M}_{i,T} - M_i\|_{\max}^2 &\leq C_3 \sigma_i^2 \frac{r d_1 \log^4 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 0, 1$.

The value γ controls the length of phase one, which has a constant exploration probability. If the primary goal is to estimate MCB parameters (i.e., to learn the optimal policy), the value γ can be set as small as near zero. In this case, the horizon and signal strength conditions reduce to the classic ones found in the existing literature on matrix completion [Candes and Recht, 2012, Keshavan et al., 2010]. In fact, the constant exploration probability ensures that $O(T)$ observations are available for estimating each of M_0 and M_1 . Moreover, the final estimators $\widehat{M}_{0,T}$ and $\widehat{M}_{1,T}$ are statistically optimal up to logarithmic factors [Koltchinskii et al., 2011b, Ma et al., 2018, Cai et al., 2023]. However, if maximizing the expected cumulative reward is the primary goal, the value γ should not be too close to zero. The reason is that a constant exploration probability implies a constant risk of making sub-optimal decisions during phase one.

4 Regret Analysis

One of the decision maker's goals is to maximize the expected cumulative reward during the policy learning process. The maximum expected cumulative reward $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in [T]} \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \langle M_i, X_t \rangle]$ is attainable from making decisions using the optimal policy a^* defined in (2). Let $a_t, t \in [T]$ be the sequence of actions taken according to Algorithm 1, which results in an expected cumulative reward $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in [T]} \langle M_{a_t}, X_t \rangle]$. Here, the expectation is taken with respect to $\mathcal{F}_T$. The difference between the

achieved expected cumulative reward and the maximum one is referred to as the regret, formally defined by

$$R_T := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \langle M_i, X_t \rangle - \langle M_{a_t}, X_t \rangle \right].$$

Under mild conditions, it is easy to show that the regret is bounded mainly by two terms:

$$R_T \lesssim \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_t + \sum_{t=1}^T \max_{i \in \{0,1\}} \left\| \widehat{U}_{i,t} \widehat{V}_{i,t}^\top - M_i \right\|_{\max}.$$

The first term originates from exploration, which is present even if both MCB parameters are perfectly estimated. The second term concerns the incorrect decisions made due to the uncertainties in estimated MCB parameters. Since each request is related to one entry of two matrices, the regret is characterized by the entry-wise error rates.

Let us consider the ETC-style schedule for exploration probabilities as in Section 3 and illustrate the trade-off between policy learning and regret performance.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that the conditions in Corollary 1 hold, and denote by $\bar{m} := \|M_0\|_{\max} + \|M_1\|_{\max}$ and $\bar{\sigma} := \max\{\sigma_0, \sigma_1\}$. Then there exists a numerical constant $C_5 > 0$ such that the regret is upper bounded by*

$$R_T \leq C_5 \left[\bar{m} r \cdot T^{1-\gamma} + \bar{\sigma} \cdot T^{(1+\gamma)/2} \sqrt{r d_1} \log^2 d_1 \right]$$

Assuming $r = O(1)$, Theorem 2 shows that the ETC-style MCB algorithm achieves the regret $R_T = \tilde{O}(\bar{m} \cdot T^{1-\gamma} + \bar{\sigma} \cdot T^{(1+\gamma)/2} d_1^{1/2})$, where logarithmic factors are hidden in $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$. As discussed after Corollary 1, the MCB algorithm can learn the optimal policy more accurately if the value γ is closer to 0. However, setting $\gamma = 0$ will lead to a trivial regret upper bound of $O(T)$. By choosing a value $\gamma > 0$ so that $T^{1-3\gamma} = (\bar{\sigma}/\bar{m})^2 d_1$, we end up with the regret upper bound $R_T = \tilde{O}((\bar{m}\bar{\sigma}^2)^{1/3} d_1^{1/3} T^{2/3})$. The $O(T^{2/3})$ regret performance has been observed in *online* high-dimensional bandit algorithms especially, when the horizon T is not too large. See, e.g., Hao et al. [2020], Ma et al. [2023b], and references therein. In the extreme case where $\bar{m} \ll \bar{\sigma}$, such that the second term dominates, the regret upper bound $O(T^{(1+\gamma)/2})$ becomes smaller as γ approaches zero.

It is worth noting that a classical ETC bandit algorithm may achieve a similar policy learning accuracy and regret performance. The classical ETC algorithm will make greedy decisions in the second phase without exploration. By setting $\varepsilon_t = \eta_t = 0$ for $T_0 < t \leq T$, the estimated MCB parameters will not be further updated after phase one. The decisions made during phase two are

only determined by the entry-wise difference between $\widehat{M}_{0,T_0}$ and $\widehat{M}_{1,T_0}$. It is easy to check that the error rates achieved by $\widehat{M}_{0,T_0}$ and $\widehat{M}_{1,T_0}$ are comparable to those stated in Corollary 1, up to constant factors. Although no exploration is made during phase two, its regret performance is comparable to that in Theorem 2. We choose the proposed exploration probability schedule as in Corollary 1 for the purpose of policy inference. If no exploration is made during phase two, the inferential methods in Section 5 will be invalid because the debiasing procedure does not yield an unbiased estimator.

5 Policy Inference by Inverse Propensity Weighting

One of our major contributions is a novel debiasing method and general framework for the statistical inference of CF policy. Suppose that the platform manager wants to decide on a marketing strategy to recommend a specific collection of products to a particular group of users. Then, there exists a $d_1 \times d_2$ matrix Q such that the expected rewards under strategies one and two may be written as $\langle M_0, Q \rangle$ and $\langle M_1, Q \rangle$, respectively. For instance, $Q = 2e_1e_1^\top + e_2e_3^\top$ corresponds to the case that user 1 plans to purchase two units of product 1 and user 2 plans to purchase one unit of product 3. Oftentimes, the manager desires not just a decision but also a confidence level in the correctness of the chosen decision. The decision-making process can be conveniently formulated as a hypothesis testing problem:

$$H_0 : \langle M_1 - M_0, Q \rangle = 0 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \langle M_1 - M_0, Q \rangle > 0. \quad (6)$$

Rejecting the null hypothesis means that strategy two is preferred for this specific marketing task.

5.1 Debiasing

Constructing a good estimator is the first step in testing hypotheses (6). The plug-in estimator $\langle \widehat{M}_{1,T} - \widehat{M}_{0,T}, Q \rangle$ suffers from potential bias caused by the implicit regularization of gradient descent, and $\widehat{M}_{0,T}, \widehat{M}_{1,T}$ may not be unbiased estimators. Proper debiasing treatment is crucial for valid inference. The commonly used debiasing method [Chen et al., 2019, Xia and Yuan, 2021] in *offline* matrix completion considers

$$\widehat{M}_1^{\text{u-off}} := \widehat{M}_{1,T} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{|\{t \in [T] : a_t = 1\}|} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1) \cdot (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{1,T}, X_t \rangle) X_t.$$

This method may not work for MCB because data are adaptively collected, and $\widehat{M}_1^{\text{u-off}}$ may still be a biased estimator of M_1 . Moreover, the estimator $\widehat{M}_1^{\text{u-off}}$ requires access to historical data to compute $\langle \widehat{M}_{1,T}, X_t \rangle X_t$.

An *online* debiasing method was recently proposed by Han et al. [2022] for the low-rank matrix regression bandit, which provides an unbiased estimator even if data are adaptively collected. The crucial ingredient is to include the inverse propensity weight (IPW), and we modify it into matrix completion setting:

$$\widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle) X_t. \quad (7)$$

The estimator $\widehat{M}_0^{\text{IPW}}$ is similarly defined using $(1 - \pi_t)^{-1}$ as the IPW. The unbiasedness of $\widehat{M}_0^{\text{IPW}}$ and $\widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}}$ can be easily verified by noticing the independence between $\widehat{M}_{1,t-1}$ and (X_t, r_t, a_t) , conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. The debiasing procedure (7) is online in nature, since it does not require saving historical data. The method only needs the incremental updating of the two summands in (7) over time. Nevertheless, the debiasing procedure (7) accumulates all past estimates, but estimates from the early stage may not be sufficiently accurate, which can potentially inflate the variance. This issue can be resolved by assuming that the initializations are already accurate enough [Han et al., 2022]. As shown by the proof of Corollary 1, the estimates $\widehat{M}_{1,T_0}$ and $\widehat{M}_{0,T_0}$ attained at the end of phase one are sufficiently accurate in the sense $\|\widehat{M}_{1,T_0} - M_1\|_{\max} + \|\widehat{M}_{0,T_0} - M_0\|_{\max} = O(\sigma_0 + \sigma_1)$ under the horizon condition stated there. Therefore, our IPW debiasing approach only uses the estimates from the second phase. Since the length of phase one is relatively small, we still have $O(T)$ data points for constructing the debiased estimator. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}_0^{\text{IPW}} &:= \frac{1}{T - T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{T - T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 0)}{1 - \pi_t} (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle) X_t \\ \widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}} &:= \frac{1}{T - T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{T - T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle) X_t. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Finally, given the low-rank assumption of MCB parameters, our final estimators are defined by the best rank- r approximation of $\widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}}$ and $\widehat{M}_0^{\text{IPW}}$, denoted by $\widehat{M}_1$ and $\widehat{M}_0$, respectively. More precisely, $\widehat{M}_1 = \widehat{L}_1 \widehat{L}_1^\top \widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}} \widehat{R}_1 \widehat{R}_1^\top$, where $\widehat{L}_1$ and $\widehat{R}_1$ consist of the left and right top- r singular vectors of $\widehat{M}_1^{\text{IPW}}$, respectively. As explained in Xia and Yuan [2021], spectral projection further reduces the variance at the cost of introducing a negligible bias. Using the plug-in method, we propose $\langle \widehat{M}_1 - \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle$ as the point estimator for the linear form $\langle M_1 - M_0, Q \rangle$.

5.2 Asymptotic normality

We now investigate the variances of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ and $\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle$, respectively, and prove that these test statistics are asymptotically normal under mild conditions. Two factors play key roles in determining the variance of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$: the properness of linear form Q and the source of variances in estimating $\widehat{M}_1$. Xia and Yuan [2021] and Ma et al. [2023a] show that the variance of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ is characterized by the alignment between Q and M_1 . More precisely, the quantity $\|\mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F$ determines the size the variance, where

$$\mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q) := Q - L_{1\perp} L_{1\perp}^\top Q R_{1\perp} R_{1\perp}^\top$$

with $L_{1\perp}$ and $R_{1\perp}$ such that $(L_1, L_{1\perp})$ and $(R_1, R_{1\perp})$ are $d_1 \times d_1$ and $d_2 \times d_2$ orthogonal matrices. If Q is orthogonal to M_1 in the sense that $L_1^\top Q = 0$ and $Q R_1 = 0$, the statistical inference for $\langle M_1, Q \rangle$ becomes an ill-posed problem.

There are two sources of variance when constructing the de-biased estimator $\widehat{M}_1$: the effective sample size and the variance inflation caused by IPW. The former concerns how likely arm 1 will be pulled over time, and the latter is mainly determined by the occasions when arm 1 is pulled for exploration. We characterize these variances by the following arm optimality conditions. For any $\delta > 0$, define $\Omega_1(\delta) := \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle > \delta\}$, $\Omega_0(\delta) := \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \langle M_0 - M_1, X \rangle < \delta\}$, and $\Omega_\emptyset(\delta) := (\Omega_1(\delta) \cup \Omega_0(\delta))^c$. Essentially, $\Omega_1(\delta)$ represents the instances where arm 1 is the optimal one, with an expected regret that is strictly larger than that of the other arm. The parameter δ is often referred to as the reward gap between the optimal and sub-optimal arms. For notational cleanness, we simply write Ω_0, Ω_1 , and $\Omega_\emptyset$ to omit their dependence on δ . The two sets Ω_1 and Ω_0 make distinct contributions to the variance of $\widehat{M}_1$. Suppose that $\widehat{M}_0$ and $\widehat{M}_1$ are sufficiently accurate so that Ω_1 and Ω_0 are already identifiable from historical data. For a future observation, if the request $X_t \in \Omega_1$, it is utilized in constructing $\widehat{M}_1$ with a probability approaching to one as $t \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, if the request $X_t \in \Omega_0$, this probability approaches zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The effective sample size is determined by Ω_1 , and variance inflation due to IPW is mainly caused by Ω_0 . Let $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1}(M)$ denote the operator which zeros out the entries of M except those in the set Ω_1 .

Assumption 1. (*Arm Optimality*) *There exists a gap $\delta > 0$ such that the sets Ω_0, Ω_1 , and $\Omega_\emptyset$ ensure $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_\emptyset} \mathcal{P}_{M_i}(Q)\|_F^2 / \min\{\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_{M_i}(Q)\|_F^2, \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{M_i}(Q)\|_F^2\} = o(1)$ as $d_1, d_2 \rightarrow \infty$ for $i = 0, 1$.*

It is worth noting that the gap specified in Assumption 1 is allowed to diminish as $d_1, d_2 \rightarrow \infty$, which is much weaker than the existing literature that requires a constant gap. See, e.g., Bastani

and Bayati [2020]. Note that observations with requests sampled from the set $\Omega_\emptyset$ also contribute to the variances of $\widehat{M}_0$ and $\widehat{M}_1$. However, it is difficult to identify the optimal arm if the request $X_t \in \Omega_\emptyset$, especially when the gap δ diminishes asymptotically. This poses significant challenges in precisely characterizing the variance contributed by the set $\Omega_\emptyset$. For technical convenience, we assume that the variance contributed by $\Omega_\emptyset$ is negligible compared with those from Ω_0 and Ω_1 .

The following theorem instates the central limit theorem for $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ and $\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle$. Here $\|Q\|_{\ell_1}$ denotes the vectorized ℓ_1 -norm, i.e., $\|Q\|_{\ell_1} = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} |\langle Q, X \rangle|$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that the conditions in Corollary 1 hold and Assumption 1 holds with $\delta^2 := \delta_T^2 := C_1(\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_1^2)(rd_1/T^{1-\gamma}) \log^4 d_1$ for some large constant $C_1 > 0$. Define $S_1^2 = T^{-\gamma} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F^2$ and $S_0^2 = T^{-\gamma} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{M_0}(Q)\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_{M_0}(Q)\|_F^2$, where $C_\gamma = 2/(c_2(1 + \gamma))$ and c_2 is defined in Corollary 1. Assume that for each $i = 0, 1$,*

$$\frac{r^2 d_1 \log^5 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} + \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \frac{\|Q\|_{\ell_1}}{S_i} \rightarrow 0 \quad (9)$$

as $d_1, d_2, T \rightarrow \infty$. Then,

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_0, Q \rangle}{\sigma_0 S_0 \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle - \langle M_1, Q \rangle}{\sigma_1 S_1 \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad (10)$$

as $d_1, d_2, T \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 3 shows that the variance of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ is characterized by two terms:

$$\frac{\sigma_1^2 d_1 d_2}{T} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F^2 + \frac{2\sigma_1^2 d_1 d_2}{c_2(1 + \gamma) T^{1-\gamma}} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F^2, \quad (11)$$

where the former term arises from exploitation with an effective sample size $\asymp T$, and the latter derives from exploration with an effective sample size $\asymp T^{1-\gamma}$. The additional $O(T^\gamma)$ factor in the latter term can also be interpreted as the variance inflation induced by IPW. If the arm optimality sets are balanced, such that $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F$ are comparable, the variance is primarily determined by the second term, implying that the error rate of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ decays at the order $O(T^{-(1-\gamma)/2})$. Moreover, observations with requests from Ω_0 play the predominant role in characterizing the variance of $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$. One particularly interesting case occurs when the first term in (11) dominates, so that the sup-norm error rate of de-biased estimator $\|\widehat{M}_1 - M_1\|_{\max}$ converges at the order $O(T^{-1/2})$, suggesting that IPW may improve the estimation accuracy of the estimator produced by bandit Algorithm 1.

5.3 Policy inference

The asymptotic normality established in Theorem 3 depends on some unknown quantities such as $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1}\mathcal{P}_{M_0}(Q)\|_F, \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{M_0}(Q)\|_F, \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1}\mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F$, and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0}\mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q)\|_F$. These quantities must be estimated for the purposes of constructing confidence intervals and testing hypothesis (6).

Towards that end, we propose the following estimators:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_0^2 &:= \frac{1}{T-T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=0)}{1-\pi_t} (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle)^2 \\ \hat{\sigma}_1^2 &:= \frac{1}{T-T_0} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} (r_t - \langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle)^2 \\ \widehat{S}_0^2 &= \left(1/T^\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{\Omega}_{0,T}}\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}_0}(Q)\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{\Omega}_{1,T}}\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}_0}(Q)\|_F^2 \right) b_T \\ \widehat{S}_1^2 &= \left(1/T^\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{\Omega}_{1,T}}\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}_1}(Q)\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{\Omega}_{1,T}}\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}_1}(Q)\|_F^2 \right) b_T.\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}_{i,T} = \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \langle \widehat{M}_{i,T} - \widehat{M}_{1-i,T}, X \rangle > 0\}$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $b_T = T/(T - T_0)$. In the supplementary materials, we show that all these estimators are consistent, and the asymptotic normality still holds when replacing the standard deviations by its data-driven estimates.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 3 hold. Then,*

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_0, Q \rangle}{\widehat{\sigma}_0 \widehat{S}_0 \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle - \langle M_1, Q \rangle}{\widehat{\sigma}_1 \widehat{S}_1 \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

as $d_1, d_2, T \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, we need to study the distribution of the point estimator $\langle \widehat{M}_1 - \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle = \langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle - \langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle$ and its studentized version to test between the two hypotheses in (6). A simple fact is that $\langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle$ and $\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle$ are uncorrelated, and the following asymptotic normality holds. This immediately enables the classic Z-test and the construction of valid confidence intervals.

Corollary 2. *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 3 hold. Then,*

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{M}_1 - \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_1 - M_0, Q \rangle}{\sqrt{(\widehat{\sigma}_0^2 \widehat{S}_0^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \widehat{S}_1^2) d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

as $d_1, d_2, T \rightarrow \infty$.

6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present several numerical studies to evaluate the practical performance of matrix completion bandit.

6.1 Statistical Inference

First, we show the performance of online inference. The dimension of the true matrices M_1 and M_0 are $d_1 = d_2 = 300$, with a rank $r = 2$. We generate M_1 by applying SVD to a random matrix with entries independently drawn from $U(-100, 100)$. M_0 is obtained by first adding a perturbation matrix with entries drawn from $U(-2, 2)$ to the aforementioned matrix, and then applying SVD to obtain a low-rank matrix using the same procedure. This construction ensures that the gap between corresponding entries in the two matrices is relatively small. $\lambda_{\max}$ is approximately 1981.3 and $\lambda_{\min}$ is about 1950.5. The noise level is set to be $\sigma_1 = \sigma_0 = 1$. The initial estimates $\widehat{M}_{1,0}$ and $\widehat{M}_{0,0}$ are obtained by randomly collecting some offline data and then applying the SOFT-IMPUTE algorithm proposed in Mazumder et al. [2010].

We propose the inference procedure on several scenarios: (1) $\langle M_1, e_1 e_5^\top \rangle$, (2) $\langle M_0, e_1 e_5^\top \rangle$, (3) $\langle M_0 - M_1, e_1 e_5^\top \rangle$ and (4) $\langle M_0, e_1 e_5^\top - e_2 e_2^\top \rangle$. For each scenario, we conduct 1000 independent runs under two different settings: $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$. For both settings, the sample size is set to be $T = 60000$ and $T_0 = 20000$. The exploration parameter is set to be $\varepsilon = 0.6$ for phase *I*, while $\varepsilon_t = 10t^{-\gamma}$ for phase *II*. The stepsize is $\eta = 0.025 \frac{d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma} \lambda_{\max}}$ for phase *I* and $\eta_t = \varepsilon_t \eta$ for phase *II*.

In Figure 1, we present the density histogram of $(\langle \widehat{M}_i, Q \rangle - \langle M_i, Q \rangle) / \widehat{\sigma}_i \widehat{S}_i \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ (scenario (1),(2),(4)) or $((\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle) - (\langle M_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_1, Q \rangle)) / \sqrt{(\widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \widehat{S}_1^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_0^2 \widehat{S}_0^2) d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ (scenario (3)) for each scenario under $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$. The empirical distributions are very close to the standard normal distribution represented by the red curve. Figure 2 displays the results under $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$, which also align with the theoretical findings.

6.2 Regret Analysis

Next, we proceed to verify the regret of the matrix completion bandit algorithm under the same settings. For $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$, the time T vary from 40,000 to 80,000 in increments of 5,000, while setting $T_0 = 13.5T^{1-\gamma}$ for each T . Similarly, for $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$, we vary T from 20,000 to 60,000, also in increments of 5,000, and T_0 is set to be $4.5T^{1-\gamma}$ for each T . We conduct 100 simulation trials and plot the average cumulative regret against $T^{2/3}$ when $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ and $T^{3/4}$ when $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$. Figure 3 clearly demonstrates a linear scaling, indicating that the cumulative regret follows an $O(T^{2/3})$ trend when $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$, and an $O(T^{3/4})$ trend when $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$, which aligns with our theoretical result in Theorem 2.




Figure 1: Empirical distribution of $(\langle \widehat{M}_i, Q \rangle - \langle M_i, Q \rangle) / \widehat{\sigma}_i \widehat{S}_i \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ or $((\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle) - (\langle M_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_1, Q \rangle)) / \sqrt{(\widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \widehat{S}_1^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_0^2 \widehat{S}_0^2) d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ based on 1000 independent trails under $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$, and the red curve represents the p.d.f. of standard normal distributions. Top left: scenario (1); top right: scenario (2). Bottom left: scenario (3); bottom right: scenario (4).

7 Real Data Analysis: *SFpark* Parking Pricing Project

Starting in April 2011, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) adopted the *SFpark* pilot project, which marked the largest pricing reform for on-street parking in San Francisco. The objective of this project was to effectively manage parking towards availability targets. Prior to that, parking meters in San Francisco charged a single hourly price regardless of the time of day or location within a zone. Consequently, certain blocks experienced severe overcrowding especially during peak hours, while others remained underutilized. Recognizing this issue, extensive literature has identified the on-street parking pricing as the dominant factor that determines parking behavior




Figure 2: Empirical distribution of $(\langle \widehat{M}_i, Q \rangle - \langle M_i, Q \rangle) / \widehat{\sigma}_i \widehat{S}_i \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ or $((\langle \widehat{M}_0, Q \rangle - \langle \widehat{M}_1, Q \rangle) - (\langle M_0, Q \rangle - \langle M_1, Q \rangle)) / \sqrt{(\widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \widehat{S}_1^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_0^2 \widehat{S}_0^2) d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$ based on 1000 independent trails under $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$, and the red curve represents the p.d.f. of standard normal distributions. Top left: scenario (1); top right: scenario (2). Bottom left: scenario (3); bottom right: scenario (4).

(Aljohani et al. [2021]). In general, higher prices encourage a few drivers to move away from the most crowded blocks, while lower prices attract the drivers to the underoccupied blocks.

SFpark thus allocates parking spaces more efficiently than uniform prices can by adjusting the price varied by time of day, day of week and from block to block. The occupancy rate of a block of a given hour is defined to be divided by 3600 seconds multiplied by the number of spaces in the block. SFMTA established the desired target occupancy rate for every block at each hour at between 60% and 80%. Numerous previous studies have evaluated the effectiveness of *SFpark* (Pierce and Shoup [2013], Millard-Ball et al. [2014]). We would like to apply our matrix completion bandit algorithm on *SFpark* data, and determine the optimal parking prices for each block in a specific hour, with




Figure 3: Average empirical cumulative regret against $T^{2/3}$ for $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ (left) and $T^{3/4}$ for $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$ (right) under 100 trials.

the aim of achieving the target occupancy rates for a greater number of blocks and time periods.

We collected the data from <https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/drive-park/demand-responsive-parking/sfpark-evaluation>. The dataset includes the hourly occupancy rate and price for each block at every hour, covering seven pilot zones and two control zones, across each day throughout the study period from April 2011 to July 2013. The pilot zones implemented a new pricing policy and involved significant data collection, while the control zones had no new policy but still underwent substantial data collection. During the study period, SFMTA executed ten demand-responsive parking price adjustments in the pilot zones, where price for each block at every hour was adjusted gradually and periodically according to the following rules: if the average occupancy rate after last adjustment was between 60% and 80%, the hourly price would remain unchanged; if the average occupancy rate was larger than 80%, the hourly price would be raised; if the occupancy rate was less than 60%, the hourly price would be lowered. In the following analysis, we will focus on the data from Downtown, which is one of the designated pilot zones, covering the time period from April 1st, 2011, to March 27th, 2012, as an illustrative example. We choose to include only one year of data because the occupancy rate after 2012 can be influenced by confounding factors such as changes in garage policies and overall city traffic developments. During the selected time period, a total of four pricing adjustments occurred on the following dates: August 1st, 2011; October 11th, 2011; December 13th, 2011; and February 14th, 2012. These adjustments allow us to divide the entire time period into five distinct periods for further analysis.

Most parking meters in Downtown are operational from 7am to 6pm, and the traffic conditions differ between weekdays and weekends. To capture this variation, we define $d_2 = 22$, representing each hour from 7 am to 6 pm on both weekdays and weekends. Here the action 1 corresponds to a high-price policy, where the hourly price is larger than or equal to \$3.5. Conversely, action 0

represents a low-price policy, with an hourly price below \$3.5. We identified $d_1 = 34$ blocks that had at least one hour for both actions during the entire time period. The underlying matrices M_1 and M_0 represent the expected deviation of the real occupancy rate from the target range $[0.6, 0.8]$ across different blocks and hours, under high price and low price, respectively. For instance, when making a decision for block $j_1 \in [d_1]$ at hour $j_2 \in [d_1]$, the contextual matrix can be represented as $X_t = e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top$. If we further choose $a_t = 1$ for the high price and observe an occupancy rate of 0.7, the reward r_t would be calculated as $r_t = 0$; if the actual occupancy rate is 0.5 or 0.9, then $r_t = -0.1$. To simulate the online data collection procedure, we evaluate each observation by comparing the decision made by our algorithm with the actual observed action. If they align, we retain the sample to fit the model and update the online estimators. Otherwise, we discard it and proceed to the next sample. Each hour for every block on each day throughout the entire time period is treated as an observation, resulting in a time horizon $T = 105,825$. Given that we have a nearly equal amount of data for each block and hour, we can consider the context X_t to be uniformly distributed, meeting our requirements. We set the low rank $r = 5$ since $\sum_{k=1}^5 \lambda_{1,k} / \sum_{k=1}^{22} \lambda_{1,k} = 0.843$ and $\sum_{k=1}^5 \lambda_{0,k} / \sum_{k=1}^{22} \lambda_{0,k} = 0.840$, where $\lambda_{1,k}$ and $\lambda_{0,k}$ denote the k -th singular values of the roughly estimated M_1 and M_0 .

We select two representative blocks and conduct statistical inference for their corresponding entries. The first one is the weekday of block 02ND ST 200, and the other is the weekend of block BATTERY ST 400. The average hourly occupancy rates for these blocks across different periods are shown in Figure 4. Clearly, 02ND ST 200 is a crowded block in period 1, with an occupancy rate consistently exceeding 80%, particularly after 12 pm. Throughout all five periods, the *SFpark* policy maintained high prices for all hours on weekdays for 02ND ST 200, resulting in a noticeable decrease in the occupancy rate due to the sustained high pricing. However, it's important to note from Figure 4 that the occupancy rate usually did not reach 60% during the early morning hours. The prolonged high prices during these hours further pushed the occupancy rate away from the target range. Conversely, our learned policy suggests implementing low prices before 11 am, which facilitates optimal utilization of parking spaces during these hours. Table 1 indicates that action 0 demonstrates statistical significance at the 95% confidence level before 12 pm, while action 1 shows statistical significance most of the time after 12 pm. On the other hand, BATTERY ST 400 represents an underutilized block, with an occupancy rate consistently below 60% on weekends. The *SFpark* policy began implementing low prices for BATTERY ST 400 starting from period 2, resulting in an increasing trend in the occupancy rate from period 2 to 5. Our analysis in Table 2 also demonstrates that action 0 exhibits statistical significance for most of the hours during




Figure 4: Average Occupancy Rate of 5 periods in different time of day of Left: Weekday of 02ND ST 200; Right: Weekend of BATTERY ST 400.

weekends, indicating the effectiveness of the price adjustments.

Time	7	8	9	10	11
p-value	0.282	0.016	0.009	0.002	0.304

Time	12	13	14	15	16	17
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.773	<0.001	0.999

Table 1: Top : the p-values of $H_0 : \langle M_0 - M_1, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle \leq 0$ vs $H_1 : \langle M_0 - M_1, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle > 0$, where j_1 denotes block 02ND ST 200 and j_2 denotes weekday 7am to 11am; Bottom : the p-values of $H_0 : \langle M_1 - M_0, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle \leq 0$ vs $H_1 : \langle M_1 - M_0, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle > 0$, where j_1 denotes block 02ND ST 200 and j_2 denotes weekday 12pm to 17pm.

Finally, we evaluate the overall performance of matrix completion bandit in comparison to the originally *SFpark* policy. This time, to generate the online data, we follow the same method as described earlier, keeping the samples where our decision coincides with the actual action. However, in cases where the actual action contradicts our decision, we utilize the occupancy rate of the current block and time with the matching action from the nearest date to fit the model, instead of simply dropping the sample. We only discard a sample when no other samples are available for the same actions at the given block and time.

Figure 5 displays the percentage of all the selected time and blocks that achieved the target occupancy rate in each period under both *SFpark* policy and matrix completion bandit. Across

Time	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
p-value	0.002	0.019	0.024	0.272	0.038	<0.001	0.010	0.002	0.003	<0.001	0.003

Table 2: The p-values of $H_0 : \langle M_0 - M_1, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle \leq 0$ vs $H_1 : \langle M_0 - M_1, e_{j_1} e_{j_2}^\top \rangle > 0$, where j_1 denotes block BATTERY ST 400 and j_2 denotes weekend 7am to 17pm.




Figure 5: Comparison of percentage of blocks and times achieve target occupancy rate over periods under Matrix Completion Bandit and *SFPark* policy

all time periods, there was an overall improvement in achieving the target occupancy rate. The matrix completion bandit consistently outperformed the original policy, particularly in the first three periods. This is because the original *SFPark* policy explored too much and may adopt sub-optimal policies in the beginning, sometimes maintaining unsuitable prices for more than one period. In contrast, the matrix completion bandit could adjust the price as soon as it detected that the current policy was not optimal enough.

References

- Alekh Agarwal, Daniel Hsu, Satyen Kale, John Langford, Lihong Li, and Robert Schapire. Taming the monster: A fast and simple algorithm for contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1638–1646. PMLR, 2014.
- Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Thompson sampling for contextual bandits with linear payoffs. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 127–135. PMLR, 2013.
- Meshari Aljohani, Stephan Olariu, Abrar Alali, and Shubham Jain. A survey of parking solutions

- for smart cities. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(8):10012–10029, 2021.
- Susan Athey, Mohsen Bayati, Nikolay Doudchenko, Guido Imbens, and Khashayar Khosravi. Matrix completion methods for causal panel data models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1716–1730, 2021.
- Jushan Bai and Serena Ng. Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1746–1763, 2021.
- Gah-Yi Ban and Cynthia Rudin. The big data newsvendor: Practical insights from machine learning. *Operations Research*, 67(1):90–108, 2019.
- Hamsa Bastani and Mohsen Bayati. Online decision making with high-dimensional covariates. *Operations Research*, 68(1):276–294, 2020.
- Hamsa Bastani, Mohsen Bayati, and Khashayar Khosravi. Mostly exploration-free algorithms for contextual bandits. *Management Science*, 67(3):1329–1349, 2021.
- Mohsen Bayati, Mark Braverman, Michael Gillam, Karen M Mack, George Ruiz, Mark S Smith, and Eric Horvitz. Data-driven decisions for reducing readmissions for heart failure: General methodology and case study. *PloS one*, 9(10):e109264, 2014.
- Dimitris Bertsimas and Nathan Kallus. From predictive to prescriptive analytics. *Management Science*, 66(3):1025–1044, 2020.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Nathan Kallus, Alexander M Weinstein, and Ying Daisy Zhuo. Personalized diabetes management using electronic medical records. *Diabetes care*, 40(2):210–217, 2017.
- Aurélien Bibaut, Maria Dimakopoulou, Nathan Kallus, Antoine Chambaz, and Mark van Der Laan. Post-contextual-bandit inference. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:28548–28559, 2021.
- Léon Bottou, Jonas Peters, Joaquin Quiñonero-Candela, Denis X Charles, D Max Chickering, Elon Portugaly, Dipankar Ray, Patrice Simard, and Ed Snelson. Counterfactual reasoning and learning systems: The example of computational advertising. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(11), 2013.

- Samuel Burer and Renato DC Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. *Mathematical programming*, 95(2):329–357, 2003.
- Jian-Feng Cai, Jingyang Li, and Dong Xia. Online tensor learning: Computational and statistical trade-offs, adaptivity and optimal regret. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03372*, 2023.
- Emmanuel Candes and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Communications of the ACM*, 55(6):111–119, 2012.
- Emmanuel J Candes and Yaniv Plan. Matrix completion with noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98(6):925–936, 2010.
- Joshua Cape, Minh Tang, and Carey E Priebe. The two-to-infinity norm and singular subspace geometry with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2405–2439, 2019.
- Haoyu Chen, Wenbin Lu, and Rui Song. Statistical inference for online decision making: In a contextual bandit setting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(533):240–255, 2021.
- Xi Chen, Zehua Lai, He Li, and Yichen Zhang. Online statistical inference for contextual bandits via stochastic gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14883*, 2022a.
- Xi Chen, Zachary Owen, Clark Pixton, and David Simchi-Levi. A statistical learning approach to personalization in revenue management. *Management Science*, 68(3):1923–1937, 2022b.
- Yuxin Chen, Jianqing Fan, Cong Ma, and Yuling Yan. Inference and uncertainty quantification for noisy matrix completion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(46):22931–22937, 2019.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Christian Hansen, Yuan Liao, and Yinchu Zhu. Inference for low-rank models. *The Annals of statistics*, 51(3):1309–1330, 2023.
- Jungjun Choi and Ming Yuan. Matrix completion when missing is not at random and its applications in causal panel data models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02364*, 2023.
- Wei Chu, Lihong Li, Lev Reyzin, and Robert Schapire. Contextual bandits with linear payoff functions. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 208–214. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.

- Chandler Davis and William Morton Kahan. The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1):1–46, 1970.
- Aurélien Garivier, Tor Lattimore, and Emilie Kaufmann. On explore-then-commit strategies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 2016.
- Rong Ge, Jason D Lee, and Tengyu Ma. Matrix completion has no spurious local minimum. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Yonatan Gur, Ahmadreza Momeni, and Stefan Wager. Smoothness-adaptive contextual bandits. *Operations Research*, 70(6):3198–3216, 2022.
- Vitor Hadad, David A Hirshberg, Ruohan Zhan, Stefan Wager, and Susan Athey. Confidence intervals for policy evaluation in adaptive experiments. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 118(15):e2014602118, 2021.
- Peter Hall and Christopher C Heyde. *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic press, 2014.
- Qiyu Han, Will Wei Sun, and Yichen Zhang. Online statistical inference for matrix contextual bandit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11385*, 2022.
- YanJun Han, Zhengqing Zhou, Zhengyuan Zhou, Jose Blanchet, Peter W Glynn, and Yinyu Ye. Sequential batch learning in finite-action linear contextual bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.06321*, 2020.
- Botao Hao, Tor Lattimore, and Mengdi Wang. High-dimensional sparse linear bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:10753–10763, 2020.
- Trevor Hastie, Rahul Mazumder, Jason D Lee, and Reza Zadeh. Matrix completion and low-rank svd via fast alternating least squares. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3367–3402, 2015.
- BiYu He, Franklin Dexter, Alex Macario, and Stefanos Zenios. The timing of staffing decisions in hospital operating rooms: incorporating workload heterogeneity into the newsvendor problem. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 14(1):99–114, 2012.

- Chi Jin, Sham M Kakade, and Praneeth Netrapalli. Provable efficient online matrix completion via non-convex stochastic gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 2016.
- Nicholas Johnson, Vidyashankar Sivakumar, and Arindam Banerjee. Structured stochastic linear bandits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05693*, 2016.
- Kwang-Sung Jun, Rebecca Willett, Stephen Wright, and Robert Nowak. Bilinear bandits with low-rank structure. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3163–3172. PMLR, 2019.
- Kaggle. Estimate the unit sales of walmart retail goods. <https://www.kaggle.com/competitions/m5-forecasting-accuracy>, 2020.
- Raghunandan Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from noisy entries. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 22, 2009.
- Raghunandan H Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from a few entries. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(6):2980–2998, 2010.
- Edward S Kim, Roy S Herbst, Ignacio I Wistuba, J Jack Lee, George R Blumenschein Jr, Anne Tsao, David J Stewart, Marshall E Hicks, Jeremy Erasmus Jr, Sanjay Gupta, et al. The battle trial: personalizing therapy for lung cancer. *Cancer discovery*, 1(1):44–53, 2011.
- Gi-Soo Kim and Myunghee Cho Paik. Doubly-robust lasso bandit. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii, Karim Lounici, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2302 – 2329, 2011a. doi: 10.1214/11-AOS894. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/11-AOS894>.
- Vladimir Koltchinskii, Karim Lounici, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2302 – 2329, 2011b. doi: 10.1214/11-AOS894. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/11-AOS894>.
- John Langford and Tong Zhang. The epoch-greedy algorithm for multi-armed bandits with side information. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 20, 2007.
- Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.

- Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- Wenjie Li, Adarsh Barik, and Jean Honorio. A simple unified framework for high dimensional bandit problems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12619–12655. PMLR, 2022.
- Yangyi Lu, Amirhossein Meisami, and Ambuj Tewari. Low-rank generalized linear bandit problems. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 460–468. PMLR, 2021.
- Alexander R Luedtke and Mark J Van Der Laan. Statistical inference for the mean outcome under a possibly non-unique optimal treatment strategy. *Annals of statistics*, 44(2):713, 2016.
- Cong Ma, Kaizheng Wang, Yuejie Chi, and Yuxin Chen. Implicit regularization in nonconvex statistical estimation: Gradient descent converges linearly for phase retrieval and matrix completion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3345–3354. PMLR, 2018.
- Wanteng Ma, Lilun Du, Dong Xia, and Ming Yuan. Multiple testing of linear forms for noisy matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00305*, 2023a.
- Wanteng Ma, Dong Xia, and Jiashuo Jiang. High-dimensional linear bandits with knapsacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01327*, 2023b.
- Benedict C May, Nathan Korda, Anthony Lee, and David S Leslie. Optimistic bayesian sampling in contextual-bandit problems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:2069–2106, 2012.
- Rahul Mazumder, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Spectral regularization algorithms for learning large incomplete matrices. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2287–2322, 2010.
- Sentao Miao and Xiuli Chao. Online personalized assortment optimization with high-dimensional customer contextual data. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 24(5):2741–2760, 2022.
- Adam Millard-Ball, Rachel R Weinberger, and Robert C Hampshire. Is the curb 80% full or 20% empty? assessing the impacts of san francisco’s parking pricing experiment. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 63:76–92, 2014.

- Susan A Murphy. Optimal dynamic treatment regimes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 65(2):331–355, 2003.
- Min-hwan Oh, Garud Iyengar, and Assaf Zeevi. Sparsity-agnostic lasso bandit. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8271–8280. PMLR, 2021.
- Mustafa Erhan Ozer, Pemra Ozbek Sarica, and Kazim Yalcin Arga. New machine learning applications to accelerate personalized medicine in breast cancer: rise of the support vector machines. *Omics: a journal of integrative biology*, 24(5):241–246, 2020.
- Vianney Perchet and Philippe Rigollet. The multi-armed bandit problem with covariates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):693 – 721, 2013. doi: 10.1214/13-AOS1101. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOS1101>.
- Vianney Perchet, Philippe Rigollet, Sylvain Chassang, and Erik Snowberg. Batched bandit problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):660–681, 2016.
- Gregory Pierce and Donald Shoup. Getting the prices right: an evaluation of pricing parking by demand in san francisco. *Journal of the american planning association*, 79(1):67–81, 2013.
- Zhimei Ren and Zhengyuan Zhou. Dynamic batch learning in high-dimensional sparse linear contextual bandits. *Management Science*, 2023.
- SFMTA. Sfpark evaluation. <https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/drive-park/demand-responsive-pricing/sfpark-evaluation>, 2013.
- Ye Shen, Hengrui Cai, and Rui Song. Robust interval estimation for optimal policy evaluation in online learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.15501*, 2021.
- Xiaoyuan Su and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey of collaborative filtering techniques. *Advances in artificial intelligence*, 2009, 2009.
- Yi Su, Maria Dimakopoulou, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Miroslav Dudík. Doubly robust off-policy evaluation with shrinkage. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9167–9176. PMLR, 2020.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.

- Xue Wang, Mingcheng Wei, and Tao Yao. Minimax concave penalized multi-armed bandit model with high-dimensional covariates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5200–5208. PMLR, 2018.
- Yu-Xiang Wang, Alekh Agarwal, and Miroslav Dudík. Optimal and adaptive off-policy evaluation in contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3589–3597. PMLR, 2017.
- Per-Ake Wedin. Perturbation bounds in connection with singular value decomposition. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 12:99–111, 1972.
- Dong Xia. Normal approximation and confidence region of singular subspaces. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2):3798–3851, 2021.
- Dong Xia and Ming Yuan. Statistical inferences of linear forms for noisy matrix completion. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 83(1):58–77, 2021.
- Ruoxuan Xiong and Markus Pelger. Large dimensional latent factor modeling with missing observations and applications to causal inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 233(1):271–301, 2023.
- Yuling Yan, Yuxin Chen, and Jianqing Fan. Inference for heteroskedastic pca with missing data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12365*, 2021.
- Ruohan Zhan, Vitor Hadad, David A Hirshberg, and Susan Athey. Off-policy evaluation via adaptive weighting with data from contextual bandits. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 2125–2135, 2021.
- Hao Zhang, Heng Yang, Tao Huang, and Gaoqiang Zhan. Dbncf: Personalized courses recommendation system based on dbn in mooc environment. In *2017 international symposium on educational technology (ISET)*, pages 106–108. IEEE, 2017.
- Kelly Zhang, Lucas Janson, and Susan Murphy. Statistical inference with m-estimators on adaptively collected data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:7460–7471, 2021.
- Qinqing Zheng and John Lafferty. Convergence analysis for rectangular matrix completion using burer-monteiro factorization and gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07051*, 2016.
- Mo Zhou, Yoshimi Fukuoka, Yonatan Mintz, Ken Goldberg, Philip Kaminsky, Elena Flowers, Anil Aswani, et al. Evaluating machine learning-based automated personalized daily step goals

delivered through a mobile phone app: Randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 6(1):e9117, 2018.

Supplement to “Online Policy Learning and Inference by Matrix Completion ”

A Proofs of Main Results

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Define event

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_t = & \left\{ \forall i \in \{0, 1\}, \forall \tau < t : \|\widehat{M}_{i,\tau} - M_i\|_F^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^{\tau} \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \|\widehat{M}_{i,0} - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}, \right. \\ & \|\widehat{M}_{i,\tau} - M_i\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^{\tau} \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2}, \\ & \left. \|e_l^\top \widehat{U}_{i,\tau} \widehat{V}_{i,\tau}^\top\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}, \|e_j^\top \widehat{V}_{i,\tau} \widehat{U}_{i,\tau}^\top\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}, \quad \forall l \in [d_1], j \in [d_2] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f(\eta_k) = \frac{\eta_k \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2}$ and $\mu_0 = 100\mu$.

Recall in Algorithm 1, at each step, we update $\widetilde{U}_{i,t}$ and $\widetilde{V}_{i,t}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{U}_{i,t} &= \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} - \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = i)}{i\pi_t + (1-i)(1-\pi_t)} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t) X_t \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}, \\ \widetilde{V}_{i,t} &= \widehat{V}_{i,t-1} - \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = i)}{i\pi_t + (1-i)(1-\pi_t)} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t) X_t^\top \widehat{U}_{i,t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{U}_{i,t} \widehat{V}_{i,t}^\top &= \widetilde{U}_{i,t} \widetilde{V}_{i,t}^\top = \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top - \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = i)}{i\pi_t + (1-i)(1-\pi_t)} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - y_t) X_t \widehat{V}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top \\ &\quad - \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = i)}{i\pi_t + (1-i)(1-\pi_t)} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t) \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{U}_{i,t-1}^\top X_t \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = i)}{i\pi_t^2 + (1-i)(1-\pi_t)^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{i,t-1} \widehat{V}_{i,t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - r_t)^2 X_t \widehat{V}_{i,t-1} \widehat{U}_{i,t-1}^\top X_t. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, in the rest of the proof, we only consider $i = 1$ and omit the subscript i , then $i = 0$ case can be proved similarly. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_t &= \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) X_t \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t \\ &\quad - \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 X_t \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_t = \mathbb{P}(a_t = 1 | X_t, \mathcal{F}_{t-1})$. In the following steps, we prove that if event $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$ happens, event $\mathcal{E}_t$ will happen with high probability.

step1: bounding $\|\hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2$

We have $\hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t = \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - \Delta_t$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 - 2\langle \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle + \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}].$$

We first compute $2\langle \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle &= \frac{2\eta_t}{d_1 d_2} (\|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \|\hat{U}_{t-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|_{\text{F}}^2) \\ &\quad - 2\eta_t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \left(\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle^2 \langle X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t, \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \xi_t^2 \langle X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t, \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle \right) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\max} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \sigma^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear to see that $\|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \|\hat{U}_{t-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|_{\text{F}}^2 \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}}{2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2$, and we apply $\frac{1}{\pi_t} \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t}$ in the latter term. Applying the incoherence property of $\hat{U}_{t-1}$, $\hat{V}_{t-1}$, U and V and Cauchy Schwarz inequality, $\|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\max} = O(\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}})$ and $\|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \leq \frac{2\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}}$ under event $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle \mathbb{E}[\Delta_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle &\geq \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{8\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \sigma^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we compute $\mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$. Since $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta_t\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &\leq 3\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \|X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad + 3\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^4} \eta_t^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^4 \|X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t\|_{\text{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \|X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{2\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2 + \mathbb{E}[\xi_t^2] \mathbb{E} \left[\|X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right) \\
& \leq \frac{2\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \sigma^2 \frac{1}{d_2} \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \frac{2\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \frac{2\eta_t^2 r \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2} O(\lambda_{\max}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since $\|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq r \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2$ and $\|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 = O(\lambda_{\max}^2)$.

By symmetry, $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \leq \frac{2\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} + \frac{2\eta_t^2 r \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} O(\lambda_{\max}^2)$. Similarly, the last expectation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^4} \eta_t^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^4 \|X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{8\eta_t^4}{\varepsilon_t^3} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle^4 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 + \mathbb{E}(\xi_t^4) \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \right) \\
& \lesssim \frac{\eta_t^4}{\varepsilon_t^3} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \sum (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 \right) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \frac{\eta_t^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_t^3} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \\
& \lesssim \frac{\eta_t^4}{\varepsilon_t^3} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^3 d_2^3} \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \frac{\eta_t^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_t^3} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As long as $\eta_t \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 r \kappa^2}$, the second order terms of η_t above will dominate the fourth order terms. Above all, for some positive constants c_1 and c_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2\mathbb{E} \left(\langle \Delta_t, \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right) + \mathbb{E} (\|\Delta_t\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\
& \leq \left(-\frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} + \frac{c_1 \eta_t^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2^2} \right) \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2} \\
& \leq -f(\eta_t) \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $f(\eta_t) = \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{2d_1 d_2}$. The second order term $\frac{c_1 \eta_t^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2^2}$ is dominated as long as $\eta_t \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_t d_2}{\mu_0 r \kappa \lambda_{\max}}$.

Next, we use telescoping to derive the relationship between $\|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ and $\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$.

Notice that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M\|_F^2 &= \|\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - \Delta_t - M\|_F^2 = \|\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 - 2\langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle + \|\Delta_t\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 - 2(\langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle - \mathbb{E}(\langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})) \\
&\quad + (\|\Delta_t\|_F^2 - \mathbb{E}(\|\Delta_t\|_F^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})) - 2\mathbb{E}(\langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) + \mathbb{E}(\|\Delta_t\|_F^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\
&\leq (1 - f(\eta_t)) \|\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{2(\mathbb{E}(\langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) - \langle \Delta_t, \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M \rangle)}_{A_t} + \underbrace{(\|\Delta_t\|_F^2 - \mathbb{E}(\|\Delta_t\|_F^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}))}_{B_t} \\
&= (1 - f(\eta_t))(1 - f(\eta_{t-1})) \|\widehat{U}_{t-2} \widehat{V}_{t-2}^\top - M\|_F^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2} + (1 - f(\eta_t)) \frac{c_2 \eta_{t-1}^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_{t-1} d_2} \\
&\quad + (1 - f(\eta_t))(A_{t-1} + B_{t-1}) + (A_t + B_t) \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \frac{c_2 \eta_\tau^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_2} + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + A_t + B_t \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + A_t + B_t.
\end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 1, we show $\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + A_t$ and $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + B_t$ will be dominated.

Lemma 1. *For any $1 \leq t \leq T$, under the conditions in Theorem 1 and event $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$, with probability at least $1 - td_1^{-200}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + A_t &\lesssim \gamma \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \gamma \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}, \\
\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + B_t &\lesssim \gamma \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \gamma \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combine with the union bound, with probability at least $1 - td_1^{-200}$,

$$\|U_t V_t^\top - M\|_F^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|U_0 V_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}.$$

step2: Incoherence

In Lemma 2, we prove the incoherence property holds true for every U_t and V_t .

Lemma 2. *For any $1 \leq t \leq T$, under the conditions in Theorem 1 and event $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$, with probability at least $1 - td_1^{-200}$,*

$$\|e_l^\top \widehat{U}_{i,\tau} \widehat{V}_{i,\tau}^\top\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} \quad \|e_j^\top \widehat{V}_{i,\tau} \widehat{U}_{i,\tau}^\top\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}, \quad \forall l \in [d_1], j \in [d_2],$$

where $\mu_0 = 100\mu$.

step3: Bounding $\|\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M\|_{\max}^2$

In order to bound $\|\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M\|_{\max}^2$, we need to bound $\|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M)\|^2$ and $\|e_j^\top (\widehat{V}_t \widehat{U}_t^\top - M^\top)\|^2$ for any $l \in [d_1], j \in [d_2]$ first.

Lemma 3. *For any $1 \leq t \leq T$, under the conditions in Theorem 1 and event $\mathcal{E}_{t-1}$, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-200}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M)\|^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}, \\ \|e_j^\top (\widehat{V}_t \widehat{U}_t^\top - M^\top)\|^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} \end{aligned}$$

for $\forall l \in [d_1], j \in [d_2]$.

Now we are ready to prove the upper bound for $\|\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M\|_{\max}^2$. For simplicity, denote $\widehat{M}_t = \widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top$. The SVD of $\widehat{M}_t$ and M are $M_t = \widehat{L}_t \widehat{\Lambda}_t \widehat{R}_t$ and $M = L \Lambda R$, respectively. Then, $\widehat{M}_t - M$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}_t - M &= \widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top \widehat{M}_t \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top - L L^\top M R R^\top \\ &= \widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top (\widehat{M}_t - M) \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top + (\widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top - L L^\top) M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top + L L^\top M (\widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top - R R^\top) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, for any $l \in [d_1], j \in [d_2]$, $e_l^\top (M_t - M) e_j$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_l^\top (\widehat{M}_t - M) e_j\|^2 &\lesssim \underbrace{\|e_l^\top \widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top (\widehat{M}_t - M) \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2}_I + \underbrace{\|e_l^\top (\widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top - L L^\top) M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2}_{II} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\|e_l^\top L L^\top M (\widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top - R R^\top) e_j\|^2}_{III}. \end{aligned}$$

Term I can be bounded in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\leq \|e_l^\top \widehat{L}_t \widehat{L}_t^\top\|^2 \|M_t - M\|_F^2 \|\widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r}{d_1} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \|\widehat{M}_0 - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right) \frac{\mu_0 r}{d_2} \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \|\widehat{M}_0 - M\|_F^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \mu_0^2 r^3 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2} \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \mu_0^2 r^3 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since $\|\widehat{M}_0 - M\|_F^2 \lesssim \lambda_{\min}^2$. Next, we look at Term II . Let $O_{\widehat{L}_t} = \arg \min_{O \in \mathbb{O}_r} \|\widehat{L}_t - LO\|$, where $\mathbb{O}_r$ denotes the set of all $r \times r$ real matrices with orthonormal columns, then

$$II \lesssim \|e_l^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t}) \widehat{L}_t^\top M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 + \|e_l^\top LO_{\widehat{L}_t} (\widehat{L}_t^\top - O_{\widehat{L}_t}^\top L^\top) M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2.$$

The second part can be bounded by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_l^\top LO_{\widehat{L}_t} (\widehat{L}_t^\top - O_{\widehat{L}_t}^\top L^\top) M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 &\leq \|e_l^\top LO_{\widehat{L}_t}\|^2 \|\widehat{L}_t^\top - O_{\widehat{L}_t}^\top L^\top\|^2 \|M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\mu r}{d_1} \|\widehat{L}_t^\top - O_{\widehat{L}_t}^\top L^\top\|^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the incoherence property and the consistency of matrix norm and vector norm. By Wedin's $\sin \Theta$ Theorem (Davis and Kahan [1970], Wedin [1972]),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{L}_t^\top - O_{\widehat{L}_t}^\top L^\top\|^2 &\leq \frac{4\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_F^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\|\widehat{M}_0 - M\|_F^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \kappa^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \\
&\lesssim \gamma \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) + \gamma \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \kappa^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first part can be bounded by the upper bound of $\|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^\top - M)\|^2$ we have obtained in Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_l^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t}) \widehat{L}_t^\top M \widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 &\leq \|e_l^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t})\|^2 \|\widehat{L}_t^\top M\|^2 \|\widehat{R}_t \widehat{R}_t^\top e_j\|^2 \\
&\leq \|e_l^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t})\|^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.7 in Cape et al. [2019] and Wedin's $\sin \Theta$ Theorem again,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_t^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t})\| &\leq 4 \frac{\|(I - LL^\top)(\widehat{M}_t - M)\|_{2,\max}}{\lambda_{\min}} + \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{L}_t, L)\|^2 \|L\|_{2,\max} \\
&\leq 4 \frac{\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_{2,\max} + \|LL^\top\| \|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_{2,\max}}{\lambda_{\min}} + \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{L}_t, L)\|^2 \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}} \\
&\leq 8 \frac{\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_{2,\max}}{\lambda_{\min}} + 2 \frac{\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_F}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_i^\top (\widehat{L}_t - LO_{\widehat{L}_t})\|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_{2,\max}^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} + \frac{\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_F^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r}{d_1} \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=t}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa)}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Above all,

$$II \lesssim \prod_{k=t}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2}.$$

By symmetry, following the same arguments, III will also have the same upper bound.

Combine the above three terms together as well as the union bound, we can conclude that with probability at least $1 - 8td_1^{-200}$,

$$\|\widehat{M}_t - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2}.$$

□

A.2 Proof of Corollary 1

Here we prove the upper bound of $\|\widehat{M}_{i,t} - M_i\|_F^2$ for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, and the entrywise error bound can be derived following the same arguments. According to the result in Theorem 1, when $1 \leq t \leq T_0 = C_0 T^{1-\gamma}$, $\eta_t = \eta = \frac{c_1 d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma} \lambda_{\max}^2}$ and $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{M}_{i,t} - M_i\|_F^2 &\lesssim \|\widehat{M}_{i,0} - M_i\|_F^2 \prod_{\tau=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}}\right) + \sigma_i^2 \frac{r \log^2 d_1}{d_2} \frac{tc_1^2 d_1^2 d_2^2 \log^2 d_1}{T^{2(1-\gamma)} \varepsilon} \\
&\lesssim \|\widehat{M}_{i,0} - M_i\|_F^2 \left(1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}}\right)^t + \frac{tr d_1^2 d_2 \log^4 d_1}{T^{2(1-\gamma)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$, $\varepsilon_t = c_2 t^{-\gamma}$ and $\eta_t = \varepsilon_t \eta$. Note that the contraction term becomes $(1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}})^{T_0} \prod_{\tau=T_0+1}^t (1 - \frac{c_1 c_2 \varepsilon_t \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}}) \leq (1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}})^{C_0 T^{1-\gamma}} = O(d_1^{-C_0 c_1 / 5\kappa})$. Since C_0 can be

sufficiently large, $O(d_1^{-C_0 c_1/4\kappa})$ can be small enough to make the first computational error term dominated by the second statistical error term. Therefore,

$$\|\widehat{M}_{i,t} - M_i\|_F^2 \lesssim \sigma_i^2 r d_1^2 d_2 \log^4 d_1 \frac{T^{1-\gamma} + \sum_{\tau=T_0+1}^t \tau^{-\gamma}}{T^{2(1-\gamma)}} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_i^2 r d_1^2 d_2 \log^4 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}, \quad (12)$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that $\sum_{\tau=T_0+1}^t \tau^{-\gamma} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \tau^{-\gamma} = O(t^{1-\gamma}) \leq O(T^{1-\gamma})$.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume at time t , arm 1 is optimal, i.e., $\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle > 0$, then the expected regret is

$$\begin{aligned} r_t &= \mathbb{E} [\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1}(\text{choose arm 0})] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1}(\text{choose arm 0}, \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle \geq 0) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1}(\text{choose arm 0}, \langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2} \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0) \right]}_{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define δ_t^2 the entrywise bound in the proof of Corollary 1 such that $\|U_{i,t} V_{i,t}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \leq \delta_t^2$ with probability at least $1 - 8td_1^{-200}$, and event $B_t = \{\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle > 2\delta_t\}$, then the latter expectation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} (2) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1} \left(\langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0 \cap B_t \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \mathbb{1} \left(\langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0 \cap B_t^c \right) \right] \\ &\leq \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0 \cap B_t \right) \right] + 2\delta_t \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}(B_t^c)]. \end{aligned}$$

Under event B_t and $\langle \widehat{M}_{0,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle = \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - M_1, X_t \rangle + \langle M_0 - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle + \langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle \\ &> \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - M_1, X_t \rangle + \langle M_0 - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle + 2\delta_t. \end{aligned}$$

This means either $\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - M_1, X_t \rangle < -\delta_t$ or $\langle M_0 - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X_t \rangle < -\delta_t$, which further implies either $\|\widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - M_1\|_{\max}$ or $\|M_0 - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}\|_{\max}$ should be larger than δ_t . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{1}(\langle M_{0,t-1} - M_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0) \cap B_t) &= \mathbb{P} (\langle M_{0,t-1} - M_{1,t-1}, X_t \rangle > 0 \cap B_t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} (\|M_{1,t-1} - M_1\|_{\max} > \delta_t) + \mathbb{P} (\|M_{0,t-1} - M_0\|_{\max} > \delta_t) \\ &\leq \frac{16(t-1)}{d^{200}}, \end{aligned}$$

For the other term, since $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(B_t^c)] = \mathbb{P}(\langle M_1 - M_0, X_t \rangle < 2\delta_t) \leq 1$, then

$$r_t \leq \varepsilon_t \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + \frac{16(t-1)}{d^{200}} \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + 2\delta_t.$$

The total regret up to time T is

$$R_T = \sum_{t=1}^T r_t \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \varepsilon_t \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + \frac{8T(T-1)}{d_1^{200}} \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + 2 \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_t.$$

In the proof of Corollary 1, we have shown that $\delta_t^2 = C_3 \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2 r^3}{d_1 d_2} \prod_{\tau=1}^t (1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}}) + C_4 \frac{t \cdot r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \sigma_i^2}{T^{2(1-\gamma)}}$ when $1 \leq t \leq T_0$ and $\delta_t^2 = C_5 \frac{r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \bar{\sigma}^2}{T^{1-\gamma}}$ when $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$, for some constants C_3, C_4 and C_5 .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &\lesssim \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \varepsilon \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{1}{t^\gamma} \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + \frac{\|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} T^2}{d_1^{200}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2 r^3}{d_1 d_2} \prod_{\tau=1}^t (1 - \frac{c_1 \log d_1}{4\kappa T^{1-\gamma}})} + \sum_{t=1}^{T_0} \sqrt{\frac{t \cdot r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \bar{\sigma}^2}{T^{2(1-\gamma)}}} + \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \sqrt{\frac{r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \bar{\sigma}^2}{T^{1-\gamma}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $T \ll d_1^{50}$, the third term is negligible. As a result, from the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^T t^{-\gamma} \lesssim T^{1-\gamma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &\lesssim T^{1-\gamma} \|M_1 - M_0\|_{\max} + T^{1-\gamma} \frac{\lambda_{\min} r^{3/2}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} + T^{(1+\gamma)/2} \sqrt{r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \bar{\sigma}^2} \\ &\lesssim T^{1-\gamma} (\|M_1\|_{\max} + \|M_0\|_{\max}) + T^{(1+\gamma)/2} \sqrt{r d_1 \log^4 d_1 \bar{\sigma}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only consider the proof for $i = 1$, and omit all the subscript.

We follow the arguments in Xia and Yuan [2021] to decompose $\hat{m}_Q - m_Q$. Notice that

$$\hat{m}_Q - m_Q = \langle \hat{L} \hat{L}^\top \hat{Z} \hat{R} \hat{R}^\top, Q \rangle + \langle \hat{L} \hat{L}^\top M \hat{R} \hat{R}^\top - M, Q \rangle.$$

Let $b = \frac{T}{T-T_0}$, notice that $b = O(1)$ and will converge to 1 as $T \rightarrow \infty$. We can write $\widehat{M}^{\text{IPW}}$ in (8) into

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}^{\text{IPW}} &= \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \widehat{M}_{t-1} + \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} (y_t - \langle M_{t-1}, X_t \rangle) X_t \\ &= M_1 + \underbrace{\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t X_t}_{=:\widehat{Z}_1} + \underbrace{\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \left(\frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle X_t - \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} \right)}_{=:\widehat{Z}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, recall that $\widehat{L}$ and $\widehat{R}$ are the top- r left and right singular vectors of $\widehat{M}^{\text{IPW}}$. Define $(d_1 + d_2) \times (2r)$ matrices

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} L & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix} \quad \widehat{\Theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{L} & 0 \\ 0 & \widehat{R} \end{pmatrix} \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ M^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, we can write

$$\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top A\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top A\Theta\Theta^\top = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top M\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - M \\ (\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top M\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - M)^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We further define

$$\widetilde{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Q \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{E} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \widehat{Z} \\ \widehat{Z}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\widehat{Z} = \widehat{Z}_1 + \widehat{Z}_2$. Therefore, we have

$$\langle \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top M\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - M, Q \rangle = \langle \widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top A\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top A\Theta\Theta^\top, \widetilde{Q} \rangle.$$

Define

$$\mathfrak{P}^{-s} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} L\Lambda^{-s}L^\top & 0 \\ 0 & R\Lambda^{-s}R^\top \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } s \text{ is even} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & L\Lambda^{-s}R^\top \\ R\Lambda^{-s}L^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } s \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{P}^0 = \mathfrak{P}^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} L_\perp L_\perp^\top & 0 \\ 0 & R_\perp R_\perp^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Theorem 1 in Xia [2021], $\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top$ has explicit representation formula of empirical spectral projector, in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E}) \\ \mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E}) &= \sum_{s_1 + \dots + s_{k+1} = k}^k (-1)^{1+\tau(s)} \mathfrak{P}^{-s_1} \widehat{E} \mathfrak{P}^{-s_2} \dots \mathfrak{P}^{-s_k} \widehat{E} \mathfrak{P}^{-s_{k+1}} \end{aligned}$$

where $s_1, \dots, s_{k+1} \geq 0$ are integers, $\tau(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathbb{1}(s_i > 0)$.

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top A\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top A\Theta\Theta^\top &= (\mathcal{S}_{A,1}(\widehat{E})A\Theta\Theta^\top + \Theta\Theta^\top A\mathcal{S}_{A,1}(\widehat{E})) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})A\Theta\Theta^\top + \Theta\Theta^\top A\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})) \\ &\quad + (\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top)A(\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top). \end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\mathcal{S}_{A,1}(\widehat{E})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{S}_{A,1}(\widehat{E})A\Theta\Theta^\top + \Theta\Theta^\top A\mathcal{S}_{A,1}(\widehat{E}), \widetilde{Q} \rangle &= \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top, Q \rangle \\ &= \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_1 RR^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_2 RR^\top, Q \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Combine all the terms above, $\widehat{m}_Q - m_Q$ can be decomposed into

$$\widehat{m}_Q - m_Q = \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_1 RR^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 RR^\top, Q \rangle \quad (13)$$

$$+ \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_2 RR^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 RR^\top, Q \rangle \quad (14)$$

$$+ \langle \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top \widehat{Z}\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top, Q \rangle - \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top, Q \rangle \quad (15)$$

$$+ \left\langle \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})A\Theta\Theta^\top + \Theta\Theta^\top A\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})), \widetilde{Q} \right\rangle + \langle (\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top)A(\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top), \widetilde{Q} \rangle. \quad (16)$$

In Lemma 4, we aim to show equation (13) is the main term which is asymptotic normal. In Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and Lemma 7, we show equation (14), (15) and (16) are negligible higher order terms, respectively.

Lemma 4. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3,*

$$\frac{\left(\langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_1 RR^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 RR^\top, Q \rangle \right)}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

where $S^2 = 1/T^\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1} \mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F^2$.

Lemma 5. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3,*

$$\frac{\left| \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_2 RR^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 RR^\top, Q \rangle \right|}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Lemma 6. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3,*

$$\frac{\left| \langle \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top \widehat{Z}\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top, Q \rangle - \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top, Q \rangle \right|}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Lemma 7. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \langle (\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})A\Theta\Theta^\top + \Theta\Theta^\top A\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})), \widetilde{Q} \rangle|}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_1 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0, \\ & \frac{|\langle (\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top)A(\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top), \widetilde{Q} \rangle|}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_1 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combine Lemma 4-7, we can conclude that

$$\frac{\widehat{m}_Q - m_Q}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

□

A.5 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only prove the $i = 1$ case. As long as we show $\widehat{\sigma}^2 \xrightarrow{p} \sigma^2$ and $\widehat{S}^2 \xrightarrow{p} S^2$, then by Slutsky's Theorem, we can obtain the desired result.

$\widehat{\sigma}^2 \xrightarrow{p} \sigma^2$ Notice that, $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma}^2 &= \underbrace{\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2}_I + \underbrace{\frac{2b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \xi_t}_{II} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t^2}_{III}. \end{aligned}$$

For term I,

$$\left| \frac{b}{T} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2 \right| \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma}{T} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \sigma^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^4 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] &\leq \frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{t^\gamma}{T^2} \sigma^4. \end{aligned}$$

By martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} I &\lesssim \left| \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right| + \sqrt{\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{d_1 r \sigma^2 \log^4 d_1 \text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa)}{T^{1-\gamma}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

which indicates $I \xrightarrow{p} 0$ when $\frac{d_1 \log^4 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$.

Similarly, for term II , note that $|\xi_t|$ is bounded with $\sigma \log^{1/2} d_1$ with high probability,

$$\left| \frac{2b}{T} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \xi_t \right| \leq \frac{2b}{T} \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \lesssim \frac{\sigma^2 \log^{1/2} d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{4b^2}{T^2} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2 \xi_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma \sigma^2}{T^2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma \sigma^4}{T^2}.$$

By martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-2}$,

$$\left| II - \frac{2b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle M - \widehat{M}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \xi_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma^2,$$

which indicates $II \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as long as $\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$.

Lastly, for term III ,

$$\left\| \frac{b}{T} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t^2 \right\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma \sigma^2}{T},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^4 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma \sigma^4}{T}.$$

By martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-2}$,

$$\left| III - \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma^2,$$

which indicates $III \xrightarrow{p} \sigma^2$ as long as $\frac{\log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$.

Showing $\widehat{S}^2 \xrightarrow{p} S^2$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}}(Q)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| &= \left| \|L^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \|L^\top Q R\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}^\top Q \widehat{R}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| \\ &\leq \left| \|L^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| + \left| \|L^\top Q R\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}^\top Q \widehat{R}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that L and $\widehat{L}$ both have orthonormal columns, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|L^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| &= \left| \|LL^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 - \|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| \\ &\leq \|(LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + 2 \left| \langle (LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)Q, LL^\top Q \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

In the following we shall consider the upper bound under the event $\mathcal{E}$ defined in the proof of Lemma 10. The probability of the following event

$$\begin{aligned} \|(LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)Q\|_F^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{j_1, j_2} |Q(j_1, j_2)| \|(LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)e_{j_1}\| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \|LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2 \lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

approaches 1 as $\|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$, which can be easily satisfied under the conditions in Theorem 3.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle (LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)Q, LL^\top Q \rangle \right| &\leq \|L^\top Q\|_F \|L^\top (LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)Q\|_F \\ &\leq \|L^\top Q\|_F \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \|(LL^\top - \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top)\|_{2, \max} \lesssim \|Q\|_F \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as $\|Q\|_F \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow 0$, the above term converges to 0 in probability.

Next we bound $\left| \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F^2 - \|\widehat{L}_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right|$. It can be decomposed into

$$\left| \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F^2 - \|\widehat{L}_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right| \leq \left| \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F^2 - \|L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right| + \left| \|L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 - \|\widehat{L}_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right|.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F^2 - \|L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right| &\leq \|L_\perp^\top Q(RR^\top - \widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top)\|_F^2 + 2 \left| \langle L_\perp^\top Q(RR^\top - \widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top), L_\perp^\top QR \rangle \right| \\ &\lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T} + \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 - \|\widehat{L}_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right| &\leq \|(\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top)Q\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top\|_F^2 + 2 \left| \langle L_\perp^\top Q(RR^\top - \widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top), L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R} \rangle \right| \\ &\lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} + (\|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F + \|L_\perp^\top Q(RR^\top - \widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top)\|_F) \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \\ &\lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} + \|L_\perp^\top QR\|_F \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} + \|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{\mu r d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can show $\left| \|L_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 - \|\widehat{L}_\perp^\top Q\widehat{R}\|_F^2 \right|$ converges to 0 in probability as long as $\|Q\|_{\ell_1}^2 \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2} \frac{d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$. As a result, $\|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}}(Q)\|_F^2 \xrightarrow{p} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F^2$. By Lemma 8, it directly follows $\|\mathcal{P}_{\widehat{\Omega}_{i,T}} \mathcal{P}_{\widehat{M}}(Q)\|_F^2 \xrightarrow{p} \|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i} \mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F^2$ for $i = 0, 1$. Moreover, $b_T \rightarrow 1$ when $T \rightarrow \infty$. Then by Slutsky's Theorem, $\widehat{S}^2 \xrightarrow{p} S^2$. $\square$

A.6 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof. Note that

$$(\widehat{m}_Q^{(1)} - \widehat{m}_Q^{(0)}) - (m_Q^{(1)} - m_Q^{(0)}) = (\widehat{m}_Q^{(1)} - m_Q^{(1)}) - (\widehat{m}_Q^{(1)} - m_Q^{(1)}),$$

then $\widehat{m}_Q^{(1)} - m_Q^{(1)}$ and $\widehat{m}_Q^{(1)} - m_Q^{(0)}$ can be decomposed into main term and negligible terms in the same way as Theorem 3. The upper bound of all the negligible terms for both $i = 0$ and 1 still follow the Lemma 5-7. The main CLT term is

$$\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t_1=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1)}{\pi_{t_1}} \xi_{t_1} \langle X_{t_1}, \mathcal{P}_{M_1}(Q) \rangle - \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t_2=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0)}{1 - \pi_{t_2}} \xi_{t_2} \langle X_{t_2}, \mathcal{P}_{M_0}(Q) \rangle.$$

As long as we show $\sum_{t_1=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1)}{\pi_{t_1}} \xi_{t_1} X_{t_1}$ is uncorrelated with $\sum_{t_2=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0)}{1 - \pi_{t_2}} \xi_{t_2} X_{t_2}$, then the asymptotic variance is the sum of their individual variance, i.e., $\sigma_1^2 S_1^2 + \sigma_0^2 S_0^2$. Notice that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b^2}{T^2} \sum_{t_1=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1)}{\pi_{t_1}} \xi_{t_1} X_{t_1} \sum_{t_2=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0)}{1 - \pi_{t_2}} \xi_{t_2} X_{t_2} \\ &= \frac{b^2 d_1^2 d_2^2}{T^2} \sum_{t_1=T_0+1}^T \sum_{t_2=T_0+1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1) \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0)}{\pi_{t_1} (1 - \pi_{t_2})} \xi_{t_1} \xi_{t_2} X_{t_1} X_{t_2}. \end{aligned}$$

When $t_1 = t_2$, $\mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1) \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0) = 0$. When $t_1 \neq t_2$, $\mathbb{E}[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_{t_1}=1) \mathbb{1}(a_{t_2}=0)}{\pi_{t_1} (1 - \pi_{t_2})} \xi_{t_1} \xi_{t_2} X_{t_1} X_{t_2}] = 0$ due to the i.i.d. distributed ξ_t . As a result, the two terms are uncorrelated.

Together with Lemma 5-7, all the negligible terms converge to 0 when divided by $\sqrt{(\sigma_1^2 S_1^2 + \sigma_0^2 S_0^2) d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}$.

Then similar as Theorem 4, we can replace $\sigma_1^2 S_1^2 + \sigma_0^2 S_0^2$ with $\widehat{\sigma}_1^2 \widehat{S}_1^2 + \widehat{\sigma}_0^2 \widehat{S}_0^2$ and conclude the proof. $\square$

B Proofs of Technical Lemmas

B.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. step1: Uniform bound for $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau$ and $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau$

For $\forall 1 \leq \tau \leq t-1$, under $\mathcal{E}_{\tau-1}$, by inequality $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_\tau\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &\leq \frac{24}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \max(\|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2, \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{48}{\varepsilon_t^4} \eta_\tau^4 (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^4 \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \kappa^2}{d_2} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \lesssim \mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2}$. And by the property of subGaussian random variable, $\max |\xi_\tau| <$

$C\sigma \log^{1/2} d_1$ for some constant C . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_\tau\|_F^2 &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} \left(\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^4} \frac{\mu_0^3 r^3 \kappa^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \left(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \left(1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}\right) \frac{\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} \right) + \sigma^4 \log^2 d_1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 = \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{2\mu_0^3 r^3 \kappa^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} (\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2})$ in the second line. The fourth order terms will be dominated as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_1^{1/2}}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}{d_1 \kappa^2}$. So $\|\Delta_\tau\|_F^2 \lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} (\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1)$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \Delta_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle \right| &\leq \left| \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_\tau (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) \langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_t (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) \langle X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For term $\langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle &= \langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle \\ &\leq \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2, \max} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, $\langle X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \rangle \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F$. In addition,

$$\langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle \leq \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \Delta_\tau, \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle| &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1) \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F \\
&+ \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_t} \left(\mu_0^{1/2} r^{1/2} \kappa \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2})^{1/2} \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F}{\sqrt{d_2}} + \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \left(\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \right) \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} \log d_1 \\
&\quad + \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right) \log^{-1} d_1.
\end{aligned}$$

By dealing $\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{\mu_0^{3/2} r^{3/2} \kappa \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} (\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2})^{1/2} \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F}{\sqrt{d_2}} + \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2}})$ as before, the second inequality holds since the second order term will be dominated as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2^{1/2}}{\mu_0 r \kappa \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}{\varepsilon_\tau^2 d_1 \kappa^2}$. And the third inequality holds by $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$.

As a result, we have the uniform bound of $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau$ for $1 \leq \tau \leq t-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau &\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \left(\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2 d_2} \log d_1 \\
&\quad + \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right) \log^{-1} d_1 \\
&\lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2 d_2} \log d_1 \left(\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right) \log^{-1} d_1 := R_A.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau &\lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2 d_2} \left(\mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M\|_F^2}{d_2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) := R_B.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the uniform bounds for A_t and B_t are the same as above.

step2: Calculating the variance

Denote the variance of $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau$ as $\sigma_{A_\tau}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{A_\tau}^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \\ &+ \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \langle X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \\ &+ \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^4} \eta_\tau^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^4 \langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \left| \langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle \right|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \mathbb{E}[\xi_\tau^2] \mathbb{E} \left(\langle X_\tau, (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \left((\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \right)_{ij}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|(\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{O(\lambda_{\max}^2)}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \langle X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M) \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^4 O\left(\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}\right) + \frac{2\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{O(\lambda_{\max}^2)}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

And the last expectation is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^4} \eta_\tau^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^4 \langle X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau, \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M \rangle^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \\
& \lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)^4 + \sigma^4 \right) \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)^4 + \sigma^4 \right) \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives,

$$\sigma_{A\tau}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2.$$

The fourth order terms is dominated as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2^{1/2}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2} \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 \kappa^2}$. Since $\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}$, we can further obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{A\tau}^2 & \lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2})^2 \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^4 + \left(\sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right)^2 \right) \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} \\
& + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{A\tau}^2} & \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2} O(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}}) \\
& + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}} O(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}}) \\
& + \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}^2 \log^{-1/2} d_1 + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^{3/2} d_1}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply inequality $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$ to term $\sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau}} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{d_1 d_2}} \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2})^{1/2} \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\text{F}}$.

Similarly, denote the variance of $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau$ as $\sigma_{B_\tau}^2$, it can be shown that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{B_\tau}^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle^4 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \max \left(\|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2,\max}^4, \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2,\max}^4 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}[\xi_\tau^4] \max \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^4 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right], \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau\|_{\mathbb{F}}^4 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right] \right) \right) \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k))^2 \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \left(\frac{1}{d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} + \sigma^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} \right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2^2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2} \right)^2 \frac{\mu_0^3 r^3 \kappa^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \sigma^4 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second term in the second last inequality comes from $\mathbb{E} \left(\|X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^4 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\|X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\tau-1} \right) \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{2,\max}^2 \leq \frac{r O(\lambda_{\max}^2)}{d_2} O(\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2})$. And in the last inequality we again use $\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \kappa^2}{d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \lesssim \mu_0 r \kappa^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\mu_0 \kappa^2 \eta_k^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2}$. Therefore, $\sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{B_\tau}^2} \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \frac{1}{d_1 d_2^{1/2}} (\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2})} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{d_2}}$.

step3: Concentration

From the calculation in step2, $R_A \log d_1 + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{A_\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}$ and $R_B \log d_1 + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{B_\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}$ as long as 1. $\max_{\tau \leq t} \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau}$, 2. $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_2}{\sqrt{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max} \log^{1/2} d_1}}$, 3. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^2}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}$, 4. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \lesssim \frac{d_1^2 d_2^3}{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4 \log d_1}$, 5. $\sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3}} \lesssim \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau}$. Under the stepsize and SNR conditions in Theorem 1, all of them can be satisfied.

By martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-200}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + A_t &\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}, \\
\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + B_t &\lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. For any l in $[d_1]$,

$$\|e_l^\top \hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t^\top\|^2 = e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - \Delta_t) (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - \Delta_t^\top) e_l = \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 - 2e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l + \|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2.$$

This leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[\|e_l^\top \hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t^\top\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}].$$

We first compute $2\mathbb{E}[e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$. Denote $\delta_{ij} = \mathbb{1}(i = j)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) &= 2\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t V_{t-1} U_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle U_{t-1} V_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 X_t V_{t-1} U_{t-1}^\top X_t V_{t-1} U_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{2\eta_t}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top (U_{t-1} V_{t-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l + \frac{2\eta_t}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M) \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l \\ &\quad - \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij}^2 - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l - \frac{4\eta_t \lambda_{\max}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top M \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l + \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l \\ &\quad - \frac{4\eta_t \lambda_{\max}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top M \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l - \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^2} - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} \\ &\geq \frac{2\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 - \frac{8\eta_t \lambda_{\max}}{d_1 d_2} \frac{\sqrt{\mu \mu_0} r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} - \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^2} - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}. \end{aligned}$$

The second order term in the second last inequality comes from $\sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij}^2 \leq \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{2, \max}^2 \|\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{2, \max}^2$. And the other term is similar. The last inequality holds since $e_l^\top M \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l \leq \|e_l^\top M\| \|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l\|$ and $\|e_l^\top M\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}}$ while $\|\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}}$.

Then we compute $\mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})$. Since $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3a^2 + 3b^2 + 3c^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) &\leq 3\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad + 3\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t X_t^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ &\quad + 3\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^4} \eta_t^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^4 X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t X_t^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top X_t^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 X_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top X_t^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 + \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sigma^2 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2} \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{d_2} \\
& \leq \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1 d_2} + \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2}{d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 3\mathbb{E} \left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t X_t^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top)_{li}^2 + \frac{6\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top)_{li}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{6\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^2} + \frac{6\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

And the last fourth order term can be bounded in the same way. Moreover, the first order term $\frac{8\eta_t \lambda_{\max}}{d_1 d_2} \frac{\sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ will dominate all the higher order terms as long as $\eta_t \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_t d_2}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\max} d_1}{\varepsilon_t \kappa}$. So the sum of all the higher order terms will be less than $\frac{2\eta_t \lambda_{\max}}{d_1 d_2} \frac{\sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$. Recall $f(\eta_t) = \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2}$. Overall, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_l^\top U_t V_t^\top\|^2 &= \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 - 2e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l + \|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 \\
&= \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 - 2(e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l - \mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})) \\
&\quad + (\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 - \mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})) - 2\mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) + \mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \\
&\leq (1 - f(\eta_t)) \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|^2 + \frac{10\eta_t \sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^3}{d_1^2 d_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{2(\mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) - e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l)}_{A_t} + \underbrace{(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 - \mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}))}_{B_t} \\
&\leq (1 - f(\eta_t))(1 - f(\eta_{t-1})) \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{t-2} \hat{V}_{t-2}^\top\|^2 + (1 - f(\eta_{t-1})) \frac{10\eta_{t-1} \sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^3}{d_1^2 d_2} + \frac{10\eta_t \sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^3}{d_1^2 d_2} \\
&\quad + (1 - f(\eta_t))(A_{t-1} + B_{t-1}) + (A_t + B_t) \\
&\leq \prod_{\tau=1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau)) \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top\|^2 + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{10\eta_\tau \sqrt{\mu} \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^3}{d_1^2 d_2} + \sum_{\tau=1}^t A_\tau + \sum_{\tau=1}^t B_\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that the first term is less than $\frac{1}{6} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$. The second term will be less than $\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ as long as $\mu_0 = 100\mu$ and $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \eta_\tau \leq \frac{d_1 d_2}{2\lambda_{\max}}$, which is satisfied under the stepsize condition

in Theorem 1. Then we need to show $\sum_{\tau=1}^t A_\tau \leq \frac{1}{6} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ and $\sum_{\tau=1}^t B_\tau \leq \frac{1}{6} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$.

Similar as the proof of Lemma 1, we first derive the uniform bound for A_τ and B_τ . Under $\mathcal{E}_{\tau-1}$, obviously, $\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}$. We use this trivial bound in the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned}
|e_l^\top \Delta_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| &\leq |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_\tau (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_\tau (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} |\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau| \max_j |e_j^\top \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| \\
&\quad + \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} |\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau| \|e_l^\top \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau\| \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l\| \\
&\quad + \frac{4\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} |\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau|^2 \max_j |e_j^\top \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau\| \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l\| \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1) \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first order term dominates as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau \sqrt{d_1 d_2}}{\lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}{\kappa}$. Then

$$A_\tau \lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \right) O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}}\right) O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}}\right) := R_A.$$

For $\|e_l^\top \Delta_\tau\|^2$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_l^\top \Delta_\tau\|^2 &\lesssim |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau^\top e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau X_\tau^\top \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^4} \eta_\tau^4 (\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau)^4 X_\tau \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau X_\tau^\top \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau^\top e_l| \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} |\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t|^2 \max_j |e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top e_j| \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} |\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau|^2 \|e_l^\top \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^4} |\langle \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau|^4 \max_j \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau\|^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2} + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^4} (\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 + \sigma^4 \log^2 d_1) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second order term dominates as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_1}{\lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}{\kappa^2}$. Then

$$B_\tau \lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sigma^2 \log d_1 \right) O\left(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2} \right) := R_B.$$

The variance of A_τ and B_τ , denoted as $\sigma_{A_\tau}^2$ and $\sigma_{B_\tau}^2$, can be calculated as before.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{A_\tau}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1} + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1} + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1},
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply $\sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{jl}^2 = \|e_l \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2 \leq \|e_l \hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2 \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2$
 $\lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} \lambda_{\max}^2$ in the last inequality.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{B_\tau}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^4 \delta_{ij} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sigma^4 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^4 (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^2 d_2^2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^4}{d_1^2 d_2^2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the calculation above, $R_A \log d + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{A\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ and $R_B \log d + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{B\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ as long as 1. $\max_{\tau} \frac{\eta_{\tau}}{\varepsilon_{\tau}} \lesssim \frac{d_2^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\mu_0 r} \log d_1 \lambda_{\max}}$, 2. $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \max_{\tau} \frac{\eta_{\tau}^2}{\varepsilon_{\tau}^2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \log^3 d_1}{d_2^3 \kappa^2}$, 3. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_{\tau}^2}{\varepsilon_{\tau}^2} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^2}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^4}$, 4. $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_{\tau}^2}{\varepsilon_{\tau}^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2 \kappa^2}$, 5. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_{\tau}^4}{\varepsilon_{\tau}^3} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^4}{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}$, 6. $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_{\tau}^4}{\varepsilon_{\tau}^3} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^4}{d_2 \kappa^4}}$. All of them can be satisfied under the stepsize and SNR conditions in Theorem 1.

As a result, by Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-200}$,

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t A_{\tau} \leq \frac{1}{6} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}.$$

And with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-200}$,

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^t B_{\tau} \leq \frac{1}{6} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}.$$

Finally, combine all the results above and the union bound, we can obtain that with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-200}$,

$$\|e_l^{\top} \widehat{U}_t V_t^{\top}\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}.$$

By symmetry, following the same arguments, we have for $\forall j \in [d_2]$, with the same probability,

$$\|e_j^{\top} \widehat{V}_t \widehat{U}_t^{\top}\|^2 \leq \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2}.$$

□

B.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. For any l in $[d_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_l^{\top} (\widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^{\top} - M)\|^2 &= e_l^{\top} (\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^{\top} - M - \Delta_t) (\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^{\top} - M^{\top} - \Delta_t^{\top}) e_l \\ &= \|e_l^{\top} (\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^{\top} - M)\|^2 - 2e_l^{\top} \Delta_t (\widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^{\top} - M^{\top}) e_l + \|e_l^{\top} \Delta_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\mathbb{E}(\|e_l^{\top} \widehat{U}_t \widehat{V}_t^{\top}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \|e_l^{\top} (\widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^{\top} - M)\|^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[e_l^{\top} \Delta_t (\widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^{\top} - M^{\top}) e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[\|e_l^{\top} \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}].$$

We first compute $2\mathbb{E}[e_l^\top \Delta_t(\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\mathbb{E}[e_l^\top \Delta_t(\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E}\left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) X_t \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
&+ 2\mathbb{E}\left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \eta_t (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_t) \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
&- 2\mathbb{E}\left[e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \eta_t^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top, X_t \rangle - \xi_t)^2 X_t \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top X_t (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
&\geq \frac{2\eta_t}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M) \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l \\
&+ \frac{2\eta_t}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top \widehat{U}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M) (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l \\
&- \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^3 (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij} - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij} (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij} \\
&\geq \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M) (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l + \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M) (\widehat{V}_{t-1}\widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top)e_l \\
&- \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} \\
&\geq \frac{2\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{d_1 d_2} \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 - \frac{4\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} O\left(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}\right) \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 - \frac{4\eta_t^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1} \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first second order term in the second last inequality comes from $\sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^3 (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top)_{ij} \leq \|\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \|\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top\|_{\max} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 \leq O\left(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2}\right) \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2$.

And the other term is similar.

For $\mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$, analogous to the calculation before, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \lesssim \frac{\eta_t^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{\eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2}.$$

Recall $f(\eta_t) = \frac{\eta_t \lambda_{\min}}{2d_1 d_2}$. Then for some constant c_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t \widehat{V}_{t-1} \widehat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) + \mathbb{E}(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) &\leq -2f(\eta_t) \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \\
&\leq -f(\eta_t) \|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_{t-1}\widehat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We again use telescoping to derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|e_l^\top (U_t V_t^\top - M)\|^2 = \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 - 2e_l^\top \Delta_t (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l + \|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 \\
& = \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 - 2(e_l^\top \Delta_t (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l - \mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})) \\
& \quad + \left(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 - \mathbb{E}[\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \right) - 2\mathbb{E}[e_l^\top \Delta_t \hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\
& \leq (1 - f(\eta_t)) \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-1} \hat{V}_{t-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} \\
& \quad + \underbrace{2(\mathbb{E}(e_l^\top \Delta_t (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) - e_l^\top \Delta_t (\hat{V}_{t-1} \hat{U}_{t-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l)}_{A_t} + \underbrace{(\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 - \mathbb{E}[\|e_l^\top \Delta_t\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}])}_{B_t} \\
& \leq (1 - f(\eta_t))(1 - f(\eta_{t-1})) \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_{t-2} \hat{V}_{t-2}^\top - M)\|^2 + (1 - f(\eta_t)) \frac{c_2 \eta_{t-1}^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_{t-1} d_1 d_2} \\
& \quad + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} + (1 - f(\eta_t))(A_{t-1} + B_{t-1}) + (A_t + B_t) \\
& \leq \prod_{\tau=1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau)) \|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M)\|^2 + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) \frac{c_2 \eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \\
& \quad + \frac{c_2 \eta_t^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_t d_1 d_2} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + A_t + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + B_t \\
& \leq \prod_{\tau=1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau)) \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{c_2 \eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2 \mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \\
& \quad + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau + A_t + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau + B_t.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term $\|e_l^\top (\widehat{U}_0 \widehat{V}_0^\top - M)\|^2 \lesssim \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1}$ under the incoherence condition of U_0 and V_0 .

Next, we derive the uniform bound for $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) A_\tau$ and $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_k)) B_\tau$.

$$\begin{aligned}
|e_l^\top \Delta_\tau (\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l| &\leq |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_\tau (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top (\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau} \eta_\tau (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_\tau \rangle - \xi_\tau) \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau (\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l| \\
&\quad + |e_l^\top \frac{\mathbb{1}(a_\tau = 1)}{\pi_\tau^2} \eta_\tau^2 (\langle \widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M, X_t \rangle - \xi_\tau)^2 X_\tau \widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top X_\tau (\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l| \\
&\leq \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1) \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max} \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top\|_{\max} \\
&\quad + \frac{2\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} + \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1) \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max} \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max} \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2} + \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \sigma^2 \log d_1 \|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2} + \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first order terms dominate as long as $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_1}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\min}^2}{\sigma^2} \gg \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \frac{\lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}{\kappa^2}$.

Since $\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2}$ under event $\mathcal{E}_{\tau-1}$, and applying $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$ to term $\frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \sigma \log^{1/2} d_1 \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max} \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) |e_l^\top \Delta_\tau (\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top) e_l| &\lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau}{\varepsilon_\tau} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2} \right) \frac{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}{d_2} + \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2} + \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \sigma^2 \log d_1 \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2} := R_A.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \|e_l^\top \Delta_\tau\|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} (\|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 + \sigma^2 \log d_1) (\|\widehat{V}_{\tau-1} \widehat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2 + \|\widehat{U}_{\tau-1} \widehat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top\|_{\max}^2) \\
&\lesssim \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1 d_2} O(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2}) + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2^2} \right) \frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2} \\
&\quad + \max_\tau \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau^2} \sigma^2 \log d_1 O(\frac{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{d_2^2}) := R_B.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we calculate their conditional variance, respectively. Denote the variance of $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))A_\tau$ and $\prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))B_\tau$ as $\sigma_{A\tau}^2$ and $\sigma_{B\tau}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{A\tau}^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))^2 \left(\frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top))_{jl}^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^2 (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top)_{jl}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top))_{jl}^2 + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 (\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top - M^\top)_{jl}^2 \left. \right) \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))^2 \left(\frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2 \|e_l (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)\|^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^2 \|e_l (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)\|^2 + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^2 \left. \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that, $\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^2 \|e_l (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)\|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{d_2} (\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2})^2$ and $\|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \lesssim \frac{1}{d_2^2} (\prod_{k=1}^{\tau-1} (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau-1} \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2})^2$ under event $\mathcal{E}_{\tau-1}$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{A\tau}^2 &\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2^2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^2 \sigma^2 \lambda_{\max}^2}{\varepsilon_\tau d_1 d_2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{B\tau}^2 &\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))^2 \left(\frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^4 \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sigma^4 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M)_{ij}^4 (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 \right) \\
&\lesssim \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau))^2 \left(\frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sigma^4 \sum_{ij} \delta_{il} \|e_j^\top \hat{V}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top\|^4 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \|\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{V}_{\tau-1}^\top - M\|_{\max}^4 \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2} \sum_{ij} (\hat{U}_{\tau-1} \hat{U}_{\tau-1}^\top)_{li}^4 \right) \\
&\lesssim \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2^4} \left(\prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{\eta_\tau^4 \sigma^4 \mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3 d_1 d_2^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the calculation above, $R_A \log d_1 + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{A\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}$ and $R_B \log d_1 + \sqrt{\sum_{\tau=1}^t \sigma_{B\tau}^2 \log d_1} \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \|\hat{U}_0 \hat{V}_0^\top - M\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r)}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}$ as long as 1. $\eta_\tau \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon_\tau d_2^{3/2}}{\mu_0 r \lambda_{\max}}$, 2. $\max \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \leq \sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau}$, 3. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^2}{\lambda_{\max}^2 \log d_1}$, 4. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^4}{\mu_0^2 r^2 \lambda_{\max}^4 \log d_1}$, 5. $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^4}{\varepsilon_\tau^3} \leq (\sum_{\tau=1}^t \frac{\eta_\tau^2}{\varepsilon_\tau})^2$. All of them can be satisfied under the stepsize and SNR conditions in Theorem 1.

By Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-2}$, $\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau)) A_\tau + A_t \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}$ and $\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \prod_{k=\tau+1}^t (1 - f(\eta_\tau)) B_\tau + B_t \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}$.

Finally, we conclude that, with probability at least $1 - t d_1^{-200}$,

$$\|e_l^\top (\hat{U}_t \hat{V}_t^\top - M)\|^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_1} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_1 d_2}.$$

By symmetry, following the same arguments, we can prove with same probability, for any $j \in [d_2]$,

$$\|e_j^\top (\hat{V}_t \hat{U}_t^\top - M^\top)\|^2 \lesssim \prod_{k=1}^t (1 - \frac{f(\eta_k)}{2}) \frac{\text{poly}(\mu, r, \kappa) \lambda_{\min}^2}{d_2} + \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{\eta_k^2 \text{poly}(\kappa, \mu, r) \lambda_{\max}^2 \sigma^2 \log^2 d_1}{\varepsilon_k d_2^2}.$$

□

B.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Denote $S^2 = 1/T^\gamma \|P_{\Omega_1}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|P_{\Omega_0}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{\frac{T^{1-\gamma}}{d_1 d_2}} \left(\langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R R^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_1 R R^\top, Q \rangle \right)}{\sigma S} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{T^{1+\gamma}}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{b\sqrt{d_1 d_2} \mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle}{\sigma S}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we apply Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1 in Hall and Heyde [2014], the Martingale Central Limit Theorem to show the asymptotic normality.

Step1: checking Lindeberg condition

For any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2 d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma} \pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \times \mathbb{1} \left(\left| \xi_t \frac{\sqrt{d_1 d_2} \mathbb{1}(a_t=1) \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle}{\sigma S \sqrt{T^{1+\gamma} \pi_t}} \right| > \delta \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{b^2 d_1 d_2}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \times \mathbb{1} \left(|\xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle| > \frac{\sigma S \delta \sqrt{T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t}}{2\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\ & \lesssim \frac{b^2 d_1 d_2}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \max_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \times \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(|\xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle| > \frac{\sigma S \delta \sqrt{T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t}}{2\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \right) \right]}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use $\mathbb{E}[XY] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X^2] \mathbb{E}[Y^2]}$. By incoherence condition,

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{X}} |\langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F.$$

Moreover, since ξ_t is a subGaussian random variable, so the product $\xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle$ has subGaussian tail probability

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle| > \frac{\sigma S \delta \sqrt{T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t}}{2\sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \right) < 2e^{-\frac{\sigma^2 S^2 \delta^2 T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t^2}{8d_1 d_2 \nu^2}},$$

where ν is the subGaussian parameter of order $O(\sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F \sigma)$. Notice that $T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t^2 \leq T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_T^2 = O(T^{1-\gamma})$. By property of exponential function, $\frac{d_1 d_2 \sigma^2}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma}} \frac{\mu r}{d_2} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F^2 \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} 2e^{-\frac{\sigma^2 S^2 \delta^2 T^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon_t^2}{16d_1 d_2 \nu^2}}$ converges to 0 as long as $\frac{d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0$. Then the Lindeberg condition is satisfied.

Step2: calculating the variance

Next, we show the conditional variance equals to 1. Recall the definition $\Omega_1 = \{X \in \mathcal{X} :$

$\langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle > \delta_{T,d_1,d_2}\}$, $\Omega_0 = \{X \in \mathcal{X} : \langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle < \delta_{T,d_1,d_2}\}$ and $\Omega_\emptyset = X \cup (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_0)^c$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{b^2 d_1 d_2}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
&= \frac{b^2}{\sigma^2 S^2 T^{1+\gamma}} \sigma^2 \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \sum_{X \in \Omega_1} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
&\quad + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{X \in \Omega_0} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{X \in \Omega_\emptyset} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The next Lemma shows the convergence of the indicator function.

Lemma 8. *Given any $X \in \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_0$, we have for any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$, with probability at least $1 - 8td_1^{-200}$,*

$$\mathbb{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{i,t} - \widehat{M}_{1-i,t}, X \rangle > 0) = \mathbb{1}(\langle M_i - M_{1-i}, X \rangle > 0).$$

Under this result, $\sum_{X \in \Omega_i} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{i,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1-i,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \rightarrow \|P_{\Omega_i}(P_M(Q))\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ and $\sum_{X \in \Omega_{1-i}} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{i,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{1-i,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \rightarrow 0$ for $i = 0, 1$. Note that $\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T 1/(1 - \varepsilon_t/2) \rightarrow 1$ and $\frac{b}{T^{1+\gamma}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T 2/\varepsilon_t \rightarrow \frac{2}{c_2(1+\gamma)}$ when $\varepsilon_t = c_2 t^{-\gamma}$. And by Assumption 1, $\sum_{X \in \Omega_\emptyset} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \leq 2/\varepsilon_t \|P_{\Omega_\emptyset}(\mathcal{P}_M(Q))\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$ is negligible. Then the conditional variance will converge in probability to 1. It follows

$$\frac{\sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

when $T, d_1, d_2 \rightarrow \infty$. □

B.5 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R_\perp R_\perp^\top, Q \rangle + \langle L_\perp L_\perp^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R R^\top, Q \rangle + \langle LL^\top \widehat{Z}_2 R R^\top, Q \rangle = \langle \widehat{Z}_2, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle \\
&= \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle - \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we prove its upper bound. For any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{b}{T} \left| \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle - \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \frac{b d_1 d_2}{T} \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F + \frac{1}{T} \sqrt{d_1 d_2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F \\
& \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\mu r}}{T^{1-\gamma}} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^{1/2} \sqrt{\mu r} \sigma}{T^{1-\gamma}} \|\mathcal{P}_M(Q)\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2 d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{T^2 \pi_t^2} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2 \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \leq \frac{b^2 d_1 d_2}{T^2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\pi_t} \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \\
& = \frac{b^2 d_1 d_2}{T^2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
& \quad + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
& \lesssim \frac{d_1^2 d_2 r \log^4 d_1 \sigma^2}{T^{3-\gamma}} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 \\
& \quad + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $S_T^2 := \frac{1}{T^{1+\gamma}} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle > 0) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2 + \mathbf{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t-1} - \widehat{M}_{0,t-1}, X \rangle < 0) \frac{1}{\frac{\varepsilon_t}{2}} \langle X, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle^2$. By martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-10}$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle - \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log^5 d_1}{T^{2-2\gamma}}} \sigma S_T.$$

As we have shown in the proof of Lemma 4, $S_T \rightarrow S$ when $T, d_1, d_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\frac{\sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle \langle X_t, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle - \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, \mathcal{P}_M(Q) \rangle}{\sigma S \sqrt{d_1 d_2 / T^{1-\gamma}}} \xrightarrow{p} 0 \text{ as long as } \frac{d_1 \log^5 d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}} \rightarrow 0. \quad \square$$

B.6 Proof of Lemma 6

Proof. We first state the following Lemmas.

Lemma 9. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-3}$,*

$$\|\widehat{Z}\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma.$$

Lemma 10. *Under the conditions in Theorem 3, with probability at least $1 - 5d_1^{-2}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} &\lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}} \\ \|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max} &\lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$|\langle \widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top \widehat{Z}\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - LL^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top, Q \rangle| \leq \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top \widehat{Z}\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - LL^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top\|_{\max}.$$

Now by triangular inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top \widehat{Z}\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - LL^\top \widehat{Z}RR^\top\|_{\max} &\leq \|(\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top) \widehat{Z}RR^\top\|_{\max} + \|LL^\top \widehat{Z}(\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top)\|_{\max} \\ &\quad + \|(\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top) \widehat{Z}(\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top)\|_{\max} \\ &\leq \|\widehat{Z}\| \left(\|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} \|R\|_{2,\max} + \|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max} \|L\|_{2,\max} \right) \\ &\quad + \|\widehat{Z}\| \|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} \|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}} \frac{\mu r d_1^{3/2} d_2^{1/2} \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then as long as $\frac{\|Q\|_{\ell_1}}{\sqrt{1/T^\gamma \|P_{\Omega_1}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|P_{\Omega_0}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2}} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{r^2 d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow 0$, we prove the claimed results. $\square$

B.7 Proof of Lemma 7

Proof. Similarly as the proof of Lemma 6, we again define events $\mathcal{E}_0 = \{\|\widehat{Z}\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma := \delta\}$, $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{\|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}}, \|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max} \lesssim \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}}\}$. Then by Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 in Xia and Yuan [2021], under the $\mathcal{E}_0$ and $\mathcal{E}_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \langle (\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E}) A \Theta \Theta^\top + \Theta \Theta^\top A \mathcal{S}_{A,k}(\widehat{E})), \widetilde{Q} \rangle \right| &\lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\mu r}{\lambda_{\min} \sqrt{d_1 d_2}} \delta^2 \\ &= \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}} \frac{\mu r d_1^{3/2} d_2^{1/2} \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle (\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top) A (\widehat{\Theta}\widehat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top), \widetilde{Q} \rangle| &\lesssim \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \|\Lambda\| \|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} \|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max} \\ &\leq \|Q\|_{\ell_1} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_{\min}} \frac{\mu r \kappa d_1^{3/2} d_2^{1/2} \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then as long as $\frac{\|Q\|_{\ell_1}}{\sqrt{1/T^\gamma \|P_{\Omega_1}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2 + C_\gamma \|P_{\Omega_0}(P_M(Q))\|_F^2}} \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{r^2 d_1^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \rightarrow 0$, we prove the claimed results. $\square$

B.8 Proof of Lemma 8

Proof. Without loss of generality, we just prove the $i = 1$ case and $i = 0$ case can be shown following the same arguments.

Recall δ defined in Theorem 3. Suppose $\langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle > 0$, then we have for any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t} - \widehat{M}_{0,t}, X \rangle &= \langle \widehat{M}_{1,t} - M_1, X \rangle + \langle M_0 - \widehat{M}_{0,t}, X \rangle + \langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle \\ &\geq \langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle - 2\delta > 0 \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 8td_1^{-200}$. The second inequality comes from the gap condition in Assumption 1. As a result, with the same probability, $\mathbb{1}(\langle \widehat{M}_{1,t} - \widehat{M}_{0,T}, X \rangle > 0) = \mathbb{1}(\langle M_1 - M_0, X \rangle > 0)$. $\square$

B.9 Proof of Lemma 9

Proof. We first look at $\|\widehat{Z}_1\| = \|\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t X_t\|$.

Since ξ_t is subGaussian random variable, then for any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\left\| \frac{b}{T} \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t X_t \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \frac{2bd_1 d_2}{T\varepsilon_t} \|\xi_t\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2 \sigma}{T^{1-\gamma}}.$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 X_t X_t^\top \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] &\leq \frac{b^2 d_1^2 d_2^2}{T^2} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[X_t X_t^\top] \\ &= \frac{b^2 d_1^2 d_2^2}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \sigma^2 \frac{1}{d_1} \mathbf{I}_{d_1} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^2 \sigma^2}{T^{1-\gamma}} \mathbf{I}_{d_1}. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, we can have

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \left\| \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 X_t X_t^\top \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right\|, \right. \\ \left. \left\| \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2}{T^2} \frac{d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 X_t^\top X_t \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right\| \right\} \lesssim \frac{d_1^2 d_2 \sigma^2}{T^{1-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by matrix Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-2}$,

$$\|\widehat{Z}_1\| \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2 \sigma}{T^{1-\gamma}} \log d_1 + \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \sigma^2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma.$$

The first term will be dominated by the second term since $T \gg d_1^{1/(1-\gamma)} \log^3 d_1$.

To prove the upper bound for $\|\widehat{Z}_2\| = \|\frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle X_t - \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|$, we follow the same arguments by observing that for any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{b}{T} \left(\frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle X_t - \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{b d_1 d_2}{T} \frac{2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} + \frac{b}{T} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\| \\ &\lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2}{T^{1-\gamma}} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} + \frac{\sqrt{d_1 d_2}}{T} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2 \sigma}{T^{1-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality comes from the fact that $\|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\| \leq \sqrt{d_1 d_2} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}$, and in the last inequality we again use $\|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max} \lesssim \sigma$.

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{b^2}{T^2} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle X_t - \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} \right) \left(\frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle X_t - \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} \right)^\top \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{b^2}{T^2} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbf{1}(a_t=1)}{\pi_t^2} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle^2 X_t X_t^\top \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \right\| + \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{b^2}{T^2} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{2 d_1^2 d_2^2}{\varepsilon_t} \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \|\mathbb{E}(X_t X_t^\top)\| + d_1 d_2 \|\widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}\|_{\max}^2 \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2^2 \sigma^2}{T^{1-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by matrix Bernstein inequality, with probability $1 - d_1^{-2}$,

$$\|\widehat{Z}_2\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma.$$

□

B.10 Proof of Lemma 10

Proof. Consider the event in Theorem 9

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\|\widetilde{Z}\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma\}.$$

The following proof is adapted from Theorem 4 and Lemma 9 in Xia and Yuan [2021]. We adapt it to martingale version. Under $\mathcal{E}$, we have $\|\widehat{Z}\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma \lesssim \lambda_{\min} =: \delta$. As long as $\sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma \lesssim \lambda_{\min}$, we have $\|\widehat{E}\| = \|\widehat{Z}\| \lesssim \lambda_{\min}$. Recall the $\mathfrak{P}^{-s}$ for $s \geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{P}^\perp$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3. Following the proof in Xia and Yuan [2021], it suffices to show under $\mathcal{E}$, there exist absolute constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ so that for all $k \geq 0$, the following bounds hold with probability at least

$$1 - 2(k+1)d_1^{-2},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [d_1]} \|e_j^\top \mathfrak{P}^\perp (\mathfrak{P}^\perp \widehat{E} \mathfrak{P}^\perp)^k \widehat{E} \Theta\| &\leq C_1 (C_2 \delta)^{k+1} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}}, \\ \max_{j \in [d_2]} \|e_{j+d_1}^\top \mathfrak{P}^\perp (\mathfrak{P}^\perp \widehat{E} \mathfrak{P}^\perp)^k \widehat{E} \Theta\| &\leq C_1 (C_2 \delta)^{k+1} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we only present the proof for $k = 0$ and the cases $k \geq 1$ can be similarly extended. Clearly, for $j \in [d_1]$,

$$\|e_j^\top \mathfrak{P}^\perp \widehat{E} \Theta\| \leq \|e_j^\top \Theta \Theta^\top \widehat{E} \Theta\| + \|e_j^\top \widehat{E} \Theta\| \leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}} + \|e_j^\top \widehat{E} \Theta\| = \delta \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}} + \|e_j^\top \widehat{Z} R\|.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} e_j^\top \widehat{Z} R &= \frac{b}{T} \left(\sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t e_j^\top X_t R \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle e_j^\top X_t R - e_j \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} R \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, for any $T_0 + 1 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\left\| \left\| \frac{b d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{T \pi_t} e_j^\top \xi_t X_t R \right\| \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \frac{d_1 d_2}{T^{1-\gamma}} \sigma \|R\|_{2, \max} \leq \frac{d_1 d_2}{T^{1-\gamma}} \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{b^2 d_1^2 d_2^2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{T^2 \pi_t^2} \xi_t^2 e_j^\top X_t R R^\top X_t^\top e_j \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \right] \lesssim \frac{t^\gamma \sigma^2 d_1 d_2}{T^2} \text{tr}(R R^\top) \leq \frac{t^\gamma r \sigma^2 d_1 d_2}{T^2}.$$

Then by martingale Bernstein inequality, with probability at least $1 - d_1^{-3}$,

$$\left\| \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \xi_t e_j^\top X_t R \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma.$$

Similarly, with the same probability,

$$\left\| \frac{b}{T} \sum_{t=T_0+1}^T \frac{d_1 d_2 \mathbb{1}(a_t = 1)}{\pi_t} \langle \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1}, X_t \rangle e_j^\top X_t R - e_j \widehat{\Delta}_{t-1} R \right\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma.$$

Then we can conclude that

$$\|e_j^\top \widehat{Z} R\| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{r d_1 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sigma$$

with probability at least $1 - 3d_1^{-3}$. Taking union bound,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{j \in [d_1]} \|e_j^\top \mathfrak{P}^\perp \widehat{E} \Theta\| \gtrsim \delta \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}}\right) &\leq 3d_1^{-2}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{j \in [d_2]} \|e_j^\top \mathfrak{P}^\perp \widehat{E} \Theta\| \gtrsim \delta \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_2}}\right) &\leq 3d_1^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Then following the proof of Lemma 4 in Xia and Yuan [2021],

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{L}\widehat{L}^\top - LL^\top\|_{2,\max} \gtrsim \frac{\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{d_1^2 d_2 \log d_1}{T^{1-\gamma}}} \sqrt{\frac{\mu r}{d_1}} \Big| \mathcal{E}\right) \leq 5d_1^{-2} \log^2 d_1.$$

And similarly we can prove the statement for $\|\widehat{R}\widehat{R}^\top - RR^\top\|_{2,\max}$.

□