

# On high-dimensional wavelet eigenanalysis <sup>\*†‡</sup>

Patrice Abry  
CNRS, ENS de Lyon, Laboratoire de Physique

B. Cooper Boniece  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Utah

Gustavo Didier  
Mathematics Department  
Tulane University

Herwig Wendt  
IRIT-ENSEEIH, CNRS (UMR 5505),  
Université de Toulouse, France

August 1, 2022

## Abstract

In this paper, we characterize the asymptotic and large scale behavior of the eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices in high dimensions. We assume that possibly non-Gaussian, finite-variance  $p$ -variate measurements are made of a low-dimensional  $r$ -variate ( $r \ll p$ ) fractional stochastic process with non-canonical scaling coordinates and in the presence of additive high-dimensional noise. The measurements are correlated both time-wise and between rows. We show that the  $r$  largest eigenvalues of the wavelet random matrices, when appropriately rescaled, converge in probability to scale-invariant functions in the high-dimensional limit. By contrast, the remaining  $p-r$  eigenvalues remain bounded in probability. Under additional assumptions, we show that the  $r$  largest log-eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices exhibit asymptotically Gaussian distributions. The results have direct consequences for statistical inference.

## 1 Introduction

A *wavelet* is a unit  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ -norm function that annihilates polynomials. For a fixed (octave)  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , a *wavelet random matrix* is given by

$$\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j) = \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D(a(n)2^j, k) D(a(n)2^j, k)^*. \quad (1.1)$$

In (1.1),  $*$  denotes transposition,  $n_{a,j} = n/a(n)2^j$  is the number of wavelet-domain observations for a sample size  $n$ . Each random vector  $D(a(n)2^j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is the *wavelet transform* of a  $p$ -variate stochastic process  $Y$  at the dyadic scale  $a(n)2^j$  and shift  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . It is defined by the entrywise convolution

$$D(a(n)2^j, k) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} Y(\ell) \tilde{h}_{a(n)2^j k - \ell} \quad (1.2)$$

for real-valued coefficients  $\tilde{h}$  that depend on the scale and on the underlying wavelet function. The entries of  $\{D(a(n)2^j, k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  are generally correlated. The so-named *wavelet eigenanalysis* methodology consists in using the behavior across scales of the eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices to study the fractality of stochastic systems (Abry and Didier (2018a, 2018b)). In this paper, we characterize the asymptotic

---

\*H.W. was partially supported by ANR-18-CE45-0007 MUTATION, France. G.D.'s long term visits to ENS de Lyon were supported by the school, the CNRS, the Carol Lavin Bernick faculty grant and the Simons Foundation collaboration grant #714014. The authors would like to thank Alice Guionnet for her comments and suggestions in the initial stages of this work.

†AMS Subject classification. Primary: 60G18, 60B20, 42C40. Secondary: 62H25.

‡Keywords and phrases: wavelets, operator self-similarity, random matrices.

and large scale behavior of the eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices in high dimensions. The (possibly non-Gaussian) underlying stochastic process  $Y = \{Y(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is assumed to have the form

$$Y(t) = \mathbf{P}X(t) + Z(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (1.3)$$

In (1.3), both  $Y$  and the noise term  $Z = \{Z(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are (high-dimensional)  $p = p(n)$ -variate processes,  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(n)$  is a rectangular coordinates matrix and, for fixed  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a (low-dimensional)  $r$ -variate fractional process. In particular, the measurements  $Y$  are correlated time-wise and between rows. We show that, if the ratio  $a(n)p(n)/n$  converges to a positive constant, under appropriate rescaling the  $r$  largest eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  converge in probability to scale-invariant functions. By contrast, the remaining  $p(n) - r$  eigenvalues remain bounded in probability. In addition, we show that the  $r$  largest log-eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  exhibit asymptotically Gaussian distributions. The results bear direct consequences for statistical inference starting from high-dimensional measurements of the form of a signal-plus-noise system (1.3), where  $X$  is a latent process containing fractal information and  $\mathbf{P}$  (as well as  $Z$ ) is unknown.

In this paper, we combine two mathematical frameworks that are rarely considered jointly: (i) high dimensional probability theory; (ii) fractal analysis. This is done by bringing together the study of large random matrices and scaling analysis in the wavelet domain.

Since the 1950s, the spectral behavior of large-dimensional random matrices has attracted considerable attention from the mathematical research community. In quantum mechanics, for example, random matrices are of great interest as statistical mechanical models of infinite-dimensional and possibly unknown Hamiltonian operators (e.g., Mehta and Gaudin (1960), Dyson (1962), Ben Arous and Guionnet (1997), Soshnikov (1999), Mehta (2004), Deift (2007), Anderson et al. (2010), Tao and Vu (2011), Erdős et al. (2012)). Random matrices have also naturally emerged as one essential mathematical framework for the modern era of “Big Data” (Briody (2011)). When hundreds to several tens of thousands of time series get recorded and stored on a daily basis, one is often interested in understanding the behavior of random constructs such as the spectral distribution of sample covariance matrices when the dimension  $p$  is comparable to the sample size  $n$  (e.g., Tao and Vu (2012), Xia et al. (2013), Paul and Aue (2014), Yao et al. (2015)). The literature on random matrices under dependence as well as on high-dimensional stochastic processes has been expanding at a fast pace (e.g., Basu and Michailidis (2015), Chakrabarty et al. (2016), Merlevède and Peligrad (2016), Che (2017), Steland and von Sachs (2017), Taylor and Salhi (2017), Wang et al. (2017), Zhang and Wu (2017), Erdős et al. (2019), Merlevède et al. (2019), Bourguin et al. (2021), Shen et al. (2022)).

In turn, recall that the emergence of a fractal is typically the signature of a physical mechanism that generates *scale invariance* (e.g., Mandelbrot (1982), West et al. (1999), Zheng et al. (2017), He (2018)). Unlike traditional statistical mechanical systems (e.g., Reif (2009)), a scale-invariant system does not display a characteristic scale, namely, one that dominates its statistical behavior. Instead, the behavior of the system across scales is determined by specific parameters called *scaling exponents*. Scale invariance manifests itself in a wide range of natural and social phenomena such as in criticality (Sornette (2006)), turbulence (Kolmogorov (1941)), climate studies (Isotta et al. (2014)), dendrochronology (Bai and Taqqu (2018)) and hydrology (Benson et al. (2006)). Mathematically, it is a topic of central importance in Markovian settings (e.g., diffusion, lattice models, universality classes) as well as in non-Markovian ones (e.g., anomalous diffusion, long-range dependence, non-central limit theorems).

In a multidimensional framework, scaling behavior does not always appear along standard coordinate axes, and often involves multiple scaling relations. A  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued stochastic process  $X$  is called *operator self-similar* (o.s.s.; Laha and Rohatgi (1981), Hudson and Mason (1982)) if it exhibits the scaling property

$$\{X(ct)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \stackrel{\text{f.d.d.}}{=} \{c^{\mathbf{H}}X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}, \quad c > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

In (1.4),  $\mathbf{H}$  is some (Hurst) matrix whose eigenvalues have real parts lying in the interval  $(0, 1]$  and  $c^{\mathbf{H}} := \exp\{\log(c)\mathbf{H}\} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\log(c)\mathbf{H})^k}{k!}$ . A canonical model for multivariate fractional systems is operator fractional Brownian motion (ofBm), namely, a Gaussian, o.s.s., stationary-increment stochastic process (Maejima and Mason (1994), Mason and Xiao (2002), Didier and Pipiras (2012)). In particular, ofBm is the natural multivariate generalization of the classical fBm (Embrechts and Maejima (2002)).

The model (1.3) provides a most natural formulation of a fractal, or scaling system, in high dimensions. Besides being very general – in particular, the measurements are possibly non-Gaussian –, it subsumes the fundamental idea behind the modeling of high-dimensional stochastic systems. In other words, a low-dimensional component, containing all the relevant physical information, is embedded in high-dimensional noise (e.g., Giraud (2015), Wainwright (2019)). In fact, (1.3) and closely related models appear in numerous applications such as, for example, in neuroscience and fMRI imaging (Ciuciu et al. (2012), Liu et al. (2015), Ting et al. (2017), Li et al. (2019), Gotts et al. (2020); cf. Chauduri et al. (2019), Stringer et al. (2019)) and in econometrics (Brown (1989), Stock and Watson (2011), Lam and Yao (2012), Chan et al. (2017), to name a few).

In the characterization of scaling properties, the use of eigenanalysis was first proposed in Meerschaert and Scheffler (1999, 2003) and Becker-Kern and Pap (2008). It has also been applied in the cointegration literature (e.g., Phillips and Ouliaris (1988), Li et al. (2009), Zhang et al. (2018)). In Abry and Didier (2018a, 2018b), *wavelet eigenanalysis* is put forward in the construction of a general methodology for the statistical identification of the scaling (Hurst) structure of ofBm in low dimensions.

In Abry et al. (2018) and Boniece et al. (2019), presented without proofs, wavelet random matrices were first used in the modeling of high-dimensional systems. In this paper, we construct the mathematical foundations of wavelet eigenanalysis in high dimensions by investigating the properties of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{p(n)}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))$  of large wavelet random matrices  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ . We assume measurements given by (1.3), where the fractional behavior of  $X$  is characterized by a scaling matrix of the Jordan form

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{P}_H \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_r) \mathbf{P}_H^{-1}, \quad h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_r. \quad (1.5)$$

The measurements  $Y$  display correlation time-wise and between rows. We consider the three-way limit as the sample size ( $n$ ), dimension ( $p(n)$ ) and scale ( $a(n)$ ) go to infinity, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p(n)a(n)}{n} =: c \in [0, \infty). \quad (1.6)$$

It is by considering the three-way limit (1.6), which includes a *scaling limit*, that large (wavelet) random matrices may be used in the characterization of low-frequency behavior in a high-dimensional framework. In fact, in this paper we show that the  $r$  largest eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices display fractal – or scaling – properties determined by (1.5) as well as, under additional assumptions, asymptotically Gaussian fluctuations. In particular, such eigenvalues are explosive. By contrast, the remaining  $p(n) - r$  eigenvalues do not exhibit fractality and remain bounded.

To be more precise, under very general assumptions, we establish that, for positive functions  $\xi_q(\cdot)$ ,

$$\lambda_{p(n)-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)2^{h_q+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_q(2^j), \quad q = 1, \dots, r, \quad (1.7)$$

whereas  $\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, p(n) - r$ , are bounded in probability (see Theorem 3.1; see also Figure 1 for an illustration). Moreover, under slightly stronger conditions, we show that the random vector

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{a(n)2^j}} \left( \log \lambda_{p(n)-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)2^{h_q+1}} \right) - \log \lambda_{p(n)-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)2^{h_q+1}} \right) \right), \quad q = 1, \dots, r, \quad (1.8)$$

is asymptotically Gaussian (see Theorem 3.2). In particular, the convergence rate in (1.8) also involves the scaling limit. Note that this stands in sharp contrast with traditional high-dimensional analysis of sample covariance matrices, in which one considers the ratio  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(n)/n$  and the largest eigenvalue often exhibits universality in the form of Tracy–Widom fluctuations (e.g., Bai and Silverstein (2010), Lee and Schnelli (2016)).

From the standpoint of probability theory, to the best of our knowledge this paper provides the first mathematical study of the high-dimensional properties of wavelet random matrices. It is also the first time, again to the best of our knowledge, that the role of scaling – or low-frequency behavior – is given special attention in the context of large random matrices, i.e., in the form of the three-way limit (1.6).

From the standpoint of fractal analysis, this paper takes a decisive step in the expansion, to the high-dimensional context, of the study of scale-invariant and non-Markovian phenomena started by Kolmogorov

(1940) and Mandelbrot and Van Ness (1968), and later taken up by the likes of Flandrin (1992), Wornell and Oppenheim (1992), Meyer et al. (1999), among many others (see Pipiras and Taqqu (2017)).

The expressions for the top  $r$  wavelet eigenvalues involve discrepant scaling rates, leading to the presence of potentially explosive terms. For this reason, establishing (1.7) requires constructing a squeeze-type argument based on lower and upper bounds where such terms have been replaced by finite and convergent sequences. In turn, proving (1.8) involves handling Taylor expansions of wavelet log-eigenvalues both in the high-dimensional limit and in the presence of potentially explosive terms. High-level discussions of the main technical issues involved in showing (1.7) and (1.8) are provided at the beginning of Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively.

For the sake of clarity and mathematical generality, our assumptions are stated directly in the wavelet domain (see Section 2). Our results have direct consequences for the empirical identification and description of fractality in high-dimensional systems, as briefly discussed in Section 3.2. We further provide encompassing classes of examples covered by the assumptions (see Section 4). Supposing  $X$  is an ofBm, we describe a very broad Gaussian framework for the noise term  $Z$  satisfying the assumptions used in Section 2. We also discuss some simple finite-variance and non-Gaussian instances  $X$  of interest, hence illustrating the broad scope of the assumptions (see Section 4; for comments on non-Gaussian  $Z$ , see Example 4.3). Detailed proofs for Section 4 can be found in the extended version of this paper (Abry et al. (2022)), which is self-contained and available online.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide the basic wavelet framework, definitions and wavelet-domain assumptions used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we state and discuss the main results on the asymptotic and large-scale behavior of wavelet eigenvalues in high dimensions. In Section 4, we provide a Gaussian framework, as well as Gaussian and non-Gaussian examples. In Section 5, we prove the main results, stated in Section 3. In Section 6, we lay out conclusions and discuss several open problems that this work leads to. This includes new aspects of the theory of wavelet random matrices, as well as consequences for statistical inference and modeling. The appendix contains the statements and proofs of auxiliary results.

## 2 Framework and notation

For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{M}(m, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{M}(m, \mathbb{C})$  be the spaces of  $m \times m$  real- and complex-valued matrices, respectively. Also, let  $\mathcal{M}(m_1, m_2, \mathbb{R})$  be the spaces of  $m_1 \times m_2$  real-valued matrices. Let  $\mathcal{S}(m, \mathbb{C})$  be the space of  $m \times m$  Hermitian matrices. We use the notation  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(m, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{> 0}(m, \mathbb{R})$  to denote the cones of symmetric positive semidefinite and symmetric positive definite matrices, respectively. The groups of real- or complex-valued invertible matrices are denoted by  $GL(m, \mathbb{R})$  and  $GL(m, \mathbb{C})$ , respectively. The symbol  $\mathbf{I}_m$  denotes the identity matrix in  $\mathcal{M}(m, \mathbb{R})$ , for convenience written simply as  $\mathbf{I}$  when dimension is unambiguous. The notation  $\mathbb{S}^{m-1} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{u} = 1\}$  represents the  $m - 1$  dimensional sphere. Throughout the manuscript,  $\|\mathbf{M}\|$  denotes the spectral norm of a matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R})$  in arbitrary dimension  $p$ , i.e.,  $\|\mathbf{M}\| = \sqrt{\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{u}} = \sqrt{\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u}}$ . Also, the norm  $\|\mathbf{M}\|$  is analogously defined when  $\mathbf{M}$  is rectangular. For any  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$-\infty < \lambda_1(\mathbf{M}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_q(\mathbf{M}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_p(\mathbf{M}) < \infty \quad (2.1)$$

denotes the set of ordered eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ . For  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}(m_1, m_2, \mathbb{R})$  and for any  $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, m_1\}$  and  $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, m_2\}$ ,

$$\pi_{i_1, i_2}(\mathbf{M}) = m_{i_1, i_2} \quad (2.2)$$

denotes entry  $(i_1, i_2)$  of the matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ . For  $S = (s_{i_1, i_2})_{i_1, i_2=1, \dots, p} \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$ , we define the operator

$$\text{vec}_S(S) = (s_{11}, s_{21}, \dots, s_{p1}, s_{22}, s_{32}, \dots, s_{p2}, \dots, s_{pp}). \quad (2.3)$$

Further recall that any matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R})$  admits a  $QR$  decomposition

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}, \quad (2.4)$$




Figure 1: **The behavior of wavelet log-eigenvalues in the three-way limit**  $\frac{p2^j}{n} \rightarrow c \in [0, \infty)$ . For  $r = 6$  and  $h_i \in \{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.6, 0.8, 0.9\}$ , the plots display the asymptotic behavior of  $\frac{1}{2}[(\log \Lambda_q(2^j))/j - 1]$ , where  $\Lambda_q(2^j) := \lambda_q(\mathbf{W}(2^j))$ . In all plots,  $p$  and  $n_j = n/2^j$  increase while their ratio remains fixed at  $p/n_j = c = 1/2$  (left column) and  $c = 1/4$  (right column). The coordinates matrix  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}_H$  is randomly drawn for each  $n$ . The  $r = 6$  largest wavelet log-eigenvalues (see (3.6)) approach  $h_1, \dots, h_6$  as  $n$ ,  $p$  and  $j$  grow, whereas the remaining wavelet log-eigenvalues (see (3.7)) tend toward zero as  $j$  increases in all instances. With  $c$  fixed (along each column), the larger sample size  $n$  (bottom row) results in near-convergence at smaller octaves  $j$  (n.b.: axes have been shifted to align the curves). Similarly, as  $c$  decreases (between left and right columns), the near-convergence also occurs at smaller  $j$ .

where  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R})$  has orthonormal columns and  $\mathbf{R} \in GL(r, \mathbb{R})$  (e.g., Horn and Johnson (2013), Theorem 2.1.14, (a)). Given any matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}(r, s, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , for simplicity we write

$$\mathbf{M}^\perp = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^r : \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}\} = \text{nullspace}(\mathbf{M}^*). \quad (2.5)$$

Also, for any collection of matrices  $\mathbf{M}_i \in \mathcal{M}(r, s_i, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , we write  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_m\}$  for the column space of the matrix  $(\mathbf{M}_1 \dots \mathbf{M}_m)$ .

We use the asymptotic notation

$$o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (2.6)$$

to describe sequences of random vectors or matrices whose *spectral norms* vanish, are bounded above and bounded away from zero, respectively, in probability.

## 2.1 Wavelet analysis

Recall that a *wavelet*  $\psi$  is a unit  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ -norm function that annihilates polynomials. Throughout the paper, we make use of a wavelet multiresolution analysis (MRA; see Mallat (1999), chapter 7), which decomposes

$L^2(\mathbb{R})$  into a sequence of *approximation* (low-frequency) and *detail* (high-frequency) subspaces  $V_j$  and  $W_j$ , respectively, associated with different scales of analysis  $2^j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular, given a wavelet  $\psi$ , there is a related *scaling function*  $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Appropriate rescalings and shifts of  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  form bases for the subspaces  $V_j$  and  $W_j$ , respectively (see Mallat (1999), Theorems 7.1 and 7.3).

In almost all mathematical statements, we make assumptions (W1 – W4) on the underlying wavelet MRA. Such assumptions are standard in the wavelet literature and are accurately described in Section A. In particular, we make use of a compactly supported wavelet basis.

So, let  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  be the scaling and wavelet functions, respectively, associated with the wavelet MRA. We further suppose the wavelet coefficients stem from Mallat’s pyramidal algorithm (Mallat (1999), chapter 7). For expositional simplicity, in our description of the algorithm we use the  $\mathbb{R}^p$ -valued process  $Y$ , though analogous developments also hold for both  $X$  and  $Z$ . Initially, suppose an infinite sequence of (generally dependent) random vectors

$$\{Y(\ell)\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}, \quad (2.7)$$

associated with the starting scale  $2^j = 1$  (or octave  $j = 0$ ), is available. Then, we can apply Mallat’s algorithm to extract the so-named *approximation* ( $A(2^{j+1}, \cdot)$ ) and *detail* ( $D(2^{j+1}, \cdot)$ ) coefficients at coarser scales  $2^{j+1}$  by means of an iterative procedure. In fact, as commonly done in the wavelet literature, we initialize the algorithm with the process

$$\mathbb{R}^p \ni \tilde{Y}(t) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} Y(k) \phi(t - k), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.8)$$

By the orthogonality of the shifted scaling functions  $\{\phi(\cdot - k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ ,

$$\mathbb{R}^p \ni A(2^0, k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{Y}(t) \phi(t - k) dt = Y(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (2.9)$$

(see Stoev et al. (2002), proof of Lemma 6.1, or Moulines et al. (2007b), p. 160; cf. Abry and Flandrin (1994), p. 33). In other words, the initial sequence, at octave  $j = 0$ , of approximation coefficients is given by the original sequence of random vectors. To obtain approximation and detail coefficients at coarser scales, we use Mallat’s iterative procedure

$$A(2^{j+1}, k) = \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} u_{k'-2k} A(2^j, k'), \quad D(2^{j+1}, k) = \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}} v_{k'-2k} A(2^j, k'), \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.10)$$

where the (scalar) filter sequences  $\{u_k := 2^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(t/2) \phi(t - k) dt\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $\{v_k := 2^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t/2) \phi(t - k) dt\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are called low- and high-pass MRA filters, respectively. Due to the assumed compactness of the supports of  $\psi$  and of the associated scaling function  $\phi$  (see condition (A.2)), only a finite number of filter terms is nonzero, which is convenient for computational purposes (Daubechies (1992)). Hereinafter, we assume without loss of generality that  $\text{supp}(\phi) = \text{supp}(\psi) = [0, T]$  (cf. Moulines et al (2007b), p. 160). Moreover, the wavelet (detail) coefficients  $D(2^j, k)$  of  $Y$  can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{R}^p \ni D(2^j, k) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} Y(\ell) h_{j, 2^j k - \ell}, \quad (2.11)$$

where the filter terms are defined by

$$\mathbb{R} \ni h_{j, \ell} = 2^{-j/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(t + \ell) \psi(2^{-j} t) dt \quad (2.12)$$

(in the notation of (1.2),  $\tilde{h}_{2^j k - \ell} = h_{j, 2^j k - \ell}$ ). If we replace (2.7) with the realistic assumption that only a finite length series

$$\{Y(k)\}_{k=1, \dots, n} \quad (2.13)$$

is available, writing  $\tilde{Y}^{(n)}(t) := \sum_{k=1}^n Y(k) \phi(t - k)$ , we have  $\tilde{Y}^{(n)}(t) = \tilde{Y}(t)$  for all  $t \in (T, n + 1)$  (cf. Moulines et al. (2007b)). Noting that  $D(2^j, k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{Y}(t) 2^{-j/2} \psi(2^{-j} t - k) dt$  and  $D^{(n)}(2^j, k) =$

$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{Y}^{(n)}(t) 2^{-j/2} \psi(2^{-j}t - k) dt$ , it follows that the finite-sample wavelet coefficients  $D^{(n)}(2^j, k)$  of  $\tilde{Y}^{(n)}(t)$  are equal to  $D(2^j, k)$  whenever  $\text{supp } \psi(2^{-j} \cdot - k) = (2^j k, 2^j(k + T)) \subseteq (T, n + 1)$ . In other words,

$$D^{(n)}(2^j, k) = D(2^j, k), \quad \forall (j, k) \in \{(j, k) : 2^{-j}T \leq k \leq 2^{-j}(n + 1) - T\}. \quad (2.14)$$

Equivalently, such subset of finite-sample wavelet coefficients is not affected by the so-named *border effect* (cf. Craigmile et al. (2005), Percival and Walden (2006)). Moreover, by (2.14) the number of such coefficients at octave  $j$  is given by  $n_j = \lfloor 2^{-j}(n + 1 - T) - T \rfloor$ . Hence,  $n_j \sim 2^{-j}n$  for large  $n$ . Thus, for notational simplicity we suppose

$$n_j = \frac{n}{2^j} \quad (2.15)$$

holds exactly and only work with wavelet coefficients unaffected by the border effect.

## 2.2 Wavelet random matrices and assumptions

Throughout the paper, we assume observations stem from the model (1.3). The independent ‘‘signal’’  $X = \{X(t)\}$  and the noise component  $Z = \{Z(t)\}$  are  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued and  $\mathbb{R}^p$ -valued, respectively, where  $r$  is fixed and  $p = p(n)$ . The deterministic matrix  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(n)$  can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R}) \ni \mathbf{P}(n) = \left( \mathbf{p}_1(n), \dots, \mathbf{p}_r(n) \right), \quad \|\mathbf{p}_q(n)\| = 1, \quad q = 1, \dots, r. \quad (2.16)$$

For the sake of clarity and mathematical generality, we state the appropriate conditions for the convergence in probability as well as for the asymptotic normality of wavelet log-eigenvalues directly in the wavelet domain. For  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a dyadic sequence  $\{a(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the random vectors

$$D(a(n)2^j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad D_X(a(n)2^j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^r \quad \text{and} \quad D_Z(a(n)2^j, k) \in \mathbb{R}^p$$

denote the wavelet transform at scale  $a(n)2^j$  of the stochastic processes  $Y$ ,  $X$  or  $Z$ , respectively. Whenever well defined, the *wavelet random matrix* – or *sample wavelet (co)variance* – of  $Y$  at scale  $a(n)2^j$  is denoted by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R}) \ni \mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j) = \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D(a(n)2^j, k) D(a(n)2^j, k)^*, \quad n_{a,j} = \frac{n}{a(n)2^j}. \quad (2.17)$$

The remaining wavelet random matrix terms  $\mathbf{W}_X$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_Z$  are naturally defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j) &= \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D_X(a(n)2^j, k) D_X(a(n)2^j, k)^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R}), \\ \mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j) &= \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D_X(a(n)2^j, k) D_Z(a(n)2^j, k)^* \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R}) \\ \text{and } \mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j) &= \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D_Z(a(n)2^j, k) D_Z(a(n)2^j, k)^* \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

In particular, since  $p = p(n) \rightarrow \infty$  in general (see (2.27)), only  $\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)$  in (2.18) has fixed dimensions.

We further define the auxiliary random matrix

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) = \mathbf{P}_H^{-1} \{ a(n)^{-\mathbf{H} - (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j) a(n)^{-\mathbf{H}^* - (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \} (\mathbf{P}_H^*)^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R}), \quad (2.19)$$

as well as its mean  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) := \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$ . In (2.19), we assume that the *scaling matrix*  $\mathbf{H}$  has the Jordan form

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{P}_H \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_r) \mathbf{P}_H^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{P}_H \in GL(r, \mathbb{R}), \quad -1/2 < h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_r < \infty. \quad (2.20)$$

For the sake of illustration, when  $X$  is an ofBm,  $\mathbf{H}$  is a *Hurst matrix* whose ordered eigenvalues satisfy  $0 < h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_r \leq 1$  (see Example 2.1). Moreover, in this case it can be shown that the relation

$$\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j) \approx a(n)^{\mathbf{H} + (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_X(2^j) a(n)^{\mathbf{H}^* + (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \approx a(n)^{\mathbf{H} + (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}_H \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \mathbf{P}_H^* a(n)^{\mathbf{H}^* + (1/2)\mathbf{I}} \quad (2.21)$$

holds approximately in law (cf. Abry and Didier (2018b), Proposition 3.1), where  $\mathbf{W}_X(2^j) := \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} D_X(2^j, k) D_X(2^j, k)^*$ . Hence, the matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  can be interpreted as a version of  $\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)$  after compensating for scaling (i.e., multiplication by  $a(n)^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}$  and its transpose) and non-canonical coordinates (i.e., multiplication by  $\mathbf{P}_H^{-1}$  and its transpose).

We make use of the following assumptions in the main results of this paper (Section 3). For expository purposes, we first state the assumptions, and then provide some interpretation.

ASSUMPTION (A1): The wavelet random matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j) &= \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)\mathbf{P}^*(n) + \mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j) + \mathbf{W}_{X,Z}^*(a(n)2^j)\mathbf{P}^*(n) \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

is well defined a.s.

ASSUMPTION (A2): In (2.22), for  $\mathbf{H}$  as in (2.19),

$$\|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)\| = O(1), \quad \max\{\|\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)\|, \|a(n)^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j)\|\} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (2.23)$$

ASSUMPTION (A3): The random matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  as in (2.19) satisfies

$$\left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} (\text{vec}_S \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) - \text{vec}_S \mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \right)_{j=j_1, \dots, j_m} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_B(j_1, \dots, j_m)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.24)$$

for some  $\Sigma_B(j_1, \dots, j_m) \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(m \cdot r, \mathbb{R})$ . In addition, its mean  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) = \mathbb{E}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) - \mathbf{B}(2^j)\| = o(1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad j = j_1, \dots, j_m, \quad (2.25)$$

where  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  is some matrix satisfying

$$\mathbf{B}(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r, \mathbb{R}). \quad (2.26)$$

ASSUMPTION (A4): The dimension  $p(n)$  and the scaling factor  $a(n)$  satisfy the relations

$$a(n) \leq \frac{n}{2^{jm}}, \quad \frac{a(n)}{n} + \frac{n}{a(n)^{h_1+3/2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{p(n)}{n/a(n)} \rightarrow c \in [0, \infty), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.27)$$

ASSUMPTION (A5): Let  $\mathbf{P}(n) \in \mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathbf{P}_H \in GL(r, \mathbb{R})$  be as in (2.16) and (2.20), respectively. Let

$$\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H = \mathbf{Q}(n)\mathbf{R}(n) \quad (2.28)$$

be the  $QR$  decomposition of  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H$  (cf. (2.4)). Then, there exists a (deterministic) matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  with Cholesky decomposition  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{R}^*\mathbf{R}$  such that

$$\|\mathbf{R}(n) - \mathbf{R}\| = o(1). \quad (2.29)$$

Assumptions (A1 – A3) pertain to wavelet domain behavior. Assumption (A1) holds under very general conditions. In fact, since  $X$  and  $Z$  are assumed independent, it suffices that  $\|\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)\| < \infty$  and  $\|\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)\| < \infty$  a.s., which holds under (W1 – W4) as long as  $X$  and  $Z$  are well defined discrete time stochastic processes. Assumption (A2) ensures that the influence of the random matrices  $\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)$  in the observed wavelet spectrum  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  is not too large. Assumption (A3) posits the asymptotic normality of the (wavelet domain) fractional component  $\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)$  after compensating for scaling and non-canonical coordinates.

In turn, Assumption (A4) controls the divergence rates among  $n$ ,  $a(n)$  and  $p(n)$  in the three-way limit. In particular, it states that the scaling factor  $a(n)$  must blow up slower than  $n$ , and that the three-component ratio  $\frac{p(n)a(n)}{n}$  must converge to a constant (cf. the traditional ratio  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p(n)/n$  for high-dimensional sample covariance matrices). Assumption (A5) ensures that, asymptotically speaking, the angles between the column vectors of the matrix  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H$  converge in such a way that the matrix of asymptotic angles  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_H^* \mathbf{P}^*(n) \mathbf{P}(n) \mathbf{P}_H = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{R}^*(n) \mathbf{R}(n) = \mathbf{A}$  has full rank. This entails that  $\mathbf{P}(n)$  does not strongly perturb the scaling properties of the hidden random matrix  $\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)$ .

A discussion of broad contexts where assumptions (A2) and (A3) hold is deferred to Section 4. In the following example, to fix ideas we briefly illustrate assumption (A3).



**Example 2.1** As discussed in the introduction, ofBm is the natural multivariate generalization of fBm. It is defined as a (i) Gaussian; (ii) o.s.s.; (iii) stationary-increment stochastic process. Suppose the  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued stochastic process  $X$  is an ofBm, and rewrite  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{P}_H J_H \mathbf{P}_H^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\mathbf{P}_H \in GL(r, \mathbb{C})$  and  $J_H$  is the Jordan form of  $\mathbf{H}$ . It can be shown that most instances of ofBm admit the spectral density

$$\mathfrak{g}_X(x) = x_+^{-(\mathbf{H}+(1/2)\mathbf{I})} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^* x_+^{-(\mathbf{H}^*+(1/2)\mathbf{I})} + x_-^{-(\mathbf{H}+(1/2)\mathbf{I})} \overline{\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*} x_-^{-(\mathbf{H}^*+(1/2)\mathbf{I})}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (2.30)$$

for some  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{C})$  (Didier and Pipiras (2011), Theorem 3.1). So, fix  $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Under mild assumptions on the ofBm, and supposing the underlying wavelet basis has  $N_\psi \geq 2$  vanishing moments (see expression (A.1)), the associated auxiliary random matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  as in (2.19) satisfies Assumption (A3) as a consequence of Theorem 3.1, Lemma C.2 (extended to dimension  $r$ ) and Proposition 3.1 in Abry and Didier (2018b). In other words, relations (2.24)–(2.26) hold for a matrix sequence  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(\mathbb{R}, r)$  and a matrix  $\mathbf{B}(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(\mathbb{R}, r)$ . Moreover, if  $\mathbf{H}$  is diagonalizable with real eigenvalues, it can be easily shown that the matrix  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  satisfies the entrywise (i.e., along canonical axes) scaling relations

$$\mathbf{B}(2^j) = \left( \mathbf{b}(2^j)_{ii'} \right)_{i,i'=1,\dots,r} = \left( 2^{j(h_i+h_{i'}+1)} \mathbf{b}(1)_{ii'} \right)_{i,i'=1,\dots,r} \quad (2.31)$$

(cf. the discussion around relation (2.21)).

## 3 Main results

### 3.1 Asymptotic behavior of wavelet eigenvalues

In our first theorem, we establish that, after proper rescaling, the  $r$  largest eigenvalues of a wavelet random matrix  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  in high dimensions converge in probability to deterministic functions  $\xi_q(2^j)$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, r$ . Thus, such functions can be interpreted as *asymptotic rescaled eigenvalues*. Notably, they display a scaling property. Moreover, the remaining  $p(n) - r$  eigenvalues of a wavelet random matrix are bounded in probability.

**Theorem 3.1** *Assume (W1 – W4) and (A1 – A5) hold, and fix  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for  $p = p(n)$ , the limits*

$$p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} =: \xi_q(2^j) > 0, \quad q = 1, \dots, r, \quad (3.1)$$

*exist, and the deterministic functions  $\xi_q$  satisfy the scaling relation*

$$\xi_q(2^j) = 2^{j(2h_q+1)} \xi_q(1). \quad (3.2)$$

*In addition,*

$$0 \leq \lambda_1(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{p-r}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (3.3)$$

In our second theorem, we establish the asymptotic normality of the  $r$  largest wavelet log-eigenvalues in high dimensions. Note that, by comparison to Theorem 3.1, the asymptotic normality of wavelet log-eigenvalues requires some additional condition so as to ensure the finite-sample differentiability of the wavelet eigenvalues with respect to the scaling parameters (see also Remark 3.1).

**Theorem 3.2** *Assume (W1 – W4) and (A1 – A5) hold, and fix integers  $0 < j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_m$ . Further suppose that*

$$\text{whenever } h_{\ell_1} = h_{\ell_2} \text{ with } \ell_1 \neq \ell_2, \text{ then } \xi_{\ell_1}(1) \neq \xi_{\ell_2}(1). \quad (3.4)$$

*Then, for  $p = p(n)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{R}^{m \cdot r} \ni \left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) \right) \right)_{q=1,\dots,r} \Big|_{j=j_1,\dots,j_m} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\lambda) \quad (3.5)$$

*as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\Sigma_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(m \cdot r, \mathbb{R})$ .*

**Example 3.1** Condition (3.4) covers the central subcases where the scaling eigenvalues are simple ( $h_1 < \dots < h_r$ ) or identical ( $h_1 = \dots = h_r$ ) with distinct constants  $\xi_q(1)$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, r$ .

**Remark 3.1** Without condition (3.4), due to the lack of smoothness of eigenvalues, the asymptotic distribution of wavelet log-eigenvalues in high dimensions is expected to be generally non-Gaussian. A broad characterization of such distribution remains an open problem.

### 3.2 Consequences for statistical inference: a short discussion

Non-canonical scaling coordinates  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H$  generally mix together slow and fast scaling laws present in the behavior of high-dimensional fractional stochastic processes. This leads to the so-called *amplitude* and *dominance effects* (see Abry and Didier (2018b) for a detailed discussion). These effects manifest themselves in the form of strong biases in standard, univariate-like statistical methodology when applied to measurements of multidimensional phenomena such as Internet traffic (e.g., Abry and Didier (2018a), Section 6), cointegration (see, for instance, Kaufmann and Stern (2002), Schmith et al. (2012) on climate science) and systems modeled in blind source separation problems (e.g., Comon and Jutten (2010); see also Example 4.2 in this paper).

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 bear direct consequences for statistical inference. This is so because they provide a framework for the high-dimensional estimation of the parameters  $h_1, \dots, h_r$  and  $r$ , and hence, of the scaling properties of the system (1.3) even in the presence of non-canonical coordinates  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H$  and high-dimensional, non-Gaussian noise.

In fact, fix  $j$ . In light of (3.1), (3.2) and (3.5), the random vector

$$\left\{ \frac{\log \lambda_{p(n)-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{2 \log a(n)} - \frac{1}{2} \right\}_{q=1, \dots, r} \quad (3.6)$$

can be interpreted, in the language of statistics, as *consistent* and *asymptotically normal* estimators of the vector of scaling parameters  $\{h_q\}_{q=1, \dots, r}$  in high dimensions. Under the same conditions, the lowest  $p(n) - r$  wavelet log-eigenvalues stay bounded, whence

$$\frac{\log \lambda_{p(n)-r}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{2 \log a(n)} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (3.7)$$

converges to zero in probability (see Figure 1). Moreover, Theorem 3.2 can be used in testing the hypothesis of the equality of scaling eigenvalues (see Example 3.1).

## 4 Examples

Recall that assumptions (A2) and (A3) (i.e., (2.23) and (2.24)–(2.25), respectively) are stated in the wavelet domain. In this section, we provide a Gaussian framework as well as Gaussian and non-Gaussian examples where such assumptions are satisfied.

### 4.1 A Gaussian framework

When  $X$  and  $Z$  are Gaussian, it can be shown that conditions (2.23)–(2.25) hold under very general assumptions. This is so, for example, when

- (a)  $X$  is an ofBm;
- (b)  $Z$  is picked independently of  $X$  and based on an appropriate array of (colored) noise density functions.

In fact, recall that, when  $X$  is an ofBm, under mild conditions the auxiliary random matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  satisfies (2.24)–(2.26) (i.e., Assumption (A3); see Example 2.1).

Moreover, in the following proposition we describe in detail general conditions under which  $X$  and  $Z$  satisfy (2.23) (i.e., Assumption (A2)). This framework is further illustrated in Example 4.1.

**Proposition 4.1** *Suppose assumptions (W1 – W4) are in place. Further suppose the following conditions hold.*

- (i) *The  $\mathbb{R}^p$ -valued (noise) stochastic process  $Z = \{Z(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  as in (1.3) has spectral density*

$$\mathbf{g}_Z(x) \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R}), \quad x \in [-\pi, \pi]. \quad (4.1)$$

In (4.1),  $\mathbf{g}_Z = \text{diag}(\mathbf{g}_{1,n}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{p,n})$ , where  $\mathbf{g}_{\ell,n}$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, p$ , are drawn independently according to a distribution  $F(d\mathbf{g})$  on a class

$$\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^1[-\pi, \pi] \quad (4.2)$$

of univariate functions  $\mathbf{g}$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{x \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\mathbf{g}(x)| < \infty, \quad |\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0)| = O(x^2), \quad x \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.3)$$

In addition, suppose that, conditionally on  $\mathbf{g}$ , the univariate covariance function  $\gamma_{Z_1, \mathbf{g}}$  satisfies

$$|\gamma_{Z_1, \mathbf{g}}(h)| \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 h}, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (4.4)$$

where the constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  do not depend on the (univariate) density  $\mathbf{g}$ ;

(ii) the measure  $F(d\mathbf{g})$  as in (i) (see (4.2)) is independent of  $X$  in (1.3);

(iii)  $h_1, \dots, h_r \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/2\}$ , and the stationary-increment,  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued stochastic process  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is an ofBm with Hurst matrix  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{P}_H \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_r) \mathbf{P}_H^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_H \in GL(r, \mathbb{R})$ , whose spectral density (2.30) is such that  $\det \Re(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^*) > 0$ .

Then, condition (2.23) (i.e., Assumption (A2)) is satisfied.

The proof of Proposition 4.1 can be found in the extended version of this paper (Abry et al. (2022)). To show it, we draw upon the concentration of measure phenomenon (Ledoux (2001), Boucheron et al. (2013)) to nonasymptotically control the behavior of large-dimensional wavelet random matrices formed from colored noise (see Section C.1, Abry et al. (2022)).

**Example 4.1** For any fixed  $n$  and for fixed integers  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , let  $Z$  be a  $p(n)$ -variate process made up of independent copies of an ARMA( $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ ) process (in particular,  $F(d\mathbf{g})$  is a Dirac delta on the associated spectral density). Further assume that  $F(d\mathbf{g})$  is independent of a  $r$ -variate ofBm  $X$  satisfying condition (iii) in Proposition 4.1. Then, all conditions of Proposition 4.1 are met.

**Remark 4.1** The assumption in Proposition 4.1 that the process  $X$  is an ofBm or even that it has (first order) stationary increments is *not* crucial. It is well known that wavelet frameworks are suitable for stationary increment processes of *any* order. This is so because, for such processes, wavelet coefficients are, in general, stationary as long as the chosen number of vanishing moments of the underlying wavelet basis (see (A.1)) is sufficiently large. Such topic has been broadly explored in the literature (e.g., Flandrin (1992), Wornell and Oppenheim (1992), Veitch and Abry (1999), Moulines et al. (2008), Roueff and Taqqu (2009); see Abry et al. (2019) on the multivariate stochastic processes). In particular, condition (2.20) on scaling eigenvalues allows for stationary fractional processes  $X$  exhibiting long-range dependence (see, for instance, Embrechts and Maejima (2002), Pipiras and Taqqu (2017)).

## 4.2 Non-Gaussian instances: a short discussion

Characterizing the wavelet domain behavior of high-dimensional, non-Gaussian, second-order and fractional frameworks is a very broad topic that lies well outside the scope of this paper. In this section, we restrict ourselves to discussing certain non-Gaussian instances so as to help illustrate the fact that the wavelet domain properties established in Section 3 do not fundamentally require the system (1.3) to be Gaussian.

**Example 4.2** Let  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a possibly non-Gaussian,  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued stochastic processes made up of independent linear fractional processes with finite fourth moments. Then, based on the framework constructed in Roueff and Taqqu (2009), we can show that the associated random matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies conditions (2.24) and (2.25) (i.e., in Assumption (A3)) under conditions (W1 – W4) and mild additional assumptions on the wavelet  $\psi$  and on the process  $X$ . This claim is made precise in Proposition C.2, Abry et al. (2022).

Even though – in this particular case – the  $r$  components of  $X$  are assumed independent, note that statistically estimating the  $r$  univariate scaling exponents based on the associated model (1.3) is still,

in general, a nontrivial problem. This is so due to the presence of the unknown coordinates matrix  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H = \mathbf{P}(n)$ , as well as of the high-dimensional noise component  $Z$ . In fact, mathematically speaking, such model is a high-dimensional version of the so-called *blind source separation* problems, which are of great interest in the field of signal processing (e.g., Naik and Wang (2014); in a fractional context, see Abry et al. (2019)).

**Example 4.3** Recall that a distribution is called *sub-Gaussian* when its tails are no heavier than those of the Gaussian distribution (Vershynin (2018), Proposition 2.5.2). Sub-Gaussian distributions form a broad family that includes the Gaussian distribution itself, as well as compactly supported distributions, for example. Suppose the noise process  $\{Z(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  consists of (discrete-time) i.i.d. sub-Gaussian observations. Consider the Haar wavelet framework, where the wavelet coefficients are computed by means of Mallat's iterative procedure (2.10). Then, for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , the nonzero coefficients in the sequences  $\{h_{j,2^j k - \ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $\{h_{j,2^j k' - \ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$  do not overlap for  $k \neq k'$  (cf. (2.11)). For this reason, the wavelet coefficients are independent at any fixed scale. Although we do not provide a proof due to space constraints, it is then possible to use traditional concentration of measure techniques to show that the wavelet random matrix  $\mathbf{W}_Z$  satisfies condition (2.23) in Assumption (A2). The study of the properties of wavelet random matrices  $\mathbf{W}_Z$  under other wavelet bases or other classes of non-Gaussian observations is currently a topic of research.

**Remark 4.2** In general, depending on the properties of the latent process  $X$ , the random matrix  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  may not be asymptotically Gaussian, i.e., assumption (A3) may not hold. In the univariate context ( $r = 1$ ), see, for instance, Bardet and Tudor (2010), Clausel et al. (2014). Nevertheless, for  $r > 1$ , the literature still lacks broad characterizations of conditions under which  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  (or  $\mathbf{W}_X(a(n)2^j)$ ) is asymptotically non-Gaussian.

## 5 Proofs of the main results

In this section, whenever convenient we simply write

$$p = p(n), \quad a = a(n), \quad \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H \equiv \mathbf{P}(n) \equiv \mathbf{P}. \quad (5.1)$$

In (5.1), the column vectors of  $\mathbf{P}$  are denoted by  $\mathbf{p}_\ell(n) \equiv \mathbf{p}_\ell$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ .

In the proofs, we fix an arbitrary  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and focus on the associated rescaled eigenvalue  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}}$ . So, for any given  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , we define the sets of indices

$$\mathcal{I}_- := \{\ell : h_\ell < h_q\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_0 := \{\ell : h_\ell = h_q\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_+ := \{\ell : h_\ell > h_q\}. \quad (5.2)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{I}_-$  and  $\mathcal{I}_+$  are possibly empty. Also write their respective cardinalities as

$$r_1 := \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_-), \quad r_2 := \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_0) \geq 1, \quad r_3 := \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_+). \quad (5.3)$$

Throughout this section, we often make use of the asymptotic notation (2.6) to denote residual random matrix terms, where convergence or boundedness in probability refers to their *spectral norms*.

### 5.1 Proving Theorem 3.1

For notational simplicity, recast the wavelet random matrix (2.17) in the form

$$\frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} = \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*(n)}{a(n)^{2h_q}}}_{\text{main scaling term}} + \underbrace{\Xi(n)}_{\text{residual}}, \quad (5.4)$$

where we use  $\mathbf{h}$  as a shorthand for the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{h} = \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_r), \quad h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_r. \quad (5.5)$$

The residual term  $\Xi(n)$  in (5.4) is simply given by

$$\Xi(n) = \Xi_q(n) := \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{\mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{h_q}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)a(n)^{h_q}\mathbf{P}^*(n)}{a(n)^{2h_q}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Note that  $\Xi(n)$  does contain scaling terms, but ultimately the fractal properties of the top  $r$  eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  will all stem from the main scaling term in (5.4).

We break up the analysis of the convergence of the top eigenvalues of the random matrices (5.4) into two main results, namely, Theorem 3.1 itself and Proposition 5.1. In Theorem 3.1, the proof of the main claim (3.1) contains the backbone of the overall mathematical framework, i.e., a two-step argument with random sub-subsequences.

On the other hand, Proposition 5.1 – which is assumed in the proof of (3.1) in Theorem 3.1 – contains the bulk of the technical argument. Explosive eigenvalues are a fundamental feature of random matrices resulting from measurements of scale-invariant systems. In the proof of the proposition, we effectively extend to the high-dimensional context the original technique first proposed in Abry and Didier (2018a) for dealing with the eigenvalues of fixed-dimensional wavelet random matrices. To state the proposition, let

$$\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n, \omega) \quad (5.7)$$

be a (random) eigenvector associated with the  $(p-r+\ell)$ -th eigenvalue of the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ .

**Proposition 5.1** *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold. Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , together with its associated indices (5.2). For each  $n$ , let  $\mathbf{p}_{r+1}(n), \dots, \mathbf{p}_p(n)$  be an orthonormal basis for  $\text{nullspace}(\mathbf{P}^*(n))$ . Let  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  be any subsequence along which*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{i=r+1}^{p(n')} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s., \quad (5.8)$$

and also where

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+ \cup \mathcal{I}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_-} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s., \quad (5.9)$$

$$\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0} |\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}^*(n') \Xi(n') \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n')| \rightarrow 0, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(2^j) \quad a.s. \quad (5.10)$$

Then, there exists a deterministic matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  such that

$$\lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(n')2^j))}{a(n')^{2h_\ell+1}} = \lambda_{r-r_2+\ell}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad a.s., \quad \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0, \quad (5.11)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_0$  is given by (5.2). In particular, the limits  $\lambda_{r-r_2+\ell}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ ,  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ , do not depend on  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

Note that conditions (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) are not vacuous – see Lemmas B.3 and B.4. A discussion of the intuition behind these conditions is also provided right before the statements of each of these lemmas.

Assuming Proposition 5.1, we are now in a position to establish Theorem 3.1.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1:** Statement (3.3) is a consequence of expression (B.8) in Lemma B.2. So, assume for the moment that (3.1) holds. To establish the scaling relationship (3.2), fix an arbitrary  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and let  $\tilde{a}(n) = a(n)2^j$ . By (3.1),

$$\xi_q(2^j) = p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} = p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(\tilde{a}(n)))}{(\tilde{a}(n)2^{-j})^{2h_q+1}} = 2^{j(2h_q+1)} \xi_q(1),$$

as we wanted to show.

So, we now prove (3.1). Let  $\mathbb{N}'$  be any subsequence of  $\mathbb{N}$ . As a consequence of condition (2.24),  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{B}(2^j)$  as  $n' \rightarrow \infty$ . Also, recall that, for any  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ ,  $h_\ell = h_q$ . Then, again for  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ ,  $\Xi_\ell(n') = \Xi_q(n') = \Xi(n')$  (cf. (5.6)). Thus, Lemma B.3, (ii), implies that  $\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0} |\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}^*(n') \Xi(n') \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n')| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$  as  $n' \rightarrow \infty$ . Now note that, by Lemma B.3, (i), the eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n')$  is asymptotically orthogonal to a coordinate vector  $\mathbf{p}_i(n')$  associated with a larger scaling exponent  $h_i > h_\ell$ . In particular, for the fixed  $q$  and the associated index sets (5.2), by considering  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n')$  for either index range  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$  or  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_-$ , Lemma B.3, (i), implies that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+ \cup \mathcal{I}_0} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_-} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0, \quad n' \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma B.4,  $\sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{i=r+1}^{p(n')} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n'), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n') \rangle^2 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ . Thus, there exists a further subsequence  $\mathbb{N}'' \ni n''$  such that (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) hold along  $n''$ . By Proposition 5.1, along this same subsequence  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$ ,

$$\lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(n'')2^j))}{a(n'')^{2h_\ell+1}} = \lambda_{r-r_2+\ell}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0.$$

Hence, (3.1) holds.  $\square$

## 5.2 Proving Proposition 5.1

It remains to prove Proposition 5.1. For the reader's convenience, before showing it we provide a short discussion of the proof method.

The main difficulty involved in proving (5.11) – and, ultimately, (3.1) – lies in dealing with the *potential singularities* in the expressions for rescaled eigenvalues. In fact, for a given  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , fix  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ . Now let  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \equiv \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n, \omega)$  be a unit (random) eigenvector of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ . Starting from (5.4), note that we can express

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}^* \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathcal{I}_0} \sum_{\ell_2 \in \mathcal{I}_0} \widehat{b}_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_2}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle + 2 \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathcal{I}_0} \sum_{\ell_2 \in \mathcal{I}_+} \widehat{b}_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle \underbrace{a^{h_{\ell_2}-h_q} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_2}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle}_{\text{potential singularity}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{\ell_1 \in \mathcal{I}_+} \sum_{\ell_2 \in \mathcal{I}_+} \widehat{b}_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \underbrace{a^{h_{\ell_1}-h_q} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_2}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle}_{\text{potential singularity}} \underbrace{a^{h_{\ell_2}-h_q} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell_2}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell} \rangle}_{\text{potential singularity}} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

In (5.12), to fix ideas, we take for granted the implicit claim that the terms represented by the symbol  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  do vanish in probability. Since  $h_\ell > h_q$  for  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_+$ , the terms marked by braces in (5.12) represent potential singularities (in probability).

So, the proof of Proposition 5.1 can be summarized as follows. Consider a subsequence  $\mathbb{N}'$  as defined in the assumptions of Proposition 5.1, and define the event

$$A = \left\{ \omega : (5.8), (5.9) \text{ and } (5.10) \text{ hold} \right\}. \quad (5.13)$$

In particular,  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$ . {Hereinafter, we use the expression

“for each  $\omega \in A$  a.s.”

to mean “for each  $\omega \in A$  up to intersection with a probability 1 event”. Then, we show that, for each  $\omega \in A$  a.s., any arbitrary (sub)subsequence

$$\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}' \quad (5.14)$$

contains a refinement (still denoted  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , for notational simplicity) such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n(\omega))2^j))}{a(\nu_n(\omega))^{2h_\ell+1}}(\omega) = \lambda_{r-r_2+\ell}(\mathbf{\Lambda}), \quad (5.15)$$

where the matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  is deterministic. This establishes the almost sure limit (5.11).

In turn, constructing the refined subsequence  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  over which (5.15) holds requires four steps, labeled **(a)**–**(d)**.

- (a)** We use the  $QR$  decomposition of  $\mathbf{P} \equiv \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H = \mathbf{Q}(n)\mathbf{R}(n)$  to make a change-of-coordinates from the high-dimensional eigenvectors (notation:  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ) of  $\frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}}$  to *fixed*-dimensional and *bounded* coordinates (notation:  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(n) = \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(n) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ). This is convenient because it allows us to refine the subsequence  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  so as to obtain the almost sure convergence of these coordinates  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n, \omega) : \ell = 1, \dots, r\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$  to a set of possibly random orthonormal vectors  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell = \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell = 1, \dots, r\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ .
- (b)** Consider the refined subsequence  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  obtained in **(a)**. Starting from the expression for  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$ , we define two functions

$$\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \quad (5.16)$$

that, up to residuals, *express and generalize* the right-hand side of (5.12) in the following two senses.

- (i) In  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}$  and  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$ , respectively, eigenvectors are *replaced* by a general argument in high-dimensional ( $\mathbf{u}$ ) and fixed-dimensional coordinates ( $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ).
- (ii) In both functions, the potential singularities in (5.12) are *replaced* by some vector of generic variables  $\mathbf{x}$ .

In particular, if we set  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n)$ , then there exists a vector  $\mathbf{x}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}$  such that we can express

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} - \underbrace{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}^*(\nu_n)\Xi(\nu_n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n)}_{\text{residual}} = \widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n)) = \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)), \quad (5.17)$$

where the last equality follows from (5.16) for  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n) = \mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ .

We further define a function  $\varphi$  that may be interpreted as a pointwise limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$ .

- (c)** For the function  $\varphi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$  obtained in **(b)**, let  $\mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau})$  be the minimizer of  $\varphi$  in  $\mathbf{x}$  for a given  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ . As it turns out, we can reexpress

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \boldsymbol{\tau}^* \mathbf{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\tau} \quad \text{for any } \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{W} := \text{span}(\mathbf{\Lambda}). \quad (5.18)$$

The newly defined matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  is deterministic and can be shown to have rank  $r_2 = \mathcal{I}_0$ . It is based on this deterministic function (5.18) that the limit of  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$  will be obtained in step **(d)**.

- (d)** For  $\ell = r_1 + 1 = \min(\mathcal{I}_0)$ , we use the singularity-free functions  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}$  and  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$  defined in **(b)** to construct *lower* and *upper bounds* for  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$ . The convergence of  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$  is then obtained by means of *squeezing*.

To be slightly more precise, let  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^r$  be an eigenvector associated with the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  defined in **(c)**. Given  $\omega \in A$  a.s., in  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  coordinates the system of bounds and their convergence as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  has the form

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}) \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell), \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \leftarrow \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)), \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)) + o(1)$$

$$\leq \frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \leq \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}(\nu_n)) + o(1) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}), \quad (5.19)$$

for some appropriate sequence  $\mathbb{R}^r \ni \mathbf{w}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{w}(\nu_n, \omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{w}$ . Analogously to (5.18), in (5.19) the vector  $\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$  denotes the minimizer of  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$  in  $\mathbf{x}$  for a given  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ .

To finish the proof of (5.11), the conclusion is then generalized to any  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0 = \{r_1 + 1, \dots, r_1 + r_2\}$  by induction.

For the sake of illustration, Example 5.1 contains steps **(a)**–**(d)** described in a simple context. We are now in a position to prove Proposition 5.1.

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.1:** Let  $\mathbb{N}'$  be a subsequence as in condition (5.10) and consider the event  $A$  as in (5.13). Fix some  $\omega \in A$  and consider an arbitrary random subsequence  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as in (5.14). We now follow the four steps **(a)**–**(d)** as described at the beginning of this section (Section 5.2).

We first tackle **(a)**. Define the sequence of rectangular random matrices

$$\mathbf{U}_r(n) = \mathbf{U}_r(n, \omega) := (\mathbf{u}_{p-r+1}(n) \dots \mathbf{u}_p(n)) \in \mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R}), \quad (5.20)$$

where each  $\mathbf{u}_\ell(n) = \mathbf{u}_\ell(n, \omega)$  is a.s. a (random) unit eigenvector associated with the  $\ell$ -th eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  (cf. (5.7)). Consider the matrix  $\mathbf{Q}(n)$  from the  $QR$  decomposition  $\mathbf{P}(n) \equiv \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H = \mathbf{Q}(n)\mathbf{R}(n)$  as in (2.28). Define

$$\mathbf{T}(n) = \mathbf{T}(n, \omega) := (\boldsymbol{\tau}_1(n), \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r(n)) := \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{U}_r(n) \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R}), \quad (5.21)$$

where each  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i(n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_i(n, \omega)$  denotes a (random) column of  $\mathbf{T}(n) = \mathbf{T}(n, \omega)$ . Note that, for the fixed  $\omega \in A$ , the fixed-dimensional sequence  $\{\mathbf{T}(\nu_n, \omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in norm. So, by applying the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem for each  $\omega \in A$  a.s., we may refine the subsequence  $\{\nu_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  further (still denoted  $\nu_n$ , for notational simplicity) so as to obtain the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{T}(\nu_n) =: \mathbf{T} = (\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r) \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R}) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.22)$$

In (5.22), each  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = \boldsymbol{\tau}_i(\omega)$  denotes a column of  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}(\omega)$ . Moreover, by Lemma B.5, (i), the limiting column vectors  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, r\}$  are orthonormal a.s.

We now turn to step **(b)**. It will be useful to introduce some notation. Starting from the limit  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(2^j)$  a.s. (see (5.10)), recast

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) = (\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{i\ell})_{i,\ell=1,2,3}, \quad \mathbf{B}(2^j) = (\mathbf{B}_{i\ell})_{i,\ell=1,2,3}, \quad (5.23)$$

where  $\mathbf{B}_{i\ell}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{i\ell}$  denote blocks of size  $r_i \times r_\ell$ . Similarly, define

$$\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{P}_1(n) \mathbf{P}_2(n) \mathbf{P}_3(n)), \quad \mathbf{R}(n) = (\mathbf{R}_1(n) \mathbf{R}_2(n) \mathbf{R}_3(n)), \quad (5.24)$$

where, for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_i(n) \in \mathcal{M}(p, r_i, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathbf{R}_i(n) \in \mathcal{M}(r, r_i, \mathbb{R})$ . Also, considering the limit  $\mathbf{R}(n) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  as in (2.29), recast

$$\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{R}_3), \quad (5.25)$$

where each  $\mathbf{R}_i$  is a full rank matrix of size  $r \times r_i$ . Now define the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{h}_1 = \text{diag}(h_1, \dots, h_{r_1}) \quad (5.26)$$

(cf. (5.5)), and let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ . Further define the scalar-valued functions  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ ,  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  and  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  by means of the relations

$$0 \leq \widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \begin{pmatrix} a^{\mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{h}_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}^* \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \begin{pmatrix} a^{\mathbf{h}_1 - \mathbf{h}_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.27)$$



$$0 \leq \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \begin{pmatrix} a^{\mathbf{h}_1 - h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{R}_1^*(\nu_n) \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{R}_2^*(\nu_n) \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}^* \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \begin{pmatrix} a^{\mathbf{h}_1 - h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{R}_1^*(\nu_n) \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{R}_2^*(\nu_n) \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.28)$$

and

$$0 \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}_2^* \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}^* \mathbf{B}(2^j) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{R}_2^* \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.29)$$

(cf. (5.16) and (5.17)). In (5.27) and (5.28), for notational simplicity we keep writing  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  along  $\nu_n$ . Since  $\mathbf{B}(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ , then  $\mathbf{B}_{33}$  is invertible. Hence, for the fixed  $\omega \in A$  and large enough  $n$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{33}$  is also invertible. Thus, for any (large)  $n$  and for each fixed  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ , the functions  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\cdot, \mathbf{u})$ ,  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  and  $\varphi(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  have unique minimizers  $\mathbf{x}_{*, \nu_n}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{*, \nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$  and  $\mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ , respectively, in the argument  $\mathbf{x}$ . In particular, we can express

$$\mathbf{x}_{*, \nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{33}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{31} a^{\mathbf{h}_1 - h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{R}_1^*(\nu_n) + \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{33}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{32} \mathbf{R}_2^*(\nu_n)) \boldsymbol{\tau}, \quad \mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -\mathbf{B}_{33}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{32} \mathbf{R}_2^* \boldsymbol{\tau}. \quad (5.30)$$

For notational simplicity, we further define

$$\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{u}) := \widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*, \nu_n}(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{u}), \quad \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) := \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*, \nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau}), \quad \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}) := \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau}). \quad (5.31)$$

In regard to (c), define the matrix

$$\mathbf{M} := \mathbf{B}_{22} - \mathbf{B}_{23} \mathbf{B}_{33}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{32} \in \mathcal{S}(r_2, \mathbb{R}). \quad (5.32)$$

From (5.29)–(5.32), we can conveniently write

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \boldsymbol{\tau}^* \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{M} \mathbf{R}_2^* \boldsymbol{\tau}. \quad (5.33)$$

Let  $\mathbf{\Pi}_3 \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R})$  be the projection matrix onto  $\mathbf{R}_3^\perp$  (see the notation (2.5)). We define

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} := \mathbf{\Pi}_3^* \mathbf{R}_2 \mathbf{M} \mathbf{R}_2^* \mathbf{\Pi}_3 \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R}). \quad (5.34)$$

By Lemma B.1, (ii),

$$\mathcal{W} := \text{span}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp. \quad (5.35)$$

Then,  $\mathbf{\Pi}_3 \boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{\tau}$  for any  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{W}$ . Thus, based on (5.33), we can recast

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \boldsymbol{\tau}^* \mathbf{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\tau}, \quad \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (5.36)$$

We are now in possession of all the elements described in (a)–(c). Following the description of (d), we establish (5.11) first for  $\ell = \min \mathcal{I}_0 = r_1 + 1$ , and then proceed by induction.

In the construction of the argument, it will be convenient to consider the decomposition of  $\mathcal{W}$  (see (5.35)) given by

$$\text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} = \mathcal{W}, \quad (5.37)$$

itself a consequence of Lemma B.5, (iii). In addition, let  $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\eta$  be the (deterministic) eigenspaces associated with the  $\eta \geq 1$  distinct positive eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ . Then, as a consequence of (5.35) and (5.37), we can further write

$$\text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} = \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_\eta. \quad (5.38)$$

**Step  $\ell = r_1 + 1$ .** First, we establish a lower bound, as well as its limit, for the rescaled eigenvalue  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$  (cf. (5.19)). By Lemma B.1, (iii),  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = r_2 \geq 1$ . So, for some  $\eta \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$0 < \chi_1 < \chi_2 < \dots < \chi_\eta \quad (5.39)$$

be the distinct values among the strictly positive  $r_2$  eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ . Recall that the vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(n, \omega)$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , are given by (5.21). Also, let  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}$  and  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}$  be as in (5.27). Then, for  $\omega \in A$  a.s., as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \\ & \geq \widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n)), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n)) + \mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}^*(\nu_n)\Xi(\nu_n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n) \\ & \geq \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n)), \boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n)) + o(1) \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}) \geq \chi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.40)$$

In (5.40), the first inequality follows from (5.17) and the fact that  $\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n))$  is a minimizer of  $\widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n))$  in the argument  $\mathbf{x}$ . The second inequality in (5.40) holds by (5.17) (**n.b.:**  $\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n)) = \mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n))$ ). The  $o(1)$  term appearing in (5.40) is a consequence of the fact that  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}^*(\nu_n)\Xi(\nu_n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n) = o(1)$  for the given  $\omega \in A$  a.s. due to condition (5.10). Also,  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n)), \boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n)) \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1})$  due to expressions (5.27)–(5.30). In addition, the last inequality in (5.40) holds since  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1} \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  (see (5.38)) and  $\chi_1$  is the smallest value  $\varphi$  can take on  $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ . This establishes the lower bound.

We now construct an upper bound, as well as its limit, for the rescaled eigenvalue  $\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}$  (cf. (5.19)). Fix an arbitrary vector

$$\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1} \quad (5.41)$$

(namely,  $\mathbf{w}$  is any unit eigenvector of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  associated with its smallest positive eigenvalue  $\chi_1$ ). By relation (5.39),

$$\varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \chi_1. \quad (5.42)$$

In view of (5.37), we can use the a.s. orthonormal vectors  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\}$  to write

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0} \alpha_\ell(\omega) \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega). \quad (5.43)$$

Let  $\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}) = (x_{*,r_1+r_2+1}(\mathbf{w}), \dots, x_{*,r}(\mathbf{w}))$  be the minimizer of  $\varphi(\cdot, \mathbf{w})$ , as defined by (5.30). In view of the convergence conditions (5.8) and (5.9), for  $\omega \in A$  a.s. we may apply Lemma B.6 to extract a sequence  $\{\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\mathbf{v}(\nu_n, \omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of unit vectors

$$\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+r_1+1}(\nu_n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(\nu_n)\} \quad (5.44)$$

such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rangle = \frac{x_{*,i}(\mathbf{w})}{a(\nu_n)^{h_i-h_q}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{w}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n)\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{w}. \quad (5.45)$$

Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \leq \mathbf{v}^*(\nu_n) \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j)}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \\ & = \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}(\nu_n)) + \mathbf{v}_{r_1+1}^*(\nu_n)\Xi(\nu_n)\mathbf{v}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \chi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

In (5.46), the inequality is a consequence of (5.44) and (B.4). The convergence follows since  $\mathbf{v}_{r_1+1}^*(\nu_n)\Xi(\nu_n)\mathbf{v}_{r_1+1}(\nu_n) = o(1)$ , and also because  $\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}_*(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}(\nu_n)) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{w})$ , itself a consequence of expressions (5.27), (5.29) and the limit in (5.45). This establishes the upper bound.

So, expressions (5.40) and (5.46) show that, for  $\omega \in A$  a.s.,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\omega)) = \varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \chi_1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.47)$$

where the last equality follows from (5.42). In addition, expression (5.47) implies that  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . This establishes (5.11) for the index value  $\ell = r_1 + 1 = \min \mathcal{I}_0$ .

**Step general**  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ . We now proceed by induction through the set  $\mathcal{I}_0$ . For the induction hypothesis, assume that, for  $i = r_1 + 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ , there exists a smallest  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for  $\omega \in A$  a.s.,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+i}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_i) \in \{\chi_1, \dots, \chi_k\}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.48)$$

where, for  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = \boldsymbol{\tau}_i(\omega)$  as in (5.22),

$$\chi_1 = \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}) \leq \dots \leq \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\ell-1}) = \chi_k \quad (5.49)$$

(**n.b.:**  $k$  does not depend on  $\omega$ ). Our goal is to show that

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \in \{\chi_k, \chi_{k+1}\}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.50)$$

which establishes the induction.

Starting from the induction hypothesis (5.48)–(5.49), letting  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \emptyset$ , the double decomposition (5.38) of  $\mathcal{W}$  implies that

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_{k-1} \subsetneq \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\ell-1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_k. \quad (5.51)$$

Thus, either

$$(i) \quad \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\ell-1}\} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_k, \quad (5.52)$$

or

$$(ii) \quad \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\ell-1}\} = \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_k. \quad (5.53)$$

We consider each case (i) and (ii) separately. To avoid the introduction of cumbersome notation and to facilitate comparison with the inductive step  $\ell = r_1 + 1$ , we reuse the notation  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{w}(\nu_n)$ , and  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)$  according to convenience.

We begin with (i). Again in view of (5.38), since the vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$  are orthogonal a.s., the first inclusion in (5.51) implies that

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell \in \mathcal{W} \cap \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{r_1+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\ell-1}\}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_\eta \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}. \quad (5.54)$$

However,  $\mathcal{M}_k, \dots, \mathcal{M}_\eta$  are the eigenspaces of  $\mathbf{A}$  associated with the distinct eigenvalues  $\chi_k < \dots < \chi_\eta$ , respectively. Hence, relation (5.54) implies that the unit vector  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell = \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega)$  is a convex combination of eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{A}$  associated with eigenvalues no smaller than  $\chi_k$ . Therefore, by expression (5.36),

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \geq \chi_k. \quad (5.55)$$

So, arguing as in (5.40) with  $\ell$  replacing  $r_1 + 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \geq \widehat{\varphi}_n(\mathbf{x}_{*,\nu_n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)), \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)) + o(1) \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \geq \chi_k. \quad (5.56)$$

On the other hand, under (5.52), relation (5.38) implies that there exists a random unit vector  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(\omega) \in \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{r-3}\} \cap \mathcal{M}_k$ . In particular,

$$\varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \chi_k. \quad (5.57)$$

Moreover, there are random coefficients  $\beta_i = \beta_i(\omega)$ ,  $i = \ell, \dots, r - r_3$ , based on which we may express

$$\mathbf{w}(\omega) = \sum_{i=\ell}^{r-r_3} \beta_i(\omega) \boldsymbol{\tau}_i(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_k \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$$

(cf. relation (5.43), where the left-hand side is deterministic). Again in view of conditions (5.8) and (5.9), for  $\omega \in A$  a.s. Lemma B.6 implies that we may pick a sequence  $\{\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of unit vectors  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(\nu_n)\}$  such that

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rangle = \frac{\mathbf{x}_{*,i}(\mathbf{w})}{a(\nu_n)^{h_i-h_q}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{w}. \quad (5.58)$$

Thus, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , arguing similarly as in (5.46),

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \leq \mathbf{v}^*(\nu_n) \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j)}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{w}). \quad (5.59)$$

As a consequence of (5.56), (5.57) and (5.59), for  $\omega \in A$  a.s. and  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_k$ ,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{w}(\omega)) = \chi_k, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.60)$$

This establishes (5.50) in case (i).

In case (ii), first note that

$$\text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{r-r_3}\} = \mathcal{M}_{k+1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_\eta$$

by (5.38) and (5.53). Then, since  $\chi_{k+1}$  is the smallest value  $\varphi$  can take on  $\mathcal{M}_{k+1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_\eta \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ , by relation (5.36),

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \geq \chi_{k+1}. \quad (5.61)$$

By analogous arguments to those for (5.40), we obtain, for  $\omega \in A$  a.s.,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}} \geq \widehat{\varphi}_n(\mathbf{x}_{*,n}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)), \boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\nu_n)) + o(1) \rightarrow \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) \geq \chi_{k+1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, fix any (deterministic)  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1} \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{w}$  is an eigenvector of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  associated with  $\chi_{k+1}$ ). Given (5.8) and (5.9), for  $\omega \in A$  a.s. Lemma B.6 implies that there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of unit vectors in  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(\nu_n)\}$  satisfying (5.58). Then, the analogous limit (5.59) follows, with  $\varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \chi_{k+1}$ . From the lower and the upper limits, we conclude that, for  $\omega \in A$  a.s.

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell) = \chi_{k+1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This establishes (5.50) in case (ii). So, the induction is complete, which in turn establishes (5.11).  $\square$

In the following example, we illustrate some of the main aspects involved in the proof of Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 3.1. The example involves the simplest possible instance where there are both a slower and a faster eigenvalue than the reference eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) = \lambda_{p-1}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))$ .

**Example 5.1** Suppose  $r = 3$  and  $r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = 1$  (i.e.,  $h_1 < h_2 < h_3$ ). Hence,  $\mathbf{P}(\nu_n) = (\mathbf{p}_1(\nu_n), \mathbf{p}_2(\nu_n), \mathbf{p}_3(\nu_n)) \in M(p, 3, \mathbb{R})$  where  $p = p(\nu_n) \rightarrow \infty$ . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= \widehat{b}_{22} \langle \mathbf{p}_2(\nu_n), \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 + 2 \widehat{b}_{23} \langle \mathbf{p}_2(\nu_n), \mathbf{u} \rangle x + \widehat{b}_{33} x^2 + o_{\text{a.s.}}(1), \\ \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) &= \widehat{b}_{22} \langle \mathbf{r}_2(\nu_n), \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle^2 + 2 \widehat{b}_{23} \langle \mathbf{r}_2(\nu_n), \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle x + \widehat{b}_{33} x^2 + o_{\text{a.s.}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{\nu_n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \rightarrow \varphi(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = b_{22} \langle \mathbf{r}_2, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle^2 + 2 b_{23} \langle \mathbf{r}_2, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle x + b_{33} x^2.$$

We now calculate the lower bound in (5.40). For ease of interpretation, suppose in addition that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathbf{R}(\nu_n) \equiv \mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{e}_1 \ \mathbf{e}_2 \ \mathbf{e}_3) \in M(3, \mathbb{R}). \quad (5.62)$$

For any fixed  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ , the global minimizer of  $\varphi(x, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  in  $x$  is given by  $x_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = -\frac{b_{23}}{b_{33}} \langle \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle$ . Therefore,  $\varphi(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \varphi(x_*(\boldsymbol{\tau}), \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \frac{1}{b_{33}} (b_{22}b_{33} - b_{23}^2) \langle \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\tau} \rangle^2$ . Moreover, by (5.35) and (5.62),  $\mathcal{W} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{e}_2\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{\pm \mathbf{e}_2\} \ni \mathbf{w}$ . Hence, the lower and upper bounds in (5.40) and (5.46) are given by  $\varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{b_{33}} (b_{22}b_{33} - b_{23}^2)$ . In other words, we ultimately conclude that

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-1}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_2+1}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \varphi(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{b_{33}} (b_{22}b_{33} - b_{23}^2), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In addition,  $\frac{\lambda_{p-2}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_2+1}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$  and  $\frac{\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_2+1}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (cf. Corollary B.1).

### 5.3 Proving Theorem 3.2

In this section, again for notational simplicity we work under (5.1), namely,  $p = p(n)$ ,  $a = a(n)$  and  $\mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H = \mathbf{P}(n) \equiv \mathbf{P}$ .

As with Proposition 5.1, before showing Theorem 3.2 for the reader's convenience we provide a summary of the proof method. The argument is based on mean value theorem-type expansions of the expressions on the left-hand side of (3.5). In the depiction of the residual terms, it will be helpful to build upon condition (2.23) by writing

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j) = O(1), \quad \mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad a(n)^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.63)$$

In (5.63), the appropriate matrix dimensions are implicit. Boundedness (deterministic or in probability) refers to the *spectral norms* of the (deterministic or random) matrices.

Analogously to (5.4), for any fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , we can use (5.5) and (5.63) to recast expression (2.22) for  $\frac{\mathbf{W}(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  in the form

$$\frac{\mathbf{W}(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} = \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}}}_{\text{main scaling term}} + \underbrace{\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q+1/2}}}_{\text{residual}}. \quad (5.64)$$

Likewise, its deterministic counterpart can be re-expressed as

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} = \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}}}_{\text{main scaling term}} + \underbrace{\frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}}_{\text{residual}}. \quad (5.65)$$

Ultimately, the asymptotic fluctuations of the log-eigenvalues of  $\frac{\mathbf{W}(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  will stem from the main scaling terms in (5.64) and (5.65).

So, we can apply (5.64) and (5.65) so as to decompose

$$\log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \quad (5.66)$$

$$= \left\{ \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q+1/2}}}_{(*)} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q+1/2}}}_{(*)} \right) \right\} \quad (5.67)$$

$$+ \left\{ \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}}_{(**)} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}} \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}}_{(**)} \right) \right\} \quad (5.68)$$

$$+ \left\{ \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}}_{(***)} \right) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}}_{(***)} \right) \right\}. \quad (5.69)$$

Then, in the proof we consider each sum term (5.67), (5.68) and (5.69) separately. For each sum term, the common factors in the arguments are marked by underbraces ((\*), (\*\*), (\*\*\*)). Accordingly, for each sum term the expansions are based on the differences

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) - \mathbf{B}_a(2^j) \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R}), \quad \frac{a^{-\mathbf{h}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a2^j)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} - \mathbf{0} = \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} - \mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R}),$$

$$\text{and } \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} = \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \in \mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R}), \quad (5.70)$$

respectively (see expressions (5.85), (5.103) and (5.95)). For all three terms, we use a similar argument by contradiction to show that differentiability holds in an appropriately defined neighborhood containing the terms appearing in (5.70). This allows us to construct mean value theorem-type expansions. Then, after pre-multiplication by the rate  $\sqrt{n_{a,j}}$ , we show that the term (5.67) converges to a Gaussian distribution, whereas the terms (5.68) and (5.69) converge to zero in probability (see expressions (5.76), (5.77) and (5.78) for the precise statements).

We are now in a position to show Theorem 3.2. Even though some steps involved in tackling each term (5.67), (5.68) and (5.69) display formal similarities, we opted for repeating them so as to facilitate reading. In regard to the notation, in the proof we use (2.2) and also express the generic matrices  $\mathbf{B} = (b_{\ell, \ell'})$ ,  $\mathbf{K} = (\kappa_{\ell, \ell'})$  entry-wise.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2: Fix an arbitrary  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{I}_0$  and (the possibly empty sets)  $\mathcal{I}_-, \mathcal{I}_+$  be as in (5.2).

Consider a generic matrix term  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  and matrix residual terms  $\mathbf{K}$  in either  $\mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$  or  $\mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R})$ . For notational simplicity, it is convenient to define the sequences of random matrices

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}) = a^{2h_q+1} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} \right), \quad (5.71)$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}) = a^{2h_q+1} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}}\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{K}^* \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \quad (5.72)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}) = a^{2h_q+1} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \mathbf{K} \right). \quad (5.73)$$

Now define the functions

$$f_{n,q,1}(\mathbf{B}) := \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right), \quad f_{n,q,2}(\mathbf{K}) := \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \quad (5.74)$$

and

$$f_{n,q,3}(\mathbf{K}) := \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right). \quad (5.75)$$

For the sake of interpretation,  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{K}$  in (5.74) and  $\mathbf{K}$  in (5.75), respectively, replace and generalize the arguments  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)$  in (5.67), the argument  $\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}}$  in (5.68), and the arguments  $\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  and  $\frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  in (5.69).

The layout of the proof is as follows. We will establish the convergence

$$\left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( f_{n,q,1}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) - f_{n,q,1}(\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \right) \right)_{q=1, \dots, r} \Big|_{j=j_1, \dots, j_m} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\lambda), \quad (5.76)$$

and also that

$$\sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( f_{n,q,2} \left( \frac{a^{-\mathbf{h}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a2^j)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) - f_{n,q,2}(\mathbf{0}) \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (5.77)$$

$$\sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.78)$$

Then, as a consequence of (5.66), (5.76), (5.77) and (5.78),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) \right) \right)_{q=1, \dots, r} \Big|_{j=j_1, \dots, j_m} \\ &= \left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( f_{n,q,1}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) - f_{n,q,1}(\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \right) \right)_{q=1, \dots, r} \Big|_{j=j_1, \dots, j_m} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which proves (3.5).

So, we proceed first to establish (5.76). Recall that, for any  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$ , the differential of a *simple* eigenvalue  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{M})$  exists in a connected vicinity of  $\mathbf{M}$  and is given by

$$d\lambda_i(\mathbf{M}) = \mathbf{u}_i^* \{d\mathbf{M}\} \mathbf{u}_i, \quad (5.79)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_i$  is a unit eigenvector of  $\mathbf{M}$  associated with  $\lambda_i(\mathbf{M})$  (Magnus (1985), p. 182, Theorem 1).

For the matrix  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  as in (2.26), define the vicinity  $\mathcal{O}_{\delta, r} = \{\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R}) : \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}(2^j)\| < \delta\}$  in the cone of  $r \times r$  positive semidefinite matrices. Also let

$$\eta_0 = \frac{1}{2} \min_{\ell=1, \dots, r} \{\xi_\ell(2^j) - \xi_{\ell-1}(2^j)\}, \quad (5.80)$$

where we define  $\xi_0(2^j) = 0$ . Note that, under condition (3.4),  $\eta_0 > 0$ . We claim that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that, for any  $n \geq n_0$  and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{p-r+q-1}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) + \eta_0 < \lambda_{p-r+q}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) < \lambda_{p-r+q+1}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) - \eta_0\right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

By way of contradiction, suppose the claim does not hold. Then, there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that, for any  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\delta_0 > 0$ , there exist  $n = n(n_0) \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{\delta_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{p-r+q}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) \leq \lambda_{p-r+q-1}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) + \eta_0 \right. \\ & \left. \cup \lambda_{p-r+q+1}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) - \eta_0 \leq \lambda_{p-r+q}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right)\right) > \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (5.81)$$

In the components of the random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})$  as in (5.81) (cf. (5.71)),  $\mathbf{P}$ ,  $a$  and each  $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  term are indexed by the subsequence  $n = n(n_0)$ . Furthermore, we can take  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n_0) = 1/n_0$ , whence  $\|\mathbf{B}_{\delta_0} - \mathbf{B}_a(2^j)\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$ . However, for  $\mathbf{M}_{n(n_0)} = a^{2h_q+1}\left(\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q+1/2}}\right)$  (see expression (B.7)), Corollary B.1 implies that

$$\lambda_{p-r+\ell}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B}_{\delta_0})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-; \\ \xi_\ell(2^j), & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0; \\ \infty, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_+, \end{cases} \quad (5.82)$$

as  $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\xi_\ell(2^j)$ ,  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ , are given by (3.1). Hence, we arrive at a contradiction with (5.81). This establishes the claim.

As a consequence of the claim, with probability going to 1, for large enough  $n$  the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \mathbf{B})}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right)$  must be simple for any  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r}$ . Then, again with probability going to 1, for large  $n$  the derivative of the function  $f_{n, q, 1}$  in (5.74) exists in the open and connected set  $\mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ . On the other hand, by condition (2.25),  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(2^j)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, with probability going to 1 and for large enough  $n$ , for any  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r}$  an application of Proposition 3 in Abry and Didier (2018a) yields

$$f_{n, q, 1}(\mathbf{B}) - f_{n, q, 1}(\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{\ell'=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell, \ell'}} f_{n, q}(\check{\mathbf{B}}) \pi_{\ell, \ell'}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \quad (5.83)$$

for some matrix  $\check{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  lying in a segment connecting  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)$  across  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ . Define the event  $A_n = \{\omega : \check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r}\}$ . By (2.24),

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \rightarrow 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.84)$$

By (5.83) and (5.84), with probability going to 1, for large enough  $n$  the expansion

$$f_{n,q,1}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) - f_{n,q,1}(\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) = \sum_{\ell=1}^r \sum_{\ell'=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} f_{n,q,1}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) \pi_{\ell,\ell'}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) - \mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \quad (5.85)$$

holds for some matrix  $\check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  lying in a segment connecting  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)$  across  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ .

So, for a generic matrix  $\check{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ , consider the matrix of derivatives

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} f_{n,q,1}(\check{\mathbf{B}}) \right\}_{\ell,\ell'=1,\dots,r} = \left\{ \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right\}_{\ell,\ell'=1,\dots,r}. \quad (5.86)$$

In (5.86), the differential of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right)$  is given by expression (5.79) with  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}})$  denoting a unit eigenvector of  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  associated with its  $(p-r+q)$ -th eigenvalue. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{P} a^h \check{\mathbf{B}} a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P} a^h}{a^{h_q}} \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right] \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P} a^h \mathbf{1}_{\ell,\ell'} a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n), \quad \ell, \ell' = 1, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \quad (5.87)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_{\ell,\ell'}$  is a matrix with 1 on entry  $(\ell, \ell')$  and zeroes elsewhere. Now consider using  $\check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  in place of  $\check{\mathbf{B}}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j))$  in place of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}})$  in (5.87). By condition (3.4), Proposition B.1 and Lemma B.7, for  $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell' \leq r$ , we can pick the sequence  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  so as to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & a^{-(2h_q+1)} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial b_{\ell,\ell'}} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) \right\} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \mathbf{P} \text{diag}(a^{h_1-h_q}, \dots, 1, \dots, a^{h_r-h_q}) \mathbf{1}_{\ell,\ell'} \text{diag}(a^{h_1-h_q}, \dots, 1, \dots, a^{h_r-h_q}) \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \\ &= \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell}(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a^{h_{\ell}-h_q} \langle \mathbf{p}_{\ell'}(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a^{h_{\ell'}-h_q} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-; \\ \gamma_{\ell q} \gamma_{\ell' q}, & \ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{I}_0, \\ \gamma_{\ell q} x_{\ell',*}, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0, \ell' \in \mathcal{I}_+; \\ x_{\ell,*} x_{\ell',*}, & \ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{I}_+. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5.88)$$

In (5.88), the entries  $x_{\ell,*}$  (depending on  $q$ ),  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_+$ , of the vector  $\mathbf{x}_{q,*}(2^j)$  are given by expression (B.64) in Lemma B.7. In turn, the entries  $\gamma_{\ell,q}$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , of the vector  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\ell}$  are given by expression (B.53) in Proposition B.1. In addition, since  $\check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{B}_a(2^j)$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , as a consequence of condition (2.25), Corollary B.1 implies that

$$\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_1(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j))}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_q(2^j) > 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.89)$$

Then, by (5.88) and (5.89), expression (5.86) (with  $\check{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$  in place of  $\check{\mathbf{B}}$ ) converges in probability to the matrix

$$\frac{1}{\xi_q(2^j)} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\gamma_{\ell q} \gamma_{\ell' q})_{\ell,\ell' \in \mathcal{I}_0} & (\gamma_{\ell q} x_{\ell',*})_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0, \ell' \in \mathcal{I}_+} \\ 0 & (x_{\ell,*} \gamma_{\ell' q})_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_+, \ell' \in \mathcal{I}_0} & (x_{\ell,*} x_{\ell',*})_{\ell,\ell' \in \mathcal{I}_+} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.90)$$

where  $\xi_q(2^j) > 0$ . Turning back to (5.85), by the arbitrariness of  $j$  and  $q$ , expression (5.90) and condition (2.24) imply that

$$\left( \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \left( f_{n,q,1}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)) - f_{n,q,1}(\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)) \right)_{q=1,\dots,r} \right)_{j=j_1,\dots,j_m} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\lambda}), \quad (5.91)$$



as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for some  $\Sigma_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r \cdot m, \mathbb{R})$ , i.e., (5.76) holds.

We now turn to (5.78). Define the vicinity  $\mathcal{O}_{\delta,p} = \{\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R}) : \|\mathbf{K}\| < \delta\}$  in the space of  $p \times p$  matrices ( $\mathbf{n.b.}: p = p(n)$ ). Note that the matrix  $\frac{\mathbf{P}a^h\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^h\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$  is deterministic. Let  $\eta_0 > 0$  be as in (5.80). We claim that there exist  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that, for any  $n \geq n_0$  and  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0,p}$ ,

$$\lambda_{p-r+q-1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) + \eta_0 < \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) < \lambda_{p-r+q+1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) - \eta_0.$$

By way of contradiction, suppose that for any  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\delta_0 > 0$ , there exist  $n = n(n_0)$  and  $\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0,p}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) &\leq \lambda_{p-r+q-1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) + \eta_0 \text{ or} \\ \lambda_{p-r+q+1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) - \eta_0 &\leq \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})). \end{aligned} \quad (5.92)$$

In the components of the matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})$  as in (5.92) (cf. (5.73)),  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $a$  are indexed by the subsequence  $n = n(n_0)$ . Furthermore, we can pick  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n_0) = 1/a(n(n_0))^{2h_q+1}$ ,  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , whence  $\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0} = O(1)/a(n(n_0))^{2h_q+1}$ . However, for  $\mathbf{M}_{n(n_0)} = a(n(n_0))^{2h_q+1}\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0}$  (see expression (B.7)), Corollary B.1 implies that

$$\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) \rightarrow \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-; \\ \xi_\ell(2^j), & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0; \\ \infty, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_+, \end{cases} \quad n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we obtain a contradiction with (5.92). This establishes the claim.

As a consequence of the claim, for large enough  $n$  the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K}))$  must be simple for any  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0,p}$ . Hence, for any matrix of the form  $\frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$ , Proposition 3 in Abry and Didier (2018a) implies that, for large  $n$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n,q,3}(\mathbf{K}) - f_{n,q,3}\left(\frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}\right) &:= \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, O(1)/a^{2h_q+1})) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} f_{n,q,1}(\check{\mathbf{K}}) \pi_{i_1, i_2} \left( \mathbf{K} - \frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.93)$$

for some matrix  $\check{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$  lying in a segment connecting  $\mathbf{K}$  and  $\frac{O(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  across  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$ . For a generic matrix  $\check{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R})$ , consider the matrix of derivatives

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} f_{n,q,3}(\check{\mathbf{K}}) \right\}_{i_1, i_2=1, \dots, p} = \left\{ \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right\}_{i_1, i_2=1, \dots, p}. \quad (5.94)$$

In (5.94), the differential of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right)$  is given by expression (5.79) with  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}}))$  denoting a unit eigenvector of  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  associated with its  $(p-r+q)$ -th eigenvalue. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^h\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \mathbf{K} \right) &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h\mathbf{B}_a(2^j)a^h\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \mathbf{K} \right] \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n), \quad i_1, i_2 = 1, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

Under condition (2.23),  $\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)/a^{2h_q+1} = O_{\mathbb{F}}(1)/a^{2h_q+1} = o_{\mathbb{F}}(1)$ . So, with probability going to 1, for large enough  $n$  expression (5.93) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} f_{n,q,3}(\check{\mathbf{K}}_n) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \pi_{i_1, i_2} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}}_n)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^p \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \pi_{i_1, i_2} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right). \quad (5.95)$$

In (5.95), the matrix  $\check{\mathbf{K}}_n$  lies between  $\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)/a^{2h_q+1} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)/a^{2h_q+1}$  and  $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)/a^{2h_q+1} = O(1)/a^{2h_q+1}$ . Since  $\check{\mathbf{K}}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , Corollary B.1 implies that  $\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_3(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}}_n)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_q(2^j)$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now recall that, for  $\mathbf{M} = (m_{i_1, i_2}) \in \mathcal{M}(p_1, p_2, \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\max_{i_1=1, \dots, p_1; i_2=1, \dots, p_2} |m_{i_1, i_2}| \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|. \quad (5.96)$$

Thus, by condition (2.23),  $\max_{i_1, i_2=1, \dots, p} |\pi_{i_1, i_2}(\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j))| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Also recall that, for a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{p} \|\mathbf{x}\|_2, \quad \text{where } \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\ell} := \left( \sum_{i=1}^p |x_i|^{\ell} \right)^{1/\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, 2. \quad (5.97)$$

Then, with probability going to 1, expression (5.95) is bounded in absolute value by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^p |\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)_{i_1} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)_{i_2}| = \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \|\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\|_1^2 \\ & \leq \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} p = C \left( \frac{n}{a^{(4/3)h_q+5/3}} \right)^{3/2} \frac{p}{n/a} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.98)$$

In (5.98), the inequality follows from (5.97) and the limit follows from condition (2.27), since  $(4/3)h_q+5/3 > h_1 + 3/2$ . Therefore,  $\sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - f_{n,q,3} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , which corresponds to (5.78).

We now turn to (5.77). Define the vicinity  $\mathcal{O}_{\delta, r, p} = \{\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R}) : \|\mathbf{K}\| < \delta\}$  in the space of  $r \times p$  matrices ( $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}.$ :  $p = p(n)$ ). Let  $\eta_0 > 0$  be as in (5.80). We claim that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that, for any  $n \geq n_0$  and any  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r, p}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \lambda_{p-r+q-1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) + \eta_0 < \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) < \lambda_{p-r+q+1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K})) - \eta_0 \right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

By way of contradiction, suppose that the claim does not hold. In other words, suppose there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that, for any  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\delta_0 > 0$ , there exist  $n = n(n_0) \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r, p}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) \leq \lambda_{p-r+\ell-1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) + \eta_0 \right. \\ & \left. \cup \lambda_{p-r+\ell+1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) - \eta_0 \leq \lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})) \right) > \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (5.99)$$

In the components of the random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0})$  as in (5.99) (cf. (5.72)),  $\mathbf{P}$ ,  $a$  and each  $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  term are indexed by the subsequence  $n = n(n_0)$ . Furthermore, we can pick  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(n_0) = 1/a(n(n_0))^{h_q+1/2}$ ,  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , whence  $\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0} = O(1)/a(n(n_0))^{h_q+1/2}$ . However, for  $\mathbf{M}_{n(n_0)} = a^{2h_q+1} \left( \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h \mathbf{K}_{\delta_0}}{a^{h_q}} + \frac{\mathbf{K}_{\delta_0}^* a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right)$  (see expression (B.7)), Corollary B.1 implies that

$$\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}_{n(n_0)})) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-; \\ \xi_{\ell}(2^j), & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0; \\ \infty, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_+, \end{cases} \quad n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we arrive at a contradiction with (5.99). This establishes the claim.

As a consequence of the claim, with probability going to 1, for large enough  $n$  the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K}))$  must be simple for any  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r, p}$ . Hence, for  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{O}_{\delta_0, r, p}$ , an adaptation of Proposition 3 in Abery and Didier (2018a) to rectangular matrices implies that

$$f_{n,q,2}(\mathbf{K}) - f_{n,q,2}(\mathbf{0}) = \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{K})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{0})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i_1=1}^r \sum_{i_2=1}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} f_{n, q, 2}(\check{\mathbf{K}}) \pi_{i_1, i_2}(\mathbf{K}) \quad (5.100)$$

for some matrix  $\check{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$  lying in a segment connecting  $\mathbf{K}$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  across  $\mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$ . For a generic matrix  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$ , consider the matrix of derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} f_{n, q, 2}(\check{\mathbf{K}}) \right\}_{i_1=1, \dots, r; i_2=1, \dots, p} \\ &= \left\{ \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right\}_{i_1=1, \dots, r; i_2=1, \dots, p}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.101)$$

In (5.101), the differential of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right)$  is given by expression (5.79) with  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}})$  denoting a unit eigenvector of  $\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}}$  associated with its  $(p-r+q)$ -th eigenvalue. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \frac{\partial}{\partial \kappa_{i_1, i_2}} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h \mathbf{B}_a(2^j) a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{2h_q}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \check{\mathbf{K}} + \check{\mathbf{K}}^* \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right] \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \\ &= \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} + \mathbf{1}_{i_2, i_1} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n), \quad i_1 = 1, \dots, r, \quad i_2 = 1, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( f_{n, q, 2}(\mathbf{K}) - f_{n, q, 2}(\mathbf{0}) \right) = \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \\ & \times \sum_{i_1=1}^r \sum_{i_2=1}^p \left\{ \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} + \mathbf{1}_{i_2, i_1} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right\}_{i_1=1, \dots, r; i_2=1, \dots, p} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \pi_{i_1, i_2}(\mathbf{K}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.102)$$

Note that, by condition (2.23),  $a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)/a^{h_q+1/2} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)/a^{h_q+1/2} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Thus, with probability going to 1, for large  $n$  expression (5.102) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( f_{n, q, 2} \left( \frac{a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) - f_{n, q, 2}(\mathbf{0}) \right) = \lambda_{p-r+q}^{-1} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}}_n)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \\ & \times \sum_{i_1=1}^r \sum_{i_2=1}^p \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} + \mathbf{1}_{i_2, i_1} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \times \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \pi_{i_1, i_2} \left( \frac{a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.103)$$

Note that  $\check{\mathbf{K}}_n$  lies in a segment connecting  $\mathbf{0}$  and the matrix  $a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)/a^{h_q+1/2} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Hence,  $\check{\mathbf{K}}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Thus, Corollary B.1 implies that

$$\lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \check{\mathbf{K}}_n)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_q(2^j), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.104)$$

As a consequence of condition (2.23) and of relation (5.96),  $\max_{i_1=1, \dots, r; i_2=1, \dots, p} |\pi_{i_1, i_2}(a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j))| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ . Therefore, by expressions (5.97), (5.104) and by condition (2.27), with probability going to 1 the right-hand side of (5.103) is bounded, in absolute value, by

$$\begin{aligned} & O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \left| \sum_{i_1=1}^r \sum_{i_2=1}^p \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} + \mathbf{1}_{i_2, i_1} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \pi_{i_1, i_2} \left( \frac{a^{-h-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) \right| \\ & \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( \frac{1}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) \sum_{i_1=1}^r \sum_{i_2=1}^p \left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}a^h}{a^{h_q}} \mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2} + \mathbf{1}_{i_2, i_1} \frac{a^h \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( \frac{1}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) \sum_{i_1=1}^r \left| \langle \mathbf{p}_{i_1}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a^{h_{i_1}-h_q} \right| \sum_{i_2=1}^p |\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)_{i_2}| \\
&\leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left( \frac{1}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) \sqrt{p} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \sqrt{\frac{p}{n/a}} \cdot \frac{n}{a^{h_q+3/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.105}$$

In (5.105),  $\sum_{i_1=1}^r |\langle \mathbf{p}_{i_1}, \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a^{h_{i_1}-h_q}| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  is a consequence of Lemma B.3, (i), and the limit follows from (2.27). In other words, we can write

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{a}} \left\{ \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, a^{-\mathbf{h}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a2^j)/a^{h_q+1/2})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) - \log \lambda_{p-r+q} \left( \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_2(a2^j, \mathbf{0})}{a^{2h_q+1}} \right) \right\} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Hence, (5.77) holds. This concludes the proof of (3.2).  $\square$

**Remark 5.1** Note that, in each term (5.67), (5.68) and (5.69), there is functional dependence between the matrices  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $O(1) \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$  and  $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \in \mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$ . However, expressions (5.83), (5.93) and (5.100) represent *partial* mean value theorem-type expansions of each term, where each matrix argument is first treated as a functionally independent variable, and then the actual value of the matrix argument is plugged back in (see (5.85), (5.95) and (5.103), respectively).

## 6 Conclusion and open problems

In this paper, we mathematically characterize the asymptotic and large-scale behavior of the eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices in high dimensions. We assume that possibly non-Gaussian, finite-variance  $p$ -variate measurements are made of a low-dimensional  $r$ -variate ( $r \ll p$ ) fractional stochastic process with unknown scaling coordinates and in the presence of additive high-dimensional noise. In the three-way limit where the sample size ( $n$ ), dimension ( $p(n)$ ) and scale ( $a(n)$ ) go to infinity, we establish that the rescaled  $r$  largest eigenvalues of the wavelet random matrices converge to scale-invariant functions, whereas the remaining  $p(n) - r$  eigenvalues remain bounded. In addition, under slightly stronger assumptions, we show that the  $r$  largest log-eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices exhibit asymptotically Gaussian distributions. The results bear direct consequences for high-dimensional modeling starting from measurements of the form of a signal-plus-noise system (1.3), where  $X$  is a latent process containing fractal information and  $\mathbf{P}$  (as well as  $Z$ ) is unknown.

This research leads to many relevant open problems involving scale invariance in high dimensions, some of which can be briefly described as follows. (i) The results in Section 3 build upon broad wavelet domain assumptions, hence providing a rich framework for future research pursuits involving wavelet random matrices. A natural direction of inquiry is the mathematical study of the properties of wavelet random matrices in second order non-Gaussian fractional instances, e.g., in regard to the mathematical control of the impact of heavier tails under the broad assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. (ii) In turn, an interesting direction of extension is the characterization of sets of conditions under which the  $r$  largest eigenvalues of wavelet random matrices exhibit non-Gaussian fluctuations (cf. Remarks 3.1 and 4.2). (iii) In modeling, starting from measurements of the general form (1.3), the construction of an extended framework for the detection of scaling laws in high-dimensional systems calls for the investigation of the behavior of wavelet random matrices when  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, such undertaking requires a deeper study, in the wavelet domain, of the so-named *eigenvalue repulsion effect* (e.g., Tao (2012)), which may severely skew the observed scaling laws (see Wendt et al. (2019) on preliminary computational studies). (iv) Superior finite-sample statistical performance can be attained by means of a wavelet eigenvalue regression procedure across scales (cf. Abry and Didier (2018b, 2018a)). Namely, fix a range of scales  $j = j_1, j_1 + 1, \dots, j_m$  and define

$$\{\widehat{\ell}_q\}_{q=1, \dots, r} := \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{j=j_1}^{j_m} w_j \log_2 \lambda_{p-r+q}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) - 1 \right) \right\}_{q=1, \dots, r}. \tag{6.1}$$

In (6.1),  $w_j, j = j_1, \dots, j_m$ , are weights satisfying the relations  $\sum_{j=j_1}^{j_m} w_j = 0$ ,  $\sum_{j=j_1}^{j_m} j w_j = 1$ , where  $w_j = 1$  if  $m = 1$ . As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1,  $\{\widehat{\ell}_q\}_{q=1, \dots, r}$  provides a consistent estimator of

$\{h_q\}_{q=1,\dots,r}$ . Moreover, as in low dimensions (Abry and Didier (2018a)), Theorem 3.2 points to asymptotic normality. However, additional results would be required, which remains a topic for future work. (v) In applications, the results in this paper naturally pave the way for the investigation of scaling behavior in high-dimensional (“Big”) data from fields such as physics, neuroscience and signal processing.

## A Assumptions on the wavelet multiresolution analysis

In the main results of the paper, we make use of the following conditions on the underlying wavelet MRA.

ASSUMPTION (W1):  $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$  is a wavelet function, namely, it satisfies the relations

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi^2(t) dt = 1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^p \psi(t) dt = 0, \quad p = 0, 1, \dots, N_\psi - 1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^{N_\psi} \psi(t) dt \neq 0, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for some integer (number of vanishing moments)  $N_\psi \geq 1$ .

ASSUMPTION (W2): the scaling and wavelet functions

$$\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } \psi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ are compactly supported} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and  $\widehat{\phi}(0) = 1$ .

ASSUMPTION (W3): there is  $\alpha > 1$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\psi}(x)| (1 + |x|)^\alpha < \infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

ASSUMPTION (W4): the function

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k^m \phi(\cdot - k) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

is a polynomial of degree  $m$  for all  $m = 0, \dots, N_\psi - 1$ .

Conditions (A.1) and (A.2) imply that  $\widehat{\psi}(x)$  exists, is everywhere differentiable and its first  $N_\psi - 1$  derivatives are zero at  $x = 0$ . Condition (A.3), in turn, implies that  $\psi$  is continuous (see Mallat (1999), Theorem 6.1) and, hence, bounded.

Note that assumptions (W1 – W4) are closely related to the broad wavelet framework for the analysis of  $\kappa$ -th order ( $\kappa \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ) stationary increment stochastic processes laid out in Moulines et al. (2007a, 2007b, 2008) and Roueff and Taqqu (2009). The Daubechies scaling and wavelet functions generally satisfy (W1 – W4) (see Moulines et al. (2008), p. 1927, or Mallat (1999), p. 253). Usually, the parameter  $\alpha$  increases to infinity as  $N_\psi$  goes to infinity (see Moulines et al. (2008), p. 1927, or Cohen (2003), Theorem 2.10.1).

## B Auxiliary statements

The proofs of Section 5 depend on a series of auxiliary statements that are established in this section.

In the following lemma, we establish some properties of the matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  used in the proofs of Proposition 5.1/Theorem 3.1 and Corollary B.1. Note that part (i) of the lemma, on the matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ , is needed for establishing part (ii).

**Lemma B.1** *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  be as in (5.32) and (5.34), respectively. Then,*

- (i)  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r_2, \mathbb{R})$ ;
- (ii)  $\text{span}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp$ ;
- (iii)  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = r_2$ .

PROOF: To show (i), let  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_2}$  be any unit vector. Then,  $\mathbf{w}^* := (\mathbf{v}^*, -(\mathbf{B}_{33}^{-1}\mathbf{B}_{32}\mathbf{v})^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_2+r_3}$  satisfies

$$0 < \mathbf{w}^* \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{22} & \mathbf{B}_{23} \\ \mathbf{B}_{32} & \mathbf{B}_{33} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v},$$

where the inequality stems from the fact that  $(\mathbf{B}_{i\ell})_{i,\ell=2,3} \in \mathcal{S}_{>0}(r_2 + r_3, \mathbb{R})$ . This establishes (i).

We now show (ii). Since the matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  is symmetric,  $\text{span}(\mathbf{\Lambda})^\perp = \text{nullspace}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ . Therefore, (ii) is proven once we establish the set of equalities

$$(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp)^\perp = \mathbf{R}_2^\perp \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp \oplus \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_3\} = \text{nullspace}(\mathbf{\Lambda}). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

So, we now show (B.1). For the leftmost equality in (B.1), recall that for any two subspaces  $W, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ ,  $(W \cap V)^\perp = W^\perp + V^\perp$ , where  $W^\perp + V^\perp := \text{span}\{W \cup V\}$ . Since  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}^\perp = \mathbf{R}_2^\perp \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp$ , we therefore have  $(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp)^\perp = (\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\})^\perp + (\mathbf{R}_3^\perp)^\perp = (\mathbf{R}_2^\perp \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp) \oplus \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_3\}$ , where the last equality stems from the fact that  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}^\perp \cap \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_3\} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . In regard to the rightmost equality in (B.1), from the definition of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  it is clear that  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_3\} \oplus (\mathbf{R}_3^\perp \cap \mathbf{R}_2^\perp) \subseteq \text{nullspace}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ . So, we now prove the opposite inclusion. First note that, as a consequence of Lemma B.1, (i), there exists a (unique) square root  $\mathbf{M}^{1/2}$ . So, if we define  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{M}^{1/2}\mathbf{R}_2^*\mathbf{\Pi}_3$ , then we can write  $\mathbf{L}^*\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{\Lambda}$ . Now let  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^r$  and suppose that  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{nullspace}(\mathbf{\Lambda})$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ . Then,  $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{v}^*\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{L}\mathbf{v})^*(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{v})$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{M}^{1/2}\mathbf{R}_2^*\mathbf{\Pi}_3\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ . However, again by Lemma B.1, (i), the matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  has full rank. Therefore,  $\mathbf{R}_2^*\mathbf{\Pi}_3\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$ . Thus, either  $\mathbf{\Pi}_3\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{R}_3)$ ) or  $\mathbf{\Pi}_3\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{R}_2^\perp$ . Then,  $\mathbf{v} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_3\} \oplus (\mathbf{R}_3^\perp \cap \mathbf{R}_2^\perp)$ . Consequently, the right equality holds in (B.1), which establishes (ii).

For (iii), by the subspace intersection lemma (e.g., Horn and Johnson (2013), p. 4), for any two subspaces  $W, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ ,

$$\dim(W \cap V) = \dim(W) + \dim(V) - \dim(W + V). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

So, by part (ii) of this lemma and relation (B.2),  $\dim(\text{span}(\mathbf{\Lambda}))$  is given by

$$\dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}) + \dim(\mathbf{R}_3^\perp) - \dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} + \mathbf{R}_3^\perp) = (r_2 + r_3) + (r - r_3) - r = r_2.$$

This shows (iii).  $\square$

Hereinafter, whenever convenient we use again the notational convention (5.1), i.e.,  $p = p(n)$ ,  $a = a(n)$  and  $\mathbf{P} \equiv \mathbf{P}(n) \equiv \mathbf{P}(n)\mathbf{P}_H$ .

Several of the following lemmas in this section are stated in terms of the random matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ . These matrices are slightly generalized versions of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ , and are defined in the statement of Lemma B.2. They appear multiple times throughout the proof of Theorem 3.2.

For the proofs, it is useful to first recall the variational characterization of the eigenvalues of a matrix  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$  provided by the Courant–Fischer principle. In other words, fix  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  and consider ordered eigenvalues as in (2.1). By the Courant–Fischer principle, we can express

$$\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{M}) = \inf_{\mathcal{U}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_\ell \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u} = \sup_{\mathcal{U}_{p-\ell+1}} \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{p-\ell+1} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $\mathcal{U}_\ell$  is a  $\ell$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (Horn and Johnson (2013), Chapter 4). A related useful fact is the following. For  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$ , let  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_p$  be unit eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{M}$  associated with the eigenvalues (2.1) respectively. Then, for  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , we can further express

$$\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{M}) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_\ell, \dots, \mathbf{u}_p\} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u} = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_\ell\} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{u}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The following result, Lemma B.2, is used in Theorem 3.1. It is also applied in Lemma B.4, which in turn is needed to establish Proposition 5.1/Theorem 3.1, Corollary B.1 and Lemma B.7.

**Lemma B.2** Fix  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  as in (2.25), let  $\mathbf{B}_n \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{R})$  be a sequence of random (or deterministic) matrices such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbf{B}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{B}(2^j) \quad (\text{or } \mathbf{B}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(2^j)). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

For  $\mathbf{h}$  as in (5.5), define the sequence of random matrices

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j) = \mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{B}_n a(n)^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{P}^*(n) + \mathbf{M}_n \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{P}^*(n) \in \mathcal{M}(p, \mathbb{R}). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

In (B.7), the terms  $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  denote generic random matrices with values in  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$  (first term) and  $\mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R})$  (second and third terms), whose spectral norms are bounded in probability. Then, under (W1 – W4) and (A4 – A5), as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\lambda_{p-r}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad q = 1, \dots, r. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

In particular, statements (B.8) and (B.9) hold for the wavelet random matrix  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  as in (2.22), whence  $\lambda_{p-r}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  and  $\lambda_{p-r+1}(\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \infty$ .

**Example B.1** In (B.6),  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j) = \mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  for the choices  $\mathbf{B}_n = \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R}) \ni O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = \mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)$  and  $\mathcal{M}(r, p, \mathbb{R}) \ni O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = a(n)^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j)$  (cf. (5.63)).

PROOF OF LEMMA B.2: To establish (B.8), just note that, by relations (B.3) and (B.6),

$$0 \leq \lambda_{p-r}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\}^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \mathbf{u} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

We now establish (B.9). Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and, for any  $n$ , define the subspace  $\mathcal{V}(n) = \{\mathbf{p}_1(n), \dots, \mathbf{p}_{q-1}(n)\}^\perp \cap \text{span}\{\mathbf{P}(n)\}$ . Then, by (B.3) and the fact that  $\dim \mathcal{V}(n) = r - q + 1$ ,

$$\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}_{r-q+1}} \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{r-q+1} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \mathbf{u} \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{V}(n) \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \mathbf{u} =: \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^*(n) \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n). \quad (\text{B.10})$$

In (B.10),  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n, \omega) \in \mathcal{V}(n)$  is a unit (random) vector at which  $\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{V}(n) \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}}$  is attained, and, like the (deterministic) vectors  $\mathbf{p}_\ell(n)$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , it is a function of  $n$ .

So, let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)$  be as in (B.10). Suppose, for the moment, that the random norm  $\|a^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{P}^*(n)\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\|$  grows at least as fast as  $a^{h_q+1/2}$ . In other words, suppose that

$$\|a^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}}\mathbf{P}^*(n)\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\|^2 \geq C a^{2h_q+1} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

In view of (B.6), we can write

$$a^{-1}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) = \mathbf{P}(n)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{B}_n a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*(n) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \mathbf{P}(n)a^{\mathbf{h}}O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*(n). \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Therefore, by (2.26), (B.5), (B.11) and (B.12), there is some constant  $C' > 0$  such that, with probability tending to 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & a^{-1}\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}} \\ &= \|\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2 \left\{ \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h}}}{\|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h}}\|} \mathbf{B}_n \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}}{\|a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\|} + \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}}{\|a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2} + \frac{2}{\|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h}}\|} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}^* O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}}{\|a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\|} \right\} \\ & \geq \|a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}\|^2 \{ \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \} \geq C' a^{2h_q}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(n)$ . Hence, (B.9) is established.

So, we now need to prove (B.11). To this end, note that  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{Q}(n)\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{P}(n)\} \supseteq \mathcal{V}(n) \ni \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)$  a.s. by condition (2.28). Then,  $\|\mathbf{Q}(n)\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\| = \|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\| = 1$  a.s. Consequently,  $\sum_{i=q}^r (\mathbf{p}_i(n), \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}(n))^2 =$

$\|\mathbf{P}^*(n)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\|^2 = \|\mathbf{R}^*(n)\mathbf{Q}^*(n)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\|^2 \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{R}(n) \mathbf{R}^*(n) \mathbf{u} \geq C$  for some  $C > 0$ , where the last inequality follows from condition (2.29). This implies that

$$\|a^{\mathbf{h}+\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}^*(n) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(n)\|^2 = \sum_{i=q}^r a^{2h_i+1} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(n) \rangle^2 \geq a^{2h_q+1} \sum_{i=q}^r \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(n) \rangle^2 \geq C a^{2h_q+1} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

In other words, (B.11) holds, as claimed.  $\square$

Lemma B.3, stated and proved next, is used in the proofs of Proposition 5.1/Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2, Lemmas B.5 and B.6, as well as in the proofs of Corollary B.1, Proposition B.1 and Lemma B.7.

As one consequence of Lemma B.3, we can see that the potential singularities in expression (5.12) are, in truth, bounded in probability. In addition, for any fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , the lemma also shows that, for the rescaled random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)/a(n)^{2h_q+1}$  (cf. (B.6)), all terms other than the main scaling term  $\mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{B}_n a(n)^{\mathbf{h}-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}^*(n)$  behave like residuals in probability *along the direction given by the eigenvector*  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ , in spite of the fact that their spectral norms may be unbounded in general.

For the purpose of stating the lemma, for a generic fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , it will also be useful to define the random matrix

$$\tilde{\Xi}(n) = \tilde{\Xi}_q(n) := \frac{\mathbf{M}_n}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} = \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} - \frac{\mathbf{P}(n)a(n)^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{B}_n a(n)^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^*(n)}{a(n)^{2h_q}} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

(cf. (5.6)). Hereinafter, we use this notation.

**Lemma B.3** *For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  be the sequence of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2). Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . Also, let*

$$\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \omega) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

*be a unit eigenvector associated with the  $(p-r+q)$ -th eigenvalue of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ .*

(i) *Then,*

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \{ |\langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle| a(n)^{h_i-h_q} \} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

(ii) *For  $\tilde{\Xi}(n)$  as in (B.13),*

$$\left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \tilde{\Xi}(n) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

*In particular, statements (B.15) and (B.16) hold for a unit eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  of the wavelet random matrix  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$  as in (2.22) and for the random matrix  $\Xi(n)$  as in (5.6).*

**PROOF:** We first show (i). For the fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , if the index set  $\mathcal{I}_+$  as in (5.2) is empty, then the claim holds vacuously. So, suppose  $\mathcal{I}_+ \neq \emptyset$  and let  $\mathbf{h}$  be the diagonal matrix given by (5.5). It suffices to show that

$$\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{B.17})$$

For this purpose, we begin by establishing two bounds. In fact, on one hand note that, by (B.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} &= \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{p-r+q}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{p-r+q} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_{q+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\}^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_\ell, \ell \in \mathcal{I}_+\}^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.18})$$



On the other hand, again in light of (B.3), relation (B.7) implies that there are sequences of nonnegative random variables

$$\{\zeta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \text{ and } \{\zeta'_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (\text{B.19})$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} &\geq \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\|^2 \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - 2 \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \zeta_n - \zeta'_n \\ &= \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \left( \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - \zeta_n \right) - \zeta'_n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.20})$$

In turn, in order to use relations (B.18) and (B.20) to bound  $\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\|$ , we need to account for the role of the term  $\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - \zeta_n$  in (B.20). Indeed, since  $\lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}(2^j)) > 0$ , then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that the sequence of events  $A_n := \{\omega \in \Omega : \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - \zeta_n > \delta\}$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(A_n) \rightarrow 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{B.21})$$

(n.b.: not to be confused with  $A_n$  appearing in (5.84)). Then, by dividing through by  $\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - \zeta_n$  in (B.20), we obtain, for each  $\omega \in A_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| &\leq 1 + \|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| \mathbf{1}_{\{\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| > 1\}} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} + \zeta'_n}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_n) - \zeta_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

So, fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $\zeta'_n$  be as in (B.20). By relations (B.18) and (B.19), there exists  $M = M(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} + \zeta'_n > M\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Pick  $M' > 0$  such that  $\delta(M' - 1) = M$ . Then, relations (B.22) and (B.23) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\| > M') \leq \mathbb{P}(A_n^c) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} + \zeta'_n > \delta(M' - 1)\right\} \cap A_n\right) < \varepsilon,$$

where the last inequality holds for large enough  $n$  as a consequence of the limit (B.21). In other words, (B.17) holds. This establishes (B.15), and hence, (i).

We now show (ii). If  $\mathcal{I}_+ = \emptyset$ , then the statement holds trivially. So, suppose  $\mathcal{I}_+ \neq \emptyset$ . We can rewrite the left-hand side of (B.16) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P} \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}} \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right| + \left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P} \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}} \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \frac{a^{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right| \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + 2 \left| \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \left( \frac{\mathbf{P} \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}} \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \right) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

However,  $\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n) \frac{\mathbf{P} \mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ , by (B.15). This establishes (B.16) and, hence, (ii).  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proofs of Proposition 5.1/Theorem 3.1, Corollary B.1 and Lemma B.7. It shows that, for any fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , the norm of an eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  of the random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  eventually concentrates in the space  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{P}(n)\}$ .

**Lemma B.4** For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  be the sequence of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2). For each  $n$ , let

$$\mathbf{p}_{r+1}(n), \dots, \mathbf{p}_p(n) \quad (\text{B.25})$$

be an orthonormal basis for  $\text{nullspace}(\mathbf{P}^*(n))$ . Fix any  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and let  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \omega)$  denote a unit eigenvector associated with  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ , as in (B.14). Then,

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^p \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(a(n)^{-(h_q + \frac{1}{2})}). \quad (\text{B.26})$$

In particular, (B.26) holds for a unit eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n, \omega)$  associated with the random matrix  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ .

PROOF: For  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(n)$ , consider the projection  $\mathbf{v}(n)$  of  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  onto  $\text{nullspace}(\mathbf{P}^*)$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}(n) = \sum_{i=r+1}^p \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle \mathbf{p}_i(n). \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Starting from expression (B.7), it is clear that  $\mathbf{v}^*(n) \{ \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{B}_n a^{\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* + \mathbf{P} a^{\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}} O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1) a^{\mathbf{h} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{P}^* \} \mathbf{v}(n) = \mathbf{0}$ . Hence, by (B.6),

$$\mathbf{v}^*(n) \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \mathbf{v}(n) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{B.28})$$

However, let  $\mathcal{O}(n) = (\mathbf{u}_1(n) \dots \mathbf{u}_p(n))$  be a random matrix of eigenvectors of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^*(n) \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j) \mathbf{v}(n) &= \mathbf{v}^*(n) \mathcal{O}(n) \text{diag}(\lambda_1(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)), \dots, \lambda_p(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j))) \mathcal{O}^*(n) \mathbf{v}(n) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \langle \mathbf{u}_i(n), \mathbf{v}(n) \rangle^2 \lambda_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)) \geq \langle \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n), \mathbf{v}(n) \rangle^2 \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)) \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=r+1}^p \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle^2 \right)^2 \lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)) \geq \left( \sum_{i=r+1}^p \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle^2 \right)^2 a(n)^{2h_q+1} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.29})$$

In (B.29), the last equality and the last inequality follow from (B.27) and (B.9) (see Lemma B.2), respectively. In view of (B.28), we therefore obtain  $\left( \sum_{i=r+1}^p \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle^2 \right)^2 \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(a(n)^{-(2h_q+1)})$ . This implies (B.26).  $\square$

Note that, as a consequence of Lemmas B.3 and B.4, for the vectors  $\mathbf{p}_{r+1}(n), \dots, \mathbf{p}_p(n)$  as in (B.25), there exist a subsequence  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  along which (5.8) and (5.9) hold. This fact is used in the proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition B.1, as well as in the assumptions of Proposition 5.1, Lemma B.5 and Lemma B.6.

The following result, Lemma B.5, is used in the proofs of Theorem 3.1, Corollary B.1, and Lemma B.6. It expresses that, along appropriate subsequences, the eigenvectors of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  corresponding to its  $r$  largest eigenvalues asymptotically align with the columns of  $\mathbf{P}(n)$ , up to an orthogonal transformation (on sufficient conditions for the same statement to hold along the *main* sequence, see Proposition B.1).

For  $\ell = 1, \dots, p$ , as in (B.14) let  $\mathbf{u}_{\ell}(n) = \mathbf{u}_{\ell}(n, \omega)$  be an eigenvector associated with the  $\ell$ -th eigenvalue of a random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  of the form given by (B.6). In the proof of Lemma B.5 and also elsewhere, we make use of the sequence of rectangular random matrices

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n) = \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n, \omega) = (\mathbf{u}_{p-r+1}(n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(n)) \in \mathcal{M}(p, r, \mathbb{R}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{B.30})$$

which contains eigenvectors associated with the  $r$  top eigenvalues of the random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  (cf. (5.20)).

We also make use of the following basic fact. For a matrix  $\mathbf{M} = (m_{i,i'}) \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R})$ , we can write

$$\sum_{i,i'=1}^r m_{i,i'}^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{M}), \quad (\text{B.31})$$

where  $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , are the singular values of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

**Lemma B.5** *For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n)$  and  $\mathbf{Q}(n)$  be the sequences of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2), (B.30) and (2.28), respectively. Consider the random matrix*

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(n) = \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(n, \omega) := (\tau_1(n), \dots, \tau_r(n)) := \mathbf{Q}^*(n) \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n) \in \mathcal{M}(r, \mathbb{R}) \quad (\text{B.32})$$

(cf. (5.21)). Let  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  be any sequence along which (5.8) and (5.9) hold, and consider any random subsequence  $\nu_1(\omega) < \nu_2(\omega) < \dots$  of  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  along which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n) =: \widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.33})$$

- (i) Then, the vectors  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r$  are orthonormal a.s., i.e., the matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(\omega)$  in (B.33) is orthogonal a.s.;
- (ii) For a fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , consider the associated index sets as defined in (5.2) as well as their cardinalities  $r_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , as in (5.3). Also consider  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  as in (B.33) and  $\mathbf{R}$  as in (2.29). Then, the matrix  $\mathbf{\Gamma} := \mathbf{R}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  is nonsingular a.s. and may be expressed as

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{12} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{13} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{22} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{23} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{\Gamma}_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.34})$$

where the submatrices  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{i\ell}$ ,  $i, \ell = 1, 2, 3$ , are of size  $r_i \times r_\ell$ . Moreover, the submatrices  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are nonsingular a.s.

- (iii) For a fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , let  $\mathcal{I}_0$  be the associated index set as defined in (5.2) and let  $\mathbf{R}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , be the matrices as in (5.25). Then,  $\text{span}\{\tau_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp$ , i.e., expression (5.37) holds.

PROOF: First, we show (i). By (5.8), for each  $q = 1, \dots, r$ ,

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^{p(\nu_n)} \langle \mathbf{p}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(\nu_n) \rangle^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.35})$$

So, write  $\mathbf{q}_1(n), \dots, \mathbf{q}_r(n)$  for the (orthonormal) columns of  $\mathbf{Q}(n)$ . By relation (B.35) and the fact that  $\text{span}\{\mathbf{P}(n)\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{Q}(n)\}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^r \langle \mathbf{q}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(\nu_n) \rangle^2 \rightarrow 1$ ,  $q = 1, \dots, r$ , a.s. Then, by relations (B.31) and (B.32),

$$\sum_{s=1}^r \sigma_s^2(\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n)) = \sum_{i,\ell=1}^r \langle \mathbf{q}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n) \rangle^2 \rightarrow r, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.36})$$

However, the largest singular value  $\sigma_r$  of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(n)$  satisfies the bound  $\sigma_r^2(\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(n)) \leq \|\mathbf{Q}^*(n)\|^2 \|\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n)\|^2 = 1$  a.s. Hence, by (B.36),  $\sigma_s^2(\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n)) \rightarrow 1$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, r$ , which implies  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  is an orthogonal matrix with probability 1. This establishes (i).

For statement (ii),  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is nonsingular a.s. as consequence of statement (i) and of the invertibility of  $\mathbf{R}$  (see condition (2.29)). Moreover, (B.34) is a consequence of (5.9). In addition, the classical formula  $\det(\mathbf{\Gamma}) = \prod_{i=1}^3 \det(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii})$  implies that  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are nonsingular a.s.

In regard to statement (iii), by expression (B.34), the columns of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  are such that

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) \in \mathbf{R}_3^\perp, \quad \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0. \quad (\text{B.37})$$

Likewise, for  $i \in \mathcal{I}_-$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i(\omega) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}^\perp$ . Now note that  $\dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}^\perp) = r_1$ . Since  $\text{card}(\mathcal{I}_-) = r_1$ , the linear independence of the vectors  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-\}$  implies that  $\text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-\} = \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}^\perp$ . Thus, by the orthogonality of the vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_1(\omega), \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r(\omega)$  (part (i) of this lemma),  $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} \subseteq \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\}$ . Moreover, by relation (B.37),

$$\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} \subseteq \text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp$$

However, as a consequence of Lemma B.1, (ii) and (iii),  $\dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3\} \cap \mathbf{R}_3^\perp) = r_2 = \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_0)$ . Hence, expression (5.37) is established.  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proofs of Proposition 5.1/Theorem 3.1, Corollary B.1 and Lemma B.7.

**Lemma B.6** *Suppose the assumptions of Lemma B.5 hold. Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and consider the associated index set  $\mathcal{I}_0$  (see (5.2)). For a given  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$  and random vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_s = \boldsymbol{\tau}_s(\omega)$ ,  $s = \ell, \dots, r$  as in (B.33), take any*

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(\omega) \in \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r\} \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1}. \quad (\text{B.38})$$

Also, fix any random vector

$$\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{x}_*(\omega) = (x_{*,r-r_3+1}(\omega), \dots, x_{*,r}(\omega))^* \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}. \quad (\text{B.39})$$

Consider a random subsequence  $\nu_1(\omega) < \nu_2(\omega) < \dots$  of  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  as in the statement of Lemma B.5. Then, there exists a.s. a sequence of unit vectors  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(\nu_n)\}$  satisfying, for large enough  $n$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_i(\nu_n), \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \rangle = \frac{x_{*,i}}{a(\nu_n)^{h_i-h_q}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_+, \quad (\text{B.40})$$

and such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{v}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{w} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.41})$$

In particular, relations (5.45) and (5.58) hold in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma B.6 is what makes the bounds (5.46) and (5.59) possible and useful. This is so because, by relation (B.40), there are no potentially explosive terms in  $\mathbf{v}^*(\nu_n) \frac{\mathbf{W}(a(\nu_n)2^j)}{a(\nu_n)^{2n_q+1}} \mathbf{v}(\nu_n)$ , and by relation (B.41), the sequence  $\mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n) \mathbf{v}(\nu_n)$  converges to a target vector in the subspace  $\text{span}\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_\ell, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r\}$ . In particular, the upper bound can be made asymptotically sharp, as described in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

PROOF OF LEMMA B.6: For the fixed  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$  and for  $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{x}_*(\omega)$  as in (B.39), define

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n} = \left( \frac{x_{*,i}}{a(\nu_n)^{h_i-h_q}} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}, \quad (\text{B.42})$$

which is a (random) vector containing the right-hand terms in (B.40). Now, for random vectors  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$ ,  $i = \ell, \dots, r$ , as in (B.38), let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0, \dots, 0, \alpha_\ell, \dots, \alpha_{r_1+r_2})^* \in \mathbb{R}^{r_2}$  be the unit vector of (generally random) coefficients such that

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=\ell}^{r_1+r_2} \alpha_i \boldsymbol{\tau}_i = \sum_{i=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \alpha_i \boldsymbol{\tau}_i. \quad (\text{B.43})$$

The proof consists in constructing a sequence of random coefficient vectors

$$\mathbb{R}^r \ni \mathbf{c}(\nu_n) = (0, \dots, 0, c_\ell(\nu_n), \dots, c_r(\nu_n))^*, \quad \|\mathbf{c}(\nu_n)\| = 1, \quad (\text{B.44})$$

such that the sequence of associated random vectors  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) := \sum_{i=\ell}^r c_i(\nu_n) \mathbf{u}_{p-r+i}(\nu_n)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfies relations (B.40) and (B.41). This will be achieved by solving a linear system of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n} = \mathbf{P}_3^*(\nu_n) \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n) (0, \dots, 0, c_\ell(\nu_n), \dots, c_r(\nu_n))^* \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}, \quad (\text{B.45})$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_3(\nu_n)$  is as in (5.24). In (B.45),  $\mathbf{P}_3^*(\nu_n)$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n)$  are given by (5.24) and (B.30), respectively. Also, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c_i(\nu_n) \rightarrow \alpha_i$  for  $i = \ell, \dots, r - r_3$  and  $c_i(\nu_n) \rightarrow 0$  for  $i \in \mathcal{I}_+$ .

So, by analogy to (B.34), define the sequences of random matrices

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}(\nu_n) := \mathbf{R}^*(\nu_n)\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{P}^*(\nu_n)\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n) =: (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ik}(\nu_n))_{i,k=1,2,3}, \quad (\text{B.46})$$

where  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ik}(\nu_n)$  are blocks of size  $r_i \times r_k$  as in (B.34). By Lemma B.5,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{33} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}(\nu_n)$  is nonsingular a.s. Therefore,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}(\nu_n)$  is nonsingular for all sufficiently large  $n$ . Hence, for each  $s \in (0, 1)$  there exists a vector  $\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}$  satisfying

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}(\nu_n)\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s) = \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n} - \mathbf{\Gamma}_{32}(\nu_n) \cdot s\boldsymbol{\alpha}. \quad (\text{B.47})$$

Note that, for  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n}$  as in (B.42),  $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In addition, as a consequence of Lemma B.5,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{32}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{0}_{r_3 \times r_2}$  a.s. Since, again,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}$  is nonsingular a.s., then

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.48})$$

Thus, for any small  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $0 \leq \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s)\| < \varepsilon < 1$  for large enough  $\nu_n(\omega)$  a.s. On other hand, for each  $n$ , the function  $f(s) = 1 - s^2 - \|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s)\|^2$  depends continuously on  $s$ . Moreover,  $f(0) > 1 - \varepsilon$  and  $f(1) = -\|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(1)\|^2$ . Hence,  $f$  must have a root  $s_0 = s_0(\nu_n) \in (0, 1]$  for large enough  $\nu_n(\omega)$ . So, we define the unit vector

$$\mathbf{c}^*(\nu_n) := (\mathbf{0}_{r_1}^*, s_0 \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*, \mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}^*(s_0))^* \in \mathbb{R}^r.$$

Moreover, in view of (B.48),  $s_0 \rightarrow 1$  a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies that

$$\mathbf{Q}^*(\nu_n)\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n)\mathbf{c}(\nu_n) = \tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{r_1} \\ s_0 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s_0) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{T}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{r_1} \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \mathbf{0}_{r_3} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{w} \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Thus, if we define

$$\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) := \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n)\mathbf{c}(\nu_n) \quad (\text{B.50})$$

then  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)$  satisfies (B.41). Also, by construction,  $s_0^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s_0)\|^2 = 1$ . Since  $\mathbf{w}$  is a unit vector and the vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$  are orthonormal, then  $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\| = 1$  a.s. This shows that  $\|\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)\| = s_0^2 \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s_0)\|^2 = 1$ . Also, by the definition of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  (see (B.43)), the first  $\ell - 1$  entries of the vector  $\mathbf{c}^*(\nu_n) \in \mathbb{R}^r$  are zero (cf. (B.44)), so  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+\ell}(\nu_n), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(\nu_n)\}$ .

We now show that (B.40) holds for  $\mathbf{v}(\nu_n)$  as in (B.50). By expression (B.46), we can write  $\mathbf{P}_3^*(\nu_n)\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(\nu_n) = (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{31}(\nu_n) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{32}(\nu_n) \mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}(\nu_n)) \in \mathcal{M}(r_3, r, \mathbb{R})$ . So, by relations (B.47) and (B.50), a.s. for large enough  $n$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}_3^*(\nu_n)\mathbf{v}(\nu_n) = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{32}(\nu_n) \cdot s_0 \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_{33}(\nu_n)\mathbf{z}_{\nu_n}(s_0) = \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{\nu_n} \quad (\text{B.51})$$

(cf. (B.45)). Together, relations (B.50) and (B.51) imply that (B.45) holds. This establishes (B.40).  $\square$

The following corollary of the proof of Theorem 3.1 is used several times throughout the proof of Theorem 3.2 and also in the proof of Proposition B.1.

**Corollary B.1** *For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  be the sequence of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2). Let  $\xi_\ell(2^j)$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , be the functions appearing in (3.1) (see Theorem 3.1). Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\lambda_{p-r+\ell} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_\ell+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_\ell(2^j), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, r.$$

*In particular, for a fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and its associated index sets as in (5.2),*

$$\lambda_{p-r+\ell} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \begin{cases} 0, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_-; \\ \xi_\ell(2^j), & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0; \\ \infty, & \ell \in \mathcal{I}_+, \end{cases} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.52})$$

PROOF: The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 5.1 can be repeated, *mutatis mutandis*, with the more general matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)$  as in (B.6) in place of  $\mathbf{W}(a2^j)$  (**n.b.**: even though  $\mathbf{W}(a2^j) \in \mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(p, \mathbb{R})$ , only the fact that  $\mathbf{W}(a2^j) \in \mathcal{S}(p, \mathbb{R})$  plays a role in the proof of Theorem 3.1). In particular, Lemmas B.2–B.6 – which are used in the proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 5.1 – are stated and proved for the matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a2^j)$ .  $\square$

Proposition B.1, stated and proved next, is used in the proofs of Theorem 3.2 and Lemma B.7. By comparison to Lemma B.5, which pertains to convergent subsequences  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(\nu_n)$ , the proposition shows that, under the additional condition (3.4), the *main* sequence of random matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}(n) = \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_r(n)$  (in particular,  $\mathbf{T}(n)$  as in (5.21)) has a limit  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$  in probability that is deterministic. This yields the convergence of the vector of angular coefficients  $\mathbf{P}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$ . Such convergence of angular coefficients plays a role analogous to that of the convergence of eigenvectors in fixed dimensions (cf. Proposition 1, (iii), in Abry and Didier (2018a)), the latter being meaningless in high dimensions.

**Proposition B.1** *For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  be the sequence of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2). Suppose condition (3.4) in Theorem 3.2 holds. Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and let  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  be as in (2.26) and (2.29), respectively. Then, there are deterministic vectors  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_q$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_q := \mathbf{R}^*\boldsymbol{\tau}_q$ , depending only on  $\mathbf{B}(2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ , and a sequence of  $(p-r+q)$ -th unit random eigenvectors  $\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  along which*

$$p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_q \in \mathbb{R}^r, \quad p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_q \in \mathbb{R}^r. \quad (\text{B.53})$$

In particular, for some sequence of unit eigenvectors  $\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ , under condition (3.4) the limits  $p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_q$  and  $p\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  exist.

Note that both the statement and proof of Proposition 5.1 naturally apply to the sequence of random matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$ . We use this fact in proving Proposition B.1.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION B.1 For the fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , let  $\mathcal{I}_0$  be as in (5.2), and also let

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n) = \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n, \omega) = \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \quad (\text{B.54})$$

be as in (B.32). The second statement in (B.53) is a direct consequence of the first one, since  $\mathbf{P}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) = \mathbf{R}^*(n)\boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{R}^*\boldsymbol{\tau}_q = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_q$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We now show the first statement in (B.53). So, starting from (B.54), it suffices to show that, for some deterministic vector  $\mathbf{w}$  and for any arbitrary subsequence  $n' \in \mathbb{N}'$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ , there exists a sub-subsequence  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}'' \subseteq \mathbb{N}'$  such that

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'') \rightarrow \mathbf{w} \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n'' \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.55})$$

First note that, by Corollary B.1,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j))}{a(n)^{2h_q+1}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi_\ell(2^j), \quad \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.56})$$

Now, in view of Lemmas B.3 and B.4, if needed we can refine the sub-subsequence  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$  so that relations (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10) hold (cf. the proof of Proposition 5.1). By an application of Proposition 5.1 naturally adapted to the random matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)$ ,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j))}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \rightarrow \lambda_{r-r_2+\ell}(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0, \quad n'' \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{B.57})$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  is the deterministic matrix given by (5.34). Thus, by the limits (B.56) and (B.57) under condition (3.4), the positive eigenvalues  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_{r_2}$  of the matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  are distinct, i.e.,

$$\chi_1 = \xi_{r_1+1}(2^j) < \dots < \chi_{r_2} = \xi_{r_1+r_2}(2^j). \quad (\text{B.58})$$

Hence, each eigenspace  $\mathcal{M}_i$  (see (5.38)) corresponding to these  $r_2$  distinct positive eigenvalues is one-dimensional, i.e.,

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}_i) = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_2. \quad (\text{B.59})$$

In particular, we can fix a deterministic vector

$$\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}_{q-r_1} \cap \mathbb{S}^{r-1} \quad (\text{B.60})$$

(**n.b.:**  $\mathbf{w}$  will be the vector appearing in the limit (B.55), hence the use of the same notation).

Now note that, for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , the sequence  $\tau_\ell(n'')$  is a.s. bounded. Following the method of proof of Proposition 5.1 (see relations (5.14) and (5.15)), we establish the almost sure convergence of  $\tau_\ell(n'')$  by considering subsequences for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  a.s. To this end, for a fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , let  $\nu_n(\omega)$  denote an arbitrary subsequence of  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$ . Then, we can apply Bolzano-Weierstrass to further refine the subsequence  $\nu'_n(\omega)$  so that the limits  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_\ell(\nu'_n(\omega)) =: \tau_\ell(\omega)$  exist a.s. as in (5.22). Suppose, for the moment, that

$$\text{span}\{\tau_{r_1+i}(\omega)\} = \mathcal{M}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r_2. \quad (\text{B.61})$$

In view of (B.59), this implies that the limiting vectors  $\tau_\ell(\omega)$ ,  $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_0$ , are deterministic up to a sign. Consequently, by multiplying  $\tau_q(\nu'_n(\omega))$  by  $(-1)$  if needed, we obtain  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_q(\nu'_n(\omega)) = \tau_q(\omega) \equiv \mathbf{w}$ . Since the sequence  $\nu'_n(\omega)$  is arbitrary, (B.55) holds. This proves that  $\tau_q(n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{w}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which establishes the first convergence statement in (B.53).

So, we now need to show (B.61). We do so by showing that, for  $i = 1, \dots, r_2$ ,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+i)}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\tau_{r_1+i}(\omega)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{B.62})$$

where, for  $\tau_i = \tau_i(\omega)$  as in (5.22),

$$\chi_1 = \varphi(\tau_{r_1+1}) < \dots < \varphi(\tau_{r_1+i}) = \chi_i. \quad (\text{B.63})$$

(cf. (5.48) and (5.49)). In fact, as a consequence of (5.38), (B.59), and the claim (B.62)–(B.63), relation (B.61) holds.

We establish (B.62)–(B.63) by induction. Indeed, by (B.57) and (B.58), we obtain that

$$\chi_1 \leftarrow \frac{\lambda_{p-r+(r_1+1)}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\tau_{r_1+1}(\omega)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

(c.f. (5.47)). In other words, the claim holds for  $i = 1$ . Next, for the induction hypothesis, assume that (B.62)–(B.63) hold  $i = r_1 + 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ . Then, the decomposition  $\text{span}\{\tau_\ell(\omega) : \ell \in \mathcal{I}_0\} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_{r_2}$  (see (5.38)) and relation (B.59) imply that the vectors  $\tau_\ell(\omega)$  satisfy  $\text{span}\{\tau_{r_1+i}(\omega)\} = \mathcal{M}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ . In turn, this implies that case (i) (see (5.52)) in the proof of Proposition 5.1 holds with  $k = \ell$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_{\ell-1} = \text{span}\{\tau_{r_1+1}, \dots, \tau_{\ell-1}\} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{M}_\ell, \quad \mathcal{M}_0 := \emptyset.$$

So, by following the same argument starting at relation (5.52), we conclude that relation (5.60) holds, namely,

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+\ell}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(\nu_n)2^j))}{a(\nu_n)^{2h_q+1}}(\omega) \rightarrow \varphi(\tau_\ell(\omega)) = \chi_\ell, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This finishes the induction. Hence, (B.62)–(B.63) hold, and so does (B.61).  $\square$

The following result, Lemma B.7, is used in the proof of Theorem 3.2. It establishes that the terms (B.15), which are shown to be bounded in probability in Lemma B.3, (i), in truth have limits in probability under the additional condition (3.4). As with Proposition B.1, when proving Lemma B.7 we use the fact that the proof of Proposition 5.1 naturally applies to the sequence of random matrices  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  in place of  $\mathbf{W}(a(n)2^j)$ .

**Lemma B.7** For a fixed  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  be the sequence of random matrices given by (B.6) (see Lemma B.2). Assume condition (3.4) in Theorem 3.2 holds. Fix  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and consider the associated index sets as in (5.2). Then, for the sequence of  $(p-r+q)$ -th unit eigenvectors  $\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n)2^j)$  described in Proposition B.1, there are deterministic constants  $x_{*,q,i}$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{I}_+$ , such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a(n)^{h_i-h_q} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} x_{*,q,i}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_+. \quad (\text{B.64})$$

PROOF: For the fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , recall that we write  $r_3 = \text{card}(\mathcal{I}_+)$  (see (5.3)). Let

$$\mathbf{x}(n) = \mathbf{x}(n, \omega) := \left( \langle \mathbf{p}_i(n), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n) \rangle a(n)^{h_i-h_q} \right)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3} \quad (\text{B.65})$$

be a random vector containing the scalar terms appearing on the left-hand side of (B.64). To establish (B.64), it suffices to show that, for some deterministic vector  $\mathbf{x}_* \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}$  and any arbitrary subsequence  $\{\mathbf{x}(n')\}_{n' \in \mathbb{N}'}$ , there exists a further subsequence  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}'' \subseteq \mathbb{N}'$  such that

$$\mathbf{x}(n'') \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_* \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n'' \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.66})$$

In fact, under condition (3.4), Proposition B.1 implies the existence of the limits  $\tau_\ell(n') = \mathbf{Q}^*(n') \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n') \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \tau_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , where each vector  $\tau_\ell$  is deterministic. By passing to a further subsequence  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}'' \subseteq \mathbb{N}'$  if needed, we may assume that

$$\lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \tau_\ell(n'') = \tau_\ell \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, r. \quad (\text{B.67})$$

For each fixed  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^r$ , recall that the vectors  $\mathbf{x}_*(\tau)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{*,n}(\tau)$ , defined in (5.30), are the minimizers of the functions  $\varphi(\cdot, \tau)$  and  $\widehat{\varphi}_n(\cdot, \tau)$ , respectively (see (5.29) and (5.28)). So, for the fixed  $q \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and  $\tau_q, \tau_q(n'')$  as in (B.67), let

$$\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{x}_*(\tau_q) = (x_{*,q+1}, \dots, x_{*,r}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}_*(n'') = \mathbf{x}_{*,n}(\tau_q(n'')) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3} \quad (\text{B.68})$$

(**n.b.:**  $\mathbf{x}_*$  will be the vector appearing in the limit (B.66), hence the use of the same notation). Note that, by expression (5.30),

$$\mathbf{x}_*(n'') \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_* \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad n'' \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.69})$$

We now use the convergence (B.69) of  $\mathbf{x}_*(n'')$  to establish the convergence (B.66) of  $\mathbf{x}(n'')$ . So, suppose, for the moment, that the functions  $\varphi$  and  $\widehat{\varphi}_{n''}$  satisfy the system of inequalities

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \tau_q) = \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*(n''), \tau_q(n'')) \leq \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}(n''), \tau_q(n'')) \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \tau_q) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.70})$$

Following the method of proof of Proposition 5.1 (see relations (5.14) and (5.15)), we show the almost sure convergence of  $\mathbf{x}(n'')$  by considering subsequences for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  a.s.

More precisely, consider  $\mathbf{x}(\nu_n(\omega))$  as in (B.65). By Lemma B.8 we can pass to a further subsequence (still denoted  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$ , for simplicity) such that, for  $\omega \in \Omega$  a.s., any arbitrary subsequence  $\nu(\omega)$  of  $n''$  has a further subsequence  $\nu'_n(\omega)$  along which  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n(\omega))\| < \infty$ . Thus, we can apply the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem to obtain a sub-subsequence (still denoted  $\nu'_n(\omega)$ , for simplicity) such that  $\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^{r_3}$  a.s., where  $\mathbf{x}_\infty$  is a possibly random limit vector. However, along this sub-subsequence  $\nu'_n$ , relations (B.67) and (B.69), respectively, imply that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_q(\nu'_n) = \tau_q$  a.s. and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}_*(\nu'_n) = \mathbf{x}_*$  a.s. Thus, by (B.70),

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \tau_q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu'_n}(\mathbf{x}_*(\nu'_n), \tau_q(\nu'_n)) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu'_n}(\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n), \tau_q(\nu'_n)) \leq \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \tau_q).$$

In other words,  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \tau_q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu'_n}(\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n), \tau_q(\nu'_n)) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_\infty, \tau_q)$ . Since the minimizer  $\mathbf{x}_*$  of  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \tau_q)$  in  $\mathbf{x}$  is unique, we conclude that  $\mathbf{x}_\infty = \mathbf{x}_*$  a.s. Since the original random subsequence  $\nu_n$  was arbitrary, we obtain (B.69). Hence, we conclude that  $\mathbf{x}(n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbf{x}_*$ , as anticipated. This establishes (B.64).

So, we now need to show (B.70). Refining the subsequence  $n''$  if necessary, by Lemmas B.3 and B.4 we may assume the convergence statements (5.8) and (5.9) hold along the subsequence  $n''$  (cf. the proof of



Proposition 5.1). Since, in addition, relation (B.67) holds, then the assumptions of Lemma B.6 hold along the *nonrandom* subsequence  $n''$ . So, by Lemma B.6, there is a sequence of unit vectors

$$\mathbb{R}^p \ni \mathbf{v}(n'') \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n''), \dots, \mathbf{u}_p(n'')\} \quad (\text{B.71})$$

such that, for some large  $M(\omega)$ ,  $n'' \geq M(\omega)$  implies that

$$\langle \mathbf{p}_i(n''), \mathbf{v}(n'') \rangle = \frac{x_{*,i}}{a^{h_i - h_q}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}_+, \quad (\text{B.72})$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q}^*(n'')\mathbf{v}(n'') =: \mathbf{w}(n'') \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\tau}_q \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.73})$$

Recall the notation (B.13) for  $\tilde{\Xi}(n'')$ . Thus, for  $\mathbf{x}_*(n'')$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(n'')$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')$  as in (B.68), (B.65) and (B.67), respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) + \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n'') &\leq \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) + \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n'') \\ &= \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j))}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \leq \mathbf{v}^*(n'')\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}}\mathbf{v}(n'') = \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{w}(n'')) + \mathbf{v}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{v}(n''). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.74})$$

The first inequality in (B.74) is a consequence of the fact that  $\mathbf{x}_*(n'')$  ( $\neq \mathbf{x}(n'')$ ) minimizes  $\widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n''))$  in  $\mathbf{x}$ . The first equality stems from (5.17) naturally reinterpreted for the matrix  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)$ . The second inequality follows from (B.71). In particular, since (B.72) implies  $\|a^{\mathbf{h}-h_q}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{P}^*\mathbf{v}(n'')\| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ , we have

$$\mathbf{v}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{v}(n'') = \mathbf{v}^*(n'')\left(\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{2h_q+1}} + \frac{\mathbf{P}a^{\mathbf{h}}}{a^{h_q}}\frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}} + \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}^*(1)}{a^{h_q+1/2}}\frac{a^{\mathbf{h}}\mathbf{P}^*}{a^{h_q}}\right)\mathbf{v}(n'') = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{B.75})$$

In view of relations (2.24), (B.75) and (B.16) (see Lemma B.3, (ii)), by passing to a further subsequence if needed we may assume  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}(2^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}(2^j)$  a.s., and also that

$$\mathbf{v}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{v}(n'') \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n'') \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.76})$$

Now note that, by relations (B.67), (B.69), (B.73), (5.28) and (5.29),

$$\lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \boldsymbol{\tau}_q) = \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{w}(n'')) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{B.77})$$

Thus, based on (B.76), (B.77) and the string of inequalities (B.74), we obtain

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \boldsymbol{\tau}_q) = \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) \leq \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) \leq \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{w}(n'')) = \varphi(\mathbf{x}_*, \boldsymbol{\tau}_q).$$

Hence, (B.70) holds, as claimed.  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proof of Lemma B.7.

**Lemma B.8** *Let  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$  be the sequence appearing in (B.69). Then, we can pass to a subsequence (still denoted  $n'' \in \mathbb{N}''$ , for simplicity) such that, for  $\omega \in \Omega$  a.s., any arbitrary random subsequence  $\nu_n(\omega)$  of  $n''$  has a further subsequence  $\nu'_n(\omega)$  along which*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_+} \{|\langle \mathbf{p}_i(\nu'_n(\omega)), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(\nu'_n(\omega)) \rangle| a(\nu'_n(\omega))^{h_i - h_q}\} < \infty. \quad (\text{B.78})$$

PROOF: Consider the matrix  $\mathbf{Q}(n)$  as in (2.28) and let  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n) = \mathbf{Q}^*(n)\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n)$  (see (B.32)). For the function  $\widehat{\varphi}_n$  as defined in (5.28) (with  $\mathbf{B}_n$  naturally replacing  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_a(2^j)$ ), we may rewrite

$$\frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j))}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} = \widehat{\varphi}_{n''}(\mathbf{x}(n''), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(n'')) + \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n'')\tilde{\Xi}(n'')\mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n'') \quad (\text{B.79})$$

(cf. (5.17)). Moreover, (B.79) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\mathcal{U}_{p-r+q}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{p-r+q} \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_{q+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r\}^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} \\
& \leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_+\}^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} \mathbf{u}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \mathbf{u} =: \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''}^* \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(n'')2^j)}{a(n'')^{2h_q+1}} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \\
& = \begin{pmatrix} a(n'')^{h_1-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^*(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^* \mathbf{B}_{n''} \begin{pmatrix} a(n'')^{h_1-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \\ \mathbf{P}_2^*(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''}^* \widetilde{\Xi}(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''}. \tag{B.80}
\end{aligned}$$

In (B.80),  $\mathbf{h}_1$  is given by (5.26) and  $\mathbf{P}_1^*(n'')$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_2^*(n'')$  are as in (5.24).

However, since  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{p}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_+\}^\perp$ , relation (B.13) implies that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''}^* \widetilde{\Xi}(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{B.81}$$

Hence, by relations (B.5), (B.16) (see Lemma B.3, (ii)) and (B.81), we can find a further subsequence (still denoted  $n''$ , for simplicity) such that the event

$$A_0 = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \|\mathbf{B}_{n''} - \mathbf{B}(2^j)\| = o(1), \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}^*(n'') \widetilde{\Xi}(n'') \mathbf{u}_{p-r+q}(n'') = o(1), \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''}^* \widetilde{\Xi}(n'') \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{n''} = o(1) \right\}$$

occurs with probability 1. So, fix  $\omega \in A_0$  and consider any subsequence  $\nu_n(\omega)$ . Let  $\mathbf{B}_{n,33}$  be the  $r_3 \times r_3$  lower-right sub-block of  $\mathbf{B}_n$ . Note that the terms  $a(\nu_n(\omega))^{h_1-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(\nu_n(\omega)) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p-r+q}(\nu_n(\omega))$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_2^*(\nu_n(\omega)) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{p-r+q}(\nu_n(\omega))$ ,  $a(\nu_n(\omega))^{h_1-h_q} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{P}_1^*(\nu_n(\omega)) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\nu_n(\omega)}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_2^*(\nu_n(\omega)) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\nu_n(\omega)}$  (cf. (B.80)) are all bounded for any  $\omega$  a.s. Thus, in view of (B.79) and (B.80), we can pass to a subsequence  $\nu'_n = \nu'_n(\omega)$  based on which we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n)\|^2 \{ \lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_{\nu'_n,33}) + o(1) \} + O(1) \leq \mathbf{x}^*(\nu'_n) \mathbf{B}_{\nu'_n,33} \mathbf{x}(\nu'_n) + O(\|\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n)\|) + O(1) \\
& = \widehat{\varphi}_{\nu'_n}(\mathbf{x}(\nu'_n), \boldsymbol{\tau}_q(\nu'_n)) + o(1) = \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(\nu'_n)2^j))}{a(\nu'_n)^{2h_q+1}} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\lambda_{p-r+q}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(a(\nu'_n)2^j))}{a(\nu'_n)^{2h_q+1}} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Since, in addition,  $\lambda_1(\mathbf{B}_{\nu'_n,33})$  is a.s. bounded away from zero for large enough  $n$ , this establishes (B.78), and hence, the claim.  $\square$

## C Proofs: Section 4

### C.1 Section 4.1: proofs and auxiliary results

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1: Note that condition (4.1) is equivalent to stating that the  $\mathbb{R}^p$ -valued stochastic process  $Z = \{Z(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  as in (1.3) admits the harmonizable representation

$$\mathbb{R}^p \ni Z(t) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{itx} \mathbf{g}_Z(x)^{1/2} \widetilde{B}_Z(dx), \tag{C.1}$$

where the  $\mathbb{C}^p$ -valued, Gaussian random measure  $\widetilde{B}_Z(dx)$  is such that  $\widetilde{B}_Z(-dx) = \overline{\widetilde{B}_Z(dx)}$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \widetilde{B}_Z(dx) \widetilde{B}_Z(dx)^* = \mathbf{I}_p \cdot dx$ . In addition, condition (iii) implies that the  $\mathbb{R}^r$ -valued stochastic process  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  admits the harmonizable representation

$$X(t) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (e^{itx} - 1) \mathbf{g}_X(x)^{1/2} \widetilde{B}(dx). \tag{C.2}$$

In (C.2),

$$\mathcal{S}_{\geq 0}(r, \mathbb{C}) \ni \mathbf{g}_X(x) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} |x + 2\pi\ell|^{-\mathbf{H} - (1/2)} \mathbf{I}_5(x + 2\pi) |x + 2\pi\ell|^{-\mathbf{H}^* - (1/2)} \mathbf{I}, \tag{C.3}$$

where  $x \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\}$  and

$$\mathfrak{s}(x) = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^* 1_{\{x>0\}} + \overline{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*} 1_{\{x<0\}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover,  $\tilde{B}(dx)$  is an orthogonal-increment Gaussian random measure satisfying  $\tilde{B}(-dx) = \overline{\tilde{B}(dx)}$  and  $\mathbb{E}\tilde{B}(dx)\tilde{B}(dx)^* = \mathbf{I}_p \cdot dx$ . In particular, relations (C.1) and (C.2) imply that, under conditions (W1 – W4), the random matrices  $\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j)$  are well defined a.s. Then, the claim is a consequence of Proposition C.1 and Lemma C.2.  $\square$

In the remainder of this section, we establish all the auxiliary results needed in the proof of Proposition 4.1 (including Proposition C.1 and Lemma C.2 themselves).

Starting from the harmonizable representations (C.1) and (C.2) for the stochastic processes  $Z = \{Z(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , we now establish concentration inequalities and asymptotic results for the wavelet random matrices  $\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)$  and  $\mathbf{W}_{X,Z}(a(n)2^j)$ .

We can express

$$D_Z(2^j, k) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} Z(\ell) h_{j, 2^j k - \ell}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where  $h_{j, \cdot}$  is given by (2.12). By the independence between  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\tilde{B}_Z(dx)$  and by Itô's isometry,

$$\mathbb{E}D_Z(2^j, k)D_Z(2^{j'}, k')^* = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ix(2^j k - 2^{j'} k')} \mathcal{H}_j(x) \overline{\mathcal{H}_{j'}(x)} \mathbb{E}\mathfrak{g}_Z(x) dx,$$

where, for each  $j$ , we define

$$\mathcal{H}_j(x) := \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{j, \ell} e^{-ix\ell}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_Z(2^j) = \mathbf{I}_p \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 \mathbb{E}\mathfrak{g}_Z(x) dx =: \mathbf{I}_p \cdot m(2^j) = \mathbf{I}_p \cdot \mathbb{E}D_Z^2(2^j, 0)_1. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Let  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{V_n}$  be the covariance matrix of the vector  $V_n$  of wavelet coefficients (of  $Z$ ) at scale  $a(n)2^j$  (i.e., (C.23) for  $m = 1$ ). Let

$$\beta := \frac{1}{2\pi} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i=1, \dots, n_{a,j}} \lambda_{i, V_n} < \infty, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Note that, by Lemma C.1, (iii),  $\beta < \infty$ .

In the following proposition, we establish a concentration inequality for the norm  $\|\mathbf{W}_Z(2^j)\| = \lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(2^j))$ . The proof follows an  $\varepsilon$ -net argument, involving steps of approximation, concentration and union bound (cf. Vershynin (2018), Sections 4.4 and 4.6, or Lugosi (2017), pp. 13–14).

**Proposition C.1** *Suppose the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 hold. Let  $m(a(n)2^j) = \mathbb{E}D_Z^2(a(n)2^j, 0)_1 > 0$  be as in (C.5) and let  $\beta$  be as in (C.6). Take any*

$$t > 8\pi\beta + \gamma \geq 0, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where  $\gamma := 2\pi\mathbb{E}\mathfrak{g}(0)$  for  $g \in \mathbb{R}$  as in (4.3). Fix a small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, for large enough  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{p(n)}(\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)) > m(a(n)2^j) + t\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left\{p(n) \log 9 - \frac{n}{a(n)2^j} \left(\frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi(\beta + \varepsilon)} - \sqrt{\frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi(\beta + \varepsilon)}}\right)\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

In particular, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability going to 1 the eigenvalue  $\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j))$  is bounded above by any constant  $C$  satisfying

$$C > 2\gamma + 8\pi(\beta + \varepsilon) \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + c2^{j+2} \log 9}}{2}\right)^2, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

where  $c \geq 0$  is as in (2.27).

PROOF: As in the statement, fix a small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Also fix  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$  and let

$$\mathcal{D}_{Z,n}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m(a2^j)}} \left( D_Z(a2^j, 1)^* \mathbf{u}, D_Z(a2^j, 2)^* \mathbf{u}, \dots, D_Z(a2^j, n_{a,j})^* \mathbf{u} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{a,j}}.$$

Write

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{D},n} = \mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_{Z,n} \mathcal{D}_{Z,n}^*$$

and consider its spectral decomposition  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{D},n} = \mathbf{O}_n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{D},n} \mathbf{O}_n^*$  for an orthogonal matrix  $\mathbf{O}_n$ . Recast

$$\frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \mathcal{D}_{Z,n}^* \mathcal{D}_{Z,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \mathbf{Z}_n^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{D},n} \mathbf{Z}_n = \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \mathbf{Z}_n^* \mathbf{O}_n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{D},n} \mathbf{O}_n^* \mathbf{Z}_n \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \mathbf{Z}_n^* \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathcal{D},n} \mathbf{Z}_n =: \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \eta_{k,n} Z_k^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}_n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_{a,j}})^*$  is a vector of i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} \equiv \boldsymbol{\eta}_n = \left( \eta_{1,n}, \dots, \eta_{n_{a,j},n} \right) \quad (\text{C.10})$$

be the vector of eigenvalues of the deterministic matrix  $\frac{1}{n_{a,j}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{D},n}$ . We claim that, for large enough  $n$ ,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\pi(\beta + \varepsilon)}{n_{a,j} m(a2^j)}. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

In fact, by the independence of the components of  $Z$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[D_Z(a2^j, k)_i D_Z(a2^j, k')_{i'}] = \begin{cases} 0, & i \neq i'; \\ \mathbb{E}[D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^j, k')_1], & i = i'. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for  $k, k' \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \ni \mathbb{E}[D_Z(a2^j, k)^* \mathbf{u} D_Z(a2^j, k')^* \mathbf{u}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{i'=1}^p D_Z(a2^j, k)_i D_Z(a2^j, k')_{i'} u_{p,i} u_{p,i'} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^j, k')_1] \sum_{i=1}^p u_{p,i}^2 = \mathbb{E}[D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^j, k')_1] \\ &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ix a 2^j (k-k')} |\mathcal{H}_{a2^j}(x)|^2 \mathbb{E} \mathbf{g}(x) dx =: \varphi_{a2^j}(k - k'). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{D},n} = \mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_{Z,n} \mathcal{D}_{Z,n}^* &= \frac{1}{m(a2^j)} \times \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{a2^j}(0) & \varphi_{a2^j}(1) & \dots & \varphi_{a2^j}(n_{a,j} - 1) \\ \varphi_{a2^j}(1) & \varphi_{a2^j}(0) & \dots & \varphi_{a2^j}(n_{a,j} - 2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \varphi_{a2^j}(n_{a,j} - 1) & \varphi_{a2^j}(n_{a,j} - 2) & \dots & \varphi_{a2^j}(0) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{m(a2^j)} \mathbb{E} V_n V_n^*, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where  $V_n$  is given by (C.23) for  $m = 1$  (i.e., a single octave  $j$ ). By (C.13) and Lemma C.1, (iii), for large enough  $n$  and for all  $k = 1, \dots, n_{a,j}$ ,

$$\eta_{k,n} \leq \frac{1}{n_{a,j} m(a2^j)} \lambda_p(\mathbb{E} V_n V_n^*) \leq \frac{2\pi(\beta + \varepsilon)}{n_{a,j} m(a2^j)},$$

where  $\beta$  is given in (C.6). In other words, (C.11) holds.

So, let

$$s > 4\pi\beta_\varepsilon, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

where we write  $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta + \varepsilon$  for notational simplicity. Define

$$x = \left( \frac{-\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 + \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j)}}{2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty} \right)^2.$$

Then,  $2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{x} + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty x = s/m(a2^j)$ . Since  $\mathbf{u}^* \mathbb{E} \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u} = m(a2^j)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u} - m(a2^j) > s\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u}}{m(a2^j)} - 1 > \frac{s}{m(a2^j)}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \eta_{k,n} (Z_k^2 - 1) \geq \frac{s}{m(a2^j)}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \eta_{k,n} (Z_k^2 - 1) \geq 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{x} + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty x\right) \leq \exp\{-x\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of Lemma C.3. Now, note that  $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n_{a,j}} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty$ , and that  $\sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j)} \leq \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 + \sqrt{2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j)}$ . Under condition (C.14), by applying relation (C.11) twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j) - \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j)}}{2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty^2} \\ &\geq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j) - \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty s/m(a2^j)}}{2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty^2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty} \left( \frac{s}{2m(a2^j)} - \sqrt{n_{a,j} \frac{s\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty}{2m(a2^j)}} \right) \geq n_{a,j} \left( \frac{s}{4\pi\beta_\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{s}{4\pi\beta_\varepsilon}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.16})$$

From (C.15) and (C.16), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u} - m(a2^j) > s\right) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{a2^j} \left(\frac{s}{4\pi\beta_\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{s}{4\pi\beta_\varepsilon}}\right)\right\}. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

We now appeal to the same argument as in Lugosi (2017), pp. 13–14. In fact, let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a 1/4-net of the unit sphere. Then, it can be shown that  $\text{card}(\mathcal{N}) \leq 9^p$ . By an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain  $\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)) \leq 2 \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u}$ . Let  $t$  be as in (C.7). Thus, by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j)) > t + m(a2^j)\right) &\leq 9^p \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u} > \frac{t + m(a2^j)}{2}\right). \\ &= 9^p \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{W}_Z(a2^j) \mathbf{u} - m(a2^j) > \frac{t - m(a2^j)}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

Note that, by Lemma C.1, (ii),

$$m(a2^j) \equiv m(a(n)2^j) \rightarrow 2\pi \mathbb{E} \mathbf{g}(0) = \gamma, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Without loss of generality assuming  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough, in view of (C.7) the inequality  $\frac{t - m(a2^j)}{2} > 4\pi\beta_\varepsilon$  holds for all large  $n$ . By combining this with (C.17) and (C.18), we arrive at (C.8).

To show the statement regarding (C.9), recast

$$\exp\left\{p(n) \log 9 - \frac{n}{a(n)2^j} \left(\frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon}}\right)\right\} =: \exp\left\{\frac{n}{a(n)} b(n)\right\}.$$

However, by (2.27) and (C.19),

$$\begin{aligned} b(n) &= \frac{p(n)}{n/a(n)} \log 9 - \frac{1}{2^j} \left( \frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{t - m(a(n)2^j)}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &\rightarrow c \log 9 - \frac{1}{2^j} \left( \frac{t - \gamma}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\frac{t - \gamma}{8\pi\beta_\varepsilon}} \right) =: L(t), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $t > t_* := \gamma + 8\pi\beta_\varepsilon \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 2^{j+2}c \log 9}}{2} \right)^2$ , then  $L(t) < 0$ . So, for  $C$  satisfying (C.9),  $C > \gamma + t_*$ . Therefore, by (C.8) and (C.19),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)) > C\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j)) > \gamma + t_*\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently,  $\lambda_p(\mathbf{W}_Z(a(n)2^j))$  is bounded above by such constant  $C$  with probability going to 1, as claimed.  $\square$

In the following lemma, we establish some properties of the wavelet coefficients of colored noise. The lemma is used in the proof of Proposition 4.1 by means of Proposition C.1 and Lemma C.2.

**Lemma C.1** *Suppose the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 hold.*

(i) *Let  $T = \text{length}(\text{supp}(\psi))$  and choose  $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$  that satisfy*

$$\frac{|2^j k - 2^{j'} k'|}{\max\{2^j, 2^{j'}\}} \geq 2T. \quad (\text{C.20})$$

*Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for constants  $C, C' > 0$  that are independent of  $j, j', k, k'$  and  $n$ ,*

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, p(n)} \mathbb{E} |D_Z(a(n)2^j, k)_i D_Z(a(n)2^{j'}, k')_i| \leq C a(n) 2^{\frac{j+j'}{2}} e^{-C' a(n) |2^j k - 2^{j'} k'|}. \quad (\text{C.21})$$

(ii) *For  $\mathbf{g}$  as in (4.1), the univariate wavelet coefficients  $\{D_Z(2^j, 0)_1\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfy*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} D_Z^2(2^j, 0)_1 = 2\pi \mathbb{E} \mathbf{g}(0). \quad (\text{C.22})$$

(iii) *Fix fixed  $j_1, \dots, j_m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the vector of univariate wavelet coefficients*

$$\begin{aligned} V_n := & (D_Z(a(n)2^{j_1}, 1)_1, \dots, D_Z(a(n)2^{j_1}, n_{a, j_1})_1, D_Z(a(n)2^{j_2}, 1)_1, \dots \\ & \dots, D_Z(a(n)2^{j_m}, n_{a, j_m})_1)^*, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

*$V_n \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu(n)}$ , where  $\nu(n) = n_{a, j_1} + \dots + n_{a, j_m}$ . Let  $\lambda_{i, V_n}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \nu(n)$ , be the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix  $\Gamma_{V_n} = \text{Cov}(V_n, V_n)$ . Then, for some  $C > 0$  that is independent of  $n$ ,*

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, \nu(n)} \lambda_{i, V_n} \leq C. \quad (\text{C.24})$$

PROOF: We first show (i). Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . For any  $k, k'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [D_Z(a2^j, k)_i D_Z(a2^{j'}, k')_i] \\ &= a^{-1} 2^{-\left(\frac{j+j'}{2}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\ell' \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi((a2^j)^{-1}t) \psi((a2^{j'})^{-1}t') \phi(t + \ell) \phi(t' + \ell') \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{E} [Z(a2^j k - \ell)_i Z(a2^{j'} k' - \ell')_i] dt dt' \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= a^{-1}2^{-\left(\frac{i+j'}{2}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\ell' \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi((a2^j)^{-1}t) \psi((a2^{j'})^{-1}t') \phi(t+\ell) \phi(t'+\ell') \\
&\quad \times \gamma_{Z_1, \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}}(a(2^j k - 2^{j'} k') + (\ell' - \ell)) dt dt'. \tag{C.25}
\end{aligned}$$

In (C.25), for any  $t, h \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\gamma_{Z_1, \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}}(h) := \mathbb{E}[Z(t+h)_1 Z(t)_1] = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ihx} \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) dx = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ihx} \mathbf{g}(x) dx \middle| \mathbf{g}\right)\right].$$

Consequently, by condition (4.4),

$$|\gamma_{Z_1, \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}}(h)| \leq C_1 e^{-C_2|h|}, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{C.26}$$

Let  $r = a(2^j k - 2^{j'} k')$ . Note that condition (C.20) is equivalent to  $\frac{|a2^j k - a2^{j'} k'|}{\max\{a2^j, a2^{j'}\}} \geq 2T$ . Therefore, by the same argument leading to expression (A.25) in Boniece et al. (2021),  $|\frac{\ell - \ell'}{r}| \leq \frac{3}{4}$ . So, by the bound (C.26),

$$|\gamma_{Z_1, \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}}(a(2^j k - 2^{j'} k') + (\ell' - \ell))| = \left| \gamma_{Z_1, \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}}\left(r\left(1 + \frac{\ell' - \ell}{r}\right)\right) \right| \leq C_1 e^{-C_2|r|}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}D_Z(a2^j, k)_i D_Z(a2^{j'}, k')_i| \\
&\leq C a^{-1}2^{-\left(\frac{i+j'}{2}\right)} e^{-C'|r|} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\ell' \in \mathbb{Z}} |\psi((a2^j)^{-1}t) \psi((a2^{j'})^{-1}t') \phi(t+\ell) \phi(t'+\ell')| dt dt'. \tag{C.27}
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that each sum over  $\ell$  and  $\ell'$  in (C.27) contains only  $(a2^j + 1)T - 1$  and  $(a2^{j'} + 1)T - 1$  terms, respectively, and recall that  $\psi$  is bounded. Thus, after interchanging the summation and integration symbols, each summand is bounded by the constant  $\|\psi\|_{\infty} \|\phi\|_{L^1}$ . Thus, (C.27) is bounded by

$$C''' a^{-1}2^{-\left(\frac{i+j'}{2}\right)} e^{-C'|r|} a^2 2^{j+j'} \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 \|\phi\|_{L^1}^2 \leq C''' a^2 \left(\frac{i+j'}{2}\right) e^{-C'|r|}.$$

Then, (C.21) holds. This establishes (i).

We now turn to (ii). Recast

$$\mathbb{E}D_Z^2(2^j, 0)_1 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) dx.$$

Recall that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{[-\pi, \pi]} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 dx = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} h_{j, \ell}^2 = 1, \tag{C.28}$$

itself a consequence of Parseval's theorem (see, e.g., Boniece et al. (2021), relations (A.11) and (A.12)). Fix  $a \in (0, \pi]$ . By relations (A.15) and (A.16) in Boniece et al. (2021),

$$\int_{[-\pi, \pi] \setminus (-a, a)} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 dx \rightarrow 0, \quad j \rightarrow \infty, \tag{C.29}$$

and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-a}^a |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 dx = 1. \tag{C.30}$$

Now note that, by condition (4.3), the function  $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x)$  is continuous at  $x = 0$ . Therefore, for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can choose  $0 < a < \pi$  small so that, for  $|x| < a$ ,  $|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0)| < \varepsilon$ . Thus, in view of (C.28),

$$\left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) dx - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 |\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0)| dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-a}^a |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 |\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0)| dx + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{[-\pi, \pi] \setminus [-a, a]} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 |\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(x) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}(0)| dx \\
&< \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} \int_{-a}^a |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{\pi} \|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}\|_\infty \int_{[-\pi, \pi] \setminus [-a, a]} |\mathcal{H}_j(x)|^2 dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.31}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the usual  $L^\infty$  norm. By condition (4.3),  $\|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}\|_\infty < \infty$ . Hence, by taking  $j$  sufficiently large, (C.29), (C.30) and (C.31) imply (C.22).

To show (iii), consider the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\|\mathbf{u}\|=1} \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{\Gamma}_{V_n} \mathbf{u} &\leq \max_{\ell=1, \dots, \nu(n)} \sum_{k=1}^{\nu(n)} |(\mathbf{\Gamma}_{V_n})_{k, \ell}| \\
&\leq m \max_{j, j'=j_1, \dots, j_m} \max_{k=1, \dots, n_j} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{j'}} |\mathbb{E}D_Z(2^j, k)_1 D_Z(2^{j'}, k')_1|.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.32}$$

Now, take  $M$  large so that (C.21) holds whenever  $|2^j k - 2^{j'} k'| > M$  and  $a \equiv a(n) = 1$ . Then, for any  $k', j, j'$  and  $a$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\#\{k : |a2^j k - a2^{j'} k'| < aM\} = \#\{k : |2^j k - 2^{j'} k'| < M\} \\
&= \#\{k : 2^{j'-j} k' - 2^{-j} M < k < 2^{j'-j} k' + 2^{-j} M\} \leq 2^{1-j} M + 1 \leq 2M + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

So, for large  $n$ , all but finitely many terms satisfy the bound (C.21), and the maximum number of which do not satisfy the bound is independent of  $k', j, j'$  and  $a$ . Furthermore, for arbitrary  $k, k', j, j'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^{j'}, k')_1| &\leq |\mathbb{E}D_Z^2(a2^j, 0)_1 \mathbb{E}D_Z^2(a2^{j'}, 0)_1|^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sup_{j, j'} |\mathbb{E}D_Z^2(a2^j, 0)_1 \mathbb{E}D_Z^2(a2^{j'}, 0)_1|^{1/2} \leq C < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

by (C.22). In other words, the finitely many terms in the sum on the right-hand side of (C.32) that do not satisfy the bound (C.21) are bounded by a constant irrespective of  $n$ . Thus, for some constants  $C', C'' > 0$ ,

$$m \max_{j, j'=j_1, \dots, j_m} \max_{k=1, \dots, n_{a, j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a, j'}} |\mathbb{E}D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^{j'}, k')_1| \leq C' \sum_{r \neq 0} e^{-C''|r|} < \infty. \tag{C.33}$$

Hence, by (C.32) and (C.33) the eigenvalues of the sequence of matrices  $\{\mathbf{\Gamma}_{V_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are bounded, i.e., (C.24) holds. This establishes (iii).  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

**Lemma C.2** *Suppose the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 hold. Then,*

$$\|a(n)^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a(n)2^j)\| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

PROOF: For any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&0 \leq \mathbf{u}^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j) \mathbf{W}_{X, Z}(a2^j)^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \mathbf{u} \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{a, j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a, j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a, j}} \mathbf{u}^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} D_X(a2^j, k) D_Z(a2^j, k')^* D_Z(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k')^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \mathbf{u} \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{a, j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a, j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a, j}} (\mathbf{u}^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} D_X(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k')^* a^{-(\mathbf{H} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \mathbf{u}) \langle D_Z(a2^j, k), D_Z(a2^j, k') \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$



Pick any  $\kappa > 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{u}$  is fixed and  $X$  and  $Z$  are independent, Markov's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\left[\frac{1}{n_{a,j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a,j}} \left\{ \mathbf{u}^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} D_X(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k)^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \mathbf{u} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \left. \times \langle D_Z(a2^j, k), D_Z(a2^j, k') \rangle \right\} \right] > \kappa\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n_{a,j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a,j}} \left\{ \mathbf{u}^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} D_X(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k)^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \mathbf{u} \right. \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \times \langle D_Z(a2^j, k), D_Z(a2^j, k') \rangle \right\}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{1}{n_{a,j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a,j}} \left\{ \|a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} \mathbb{E} D_X(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k)^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \| \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \times |\mathbb{E} \langle D_Z(a2^j, k), D_Z(a2^j, k') \rangle| \right\}, \tag{C.34}
\end{aligned}$$

which holds uniformly in  $\mathbf{u}$ . However, Lemma C.4 implies that

$$M := \sup_{n,k,k'} \|a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})} \mathbb{E} D_X(a2^j, k) D_X(a2^j, k')^* a^{-(\mathbf{H}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I})^*} \| < \infty.$$

Furthermore,  $\mathbb{E} D_Z(a2^j, k)_i D_Z(a2^j, k')_i = \mathbb{E} D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^j, k')_1$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ . Therefore, expression (C.34) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{M}{n_{a,j}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{a,j}} \sum_{k'=1}^{n_{a,j}} |\mathbb{E} \langle D_Z(a2^j, k), D_Z(a2^j, k') \rangle| \\
& = \frac{M}{\kappa} \frac{p}{n_{a,j}^2} \left( n_{a,j} \varphi_{a2^j}(0) + 2 \sum_{\tau=1}^{n_{a,j}-1} (n_{a,j} - \tau) |\varphi_{a2^j}(\tau)| \right), \tag{C.35}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\varphi_{a2^j}(\tau) = \mathbb{E} D_Z(a2^j, 0)_1 D_Z(a2^j, \tau)_1$  and  $|k - k'| = \tau$ . In (C.35), for some constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$|\varphi_{a2^j}(\tau)| = |\mathbb{E} D_Z(a2^j, k)_1 D_Z(a2^j, k')_1| \leq \mathbb{E} D_Z^2(a2^j, 0)_1 = m(a2^j) \leq C.$$

Consider the second sum term on the right-hand side of (C.35). By taking any integer  $K > 2 \text{length}(\text{supp}(\psi))$  (cf. (C.20)),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{p}{n_{a,j}^2} \sum_{\tau=1}^{n_{a,j}-1} (n_{a,j} - \tau) \varphi_{a2^j}(\tau) = \frac{p}{n_{a,j}^2} \left\{ \sum_{\tau=1}^K + \sum_{\tau=K+1}^{n_{a,j}-1} \right\} (n_{a,j} - \tau) \varphi_{a2^j}(\tau) \\
& \leq \frac{p}{n_{a,j}^2} \left( C'(n_{a,j} - 1) + n_{a,j}^2 \sup_{\tau > K} \varphi_{a2^j}(\tau) \right) \leq C' \frac{p}{n_{a,j}} + p \sup_{\tau > K} \varphi_{a2^j}(\tau) \\
& \leq C' \frac{p}{n_{a,j}} + O(p a e^{-C'' a}) \rightarrow C''' \in [0, \infty), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{C.36}
\end{aligned}$$

In (C.36), the last inequality follows from Lemma C.1, (i). The limit stems from the fact that  $O(p a e^{-C'' a}) = O(n e^{-C'' a}) \rightarrow 0$ , itself a consequence of condition (2.27). Relation (C.36) implies that, for some constant  $M' > 0$  independent of  $n_{a,j}$  (and  $\kappa$ ), expression (C.35) is bounded above by  $M'/\kappa$ . Consequently, so is (C.34). Since  $\kappa > 0$  is arbitrarily large, this establishes the claim.  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proof of Proposition C.1. It provides a concentration inequality for centered quadratic forms. It corresponds to Lemma 1 in Laurent and Massart (2000) (see also Birgé and Massart (1998), Lemma 8, and Boucheron et al. (2013), p. 39).

**Lemma C.3** (Laurent and Massart (2000)) Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \geq 0$ , not all zero. Let  $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty$  be the Euclidean square and sup norms of the vector  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)^*$ . Also, define the random variable  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i (Z_i^2 - 1)$ . Then, for every  $x > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \geq 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{x} + 2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_\infty x\right) \leq \exp\{-x\}, \quad (\text{C.37})$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \leq -2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 \sqrt{x}\right) \leq \exp\{-x\}. \quad (\text{C.38})$$

In the following lemma, we characterize the same-scale scaling property of the cross-correlation  $\mathbb{E}[D_X(a(n)2^j, k)D_X(a(n)2^j, k')^*]$  between wavelet coefficients. The lemma is used in the proof of Lemma C.2.

**Lemma C.4** Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.1, there is a constant  $C > 0$  so that

$$\|a(n)^{-(\mathbf{H}+(1/2)\mathbf{I})}\mathbb{E}[D_X(a(n)2^j, k)D_X(a(n)2^j, k')^*]a(n)^{-(\mathbf{H}^*+(1/2)\mathbf{I})}\| \leq C, \quad (\text{C.39})$$

uniformly in  $k, k'$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

PROOF: Let  $\mathcal{D}_X(2^j, k)$  be the wavelet coefficient at scale  $2^j$  and shift  $k$  obtained from a continuous time sample path of  $X$  (see Abry and Didier (2018a), Definition 1). For a random vector  $\mathbf{Q}$ , consider the norm  $\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{Q}\|_{\ell_1}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_1}$  is the  $\ell_1$  vector norm. Under condition (iii) in Proposition 4.1, the proof of Lemma C.2 in Abry and Didier (2018b) – reinterpreted as for dimension  $r$  – implies that there exists some  $C > 0$  such that

$$\|a^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\mathcal{D}_X(a2^j, k)D_X(a2^j, k)^*a^{-\mathbf{H}^*-(1/2)\mathbf{I}} - \mathcal{D}_X(2^j, k)\mathcal{D}_X(2^j, k)^*\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|a^{-\mathbf{H}-(1/2)\mathbf{I}}\|. \quad (\text{C.40})$$

Expression (C.39) is a consequence of (C.40).  $\square$

**Remark C.1** Although time reversibility ( $\Im(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*) = 0$ ) is included among the assumptions of Lemma C.2 in Abry and Didier (2018b), it is not used in the argument.

## C.2 Section 4.2: auxiliary results for the case of non-Gaussian $X$

The following proposition is mentioned in Example 4.2. In the statement of the proposition, we make use of the following univariate construct. Fix  $\tilde{d} \in \mathbb{R}$  and any integer  $k > \tilde{d} - 1/2$ . Suppose the univariate stochastic process  $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k} = \{\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a  $M(\tilde{d})$  process (Roueff and Taquq (2009), Definition 1) with parameter  $\tilde{d} > 0$ . In other words, the  $k$ -th order difference process  $\Delta^k \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k}$  is weakly stationary with (generalized) spectral density

$$f_{\Delta \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k}}(x) = |1 - e^{-ix}|^{2(k-\tilde{d})} f_*(x), \quad x \in [-\pi, \pi]. \quad (\text{C.41})$$

In (C.41),  $f_*(x) \geq 0$  is a symmetric function that is continuous and nonzero at the origin. Moreover, we assume that, for some

$$\beta \in (0, 2], \quad (\text{C.42})$$

the function  $f_*$  satisfies

$$|f_*(x) - f_*(0)| = O(|x|^\beta), \quad x \rightarrow 0.$$

In addition, suppose  $\Delta^k \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k}(t)$  is a linear process of the form

$$\Delta^k \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}, k}(t) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{\tilde{d}}(t - \ell)\xi_\ell, \quad \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{\tilde{d}}^2(\ell) < \infty. \quad (\text{C.43})$$

In (C.43),  $\{\xi_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean zero, unit variance, and finite fourth moment.

**Proposition C.2** Let  $0 < \tilde{d}_1 \dots \leq \tilde{d}_r$ . Fix  $k_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , and  $\beta$  satisfying (C.42). Further fix pairwise distinct  $j_1, \dots, j_m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose the following conditions are in place.

(i)  $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} = \{(X_1(t), \dots, X_r(t))^*\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a  $r$ -variate stochastic process, where the entry-wise processes are independent and  $X_\ell \stackrel{\text{f.d.d.}}{=} \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{d}_\ell, k_\ell}$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ ;

(ii) conditions (W1 – W4) hold with  $(1 + \beta)/2 - \alpha < \tilde{d}_\ell \leq N_\psi$  and  $k_\ell \leq N_\psi$ ,  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ ;

(iii)  $\{a(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a dyadic sequence such that  $n/a(n) \rightarrow \infty$  and  $(n/a(n))^{1/2} a(n)^{1-2\alpha-2\tilde{d}_1} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then, with  $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}(\tilde{d}_1 - \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \tilde{d}_r - \frac{1}{2})$  the weak limit (2.24) holds for some diagonal matrix  $\Sigma_B(j_1, \dots, j_m)$ . Moreover,

$$\|\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) - \mathbf{B}(2^j)\| = O(a(n)^{-\beta}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad j = j_1, \dots, j_m. \quad (\text{C.44})$$

In particular, conditions (2.24) and (2.25) in assumption (A3) hold.

PROOF: The limit (2.24) is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2 in Roueff and Taquq (2009). For the limit (C.44), observe that

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbf{W}_X(2^j) = \text{diag}(\mathbb{E}D_X(2^j, 0)_1^2, \dots, \mathbb{E}D_X(2^j, 0)_r^2).$$

Moreover, in view of condition (C.42), under (i), (ii) and (iii), expression (67) in Roueff and Taquq (2009) shows that, for some constants  $K_\ell(j)$ ,

$$|a(n)^{-2\tilde{d}_\ell} \mathbb{E}D_X(a(n)2^j, 0)_\ell^2 - K_\ell(j)| = O(a(n)^{-\beta}), \quad \ell = 1, \dots, r.$$

Therefore, with  $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}(\tilde{d}_1 - \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \tilde{d}_r - \frac{1}{2})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{B}_a(2^j) - \mathbf{B}(2^j)\| \\ &= \|\text{diag}(a(n)^{-2\tilde{d}_1} \mathbb{E}D_X(a(n)2^j, 0)_1^2 - K_1(j), \dots, a(n)^{-2\tilde{d}_r} \mathbb{E}D_X(a(n)2^j, 0)_r^2 - K_r(j))\| = O(a(n)^{-\beta}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows (C.44).  $\square$

## References

- Abry, P. & Didier, G. (2018a), ‘Wavelet eigenvalue regression for  $n$ -variate operator fractional Brownian motion’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **168**, 75–104.
- Abry, P. & Didier, G. (2018b), ‘Wavelet estimation for operator fractional Brownian motion’, *Bernoulli* **24**(2), 895–928.
- Abry, P. & Flandrin, P. (1994), ‘On the initialization of the discrete wavelet transform algorithm’, *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **1**(2), 32–34.
- Abry, P., Boniece, B. C., Didier, G. & Wendt, H. (2022), ‘On high-dimensional wavelet eigenanalysis (with a supplement on Gaussian and non-Gaussian examples)’, *arXiv* (2102.05761v3), 1–56.
- Abry, P., Didier, G. & Li, H. (2019), ‘Two-step wavelet-based estimation for Gaussian mixed fractional processes’, *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* **22**(2), 157–185.
- Abry, P., Wendt, H. & Didier, G. (2018), Detecting and estimating multivariate self-similar sources in high-dimensional noisy mixtures, in ‘2018 IEEE Statistical Signal Processing Workshop (SSP)’, pp. 688–692.
- Anderson, G., Guionnet, A. & Zeitouni, O. (2010), *An Introduction to Random Matrices*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, volume 118, Cambridge University Press.

- Bai, S. & Taqqu, M. S. (2018), ‘How the instability of ranks under long memory affects large-sample inference’, *Statistical Science* **33**(1), 96–116.
- Bai, Z. & Silverstein, J. (2010), *Spectral Analysis of Large Dimensional Random Matrices*, Vol. 20, Springer.
- Bardet, J.-M. & Tudor, C. A. (2010), ‘A wavelet analysis of the Rosenblatt process: chaos expansion and estimation of the self-similarity parameter’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **120**(12), 2331–2362.
- Basu, S. & Michailidis, G. (2015), ‘Regularized estimation in sparse high-dimensional time series models’, *Annals of Statistics* **43**(4), 1535–1567.
- Becker-Kern, P. & Pap, G. (2008), ‘Parameter estimation of selfsimilarity exponents’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **99**, 117–140.
- Ben Arous, G. & Guionnet, A. (1997), ‘Large deviations for Wigner’s law and Voiculescu’s non-commutative entropy’, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **108**(4), 517–542.
- Benson, D. A., Meerschaert, M. M., Baeumer, B. & Scheffler, H.-P. (2006), ‘Aquifer operator scaling and the effect on solute mixing and dispersion’, *Water Resources Research*.
- Birgé, L. & Massart, P. (1998), ‘Minimum contrast estimators on sieves: exponential bounds and rates of convergence’, *Bernoulli* **4**(3), 329–375.
- Boniece, B. C., Didier, G. & Sabzikar, F. (2021), ‘Tempered fractional Brownian motion: wavelet estimation, modeling and testing’, *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **51**, 461–509.
- Boniece, B. C., Wendt, H., Didier, G. & Abry, P. (2019), Wavelet-based detection and estimation of fractional Lévy signals in high dimensions, in ‘2019 IEEE 8th International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)’, pp. 574–578.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G. & Massart, P. (2013), *Concentration Inequalities: a Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*, 3 edn, Oxford University Press.
- Bourguin, S., Diez, C.-P. & Tudor, C. A. (2021), ‘Limiting behavior of large correlated Wishart matrices with chaotic entries’, *Bernoulli* **27**(2), 1077–1102.
- Briody, D. (2011), Big data: Harnessing a game-changing asset, in G. Stahl & M. Kenny, eds, ‘A report from the Economist Intelligence Unit, sponsored by SAS’, The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd., U.K.
- Brown, S. J. (1989), ‘The number of factors in security returns’, *Journal of Finance* **44**(5), 1247–1262.
- Chakrabarty, A., Hazra, R. S. & Sarkar, D. (2016), ‘From random matrices to long range dependence’, *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications* **5**(02), 1650008.
- Chan, N. H., Lu, Y. & Yau, C. Y. (2017), ‘Factor modelling for high-dimensional time series: inference and model selection’, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **38**(2), 285–307.
- Chaudhuri, R., Gerçek, B., Pandey, B., Peyrache, A. & Fiete, I. (2019), ‘The intrinsic attractor manifold and population dynamics of a canonical cognitive circuit across waking and sleep’, *Nature Neuroscience* **22**(9), 1512–1520.
- Che, Z. (2017), ‘Universality of random matrices with correlated entries’, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **22**, 1–38.
- Ciuciu, P., Varoquaux, G., Abry, P., Sadaghiani, S. & Kleinschmidt, A. (2012), ‘Scale-free and multifractal properties of fMRI signals during rest and task’, *Frontiers in Physiology* **3**, 186.
- Clausel, M., Roueff, F., Taqqu, M. S. & Tudor, C. (2014), ‘Wavelet estimation of the long memory parameter for Hermite polynomial of Gaussian processes’, *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* **18**, 42–76.

- Cohen, A. (2003), *Numerical Analysis of Wavelet Methods*, Vol. 32, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Comon, P. & Jutten, C. (2010), *Handbook of Blind Source Separation: Independent Component Analysis and Applications*, Academic Press.
- Craigmile, P., Guttorp, P. & Percival, D. (2005), ‘Wavelet-based parameter estimation for polynomial contaminated fractionally differenced processes’, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **53**(8), 3151–3161.
- Daubechies, I. (1992), *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*, Vol. 61, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia-PA.
- Deift, P. (2007), Universality for mathematical and physical systems, in ‘Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians Madrid, August 22–30, 2006’, pp. 125–152.
- Didier, G. & Pipiras, V. (2011), ‘Integral representations and properties of operator fractional Brownian motions’, *Bernoulli* **17**(1), 1–33.
- Didier, G. & Pipiras, V. (2012), ‘Exponents, symmetry groups and classification of operator fractional Brownian motions’, *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **25**, 353–395.
- Dyson, F. J. (1962), ‘A Brownian-motion model for the eigenvalues of a random matrix’, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **3**(6), 1191–1198.
- Embrechts, P. & Maejima, M. (2002), *Selfsimilar Processes*, Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Erdős, L., Krüger, T. & Schröder, D. (2019), ‘Random matrices with slow correlation decay’, *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma* **7**, e8, 89 pages.
- Erdős, L., Yau, H.-T. & Yin, J. (2012), ‘Rigidity of eigenvalues of generalized Wigner matrices’, *Advances in Mathematics* **229**(3), 1435–1515.
- Flandrin, P. (1992), ‘Wavelet analysis and synthesis of fractional Brownian motion’, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **38**, 910 – 917.
- Giraud, C. (2015), *Introduction to High-Dimensional Statistics*, Vol. 139 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, CRC Press, Boca Raton FL.
- Gotts, S. J., Gilmore, A. W. & Martin, A. (2020), ‘Brain networks, dimensionality, and global signal averaging in resting-state fMRI: Hierarchical network structure results in low-dimensional spatiotemporal dynamics’, *Neuroimage* **205**, 116289.
- He, J.-H. (2018), ‘Fractal calculus and its geometrical explanation’, *Results in Physics* **10**, 272–276.
- Horn, R. A. & Johnson, C. R. (2013), *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, W. N. & Mason, J. D. (1982), ‘Operator-self-similar processes in a finite-dimensional space’, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **273**(1), 281–297.
- Isotta, F., Frei, C., Weilguni, V., Perčec Tadić, M., Lassegues, P., Rudolf, B., Pavan, V., Cacciamani, C., Antolini, G., Ratto, S. M. & Munari, M. (2014), ‘The climate of daily precipitation in the Alps: development and analysis of a high-resolution grid dataset from pan-Alpine rain-gauge data’, *International Journal of Climatology* **34**(5), 1657–1675.
- Kaufmann, R. K. & Stern, D. I. (2002), ‘Cointegration analysis of hemispheric temperature relations’, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **107**(D2), ACL–8.
- Kolmogorov, A. N. (1940), The Wiener spiral and some other interesting curves in Hilbert space, in ‘Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR’, Vol. 26, pp. 115–118.

- Kolmogorov, A. N. (1941), The local structure of turbulence in an incompressible fluid at very high Reynolds numbers, in ‘Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR’, Vol. 30, pp. 299–303.
- Laha, R. & Rohatgi, V. (1981), ‘Operator self similar stochastic processes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **12**(1), 73–84.
- Lam, C. & Yao, Q. (2012), ‘Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: inference for the number of factors’, *Annals of Statistics* **40**(2), 694–726.
- Laurent, B. & Massart, P. (2000), ‘Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection’, *Annals of Statistics* pp. 1302–1338.
- Ledoux, M. (2001), *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon*, number 89, American Mathematical Society.
- Lee, J. O. & Schnelli, K. (2016), ‘Tracy–Widom distribution for the largest eigenvalue of real sample covariance matrices with general population’, *Annals of Applied Probability* **26**(6), 3786–3839.
- Li, L., Pluta, D., Shahbaba, B., Fortin, N., Ombao, H. & Baldi, P. (2019), ‘Modeling dynamic functional connectivity with latent factor gaussian processes’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32**, 8263–8273.
- Li, Q., Pan, J. & Yao, Q. (2009), ‘On determination of cointegration ranks’, *Statistics and Its Interface* **2**(1), 45–56.
- Liu, H., Aue, A. & Paul, D. (2015), ‘On the Marčenko–Pastur law for linear time series’, *Annals of Statistics* **43**(2), 675–712.
- Lugosi, G. (2017), Lectures on Combinatorial Statistics, in ‘47th Probability Summer School, Saint-Flour’, pp. 1–91.
- Maejima, M. & Mason, J. D. (1994), ‘Operator-self-similar stable processes’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **54**(1), 139–163.
- Magnus, J. R. (1985), ‘On differentiating eigenvalues and eigenvectors’, *Econometric Theory* **1**(2), 179–191.
- Mallat, S. (1999), *A Wavelet Tour of Signal Processing*, Academic Press, London.
- Mandelbrot, B. (1982), *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*, W. H. Freeman, San Francisco.
- Mandelbrot, B. & Van Ness, J. (1968), ‘Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications’, *SIAM Review* **10**(4), 422–437.
- Mason, J. & Xiao, Y. (2002), ‘Sample path properties of operator-self-similar Gaussian random fields’, *Theory of Probability and Its Applications* **46**(1), 58–78.
- Meerschaert, M. & Scheffler, H.-P. (1999), ‘Moment estimator for random vectors with heavy tails’, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **71**, 145–159.
- Meerschaert, M. & Scheffler, H.-P. (2003), Portfolio modeling with heavy-tailed random vectors, in ‘Handbook of heavy-tailed distributions in Finance (S. T. Rachev (ed.))’, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, pp. 595–640.
- Mehta, M. & Gaudin, M. (1960), ‘On the density of eigenvalues of a random matrix’, *Nuclear Physics* **18**, 420–427.
- Mehta, M. L. (2004), *Random Matrices*, 3 edn, Elsevier.
- Merlevède, F. & Peligrad, M. (2016), ‘On the empirical spectral distribution for matrices with long memory and independent rows’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **126**(9), 2734–2760.

- Merlevède, F., Najim, J. & Tian, P. (2019), ‘Unbounded largest eigenvalue of large sample covariance matrices: Asymptotics, fluctuations and applications’, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **577**, 317–359.
- Meyer, Y., Sellan, F. & Taqqu, M. S. (1999), ‘Wavelets, generalized white noise and fractional integration: the synthesis of fractional Brownian motion’, *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* **5**(5), 465–494.
- Moulines, E., Roueff, F. & Taqqu, M. (2007a), ‘Central limit theorem for the log-regression wavelet estimation of the memory parameter in the Gaussian semi-parametric context’, *Fractals* **15**(4), 301–313.
- Moulines, E., Roueff, F. & Taqqu, M. (2007b), ‘On the spectral density of the wavelet coefficients of long-memory time series with application to the log-regression estimation of the memory parameter’, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **28**(2), 155–187.
- Moulines, E., Roueff, F. & Taqqu, M. (2008), ‘A wavelet Whittle estimator of the memory parameter of a nonstationary Gaussian time series’, *Annals of Statistics* pp. 1925–1956.
- Naik, G. R. & Wang, W. (2014), *Blind Source Separation: Advances in Theory, Algorithms and Applications*, Springer, Berlin.
- Paul, D. & Aue, A. (2014), ‘Random matrix theory in statistics: a review’, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **150**, 1–29.
- Percival, D. B. & Walden, A. (2006), *Wavelet Methods for Time Series Analysis*, Vol. 4, Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, P. C. B. & Ouliaris, S. (1988), ‘Testing for cointegration using principal components methods’, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **12**(2-3), 205–230.
- Pipiras, V. & Taqqu, M. S. (2017), *Long-Range Dependence and Self-Similarity*, Cambridge Series on Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Reif, F. (2009), *Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics*, Waveland Press.
- Roueff, F. & Taqqu, M. S. (2009), ‘Asymptotic normality of wavelet estimators of the memory parameter for linear processes’, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **30**(5), 534–558.
- Schmith, T., Johansen, S. & Thejll, P. (2012), ‘Statistical analysis of global surface temperature and sea level using cointegration methods’, *Journal of Climate* **25**(22), 7822–7833.
- Shen, J., Stoev, S. & Hsing, T. (2022), ‘Tangent fields, intrinsic stationarity and self similarity’, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **27**, 1–56.
- Sornette, D. (2006), *Critical Phenomena in Natural Sciences: Chaos, Fractals, Selforganization and Disorder: Concepts and Tools*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Soshnikov, A. (1999), ‘Universality at the edge of the spectrum in Wigner random matrices’, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **207**(3), 697–733.
- Steland, A. & Von Sachs, R. (2017), ‘Large-sample approximations for variance-covariance matrices of high-dimensional time series’, *Bernoulli* **23**(4A), 2299–2329.
- Stock, J. H. & Watson, M. (2011), ‘Dynamic factor models’, *Oxford Handbooks Online*.
- Stoev, S., Pipiras, V. & Taqqu, M. (2002), ‘Estimation of the self-similarity parameter in linear fractional stable motion’, *Signal Processing* **82**, 1873–1901.
- Stringer, C., Pachitariu, M., Steinmetz, N., Carandini, M. & Harris, K. D. (2019), ‘High-dimensional geometry of population responses in visual cortex’, *Nature* **571**(7765), 361–365.

- Tao, T. (2012), *Topics in Random Matrix Theory*, Vol. 132, American Mathematical Society.
- Tao, T. & Vu, V. (2011), ‘Random matrices: universality of local eigenvalue statistics’, *Acta Mathematica* **206**(1), 127–204.
- Tao, T. & Vu, V. (2012), ‘Random covariance matrices: universality of local statistics of eigenvalues’, *Annals of Probability* **40**(3), 1285–1315.
- Taylor, C. & Salhi, A. (2017), ‘On partitioning multivariate self-affine time series’, *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **21**(6), 845–862.
- Ting, C.-M., Ombao, H., Samdin, S. B. & Salleh, S.-H. (2017), ‘Estimating dynamic connectivity states in fmri using regime-switching factor models’, *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* **37**(4), 1011–1023.
- Veitch, D. & Abry, P. (1999), ‘A wavelet-based joint estimator of the parameters of long-range dependence’, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **45**(3), 878–897.
- Vershynin, R. (2018), *High-Dimensional Probability: an Introduction with Applications in Data Science*, Vol. 47, Cambridge University Press.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019), *High-Dimensional Statistics: a Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*, Vol. 48, Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, L., Aue, A. & Paul, D. (2017), ‘Spectral analysis of sample autocovariance matrices of a class of linear time series in moderately high dimensions’, *Bernoulli* **23**(4A), 2181–2209.
- Wendt, H., Abry, P. & Didier, G. (2019), Bootstrap-based bias reduction for the estimation of the self-similarity exponents of multivariate time series, in ‘2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)’, pp. 4988–4992.
- West, G. B., Brown, J. H. & Enquist, B. J. (1999), ‘The fourth dimension of life: fractal geometry and allometric scaling of organisms’, *Science* **284**(5420), 1677–1679.
- Wornell, G. & Oppenheim, A. (1992), ‘Estimation of fractal signals from noisy measurements using wavelets’, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **40**(3), 611–623.
- Xia, N., Qin, Y. & Bai, Z. (2013), ‘Convergence rates of eigenvector empirical spectral distribution of large dimensional sample covariance matrix’, *Annals of Statistics* **41**(5), 2572–2607.
- Yao, J., Zheng, S. & Bai, Z. (2015), *Large Sample Covariance Matrices and High-Dimensional Data Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Zhang, D. & Wu, W. B. (2017), ‘Gaussian approximation for high dimensional time series’, *Annals of Statistics* **45**(5), 1895–1919.
- Zhang, R., Robinson, P. M. & Yao, Q. (2018), ‘Identifying cointegration by eigenanalysis’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* pp. 1–12.
- Zheng, X., Shen, G., Wang, C., Li, Y., Dunphy, D., Hasan, T., Brinker, C. J. & Su, B.-L. (2017), ‘Bio-inspired murray materials for mass transfer and activity’, *Nature Communications* **8**(1), 1–9.