

# Optimal Imperfect Classification for Gaussian Functional Data

Shuoyang Wang<sup>1</sup>, Zuofeng Shang<sup>2</sup>, and Guanqun Cao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University, U.S.A.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology, U.S.A.

*Abstract:* Existing works on functional data classification focus on the construction of classifiers that achieve perfect classification in the sense that classification risk converges to zero asymptotically. In practical applications, perfect classification is often impossible since the optimal Bayes classifier may have asymptotically nonzero risk. Such a phenomenon is called as imperfect classification. In the case of Gaussian functional data, we exploit classification problem in imperfect classification scenario. Sharp convergence rates for minimax excess risk are derived when data functions are either fully observed or discretely observed. Easily implementable classifiers based on discriminant analysis are proposed which are proven to achieve minimax optimality. In discretely observed case, we discover a critical sampling frequency that governs the sharp convergence rates. The proposed classifiers perform favorably in finite-sample applications, as we demonstrate through comparisons with other functional classifiers in simulations and one real data application.

*Key words and phrases:* Functional data analysis; Gaussian process; Imperfect classification; minimax excess risk ; functional quadratic discriminant analysis.

## 1 Introduction

Functional classification has applications in many areas such as machine learning, chemometrics and artificial intelligence [30, 20, 26, 11]. A variety of functional classification techniques have been proposed such as logistic regression [2], distance-based classifiers [18, 19], k-nearest neighbor classifiers [5, 6], Bayesian classifiers [21, 14], data depth based classifiers [13, 27], functional linear or quadratic discriminant analysis [28, 25], and projection-based methods [12, 16]. Recent monographs by [24, 33] provide comprehensive and general discussions on this topic.

Existing works on functional classification have been merely focusing on the construction of classifiers that achieve *perfect classification* phenomenon in the sense that the probability of misclassifying a new data function converges to zero asymptotically. For instance, [15] established perfect classification of a linear centroid classifier and suggested a practical representation using components obtained from functional principal component analysis and partial least squares; [14] proposed to use density ratios of projections on a sequence of eigenfunctions that are common to the two populations and showed the perfect classification property; [17] studied perfect classification property when the data functions are observed on different domains; [4] further

clarified the near-perfect classification phenomenon in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space framework for Gaussian processes. As revealed by [14], perfect classification is only achievable when the two populations are sufficiently separated from each other in the sense that the infinite series characterizing the distance between the mean functions or covariance functions is divergent. When both series are convergent, perfect classification is no longer achievable which we call it as the *imperfect classification* problem. In imperfect classification, the risk of any classifier, including the optimal Bayes classifier, does not tend to zero. Therefore, the theory of perfect classification is no longer valid.

In this paper, we study functional classification problem through minimax optimality which will address the above issue. Specifically, we derive sharp convergence rates of minimax excess risk (MER) for classifying Gaussian functional data. MER framework is able to accommodate imperfect classification since it allows for nonvanishing classification risk. Moreover, the derived optimal rates for MER may serve as a gold standard to evaluate the performance of any functional classifiers.

Discriminant analysis is one of the most popular classification techniques in statistics and machine learning due to its simplicity and effectiveness, therefore, it would be interesting to investigate whether it is able to achieve minimax optimality. In low-dimensional regime, linear discriminant analysis (LDA) and quadratic discriminant analysis (QDA) have been well studied in both theoretical and applied aspects [1]. In high-dimensional regime, despite recent methodological development, there has been relatively few fundamental studies on minimax theory for discriminant analysis. Recently, [9, 8] developed minimax theory for LDA and QDA in high-dimensional setting by imposing sparsity assumptions on discriminating directions. Extension of discriminant analysis to functional data appears to be challenging due to the infinite-dimensional feature of the data. When data are fully observed, [19] proposed a closely related functional quadratic method for discriminating two general Gaussian populations by making use of a suitably defined Mahalanobis distance for functional data, and [15] considered Gaussian populations with equal covariance using functional linear discriminant. However, minimax optimality of these techniques is unclear. The present paper will demonstrate the minimax optimality of discriminant analysis techniques in imperfect classification where data are either fully or discretely observed. The latter scenario is practically meaningful, since in real-world problems, functional data can only be observed at discrete sampling points. We will investigate MER in both scenarios when data functions are Gaussian and propose computationally efficient classifiers that achieve minimax optimality.

Our main idea is to project the functional data onto an orthogonal system that is common in both populations, then to construct the so-called Functional Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (FQDA) classifiers based on the projection scores. When data are fully observed, we derive an explicit upper bound for the excess risk of the proposed FQDA classifiers. Moreover, we establish a lower bound for the MER which matches the upper bound, demonstrating the minimax optimality of our method. We extend these results to the scenario of discretely observed data in which the rate of MER demonstrates a phase transition phenomenon jointly characterized by the number of data curves and sampling frequency. Our analysis reveals that when sampling frequency is relatively small, the number of data curves has little effect on the rate of MER. When sampling frequency is relatively large, the rate of MER more depends on the number of data curves. In other words, there exists a critical sampling frequency that governs the performance of the minimax optimal classifier. In functional data estimation, existence of a critical sampling frequency has been discovered by [7]. The present work has made a relevant discov-

ery in functional data classification. Both simulation and real data studies are carried out to demonstrate the performance of our FQDA classifiers

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents in detail the data-driven classification procedure FQDA. Theoretical properties of FQDA are investigated in Section 3. The upper and lower bounds together show that the FQDA rule achieves the optimal rate in terms of the classification error. The corresponding classifier are investigated. Simulation studies are given in Section 4 where we compare the performance of the proposed algorithms to other existing classification methods in the literature. In addition, the merits of the FQDA and FQDA classifiers are illustrated through an analysis of the speech recognition dataset in Section 5. We summarize the proposed methodology and discuss the future work in Section 6. Major technical details for the proofs of main results are included in the Appendix.

*Notation and Terminologies.* We introduce basic notations and definitions that will be used throughout the rest of the paper. Vectors and matrices are denoted by boldface letters. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_{p \times p}$ ,  $|\mathbf{A}|$  is the determinant of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{I}_p$  is the  $p \times p$  identity matrix. For two sequences of positive numbers  $a_n$  and  $b_n$ ,  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  means that for some constant  $c > 0$ ,  $a_n \leq cb_n$  for all  $n$ , and  $a_n \asymp b_n$  means  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $b_n \lesssim a_n$ .  $a_n \ll b_n$  means  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n|/|b_n| = 0$ . We also use  $c, c_1, c_2, \dots, C, C_1, C_2, \dots$  to denote absolute constants whose values may vary from place to place.

## 2 Model Assumptions and Functional Quadratic Discriminant Analysis

### 2.1 Model Assumptions and Oracle QDA

Let  $Z(t), t \in \mathcal{T}$  be a random function defined on a compact interval  $\mathcal{T}$  which belongs to class  $k$  if  $Z \sim \mathcal{GP}(\eta_k, \Omega_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2$ , where  $\mathcal{GP}(\eta_k, \Omega_k)$  is a Gaussian process model with unknown mean function  $\eta_k(\cdot)$  and unknown covariance function  $\Omega_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Let  $L(Z)$  denote the class label of  $Z$  with probability distribution  $P(L(Z) = k) = \pi_k$ , where  $\pi_k \in (0, 1)$  are unknown satisfying  $\pi_1 + \pi_2 = 1$ . When  $L(Z) = k$ , suppose that  $Z$  admits a basis expansion  $Z(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_j^{(k)} \psi_j(t)$ , where  $\{\psi_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\xi_j^{(k)}, j \geq 1$  are uncorrelated projection scores. Hence,

$$\eta_k(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{kj} \psi_j(t) \text{ and } \Omega_k(t, s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(k)} \psi_j(t) \psi_j(s), \quad t, s \in \mathcal{T},$$

where  $\mu_{kj} = E\xi_j^{(k)}$  is the  $j$ -th mean projection score and  $\lambda_j^{(k)} = \text{Var}(\xi_j^{(k)})$  is the  $j$ -th eigenvalue. For  $J \geq 1$  and  $k = 1, 2$ , let  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_J)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k = (\mu_{k1}, \dots, \mu_{kJ})^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^{(k)}, \dots, \lambda_J^{(k)})$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)$ . For predicting  $L(Z)$ , the *oracle QDA* classifier is defined by

$$G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*(Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0, \\ 2, & Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is the discriminant function defined by

$$Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - 2\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1}(\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - \log(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|) + 2 \log(\pi_1/\pi_2),$$

with  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_2}{2}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1$ , and  $\mathbf{D} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}$ . The performance of (1) depends on the discriminating direction  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\delta}$  and the differential graph  $\mathbf{D}$ . The necessity of considering the covariance difference for functional data analysis has been shown by [10]. If  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2$ , the quadratic classification boundary in (1) becomes linear, and (1) degenerates to LDA. In this work, we focus on QDA for functional data which allows different covariances.

To obtain a consistent estimator for the oracle rule  $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*$ , we begin by noting an important observation that  $\log(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|) = \log(|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J|)$ , and rewriting  $Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  as

$$Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - 2\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - \log(|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J|) + 2 \log(\pi_1/\pi_2), \quad (2)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ . A simple but essential observation of (2) is that the first three quantities in (2) depends on either  $\mathbf{D}$  or  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , and the fourth term  $\log(\pi_1/\pi_2)$  represents the log odds ratio, and all terms will be estimated in next sections.

## 2.2 FQDA for fully observed functional data

Suppose we observe a training sample  $\{X_i^{(k)}(t) : 1 \leq i \leq n_k, k = 1, 2\}$ , where  $n_k$  is the sample size for class  $k$ ,  $X_i^{(k)}(t) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{GP}(\eta_k, \Omega_k)$  and all  $X_i^{(k)}(t)$ 's and  $Z(t)$  are independent. We first consider the ideal case where the entire function curves  $X_i^{(k)}(t)$  are fully observed. Recall the basis expansion  $X_i^{(k)}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_{ij}^{(k)} \psi_j(t)$  with  $E(\xi_{ij}^{(k)}) = \mu_{kj}$  and  $Var(\xi_{ij}^{(k)}) = \lambda_j^{(k)}$ . We estimate the mean vector, differential graph and discriminant vector as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k &= (\bar{\xi}_{\cdot 1}^{(k)}, \dots, \bar{\xi}_{\cdot J}^{(k)})^\top, \\ \hat{\mathbf{D}} &= \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2^{-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1^{-1}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_2), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{\xi}_{\cdot j}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \xi_{ij}^{(k)}$ ,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k = \text{diag}(\hat{\lambda}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_J^{(k)})$ ,  $\hat{\lambda}_j^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (\xi_{ij}^{(k)} - \bar{\xi}_{\cdot j}^{(k)})^2$ . We then propose the following classification rule, called as FQDA:

$$\hat{G}_J^{FQDA}(Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & \hat{Q}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0, \\ 2, & \hat{Q}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where

$$\hat{Q}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) := (\mathbf{z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \hat{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) - 2\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - \log(|\hat{\mathbf{D}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J|) + 2 \log(\hat{\pi}_1/\hat{\pi}_2),$$

$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1 + \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_2)/2$  and  $\hat{\pi}_k = n_k/(n_1 + n_2)$  is the sample proportion of class  $k$ . The tuning parameter  $J$  is chosen to minimize the cross-validation estimator of classification error [16]. In Section 3, the desirable asymptotic property of (5) is presented.

## 2.3 FQDA for discretely observed functional data

Consider a more practical scenario where each data curve can only be observed on  $M$  evenly spaced discrete sampling points  $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_M\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ . Choose  $1 \leq J \leq M$  and define

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(t_1) & \psi_2(t_1) & \cdots & \psi_J(t_1) \\ \psi_1(t_2) & \psi_2(t_2) & \cdots & \psi_J(t_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \psi_1(t_M) & \psi_2(t_M) & \cdots & \psi_J(t_M) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Heuristically, when  $J$  is suitably large, the data vector  $\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} = (X_i^{(k)}(t_1), \dots, X_i^{(k)}(t_M))^\top$  has an approximate expression  $\mathbf{X}_i^{(k)} \approx \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ . For technical convenience, we focus on the special case that  $\psi_j$ 's are Fourier basis or Haar wavelet basis so that  $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_J$ . This leads to  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k \approx \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(k)} := \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}$ . Therefore, we propose the following estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  as well as the estimators of the differential graph and the discriminating direction:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{sk} = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(k)},$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_s = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{s2}^{-1} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{s1}^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_s = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{s2}^{-1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s2} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s1}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{sk} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\lambda}_{s1}^{(k)}, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_{sJ}^{(k)})$  with  $\widehat{\lambda}_{sj}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} (\zeta_{ij}^{(k)} - \bar{\zeta}_{\cdot j}^{(k)})^2$ ,  $\bar{\zeta}_{\cdot j}^{(k)} = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \zeta_{ij}^{(k)}$ , and  $\zeta_{ij}^{(k)}$ 's are components of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i^{(k)}$ . We then propose the following classification rule, called as sampling FQDA (sFQDA):

$$\widehat{G}_J^{\text{sFQDA}}(Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & \widehat{Q}_s(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0, \\ 2, & \widehat{Q}_s(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where

$$\widehat{Q}_s(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) := (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s1})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_s (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s1}) - 2\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_s^\top (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_s) - \log \left( |\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_s \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{s1} + \mathbf{I}_J| \right) + 2 \log \left( \widehat{\pi}_1 / \widehat{\pi}_2 \right),$$

with  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_s = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s1} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s2})/2$ . In the subsequent sections, we shall show that (8) has desirable theoretical properties and finite-sample performance.

### 3 Theoretical Properties

In this section, we derive sharp convergence rate for MER when data curves are either fully observed or discretely observed. We also show that the proposed FQDA and sFQDA classifiers are able to achieve the minimax optimal rates. All results are derived in imperfect classification scenario.

With a slight abuse of notation, let  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)$  in which  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k = (\mu_{k1}, \mu_{k2}, \dots)$  is the infinite sequence of mean projection scores and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$  is a diagonal linear operator from  $L^2(\mathcal{T})$  to  $L^2(\mathcal{T})$  satisfying  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \psi_j = \lambda_j^{(k)} \psi_j$  for  $j \geq 1$  and  $k = 1, 2$ . Given  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , it follows by [4] and [31] that the optimal Bayes classification rule for classifying a new data function  $Z \in L^2(\mathcal{T})$  has an expression

$$G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*(Z) = \begin{cases} 1, & Q^*(Z, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0, \\ 2, & Q^*(Z, \boldsymbol{\theta}) < 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$Q^*(Z, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \langle \mathbf{D}(Z - \eta_1), Z - \eta_1 \rangle - 2\langle \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1}(\eta_2 - \eta_1), Z - \bar{\eta} \rangle - \log \det (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) + \log \left( \frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2} \right),$$

with  $\bar{\eta} = (\eta_1 + \eta_2)/2$ ,  $\mathbf{D} = \Sigma_2^{-1} - \Sigma_1^{-1}$  (difference of inverse operators),  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  being the usual  $L^2$  inner product, and

$$\det(\Sigma_2^{-1}\Sigma_1) = \exp \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{s-1}}{s} \text{Tr} \left( [\Sigma_2^{-1}\Sigma_1 - \text{id}]^s \right) \right\}$$

being the infinite determinant of  $\Sigma_2^{-1}\Sigma_1$ , often called the Plemelj's formula (see [29]), and is convergent if  $\text{Tr}(|\Sigma_2^{-1}\Sigma_1 - \text{id}|) < \infty$ . Indeed,  $Q^*(Z, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is well-defined as long as both series  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\mu_{1j} - \mu_{2j})^2 / \lambda_j^{(2)}$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \lambda_j^{(1)} / \lambda_j^{(2)} - 1 \right)^2$  are convergent (see Lemma 3 of [14]).

### 3.1 Fully observed case

Suppose that the data functions are fully observed as in Section 2.2. Consider the following parameter space:

$$\Theta = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(k)} \leq C_0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{kj}^2 \leq C_0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\mu_{1j} - \mu_{2j})^2 / \lambda_j^{(2)} \leq C_1, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \lambda_j^{(1)} / \lambda_j^{(2)} - 1 \right)^2 \leq C_2, C_3 \leq \pi_1, \pi_2 \leq 1 - C_3 \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3$  are absolute constants with  $C_3 \in (0, 1/2)$ . Let us provide some insights on  $\Theta$ . Assumption  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(k)} \leq C_0$  implies that the covariance function  $\Omega_k$  is uniformly bounded. Assumption  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{kj}^2 \leq C_0$  implies  $\eta_k \in L^2(\mathcal{T})$ . Assumption  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\mu_{1j} - \mu_{2j})^2 / \lambda_j^{(2)} \leq C_1$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \lambda_j^{(1)} / \lambda_j^{(2)} - 1 \right)^2 \leq C_2$  characterizes the closeness of the two populations. Note that in [14, 17], either of the two series is required being divergent so that the optimal Bayes risk is asymptotically vanishing and perfect classification is achieved. They proposed classifiers which are proven to achieve perfect classification. In our case, both series are convergent implying that the two populations are much closer than the ones in [14, 17], therefore, optimal Bayes risk does not go to zero and perfect classification is impossible. This imposes additional challenge in finding correct classification.

For  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$  and a generic classifier  $\widehat{G}$ , let  $R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{G})$  be the classification risk for  $\widehat{G}$  under  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ :

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{G}) = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[\mathbb{I}\{\widehat{G}(Z) \neq L(Z)\}].$$

For  $J \geq 0$ , define

$$g(J; \Theta) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\{ \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\mu_{1j} - \mu_{2j})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} + \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \left( \lambda_j^{(1)} / \lambda_j^{(2)} - 1 \right)^2 \right\}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume  $g(J; \Theta) \leq 1$  for any  $J \geq 0$ ; otherwise one can scale  $g(J; \Theta)$  by  $g(0; \Theta)$ . Let  $J^*$  be the unique solution to  $\frac{J^* \log n}{n} = g(J^*; \Theta)$  with  $n := \min\{n_1, n_2\}$ . Theorem 1 provides an upper bound for excess risk of  $\widehat{G}_J^{FQDA}$  when  $J = J^*$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta$ . Then the proposed FQDA classifier (5) satisfies*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}_{J^*}^{FQDA}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \lesssim \frac{J^* \log n}{n}.$$

In the following theorem, we provide a lower bound for the MER which matches the above upper bound, thus, the optimality of FQDA is verified.

**THEOREM 2.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta$ . Then the MER over  $\Theta$  satisfies*

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \gtrsim \frac{J^* \log n}{n},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible classifiers.

The results in Theorems 1 and 2 together guarantee that  $\widehat{G}_{J^*}^{FQDA}$  is able to mimic  $G_{\theta}^*$  consistently over the parameter space  $\Theta$ . Both of the lower and upper bounds show that the proposed FQDA rule is optimal for classifying Gaussian functional data under mild regularity conditions. No other method can achieve a faster MER rate than the proposed FQDA classifier. To the best of our knowledge, they are the first theorems providing sharp convergence rate for MER in imperfect classification.

In general,  $J^*$  has no explicit expression so the rates in Theorems 1 and 2 are abstract. To gain more insights, we consider a particular parameter space that enables us to derive a more concrete result. Specifically, consider the following parameter space,

$$\Theta(\alpha) = \left\{ \theta : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(k)} \leq C_0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{kj}^2 \leq C_0, C_4 j^{-a} \leq (\lambda_j^{(1)} / \lambda_j^{(2)} - 1)^2 \leq C_5 j^{-a}, \right. \\ \left. C_6 j^{-b} \leq (\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2 / \lambda_j^{(2)} \leq C_7 j^{-b}, a, b > \alpha, C_3 \leq \pi_1, \pi_2 \leq 1 - C_3 \right\},$$

where  $\alpha \geq 1$  characterizes the closeness of the two populations and  $C_0, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7$  and  $0 < C_3 < 1/2$  are absolute constants. Note that  $\Theta(\alpha)$  is a subset of  $\Theta$ , and Proposition 1 below provides a concrete result under  $\Theta(\alpha)$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta(\alpha)$ .*

*i) The proposed FQDA classification rule in (5) satisfies*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta(\alpha)} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}_{J^*}^{FQDA}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \lesssim \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1-1/\alpha},$$

$$\text{where } J^* = \left( \frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/\alpha}.$$

*ii) The MER over  $\Theta(\alpha)$  satisfies*

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(\alpha)} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \gtrsim \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{1-1/\alpha},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible classifiers.

### 3.2 Discretely observed case

Suppose that the data functions are discretely observed as in Section 2.3. For  $M \geq 0$ , define

$$f_1(M) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left[ \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} (\mu_{1j}^2 \vee \mu_{2j}^2) \right]^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(M) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j^{(1)} \vee \lambda_j^{(2)}),$$

where  $\Theta$  is provided in (9). Without loss of generality, assume  $f_1(M) \leq 1$  and  $f_2(M) \leq 1$  for any  $M \geq 0$ ; otherwise one can scale them by  $f_1(0)$  and  $f_2(0)$ , respectively. Both  $f_1(M)$  and  $f_2(M)$  are decreasing in  $M$  which depict the decay rate of  $\mu_{kj}$  and  $\lambda_j^{(k)}$ .

We now show that when data are discretely observed, the proposed sFQDA classification rule in (8) can mimic  $G_{\theta}^*$  consistently over the parameter space  $\Theta$ . Define  $M^*$  as the unique solution to  $\frac{\log n}{n} = f(M)$ , where  $f(M) = f_1^2(M) \vee f_2^2(M)$  for each  $M \geq 1$ . When  $M \leq M^*$ , define  $J_1^* \equiv J_1^*(M, n) \leq M$  to be the unique solution to  $f(M) = g(J; \Theta)/J$ , and when  $M > M^*$ , define  $J_2^* \equiv J_2^*(M, n) \leq M$  to be the unique solution to  $\log n/n = g(J; \Theta)/J$ . We shall show the existence and uniqueness of such  $J_1^*$  and  $J_2^*$  in Lemma 10 of Appendix.

**THEOREM 3.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta$ . The sFQDA in (8) satisfies the following.*

i) When  $M \leq M^*$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}_{J_1^*}^{sFQDA}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \lesssim J_1^* f(M);$$

ii) When  $M > M^*$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}_{J_2^*}^{sFQDA}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \lesssim \frac{J_2^* \log n}{n}.$$

Theorem 3 provides upper bounds for the MER of  $\widehat{G}_J^{sFQDA}$  when  $J = J_1^*$  and  $J = J_2^*$  corresponding to  $M \leq M^*$  and  $M > M^*$ , respectively. The upper bounds are dramatically different in the two regimes. In the following theorem, we obtain lower bounds for the MER in both regimes which match the upper bounds given in Theorem 3. Therefore, the proposed sFQDA classifier is proven minimax optimal.

**THEOREM 4.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta$ . The MER over  $\Theta$  satisfies*

i) when  $M \leq M^*$ ,

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \gtrsim J_1^* f(M);$$

ii) when  $M > M^*$ ,

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \gtrsim \frac{J_2^* \log n}{n},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible classifiers  $\widehat{G}$ .

To provide an explicit rate for the MER, we consider the following parameter space

$$\Theta(c, d, \alpha) = \left\{ \theta : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{(k)} \leq C_0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_{kj}^2 \leq C_0, C_4 j^{-a} \leq (\lambda_j^{(1)}/\lambda_j^{(2)} - 1)^2 \leq C_5 j^{-a}, \right. \\ \left. C_6 j^{-b} \leq (\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2 / \lambda_j^{(2)} \leq C_7 j^{-b}, a, b > \alpha, \mu_{1j} \vee \mu_{2j} \asymp j^{-c'}, \right. \\ \left. \lambda_j^{(1)} \vee \lambda_j^{(2)} \asymp j^{-d'}, c' > c, d' > d, C_3 \leq \pi_1, \pi_2 \leq 1 - C_3 \right\},$$



where  $c \geq 1/2$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $\alpha \geq \varsigma$ , such that  $\varsigma = \min(2c - 1, 2d - 2)$ ,  $C_0, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7 > 0$  are constants,  $C_3 \in (0, 1/2)$ . Note that  $\Theta(c, d, \alpha)$  is a subset of  $\Theta$ . When restricted to the space  $\Theta(c, d, \alpha)$ , we have the following more specific rate for the MER of sFQDA. Define  $J^* = M^{\varsigma/\alpha} \mathbb{I}(M < M^*) + (n/\log n)^{1/\alpha} \mathbb{I}(M \geq M^*)$ , where  $M^* = (n/\log n)^{1/\varsigma}$  and  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Consider the parameter space  $\Theta(c, d, \alpha)$ . Then sFQDA in (8) satisfies*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta(c, d, \alpha)} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}_{J^*}^{\text{sFQDA}}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \lesssim \left( \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{1}{M^{\varsigma}} \right)^{1-1/\alpha},$$

and

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(c, d, \alpha)} E \left[ R_{\theta}(\widehat{G}) - R_{\theta}(G_{\theta}^*) \right] \gtrsim \left( \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{1}{M^{\varsigma}} \right)^{1-1/\alpha},$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible classifiers.

By Proposition 2, the critical sampling frequency for the MER over the space  $\Theta(c, d, \alpha)$  is  $M^*$ . When  $M > M^*$ , the MER is of rate  $(\log n/n)^{1-1/\alpha}$  which is free of the sampling frequency and is consistent with the rate derived in Proposition 1. In other words, when  $M > M^*$ , increasing sampling frequency will not boost the performance of sFQDA, which performs equally well as FQDA when data functions are fully observed. When  $M \leq M^*$ , the MER is of rate  $(M^{\varsigma})^{1/\alpha-1}$  which solely relies on the sampling frequency. Another interesting finding is that the rate of MER relies on the smoothness degree  $c, d$  of the mean functions and covariance functions, as well as the closeness degree  $\alpha$  between the two populations. This differs from the estimation problems in which the rate of MER only relies on the smoothness degree of the mean function ([7]).

## 4 Simulation

In this section, we provide extensive numerical evidence to show the empirical performance of FQDA by comparing with other functional classifiers, including quadratic discriminant method (QD) proposed in [17] and the nonparametric Bayes classifier (NB) proposed in [14]. We evaluate all methods via four synthetic datasets. In all simulations, we generate  $n = n_1 = n_2 = 50, 100$  training samples for each class, which indicates  $\pi_1 = \pi_2 = 0.5$ . The functional data are generated from  $\mathcal{GP}(\eta_k, \Omega_k)$ , where  $k = 1, 2$ . The mean for class 1 is  $\eta_1(t) = \gamma t$ ,  $\gamma = 1$  or  $3$ , and the mean for class 2 is set to be  $\eta_2(t) = 0$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . We use the following two models to generate covariance functions  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ .

**Model 1: Exponential covariance function:** Assign  $\Omega_1(t, t') = \exp(-|t - t'|)$ , and  $\Omega_2(t, t') = \exp(-|t - t'|/\rho)$ , where  $\rho = 0.75, 1.5$ .

**Model 2: Matérn covariance function:** Let  $\Omega_1(t, t') = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(1/2)} |t - t'|^{1/2} K_{1/2}(|t - t'|)$ , and  $\Omega_2(t, t') = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(1/2)} \left( \frac{|t - t'|}{\rho} \right)^{1/2} K_{1/2} \left( \frac{|t - t'|}{\rho} \right)$ , where  $K_{1/2}(\cdot)$  is the modified Bessel function and  $\rho = 0.75, 1.5$ .

The random functions are sampled at  $M$  equally spaced sampling points from 0 to 1. We choose  $M$  from  $\{3, 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$  to detect how sampling frequency effects the classification error, where we regard  $M = 50$  as the full observation. In each scenario, the number of repetition is set to be 100, and the classification errors are evaluated with 500 samples.

Tables 1 to 4 present the misclassification rates for three methods given the combinations of two different covariance models and two mean functions. Nevertheless the proposed FQDA classifiers have comparable performance with two competitors given different sample sizes. As expected, when the discrepancy between mean and covariance functions are smaller, e.g.  $\gamma = 1$ ,  $\rho = 1.5$ , the misclassification rates for all three methods are larger. When the number of sampling points  $M$  and sample size  $n$  are increasing, misclassification rates of FQDA are decreasing, which echoes the theoretical results in Section 3. Similar patterns can be found for the other two methods. When the sampling points are extremely sparse,  $M = 3$ , FQDA has significantly superior performance compared with QD and NB methods, about 10% smaller than the other two classifiers. Given moderate sparse sampling points,  $M = 5, 10, 20$ , all methods have fairly comparable performance. When the sampling points are dense,  $M > 20$ , FQDA outperforms two counterparts, although these two competitors also work reasonable well.

Table 1: Misclassification rates (%) with standard errors in brackets for Model 1 with  $\eta_1(t) = 3t$ .

$M$	$n$	$\rho = 1.5$			$\rho = 0.75$		
		FQDA	QD	NB	FQDA	QD	NB
50	50	6.35(0.01)	7.10(0.01)	7.37(0.02)	7.52(0.01)	7.91(0.01)	8.48(0.02)
	100	5.70(0.01)	6.15(0.01)	6.36(0.02)	6.86(0.01)	7.38(0.01)	7.33(0.01)
40	50	6.30(0.01)	7.00(0.01)	7.32(0.02)	7.53(0.01)	7.96(0.01)	8.28(0.02)
	100	6.02(0.01)	6.13(0.01)	6.46(0.01)	7.23(0.01)	7.20(0.01)	7.53(0.01)
30	50	6.64(0.01)	7.00(0.02)	6.98(0.02)	7.31(0.01)	7.94(0.01)	8.49(0.02)
	100	6.10(0.01)	5.95(0.01)	6.13(0.01)	7.18(0.01)	7.02(0.01)	7.30(0.02)
20	50	6.66(0.01)	6.65(0.01)	6.91(0.02)	8.16(0.01)	7.77(0.01)	8.63(0.02)
	100	6.40(0.01)	5.98(0.01)	5.97(0.01)	7.50(0.01)	6.93(0.01)	7.12(0.01)
10	50	8.31(0.01)	6.43(0.01)	6.68(0.02)	9.36(0.01)	7.67(0.02)	7.85(0.02)
	100	7.99(0.01)	5.89(0.01)	5.71(0.01)	9.05(0.01)	7.15(0.01)	6.88(0.01)
5	50	9.14(0.01)	5.96(0.01)	6.33(0.01)	9.77(0.01)	7.36(0.01)	7.42(0.01)
	100	9.13(0.01)	5.75(0.01)	5.92(0.01)	9.68(0.01)	7.00(0.01)	6.71(0.01)
3	50	9.60(0.01)	19.22(0.02)	20.10(0.03)	9.60(0.01)	18.28(0.03)	19.07(0.03)
	100	9.36(0.01)	19.13(0.02)	19.71(0.02)	9.26(0.01)	17.60(0.01)	18.12(0.02)

## 5 Real Data Illustrations

This benchmark data example was extracted from the TIMIT database (TIMIT Acoustic-Phonetic Continuous Speech Corpus, NTIS, US Dept of Commerce) which is a widely used resource for research in speech recognition and functional data classification [18]. The data set we use was formed by selecting five phonemes for classification based on digitized speech from this database. From each speech frame, a log-periodogram was used as transformation for casting speech data in a form suitable for speech recognition. The five phonemes in this data set are transcribed as follows: “sh” as in “she”, “dcl” as in “dark”, “iy” as the vowel in “she”, “aa” as the vowel in “dark”, and “ao” as the first vowel in “water”. For illustration purpose, we focus on the “aa”, “iy” and “ao” phoneme classes. Each speech frame is represented by  $n = 400$  samples at a 16-kHz sampling rate; the first  $M = 150$  frequencies from each subject are retained. Figure 1 displays 10 log-periodograms for each class phoneme.

Table 2: Misclassification rates (%) with standard errors in brackets for Model 1 with  $\eta_1(t) = t$ .

$M$	$n$	$\rho = 1.5$			$\rho = 0.75$		
		FQDA	QD	NB	FQDA	QD	NB
50	50	29.93(0.02)	33.26(0.03)	30.09(0.03)	31.99(0.02)	35.79(0.04)	35.25(0.03)
	100	29.37(0.02)	32.10(0.02)	26.37(0.02)	30.49(0.02)	32.49(0.02)	31.54(0.03)
40	50	29.89(0.02)	33.40(0.03)	30.82(0.03)	31.68(0.02)	35.27(0.03)	34.47(0.03)
	100	29.25(0.02)	31.36(0.02)	27.73(0.03)	30.66(0.02)	33.28(0.03)	32.56(0.03)
30	50	30.30(0.02)	33.49(0.03)	31.42(0.03)	32.19(0.02)	35.27(0.04)	35.07(0.03)
	100	29.55(0.02)	31.99(0.03)	28.23(0.02)	31.39(0.02)	33.03(0.02)	32.00(0.02)
20	50	30.57(0.02)	32.90(0.03)	31.95(0.04)	32.56(0.01)	35.02(0.04)	35.13(0.04)
	100	30.17(0.02)	31.24(0.02)	29.32(0.02)	31.61(0.02)	32.77(0.02)	32.93(0.03)
10	50	32.39(0.02)	32.59(0.03)	33.96(0.03)	33.72(0.02)	34.47(0.03)	35.59(0.03)
	100	31.89(0.02)	31.09(0.02)	31.05(0.03)	32.96(0.02)	32.49(0.02)	33.12(0.03)
5	50	32.98(0.02)	31.81(0.03)	33.38(0.04)	33.61(0.02)	33.44(0.03)	34.42(0.03)
	100	32.78(0.02)	30.15(0.02)	31.12(0.02)	33.10(0.02)	31.94(0.02)	32.24(0.02)
3	50	33.13(0.01)	39.10(0.02)	41.48(0.03)	33.54(0.02)	38.43(0.02)	40.80(0.04)
	100	32.96(0.01)	38.68(0.02)	40.09(0.03)	33.43(0.02)	38.64(0.02)	39.41(0.03)

We randomly select training sample size  $n_1 = n_2 = 300$  to train the classifiers of three methods and the rest of 100 samples remained as the test samples. Table 5 report the mean percentage (averaged over the 100 repetitions) of misclassified test curves. It can be seen that NB classifier slightly outperforms FQDA when classifying “aa” and “iy” and FQDA remains excellent when classifying “ao” and “iy”.

## 6 Discussion

We present a new minimax optimality viewpoint for solving functional classification problems in imperfect classification scenario. In contrast to literature on perfect classification, our results are able to deal with the more practical scenarios where the optimal Bayes risk is asymptotically nonvanishing and the two populations are relatively close. Our contributions are twofold. First, we provide sharp convergence rates for MER when data are either fully or discretely observed, as well as a critical sampling frequency that governs the rate in the latter case. Second, we propose classifiers based on FQDA which are proven to achieve minimax optimality.

We present a new viewpoint for solving classification problems involving functional data, and we argue that those problems have attractive and fascinating properties that have not been investigated in functional classification literature. The contributions of the present paper are three-fold. Firstly, under the sparsity assumptions, we proposed the FQDA rule, and established an explicit convergence rate of classification error. Secondly, to our best knowledge, the present paper is the first work on minimax lower and upper bounds, which guarantees that the convergence rate obtained by the FQDA rule is optimal. Finally, we extend our theoretical results to cover the practically important situation where the functional data are not fully observed, but rather are sampled at discrete points, while previous approaches were based on the less realistic assumption of fully observed trajectories.




Figure 1: A sample of 10 log-periodograms per class

Table 3: Misclassification rates (%) with standard errors in brackets for Model 2 with  $\eta_1(t) = 3t$ .

$M$	$n$	$\rho = 1.5$			$\rho = 0.75$		
		FQDA	QD	NB	FQDA	QD	NB
50	50	6.20(0.01)	6.88(0.01)	7.08(0.02)	7.52(0.01)	8.28(0.02)	8.69(0.02)
	100	5.68(0.01)	6.02(0.01)	6.12(0.01)	6.98(0.01)	7.49(0.01)	7.43(0.01)
40	50	6.23(0.01)	6.80(0.01)	6.78(0.02)	7.54(0.01)	8.03(0.01)	8.76(0.02)
	100	5.83(0.01)	6.22(0.01)	6.21(0.01)	7.07(0.01)	7.07(0.01)	7.23(0.02)
30	50	6.40(0.01)	6.60(0.01)	6.97(0.02)	7.57(0.01)	7.91(0.01)	8.47(0.02)
	100	6.15(0.01)	6.23(0.01)	5.94(0.01)	7.34(0.01)	7.38(0.01)	7.58(0.02)
20	50	6.81(0.01)	6.97(0.02)	7.29(0.02)	8.15(0.01)	7.96(0.01)	8.31(0.02)
	100	6.50(0.01)	5.96(0.01)	5.97(0.01)	7.60(0.01)	7.12(0.01)	7.09(0.01)
10	50	8.71(0.01)	6.50(0.01)	6.79(0.02)	9.27(0.01)	7.38(0.01)	8.02(0.02)
	100	7.93(0.01)	6.02(0.01)	6.03(0.01)	9.15(0.01)	7.06(0.01)	6.94(0.01)
5	50	9.31(0.01)	5.93(0.01)	6.42(0.02)	9.84(0.01)	7.41(0.01)	7.68(0.02)
	100	9.03(0.01)	5.80(0.01)	6.07(0.01)	9.40(0.01)	6.97(0.01)	6.81(0.01)
3	50	9.76(0.01)	19.06(0.02)	20.29(0.04)	9.51(0.01)	18.05(0.02)	18.91(0.04)
	100	9.50(0.01)	19.07(0.02)	19.94(0.02)	9.27(0.01)	18.21(0.02)	18.72(0.02)

## Acknowledgement

Wang's and Cao's research was partially supported by NSF award DMS 1736470. Shang's research was supported in part by NSF DMS 1764280 and 1821157.

## Appendix

We introduce additional notations and definitions that will be used throughout the rest of the paper.  $\mathbf{1}_p$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector with elements being 1. For a vector  $\mathbf{u}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty$  denote the  $L_2$  norm and  $L_\infty$  norm respectively. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F$  denote the spectral norm, Frobenius norm respectively.

We begin by collecting a few important technical lemmas that will be used in the proofs of the minimax lower bounds.

### 6.1 Technical lemmas

We define an alternative risk function  $L_\theta(\hat{G})$  as follows,

$$L_\theta(\hat{G}) = P\left(\hat{G}(Z) \neq G_\theta^*(Z)\right).$$

This loss function  $L_\theta(\hat{G})$  is essentially the probability that  $\hat{G}$  produces a different label than  $G_\theta^*$ , and satisfies the triangle inequality. The connection between  $R_\theta(\hat{G}) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*)$  and  $L_\theta(\hat{G})$  is presented by the following lemma, which shows that it's sufficient to provide a lower bound for  $L_\theta(\hat{G})$  to prove Theorem 1.

**LEMMA 1.** ([3]) *For any  $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$  and any classification rule  $\hat{G}$ , recall that  $G_\theta^*$  is the optimal*

Table 4: Misclassification rates (%) with standard errors in brackets for Model 2 with  $\eta_1(t) = t$ .

$M$	$n$	$\rho = 1.5$			$\rho = 0.75$		
		FQDA	QD	NB	FQDA	QD	NB
50	50	29.90(0.02)	33.71(0.03)	29.88(0.04)	31.62(0.02)	35.03(0.03)	34.90(0.02)
	100	28.99(0.02)	31.96(0.02)	26.41(0.03)	30.66(0.02)	33.47(0.03)	31.92(0.02)
40	50	30.21(0.02)	33.64(0.04)	30.59(0.03)	31.55(0.02)	35.15(0.04)	34.90(0.03)
	100	29.47(0.02)	31.62(0.02)	27.43(0.02)	30.82(0.02)	33.52(0.03)	32.31(0.03)
30	50	30.22(0.02)	33.80(0.04)	31.56(0.04)	31.78(0.02)	34.05(0.03)	34.82(0.03)
	100	29.59(0.02)	32.14(0.03)	29.12(0.02)	31.35(0.02)	32.97(0.03)	32.06(0.02)
20	50	31.14(0.02)	33.45(0.03)	32.67(0.03)	32.74(0.02)	34.40(0.03)	35.24(0.03)
	100	30.08(0.02)	31.52(0.02)	29.45(0.02)	31.90(0.02)	33.30(0.03)	33.16(0.03)
10	50	32.12(0.02)	32.47(0.03)	32.86(0.04)	34.06(0.02)	34.34(0.03)	35.99(0.04)
	100	31.88(0.02)	31.55(0.02)	30.63(0.02)	32.73(0.02)	31.97(0.02)	32.94(0.02)
5	50	33.22(0.02)	31.77(0.03)	32.87(0.04)	33.90(0.02)	32.98(0.03)	35.10(0.04)
	100	32.57(0.02)	30.50(0.02)	31.52(0.03)	33.35(0.02)	32.27(0.02)	32.49(0.03)
3	50	33.35(0.02)	39.11(0.02)	41.34(0.03)	33.40(0.02)	38.89(0.02)	40.39(0.04)
	100	33.30(0.02)	39.08(0.02)	40.32(0.03)	33.13(0.02)	28.18(0.02)	39.22(0.03)

Table 5: Misclassification rates (%) with standard errors in brackets for Speech Recognition data (“aa” vs “iy”).

Classes	FQDA	QD	NB
“aa” vs “iy”	0.090(0.003)	0.185(0.003)	0.040(0.002)
“ao” vs “iy”	0.040(0.001)	0.330(0.005)	0.130(0.003)

rule w.r.t.  $\tilde{\theta}$ . If

$$L_{\theta}(G_{\tilde{\theta}}^*) + L_{\theta}(\hat{G}) + \sqrt{\frac{KL(P_{\theta}, P_{\tilde{\theta}})}{2}} \leq 1/2,$$

then

$$L_{\theta}(G_{\tilde{\theta}}^*) - L_{\theta}(\hat{G}) - \sqrt{\frac{KL(P_{\theta}, P_{\tilde{\theta}})}{2}} \leq L_{\tilde{\theta}}(\hat{G}) \leq L_{\theta}(G_{\tilde{\theta}}^*) + L_{\theta}(\hat{G}) + \sqrt{\frac{KL(P_{\theta}, P_{\tilde{\theta}})}{2}},$$

where the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence of two probability density functions  $P_{\theta_1}$  and  $P_{\theta_2}$  is defined by

$$KL(P_{\theta_1}, P_{\theta_2}) = \int P_{\theta_1}(z) \log \frac{P_{\theta_1}(z)}{P_{\theta_2}(z)} dz.$$

The following lemma gives a Fano’s type minimax lower bound.

**LEMMA 2.** (Fano’s Lemma in [32]) Let  $N \geq 0$  and  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N, \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta$ . For some constants  $\varrho \in (0, 1/8)$ ,  $c > 0$ , and any classification rule  $\hat{G}$ , if  $KL(P_{\theta_i}, P_{\tilde{\theta}_0}) \geq \varrho \log N/n$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and  $L_{\theta_i}(\hat{G}) < c$  implies  $L_{\theta_i}(\hat{G}) \geq c$  for all  $0 \leq i \neq j \leq N$ , then  $\inf \sup_{i=1, \dots, N} E_{\theta_i}[L_{\theta_i}(\hat{G})] \gtrsim c$ .

We need a covering number argument, which is provided by the following lemma.

LEMMA 3. ([32]) Define  $\mathcal{A}_{J,J^*} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \{0, 1\}^J, \|\mathbf{u}\|_0 = J^* \right\}$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_0$  denotes the number of non-zero entries. If  $J > 4J^*$ , then there exists a subset  $\{\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{J,J^*}$ , such that  $\mathbf{u}_0 = (0, \dots, 0)^\top$ ,  $\rho_H(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j) \geq J^*/2$  and  $\log(N+1) \geq \frac{J^*}{5} \log(\frac{J}{J^*})$ , where  $\rho_H$  the Hamming distance.

LEMMA 4. (Lemma 4.1 in [8]) Suppose  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ . There exists a constant  $c > 0$ , which doesn't depend on  $n$ , such that for any classification rule  $G$ , if  $L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G) < c$ , then  $L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2(G) \lesssim P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G(Z) \neq L(Z)) - P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z) \neq L(Z))$ .

Based on Lemma 4, we use Fano's inequality on a carefully designed least favorable multivariate normal distributions to complete the proof of Theorem 1. Without loss of generality, the following proofs assume that  $\mathbf{z}$  is from class 1.

The following two lemmas show the consistency of the differential direction and graphical direction. With a slight abuse of notation,  $\mathbf{D}$  represents the matrix given in (1).

LEMMA 5. The proposed estimators in (3) and (4) satisfy that, with probability at least  $1 - 3/n$ ,  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F)$ ,  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2$ .

*Proof.* Note that matrices  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2, \mathbf{D}_1$  and  $\mathbf{D}_2$  are diagonal matrices. Hence,  $\|(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\|_F \asymp \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F^2$ . Since we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{D}} - (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{D}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{D}} - (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) \widehat{\mathbf{D}} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) \widehat{\mathbf{D}} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \\
&= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) \right\} \widehat{\mathbf{D}} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \\
&= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) \right\} \widehat{\mathbf{D}} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2),
\end{aligned}$$

thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\|_F \\
= & \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})^\top \left\{ (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) - (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)\mathbf{D}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2)\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right\} \right\|_F \\
= & \left\| (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})^\top \left\{ (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) - (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)\mathbf{D}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2)\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 + (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \right\} \right\|_F \\
\leq & 2\sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F + \frac{J \log n}{n} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F^2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \\
& + \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F) \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F + \frac{J \log n}{n} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \\
\lesssim & \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F^2 + \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F + \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F) \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is derived by Lemma 8.5 in [8]. In the above inequality, we divide  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F$  on both sides, and we have  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F)$ .

Similarly, we have  $|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})| \asymp \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2$ . With probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})| \\
= & |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} - \boldsymbol{\delta})| \\
= & |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) \boldsymbol{\beta} + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_2) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} - \boldsymbol{\delta})| \\
\lesssim & \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 + \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above inequality, we divide  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2$  on both sides, and we have  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 6.** *The proposed estimators in (6) and (7) satisfy that, with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_s - \mathbf{D}\|_F & \lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} + \sqrt{J} f_2(M) \right) (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F), \\
\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_s - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 & \lesssim \left( \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} + \sqrt{J} f_2(M) \right) \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 + \sqrt{J} f_1(M).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* In the following we omit  $k$  for simplicity. Consider the parameter space  $\Theta$ , we have  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{B}^{-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ , where  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = (\bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \dots, \bar{\xi}_J)^\top$ ,  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \epsilon_{i2}, \dots, \epsilon_{iM})^\top$  and  $\epsilon_{im} = \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \xi_{ij} \psi_j(t_m)$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, M$ . For any  $M$  dimensional vector  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $J \leq M$ , define  $\mathbf{a}_J$  as the vector of first  $J$  elements in  $\mathbf{a}$ .



Since  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = \left( \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_j \psi_j(t_1), \dots, \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_j \psi_j(t_M) \right)^\top$ , we have

$$\mathbf{B}^{-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = \left( \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_1(t_m) \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_j \psi_j(t_m), \dots, \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_M(t_m) \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \bar{\xi}_j \psi_j(t_m) \right)$$

and  $\bar{\xi}_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, n^{-1} \lambda_j)$ , hence for the first  $J$  elements, where  $J \leq M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\mathbf{B}^{-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})_J \right\|_2^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^J \left\{ \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_k(t_m) \psi_j(t_m) \bar{\xi}_j \right) \right\}^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^J \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_k(t_m) \psi_j(t_m) \right\}^2 (\mu_j^2 + n^{-1} \log n \lambda_j) \\ &\lesssim J f_1^2(M) + \frac{\log n}{n} \left( \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \right) \lesssim J f_1^2(M) + \frac{\log n}{n} \end{aligned}$$

in probability  $1 - O(1/n)$ , therefore

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_J - \boldsymbol{\mu}_J\|_2 \leq \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_J - \boldsymbol{\mu}_J\|_2 + \|(\mathbf{B}^{-1} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})_J\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sqrt{J} f_1(M)$$

with probability  $1 - O(1/n)$ . In the following lemma, for any  $J \times J$  square matrix  $A$ , let  $\text{Diag}\{A\}$  denote a  $J \times J$  diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the same as the diagonal elements of  $A$ . We estimate the variance as  $\hat{\lambda}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_j)^2$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} &= \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \right\} \\ &= \text{Diag} \left\{ \mathbf{B}^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^\top - \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\top) \right] (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \\ &= \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\top) \right\} + \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \\ &\quad + \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{B}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimation bias is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} &= \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\top) \right\} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \\ &\quad + \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{B}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Lemma 8.5 in [8],

$$\left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^\top) \right\} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \\ & \quad \times \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \mathbf{I}_M (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{B}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^\top) (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \sup_{m, m'} \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_{m'}) \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_M (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/n$  separately. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 \\ & \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \\ & \quad \times \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \mathbf{I}_M (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \\ & \quad + \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \sup_{m, m'} \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_{m'}) \left\| \text{Diag} \left\{ \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{I}_M (\mathbf{B}^{-1})^\top \right\} \right\|_2 \\ & = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left( 1 + \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \sup_m \sqrt{\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_m)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \sup_{1 \leq j \leq M} \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_j(t_m) \right) \\ & \quad + \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right) \sup_{m, m'} \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(t_m) \psi_j(t_{m'}) \sup_{1 \leq j \leq M} \left( \sum_{m=1}^M \psi_j(t_m) \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 3/n$ .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right) \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \\ &\asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + f_2(M),\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 3/n$ . Hence, the result can be easily derived from the proof of Lemma 5.  $\square$

Let  $M(\mathbf{z}) = Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})} = \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\|_F + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2)$ .

LEMMA 7. *We have  $P(M(\mathbf{z}) \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}) \geq 1 - O(1/n)$ .*

*Proof.* Given the definition of  $Q(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  in (2) and  $\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}M(\mathbf{z}) &= \left\{ (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \right\} + \left\{ 2\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - 2\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \right\} \\ &\quad + \log |\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| - \log |\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| + 2 \log(\pi_1/\pi_2) - 2 \log(\widehat{\pi}_1/\widehat{\pi}_2) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \right\} - \text{tr} \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} \right) \\ &\quad + \left\{ 2\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - 2\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \right\} \\ &\quad + \log |\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| - \log |\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| + \text{tr} \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \log(\pi_1/\pi_2) - 2 \log(\widehat{\pi}_1/\widehat{\pi}_2) \\ &= \Xi_1 + \Xi_2 + \Xi_3 + \Xi_4\end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, assuming  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ . First, we shall bound  $\Xi_1$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}& (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \\ &= (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) + (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \\ &= 2(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z} + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) + (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)} \sqrt{\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z}} + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3\end{aligned}$$

According to Gaussian Chaos, since  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ , and  $E\{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)\} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J (\epsilon_j - 1)$  and  $\epsilon_j = \lambda_j^{(1)}/\lambda_j^{(2)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}P\left( (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) > 2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} (\text{diag}(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_J) - \mathbf{I}_J) \right\|_F \sqrt{x} \right. \\ \left. + 2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} (\text{diag}(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_J) - \mathbf{I}_J) \right\|_2 x + \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\epsilon_j - 1}{n} \right) \leq \exp(-x)\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|\frac{1}{n}(\text{diag}(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_J) - \mathbf{I}_J)\|_F = \frac{1}{n}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^J(\epsilon_j - 1)^2}$  and  $\|\frac{1}{n}(\text{diag}(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_J) - \mathbf{I}_J)\|_2 = \frac{1}{n}\max_j(\epsilon_j - 1)$ . Therefore, take  $x = \log n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 & \\ &= (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{n} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{J}}{n} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/n$ . Note that

$$\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\top \mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1$$

Since  $\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ , and we have  $E\{(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)\} = \sum_{j=1}^J(\epsilon_j - 1)$ , Thus

$$(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \lesssim \sqrt{\log n} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \log n + \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \lesssim \sqrt{J} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F$$

with probability at least  $1 - 1/n$ . Note that  $2\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\mu_{1j}^2}{\lambda_j^{(1)}}(\epsilon_j - 1)^2)$ , we have  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\top \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \lesssim \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \sqrt{\log n}$  with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ . Since  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\top \mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_4^2 \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F$ , we have  $\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z} \lesssim \sqrt{J} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F$  with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ . Thus

$$I_1 = 2\sqrt{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)} \sqrt{\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{z}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J}{n}} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F. \quad (11)$$

Denote the diagonal matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} = \text{diag}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_J)$ , and  $\mathbf{z}_0 = (z_{01}, \dots, z_{0J})^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_J)$  are independent standard normally distributed random variables, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I_3 - \text{tr}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}\right) \\ &= (\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1)^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_1) - \text{tr}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}\right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \mathbf{z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}) \mathbf{z}_0 - \text{tr}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2}\right) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \sum_{j=1}^J \rho_j (z_{0j}^2 - 1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^J \rho_j \\ &\lesssim \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ , where the second last inequality comes from Gaussian Chaos and the last inequality comes from Lemma 5. Combining (10), (11) and (12),

$$\Xi_1 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F). \quad (12)$$

Secondly, by Lemma 5, with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_2 = |2\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - 2\boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})| &= |2(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})(\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - \boldsymbol{\beta}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})| \\ &\leq 2\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \|\mathbf{z} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Thirdly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log |\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| - \log |\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J| \\
& \leq \text{tr} \left\{ (\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \mathbf{I}_J)^{-1} (\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) \right\} \\
& = \text{tr} \left\{ -\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 (\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) \right\} + \text{tr} (\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F + \text{tr} (\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) + \text{tr} (\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Since with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F \left( \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\|_F + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\|_F \right) \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F \left( \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\|_F + \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1)\mathbf{D}\|_F + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\|_F \right) \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2)
\end{aligned}$$

and with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1) & \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{I}_J - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}\|_F \\
& \leq \|(\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F \\
& \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \mathbf{D}\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1\|_F \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F) + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \right\} \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \frac{J \log n}{n} \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \leq \|\mathbf{D} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\|_F \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F).$$

Note that  $\text{tr} \left( \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} (\mathbf{D} - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{1/2} \right) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ , hence we have with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$

$$\Xi_3 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} (\|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_F + \|\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F) \tag{14}$$

Lastly, by Hoeffding inequality, we have  $\widehat{\pi}_k - \pi_k \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$  with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Thus

$$\Xi_4 = \left| \log \left( \frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2} \right) - \log \left( \frac{\widehat{\pi}_1}{\widehat{\pi}_2} \right) \right| \lesssim |\log(\widehat{\pi}_1 - \pi_1)| + |\log(\widehat{\pi}_2 - \pi_2)| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \tag{15}$$

in probability  $1 - O(1/n)$ .

Combining (12) to (15), the lemma has been proved.  $\square$

LEMMA 8. Denote  $f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t)$  the probability density function of  $Q(\mathbf{z})$ . When  $\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})} = o(1)$ , we have

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})} \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}} f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}^2.$$

When  $\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})} = O(1)$  or  $\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})} = \infty$ , we have

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t) dt \lesssim \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}} f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assuming  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ . By simple calculation, we have

$$Q(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{j=1}^J (\epsilon_j - 1) \chi^2(\delta_j^2) - \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} (\epsilon_j - 1)^{-1} - \sum_{j=1}^J \log \epsilon_j, \quad (16)$$

where  $\chi^2(\delta_j^2) = h_j^2$ , such that  $h_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\delta_j, 1)$ , where  $\delta_j = \frac{\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2}}{(\lambda_j^{(2)})^{1/2}} \frac{\epsilon_j^{1/2}}{\epsilon_j - 1}$ . Denote  $q_z = \sum_{j=1}^J (\epsilon_j - 1) \chi_j^2(\delta_j)$ . To estimate the density of  $q_z$ , without loss of generality, we assume that  $\epsilon_1 - 1 \geq \epsilon_2 - 1 \geq \dots \geq 0$ , otherwise,  $q_z$  can always be represented as the subtraction of two linear combinations of non-central chi-square random variables with positive coefficients, whose density function can be derived by convolution, thus, the boundedness of the density can be obtained by this simple case. As suggested in [22], define

$$A_k = \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ (\epsilon_j - 1)^k + k(\epsilon_j - 1)^{k-1} \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} + (\epsilon_j - 1)^{k-2} \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} \right\},$$

then  $\mu_q := E(q_z) = \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ \epsilon_j - 1 + \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} + \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} (\epsilon_j - 1)^{-1} \right\}$  and

$$\sigma_q := SD(q_z) = \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ (\epsilon_j - 1)^2 + 2 \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} \epsilon_j \right\}}.$$

Define  $s_1^2 = A_3^2 A_2^{-3}$  and  $s_2 = A_4 A_2^{-2}$ .

i) When  $s_1^2 > s_2$ , define  $\mu_\chi = \frac{s_1 - 2\sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2}}{(s_1 - \sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2})^3}$ ,  $\sigma_\chi = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{s_1 - \sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2}}$ ,  $D_q = \frac{\mu_\chi}{\sigma_\chi} \sigma_q - \mu_q$  and  $U_q = \frac{\sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2}}{(s_1 - \sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2})^3}$ . Denote  $\gamma = \frac{s_1 - 3\sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2}}{(s_1 - \sqrt{s_1^2 - s_2})^3}$ . Then, the probability density function of  $q_z$  is approximately by noncentral chi-square distribution with noncentrality parameter  $U_q$  and degree of freedom  $\gamma$  as following

$$f_q(t) = \frac{\sigma_\chi}{2\sigma_q} \exp\left(-\frac{K_q + U_q}{2}\right) \left(\frac{K_q}{U_q}\right)^{\gamma/4 - 1/2} I_{\frac{\gamma}{2} - \gamma}(\sqrt{U_q K_q}),$$

where  $K_q = \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q}(t + D_q)$ ,  $I_{\gamma/2 - \gamma}(\cdot)$  is a modified Bessel function. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_q(t) &\leq \frac{\sigma_\chi}{2\sigma_q} U_q^{1/2 - \gamma/4} \exp\left(-\frac{U_q + K_q}{2}\right) K_q^{\gamma/4 - 1/2} \\ &\quad \times (U_q K_q)^{\gamma/4 - 1/2} \exp\left(\sqrt{U_q K_q}\right) 2^{1 - \gamma/2} \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma/2 - 1) \\ &\leq \frac{\sigma_\chi}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \sigma_q} \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma/2 - 1) \exp\left\{-\frac{U_q + K_q}{2} + \sqrt{U_q K_q}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality is obtained from [23] and Bessel function has the inequality  $1 < \Gamma(\nu + 1) \left(\frac{x}{\nu}\right)^\nu I_\nu(x) < \cosh x \leq e^x$ , where  $\nu > -1/2$ ,  $x > 0$ . Here we can still find that  $f_q(t)$  has lower bound  $\frac{\sigma_\chi}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\sigma_q} \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma/2 - 1) \exp\{-(U_q + K_q)/2\}$ , which will be used later. Then we have

$$f_{Q(z)}(t) \leq \frac{\sigma_\chi}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\sigma_q} \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma/2 - 1) \exp \left\{ -\frac{\sigma_\chi L_J}{2\sigma_q} - \frac{K_q + U_q}{2} + \sqrt{U_q \left( K_q + \frac{\sigma_\chi L_J}{\sigma_q} \right)} \right\},$$

where  $L_J = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} (\epsilon_j - 1)^{-1} + \sum_{j=1}^J \log \epsilon_j$ . The upper bound is a function increasing when  $t < \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_\chi} U_q - D_q - L_J$ , and decreasing otherwise. When  $t = \frac{\sigma_q}{\sigma_\chi} U_q - D_q - L_J$ , the global maximal value of density is  $\frac{\sigma_\chi}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\sigma_q} \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma/2 - 1)$ .

When  $\Delta_{M(z)} = o(1)$ , then

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)} \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)}^2 \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2} - 1)},$$

otherwise

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2} - 1)}.$$

ii) When  $s_1^2 \leq s_2$ , noncentrality parameter  $U_q = 0$ ,  $\gamma = s_1^{-2}$ . The probability density function of  $q_z$  is

$$f_q(t) = \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \frac{1}{2^{\gamma/2} \Gamma(\gamma/2)} \exp(-K_q/2) K_q^{\gamma/2-1}.$$

Note that  $\frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} (q_z + D_q) \sim \chi_\gamma^2$ . Given the parameter space  $\Theta$ , scale parameter  $\sigma_\chi/\sigma_q < \infty$ , thus  $f_q(t) < \infty$  when  $s_1^2 \leq s_2$ .

Hence, when  $\Delta_{M(z)} \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)} \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)}^2 \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\gamma}} \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)}^2,$$

otherwise we have

$$\int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(z)}} f_{Q(z)}(t) dt \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi\gamma}} \lesssim \Delta_{M(z)}.$$

□

**LEMMA 9.** Consider parameter space  $\Theta$ , we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_\theta(\widehat{G}_J) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*) \right] \lesssim \frac{J \log n}{n} + g(J; \Theta),$$

where  $\widehat{G}_J$  is the proposed classifier for first  $J$  scores. Thus we can easily conclude the least upper bound

$$\inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_\theta(\widehat{G}) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*) \right] \lesssim \frac{J^* \log n}{n},$$

where  $J^*$  satisfies  $\frac{J^* \log n}{n} = g(J^*; \Theta)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assuming  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{G}_J) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_J^*) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(\mathbf{z}) > 0} \frac{\pi_1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)} d\mathbf{z} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(\mathbf{z}) \leq 0} \frac{\pi_2}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)} d\mathbf{z} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}) > 0} \frac{\pi_1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)} d\mathbf{z} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}) \leq 0} \frac{\pi_2}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_2)} d\mathbf{z} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(\mathbf{z}) > 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/2} \left(1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}\right) d\mathbf{z} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}) > 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/2} \left(1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}\right) d\mathbf{z} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(\mathbf{z}) > 0, \widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z}) \leq 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/2} \left(1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}\right) d\mathbf{z} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{Q(\mathbf{z}) > 0, Q(\mathbf{z}) \leq Q(\mathbf{z}) - \widehat{Q}(\mathbf{z})} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|^{1/2}} e^{-1/2(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}\right) d\mathbf{z} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} E_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)} \left\{ (1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}) \mathbb{I}\{0 < Q(\mathbf{z}) \leq M(\mathbf{z})\} \mathbb{I}(M(\mathbf{z}) \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}) \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} E_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)} \left\{ (1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}) \mathbb{I}(0 < Q(\mathbf{z}) \leq M(\mathbf{z})) \mathbb{I}(M(\mathbf{z}) \gtrsim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}) \right\} \\
&\lesssim E_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)} \left\{ (1 - e^{-Q(\mathbf{z})}) \mathbb{I}(0 < Q(\mathbf{z}) \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}) \right\} + n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7, we have  $P\{M(\mathbf{z}) \lesssim \Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}\} = 1 - O(1/n)$ . Hence,  $R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{G}_J) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_J^*) \lesssim \int_0^{C\Delta_{M(\mathbf{z})}} (1 - e^{-t}) f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t) dt + n^{-1}$ . By Lemma 8 we have

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{G}_J) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_J^*) \lesssim \frac{J \log n}{n}. \quad (17)$$

Next, we approximate the first  $J$  scores and the whole process. Note that

$$R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_J^*) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*) \asymp P(Q_\infty(Z) > 0) - P(Q(\mathbf{z}) > 0) = \int_0^\infty (f_\infty(t) - f_{Q(\mathbf{z})}(t)) dt,$$

where  $f_\infty$  is the density function of  $Q_\infty$ . Denote

$$R_J = Q_\infty - Q_J = \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty (\epsilon_j - 1) \chi^2(\delta_j^2) - \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} (\epsilon_j - 1)^{-1} - \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty \log \epsilon_j.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(Q_\infty > 0) - P(Q_J > 0) \\
&= P(Q_\infty > 0) - P(Q_\infty > R_J) = P(Q_\infty > 0) - E[P(Q_\infty > R_J | R_J)] \\
&= \left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^0 f_\infty(t) dt\right) - E\left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^{R_J} f_\infty(t) dt\right) = E\left(\int_{R_J}^0 f_\infty(t) dt\right).
\end{aligned}$$



When  $0 < f_\infty(t) < \infty$ , we have

$$E \left( \int_0^{R_J} f_\infty(t) dt \right) \asymp E(R_J).$$

Recall in (16),  $\chi^2(\delta_j^2) = h_j^2$  and  $h_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\delta_j, 1)$ , we have  $E(R_J) = \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty (\epsilon_j - 1 - \log \epsilon_j) + \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}}$ . Given parameter space  $\Theta$ ,  $\epsilon_j$ 's are constants for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $E(R_J) \asymp \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty (\epsilon_j - 1)^2 + \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}}$ . Hence, we have

$$R_\theta(G_J^*) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*) \asymp \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty (\epsilon_j - 1)^2 + \sum_{j=J+1}^\infty \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}}. \quad (18)$$

Hence, by (17) and (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_\theta(\widehat{G}) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*) \right] \\ &= \inf_{\widehat{G}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E \left[ R_\theta(\widehat{G}) - R_\theta(G_J^*) \right] + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} [R_\theta(G_J^*) - R_\theta(G_\theta^*)] \lesssim \frac{J \log n}{n} + g(J; \Theta). \end{aligned}$$

□

**LEMMA 10.** For some  $n$  large enough and absolute constants  $C_{11}$  and  $C_{12}$ ,

- i) When  $M \leq M^*$ , there exists a  $J_1^* \equiv J_1^*(M, n) \leq M$  being the unique solution of  $C_{11}f(M) = g(J; \Theta)/J$ , where  $f(M) = f_1^2(M) \vee f_2^2(M)$  for each  $M \geq 1$ ;
- ii) When  $M > M^*$ , there exists a  $J_2^* \equiv J_2^*(M, n) \leq M$  being the unique solution of  $C_{12} \log n/n = g(J; \Theta)/J$ .

*Proof.* First, note that  $f(x)$  and  $g(x; \Theta)/x$  are two monotone decreasing functions which converge to 0 as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .

When  $M \leq M^*$ ,  $\log n/n = o(f(M))$ , thus  $f(M)$  dominates the MER for the first  $J$  scores. Without loss of generality, we assume  $g(1; \Theta) \geq f(1)$ , since  $g(1; \Theta)$  and  $f(1)$  are both absolute constants, we can always realize it by rescaling. For any fixed  $M$ , if  $f(M) \geq g(M; \Theta)/M$ , there must be a  $J_1^*$  such that  $f(M) = g(J_1^*; \Theta)/J_1^*$ ; Otherwise, there exists a constant  $r_{11} > 1$ , such that  $f(M) \geq g(r_{11}M; \Theta)/(r_{11}M)$ . Let  $h(r) = g(rM; \Theta)/g(M; \Theta)$ ,  $r > 1$ , then it's easy to see that  $h(r)$  is a monotone decreasing function of  $r$ , when  $r = r_{11}$ , there exists a  $r_{12} > 1$ , such that  $h(r_{11}) \geq r_{12}$ . Thus we have  $r_{11}f(M) \geq r_{12}g(M; \Theta)/M$ , i.e.  $r_1f(M) \geq g(M; \Theta)/M$ , where  $r_1 = r_{11}/r_{12}$ .

When  $M > M^*$ ,  $\log n/n$  dominates the MER for the first  $J$  scores. For some large  $n$ ,  $\log n/n < g(1; \Theta)$  is naturally satisfied. For any fixed  $n$  and  $M$ , if  $\log n/n \geq g(M; \Theta)/M$ , there must be a  $J_2^*$  such that  $\log n/n = g(J_2^*; \Theta)/J_2^*$ ; Otherwise, since  $f(M) < \log n/n < g(M; \Theta)/M$ , we can get the similar result with another constant  $r_2$  such that  $r_2 \log n/n \geq g(M; \Theta)/M$ . □

## 6.2 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* Theorem 1 can be derived easily from Lemma 9. □

### 6.3 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof.* Consider parameter space  $\Theta(\alpha)$ , for any  $\theta \in \Theta(\alpha)$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} (\epsilon_j - 1)^2 \asymp \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} j^{-a} \asymp \int_{J+1}^{\infty} t^{-a} dt = (a-1)^{-1}(J+1)^{1-a}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} \asymp \sum_{j=J+1}^{\infty} j^{-b} \asymp \int_{J+1}^{\infty} t^{-b} dt = (b-1)^{-1}(J+1)^{1-b}.$$

Since  $a, b > \alpha$ ,

$$g(J; \Theta) = \sup_{a,b} \left\{ (a-1)^{-1}(J+1)^{1-a} + (b-1)^{-1}(J+1)^{1-b} \right\} \asymp J^{-(\alpha-1)}.$$

□

### 6.4 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* For any  $3 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < \ell_3 < J$ , define the following partial summations based on the definitions in the proof of Lemma 8.

$$A_k(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \sum_{j=\ell_1}^{\ell_2} \left[ (\epsilon_j - 1)^k + k(\epsilon_j - 1)^{k-1} \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} + (\epsilon_j - 1)^{k-2} \frac{(\mu_{j1} - \mu_{j2})^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} \right],$$

$$s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) = A_3^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) A_2^{-3}(\ell_1, \ell_2), \quad s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2) = A_4(\ell_1, \ell_2) A_2^{-2}(\ell_1, \ell_2),$$

$$\sigma_\chi(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{s_1(\ell_1, \ell_2) - \sqrt{s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) - s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)}}, \quad \sigma_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=\ell_1}^{\ell_2} \left[ (\epsilon_j - 1)^2 + 2 \frac{\Delta \mu_j^2}{\lambda_j^{(2)}} \epsilon_j \right]},$$

$$D_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \frac{\mu_\chi(\ell_1, \ell_2)}{\sigma_\chi(\ell_1, \ell_2)} \sigma_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) - \mu_q(\ell_1, \ell_2), \quad U_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \frac{\sqrt{s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) - s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)}}{(s_1(\ell_1, \ell_2) - \sqrt{s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) - s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)})^3}, \quad \gamma(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \frac{s_1(\ell_1, \ell_2) - 3\sqrt{s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) - s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)}}{(s_1(\ell_1, \ell_2) - \sqrt{s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) - s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)})^3} \mathbb{I}(s_1(\ell_1, \ell_2)^2 > s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)) + s_1^{-2}(\ell_1, \ell_2) \mathbb{I}(s_1^2(\ell_1, \ell_2) \leq s_2(\ell_1, \ell_2)).$$

Define a particular parameter space for  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^J$ ,

$$\mathcal{B}_J = \left\{ \{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^J : R_{3, \ell_1} \exp \left\{ \frac{-U_q(3, \ell_1) - \sum_{j=3}^{\ell_1} \lambda_j}{2} \right\} > c_0^{-1}, \ell_1 < J^*/2, \right. \\ \left. \ell_2 - \ell_1, \ell_3 - \ell_2 \geq J^*/2 \right\},$$

where  $R_{\ell_1, \ell_2} = \frac{\sigma_\chi(\ell_1, \ell_2) \sigma_q^{-1}(\ell_1, \ell_2)}{2^{\gamma(\ell_1, \ell_2)/2-1} \Gamma(\gamma(\ell_1, \ell_2)/2-1)}$ ,  $H_{\ell_1, \ell_2} = U_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) + \sigma_\chi(\ell_1, \ell_2) \sigma_q(\ell_1, \ell_2)^{-1} (D_q(\ell_1, \ell_2) + \sum_{j=\ell_1}^{\ell_2} \lambda_j)$  and

$$c_0 = \inf_{3 \leq \ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3 \leq J} R_{\ell_1, \ell_2} R_{\ell_2, \ell_3} \exp \left\{ \frac{-H_{\ell_1, \ell_2} - H_{\ell_2, \ell_3} - \sigma_\chi(\ell_2, \ell_3) \sigma_q^{-1}(\ell_2, \ell_3) (\sum_{j=\ell_2}^{\ell_3} \lambda_j + 1)}{2} \right\} \quad (19)$$

is a constant. Let  $\mathbf{e}_j$  be the vector with  $j$ -th element 1 and 0 otherwise. Let  $\mathbf{E}_j$  be the diagonal matrix with  $j$ -th diagonal element 1 and 0 otherwise. Let  $\tau_1, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2$  be some constants small enough, which are specified later. For any  $J > 4J^*$ , we consider the parameter space

$$\Theta_u = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta}_u = (\tau_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + \tilde{\tau}_1 \mathbf{e}_2, -\tau_1 \mathbf{e}_1 - \tilde{\tau}_1 \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^u, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2) : \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_J), \{\lambda_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq J} \in \mathcal{B}_J, \right. \\ \left. (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^u)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} + \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} u_j \mathbf{E}_j + \tilde{\tau}_2 \mathbf{E}_J, \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_J) \in \mathcal{A}_{J, J^*} \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_{J, J^*}$  is defined in Lemma 3. Thus, we have  $\Theta_u \subseteq \Theta$ .

We first calculate KL divergence between two distributions for  $u$  and  $u'$ . By Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} KL(P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}, P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{u'}|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^u|} - J + \text{tr} \left( (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{u'})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^u \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} \left\{ \tau_2^2 \frac{\log n}{n} (u_j - u'_j)^2 + o\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_2^2 J^* \log n}{2n} + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) \leq \alpha \frac{\log N}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose some constant  $\tau_2$  such that  $\alpha \in (0, 1/8)$ . By Lemmas 1 and 2, given any classifier  $\hat{G}$  in the considered parameter space  $\Theta_u$ , we have

$$\left[ R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{G}) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}^*) \right] + \left[ R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{G}) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^*) \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^*) - \sqrt{\frac{KL(P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}, P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}})}{2}} \right)^2.$$

Since  $KL(P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}, P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}) \leq \frac{\tau_2^2 J^* \log n}{n}$ , it's sufficient to show that  $L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^*) \geq c \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}}$  for some  $c > \tau_2/2$ . Now, we need to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\top \mathbf{D}^u (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) - 2\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_2^u (\mathbf{z} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) - \log(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^u|/|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|) \\ &= -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} u_j z_j^2 + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 z_J^2 + \log(1 + \lambda_J \tilde{\tau}_2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} \log \left( 1 + \lambda_j \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} u_j \right) \\ &= -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} u_j (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 (z_J^2 - \lambda_J) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_J^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} \lambda_j^2 \tau_2^2 \frac{\log n}{n} u_j + o\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \\ &= -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{J-1} u_j (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 (z_J^2 - \lambda_J) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_J^2 \\ &\quad + o\left(\frac{\tau_2^2 J^* \log n}{n}\right) + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)$  and  $u_j = u'_j = 1$  when  $i = 3, \dots, m_1$ ,  $u_j = 1 - u'_j = 1$  when  $j = m_1 + 1, \dots, m_2$ ,  $u_j = 1 - u'_j = 0$  when  $j = m_2 + 1, \dots, m_3$  and  $u_j = u'_j = 0$  when  $j = m_3 + 1, \dots, J - 1$ . Then for  $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}^*$ , we have decision function

$$\begin{aligned} Q_u(\mathbf{z}) &= -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left( \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) + \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) \right) + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 (z_J^2 - \lambda_J) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_J^2 + O\left(\tau_2^2 \frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and for  $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^*$ , we have decision function

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{u'}(\mathbf{z}) &= -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left[ \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) + \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) \right] + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 (z_J^2 - \lambda_J) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_J^2 + O\left(\tau_2^2 \frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $T_1 = -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j) + \frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 + \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 - \tilde{\tau}_2 (z_J^2 - \lambda_J) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_J^2 + O\left(\tau_2^2 \frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right)$ ,

$T_2 = -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j)$ ,  $T_3 = -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_u}^* \neq G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^* \right\} &= \left\{ T_3 + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) < T_1 \leq T_2 + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. T_2 + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) < T_1 \leq T_3 + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'}}^*) \geq \frac{1}{2} P_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)}(T_2 < T_1 \leq T_3) + o\left(\frac{J^* \log n}{n}\right)$ .

Notice that  $Ez_j = 0$  and  $Ez_j^2 = \lambda_j$  for all  $j \geq 3$ . Since  $\sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} z_j^2 = \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j h_j^2$  and  $\sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} z_j^2 = \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} \lambda_j h_j^2$ , where  $h_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , following the same procedure in the proof of Lemma 8, we have  $A'_k = \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j^k$ ,  $\mu'_q = \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j$  and  $\sigma'_q = \sqrt{2 \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j^2}$ , which are all constants. Without loss of generality, we have  $s_1^2 > s_2$ . Using the lower bound of probability

density, with constants  $\sigma_\chi/\sigma_q$ ,  $D_q$  and  $U_q$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[ (T_3 - T_2) \mathbb{I} \left\{ -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \right\} \right] \\
& \geq E \left[ (T_3 - T_2) \mathbb{I} \left\{ -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < 0, 0 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \right\} \right] \\
& \geq 2\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} P \left( -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < 0 \right) P \left( 0 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \right) \\
& = 2\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} P \left( \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j \leq \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} z_j^2 < \sqrt{J^*} + \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j \right) \\
& \quad \times P \left( \left( -\sqrt{J^*} + \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} \lambda_j \right) \vee 0 < \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} z_j^2 < \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} \lambda_j \right) \\
& \geq 2\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} P \left( \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j \leq \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} z_j^2 < 1 + \sum_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} \lambda_j \right) \\
& \quad \times P \left( \left( -1 + \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} \lambda_j \right) \vee 0 < \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} z_j^2 < \sum_{j=m_2+1}^{m_3} \lambda_j \right) \\
& \geq 2c_0 \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar as  $T_2$  and  $T_3$ , the density function for  $T_1^* = -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} (z_j^2 - \lambda_j)$  has the lower bound

$$-\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \sigma_q \Gamma(\gamma/2 - 1)} \exp \left( \frac{\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} K_q - U_q - \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} \lambda_j}{2} \right),$$

and  $\frac{4\tau_1}{\lambda_1} z_1 \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \frac{4\tau_1^2}{\lambda_1}, \frac{16\tau_1^2}{\lambda_1} \right)$ ,  $\frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1}{\lambda_2} z_2 \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \frac{4\tilde{\tau}_1^2}{\lambda_2}, \frac{16\tilde{\tau}_1^2}{\lambda_2} \right)$ . Since  $\lambda_J$  is decreasing with  $J$ ,  $-\tilde{\tau}_2(z_j^2 - \lambda_j) - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\tau}_2^2 \lambda_j^2 = o_p(1)$  and  $O \left( \tau_2^2 \frac{J^* \log n}{n} \right) = o \left( \frac{J^* \log n}{n} \right)$  when  $\tilde{\tau}_2$  and  $\tau_2$  are sufficiently small,  $T_1$  is the sum of  $T_1^*$  and it is a normal random variable. By simple calculation, we have

$$f_{T_1}(t) \geq c_1 c_2 \exp \left[ -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \left\{ t - \left( \frac{12\tau_1^2}{\lambda_1} + \frac{12\tilde{\tau}_1^2}{\lambda_2} \right) - D_q \right\} \right],$$

where  $c_1 = \frac{\sigma_\chi \sigma_q^{-1}}{2^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \Gamma(\gamma/2 - 1)}$  and  $c_2 = \exp \left( \frac{-U_q - \sum_{j=3}^{m_1} \lambda_j}{2} \right)$ . When  $|t| < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}}$ , and  $\tilde{\tau}_2$  is suffi-

ciently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{t:|t|<\tau_2\sqrt{\frac{J^*\log n}{n}}} f(t) \\
& \geq c_1 c_2 \exp \left\{ -\tau_2^2 \frac{\log n}{n} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \sqrt{J^*} - \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} \left( \frac{12\tau_1^2}{\lambda_1} + \frac{12\tilde{\tau}_1^2}{\lambda_2} \right) - \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{\sigma_\chi}{\sigma_q} D_q \right\} \\
& \geq c_1 c_2 C_n(\tau_1, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tau_2).
\end{aligned}$$

When  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tau_1, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tau_2 \rightarrow 0$ ,  $C_n(\tau_1, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tau_2) \rightarrow 1$ , and given parameter space  $\Theta_u$ , we have  $2c_1 c_2 \geq c_0^{-1}$ , where  $c_0$  is given in (19). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)}(T_2 < T_1 \leq T_3) \\
& \geq P_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2)} \left( T_2 < T_1 \leq T_3, -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \right) \\
& = E_{T_2} \left[ \mathbb{I} \left\{ -\sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \right\} \int_{T_2}^{T_3} f_{T_1}(t) dt \right] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2c_0} E \left[ (T_3 - T_2) \mathbb{I} \left\{ -\tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} \leq T_2 < T_3 < \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J \log n}{n}} \right\} \right] \\
& \geq \frac{c_0}{2c_0} \tau_2 \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}} = \frac{\tau_2}{2} \sqrt{\frac{J^* \log n}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Lemma 2, we can conclude that for any  $J > 4J^*$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{G}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} E \left[ R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{G}) - R_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*) \right] \gtrsim \frac{J^* \log n}{n}.$$

□

## 6.5 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof.* The proof can be easily derived from Lemma 10 and the proof of Lemma 6 and Theorem 1, thus it is omitted.

□

## 6.6 Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof.* The proof can be easily derived from the proof of Lemma 6 and Theorem 2, thus it is omitted.

□

## 6.7 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* Consider the parameter space  $\Theta^*(c, d, \alpha)$ ,  $\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \mu_j^2 \asymp (2c'-1)^{-1} M^{1-2c'}$  and  $\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \asymp (d'-1)^{-1} M^{1-d'}$ . Thus we have

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_J - \boldsymbol{\mu}_J\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sqrt{J} (2c-1)^{-1} M^{1-2c},$$

with probability at least  $1 - O(1/n)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_2 &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j} + \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right) \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \\ &\asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + \sum_{j=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + (d-1)^{-1} M^{1-d}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least  $1 - 3/n$ . Hence, the result can be easily derived from the proof of Lemma 6 and Proposition 1, thus it is omitted.  $\square$

## References

- [1] T. W. Anderson. An Introduction To Multivariate Statistical Analysis 3rd Ed. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2003.
- [2] Yuko Araki, Sadanori Konishi, Shuichi Kawano, and Hidetoshi Matsui. Functional logistic discrimination via regularized basis expansions. Communications in Statistics. Theory and Methods, 38(16-17):2944–2957, 2009.
- [3] Martin Azizyan, Aarti Singh, and Larry Wasserman. Minimax theory for high-dimensional gaussian mixtures with sparse mean separation. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, page 2139–2147, 2013.
- [4] J. R. Berrendero, A. Cuevas, and J. L. Torrecilla. On the use of reproducing kernel hilbert spaces in functional classification. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 113(523):1210–1218, 2018.
- [5] G. Biau, F. Bunea, and M. Wegkamp. Functional classification in hilbert spaces. IEEE Trans. Info. Theory, 51:2163–2172, 2005.
- [6] G. Biau, F. Cérou, and A. Guyader. Rates of convergence of the functional k-nearest neighbor estimate. IEEE Trans. Info. Theory, 56:2034–2040, 2010.
- [7] T. T. Cai and M. Yuan. Optimal estimation of the mean function based on discretely sampled functional data: Phase transition. The Annals of Statistics, 39:2330–2355, 2011.
- [8] T. Tony Cai and Linjun Zhang. A convex optimization approach to high-dimensional sparse quadratic discriminant analysis. arXiv:1912.02872, 2019.
- [9] T. Tony Cai and Linjun Zhang. High dimensional linear discriminant analysis: optimality, adaptive algorithm and missing data. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B. Statistical Methodology, 81(4):675–705, 2019.
- [10] G. Cao, L. Wang, Y. Li, and L. Yang. Oracle-efficient confidence envelopes for covariance functions in dense functional data. Statistica Sinica, 26:359–383, 2016.
- [11] F. Chamroukhi and H. Glotin. Mixture model-based functional discriminant analysis for curve classification. Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), pages 1–8, 2012.

- [12] Jeng-Min Chiou and Pai-Ling Li. Correlation-based functional clustering via subspace projection. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 103(484):1684–1692, 2008.
- [13] Antonio Cuevas, Manuel Febrero, and Ricardo Fraiman. Robust estimation and classification for functional data via projection-based depth notions. Computational Statistics, 22(3):481–496, 2007.
- [14] Xiongtao Dai, Hans-Georg Müller, and Fang Yao. Optimal Bayes classifiers for functional data and density ratios. Biometrika, 104(3):545–560, 2017.
- [15] A. Delaigle and P. Hall. Achieving near-perfect classification for functional data. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 74:267–286, 2012.
- [16] A. Delaigle, P. Hall, and N. Bathia. Componentwise classification and clustering of functional data. Biometrika, 99(2):299–313, 2012.
- [17] Aurore Delaigle and Peter Hall. Classification using censored functional data. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 108(504):1269–1283, 2013.
- [18] F. Ferraty and P. Vieu. Curves discrimination: a nonparametric functional approach. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 44(1-2):161–173, 2003.
- [19] Pedro Galeano, Esdras Joseph, and Rosa E. Lillo. The Mahalanobis distance for functional data with applications to classification. Technometrics, 57(2):281–291, 2015.
- [20] X. Leng and H.G. Müller. Classification using functional data analysis for temporal gene expression data. Bioinformatics, 22:68–76, 2006.
- [21] Xiuqi Li and Subhashis Ghosal. Bayesian classification of multiclass functional data. Electronic Journal of Statistics, 12(2):4669–4696, 2018.
- [22] Huan Liu, Yongqiang Tang, and Helen Zhang. A new chi-square approximation to the distribution of non-negative definite quadratic forms in non-central normal variables. CSDA, 53:853–856, 2009.
- [23] Yudell L.Luke. Inequalities for generalized hypergeometric functions. Journal of Approximation Theory, 5:41–65, 1972.
- [24] S. J. Morris. Spline estimators for semi-functional linear model. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 2:321–359, 2015.
- [25] Juhyun Park, Jeongyoun Ahn, and Yongho Jeon. Sparse functional linear discriminant analysis. arXiv:2012.06488, 2020.
- [26] Fabric Rossi, Delannay Nicolas, Briec Conan-Guez, and Michel Verleysen. Representation of functional data in neural networks. Neurocomputing, 64:183–210, 2005.
- [27] Carlo Sguera, Pedro Galeano, and Rosa Lillo. Spatial depth-based classification for functional data. TEST, 23(4):725–750, 2014.
- [28] H. Shin. An extension of fisher’s discriminant analysis for stochastic processes. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 99:1191–1216, 2008.



- [29] Barry Simon. Notes on infinite determinants of Hilbert space operators. Advances in Mathematics, 24(3):244–273, 1977.
- [30] J. Song, W. Deng, H. Lee, and D. Kwon. Optimal classification for time-course gene expression data using functional data analysis. Biometrika, 103(1):147–159, 2016.
- [31] J. L. Torrecilla, Carlos Ramos-Carreno, Manuel Sanchez-Montanes, and Suarez Alberto. Optimal classification of gaussian processes in homo- and heteroscedastic settings. Statistics and Computing, 30:1091–1111, 2020.
- [32] Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Introduction to nonparametric estimation. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2009.
- [33] J.L. Wang, J. M. Chiou, and H. G. Müller. Functional data analysis. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 3:257–295, 2016.