

Dimension free convergence rates for Gibbs samplers for Bayesian linear mixed models

Zhumengmeng Jin and James P. Hobert

Department of Statistics

University of Florida

August 2021

Abstract

The emergence of big data has led to a growing interest in so-called convergence complexity analysis, which is the study of how the convergence rate of a Monte Carlo Markov chain (for an intractable Bayesian posterior distribution) scales as the underlying data set grows in size. Convergence complexity analysis of *practical* Monte Carlo Markov chains on continuous state spaces is quite challenging, and there have been very few successful analyses of such chains. One fruitful analysis was recently presented by Qin and Hobert (2021b), who studied a Gibbs sampler for a simple Bayesian random effects model. These authors showed that, under regularity conditions, the geometric convergence rate of this Gibbs sampler converges to zero as the data set grows in size. It is shown herein that similar behavior is exhibited by Gibbs samplers for more general Bayesian models that possess both random effects and traditional continuous covariates, the so-called mixed models. The analysis employs the Wasserstein-based techniques introduced by Qin and Hobert (2021b).

1 Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods have revolutionized the exploration of intractable probability distributions (see, e.g., (Diaconis, 2009)). This has affected many areas of science, but none more than Bayesian statistics. Indeed, MCMC allows for the exploration of intractable high dimensional posterior distributions that would have remained virtually impenetrable without these

Key words and phrases. Contraction condition, Convergence complexity analysis, Drift condition, Geometric ergodicity, High-dimensional inference, Markov chain Monte Carlo, Total variation distance, Wasserstein distance

tools. The revolution has not come without a cost, however. Employing an MCMC algorithm in a principled manner requires information about the rate at which the underlying Markov chain converges to its target distribution (Flegal et al., 2008), and such information is notoriously difficult to ascertain. Substantial progress has been made over the last several decades, both on the development of general techniques to get bounds on convergence rates (mostly based on drift and minorization conditions), and on the application of said techniques to specific Monte Carlo Markov chains. Unfortunately, most of these results are not sharp enough to be useful in the emerging area of *convergence complexity analysis*, which is the (big data driven) study of how the convergence rate of a Monte Carlo Markov chain for a Bayesian problem scales with the size of the underlying data set (Rajaratnam and Sparks, 2015; Qin and Hobert, 2021a). In fact, it has become clear that convergence complexity analysis requires new theory (see, e.g., (Durmus and Moulines, 2015; Hairer et al., 2011; Qin and Hobert, 2021b; Yang and Rosenthal, 2019)). Qin and Hobert (2021b) provide a new technique that entails bounding the *Wasserstein* distance to stationarity, and then converting the Wasserstein bounds into total variation bounds. These authors apply their method to a Gibbs sampler for a simple Bayesian random effects model and show that, under regularity conditions, the geometric convergence rate converges to zero as the data set grows in size. This is, of course, even better than dimension free. In this paper, we show that similar behavior is exhibited by Gibbs samplers for more general Bayesian models that possess both random effects and traditional continuous covariates, the so-called mixed models. We now provide a detailed description of the Gibbs samplers that are the focus of our study.

Consider the linear mixed effects model given by

$$y_{ij} = x_{ij}^{\top} \beta + \eta_i + e_{ij},$$

where $i = 1, \dots, q$, $j = 1, \dots, r_i$, x_{ij} is a $p \times 1$ vector of known covariates associated with y_{ij} , β is an unknown p -dimensional regression parameter, the η_i are iid $N(\mu, \lambda^{-1})$, and the e_{ij} are iid $N(0, \tau^{-1})$ and independent of the η_i . A Bayesian version of this model is formed by placing prior distributions on the unknown parameters β , μ , λ , and τ . In the model we consider, the four parameters are assumed *a priori* independent, and we put flat priors on β and μ , and proper gamma priors on λ and τ . In particular, our prior density is proportional to

$$\lambda^{a_1-1} \exp(-b_1 \lambda) I_{\mathbb{R}_+}(\lambda) \tau^{a_2-1} \exp(-b_2 \tau) I_{\mathbb{R}_+}(\tau),$$

where a_1 , a_2 , b_1 , and b_2 are strictly positive hyperparameters and $\mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty)$. (Assume for the time being that the resulting posterior distribution is proper.) Denote the posterior density

by $\pi^*(\beta, \mu, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q, \lambda, \tau | Y)$, where $Y = (y_{11}, \dots, y_{qr_q})^\top$ is the observed data, and, as usual, the random effects are included because they are unobserved. This posterior density, which has dimension $q + p + 3$, is highly intractable. However, because the prior density is conditionally conjugate, there is a simple (two-block) Gibbs sampler that can be used to explore π^* . It turns out to be more convenient to work with a very simple transformation of π^* . Indeed, let $\eta_{00} = \sqrt{q}\beta$ and $\eta_0 = \sqrt{q}\mu$, and define $\eta = (\eta_{00}^\top, \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q)^\top$. Denote the new posterior density by $\pi(\eta, \lambda, \tau | Y)$. In this paper, we analyze the Markov chain $\Gamma = \{\eta^{(n)}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ whose Markov transition density $k : \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is given by

$$k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \pi_1(\tilde{\eta} | \lambda, \tau, Y) \pi_2(\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y) d\lambda d\tau, \quad (1)$$

where $\pi_1(\eta | \lambda, \tau, Y)$ and $\pi_2(\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y)$ denote conditional densities associated with π . Of course, Γ is the η -marginal chain of the two-block Gibbs sampler that alternates between (λ, τ) and η . It's easy to see that Γ is irreducible, aperiodic, and positive Harris recurrent with invariant density $\pi(\eta | Y) := \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \pi(\eta, \lambda, \tau | Y) d\lambda d\tau$. Furthermore, it is well known that, for two-block Gibbs samplers, the marginal chains have the same convergence rate as the underlying two-block Gibbs sampler (see, e.g., (Roberts and Rosenthal, 2001; Diaconis et al., 2008)). Thus, in order to learn about the convergence complexity of the two-block Gibbs sampler, it suffices to study the marginal chain Γ . It would clearly also suffice to study the other marginal chain whose Markov transition density $k' : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is given by

$$k'((\lambda, \tau), (\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\tau})) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{q+p+1}} \pi_2(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\tau} | \eta, Y) \pi_1(\eta | \lambda, \tau, Y) d\eta.$$

However, despite the fact that this chain's dimension remains constant (at 2) as p and q increase, Γ is more amenable to analysis.

Drawing from $\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y$ is simple since, conditional on (η, Y) , λ and τ are independent, and each has a gamma distribution. Making draws from $\eta | \lambda, \tau, Y$ is more complicated, but still straightforward. Our strategy is to sample sequentially. We first draw from $\eta_{00} | \lambda, \tau, Y$, and then from $\eta_0 | \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y$, and finally from $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_q | \eta_0, \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y$. All three of these conditional distributions are normal distributions, and the last of the three steps is easy since $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^q$ are independent given $(\eta_0, \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y)$. The distributions of $\eta_{00} | \lambda, \tau, Y$ and $\eta_0 | \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y$ are derived in Appendix A.

In order to provide a precise statement of the algorithm, we must introduce a bit of notation. Let $N = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i$ (total sample size), and let X denote what is traditionally called the design matrix, i.e., X is the $N \times p$ matrix given by $X = (x_{11}, \dots, x_{qr_q})^\top$. Let $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}_1 1_{r_1}^\top, \dots, \bar{x}_q 1_{r_q}^\top)^\top$, where $\bar{x}_i = r_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} x_{ij}$, and 1_{r_i} is an $r_i \times 1$ column vector of 1s. Note that \bar{X} is also $N \times p$. Let

$\bar{Y} = (\bar{y}_1 \mathbf{1}_{r_1}^\top, \dots, \bar{y}_q \mathbf{1}_{r_q}^\top)^\top$, where $\bar{y}_i = r_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} y_{ij}$. Thus, we have

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11}^\top \\ \vdots \\ x_{1r_1}^\top \\ \vdots \\ x_{q1}^\top \\ \vdots \\ x_{qr_q}^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ \bar{x}_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ \bar{x}_q^\top \\ \vdots \\ \bar{x}_q^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{y}_q \\ \vdots \\ \bar{y}_q \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $c_i = r_i \tau / (\lambda + r_i \tau)$, $D_c = \bigoplus_{i=1}^q c_i I_{r_i}$, and

$$M = D_c + \frac{(I - D_c) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c)}{\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) \mathbf{1}}.$$

(When we use $\mathbf{1}$ with no subscript, it is understood to mean $\mathbf{1}_N$.) Finally, let $Q = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1}$, $v = \sqrt{q} Q (X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{Y})$, $t_i = \lambda + r_i \tau$, and $z_i = t_i / (r_i \lambda \tau)$. We now state the algorithm for simulating Γ . If the current state of the chain is $\eta^{(n)} = \eta = (\eta_{00}^\top, \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q)^\top$, then we simulate the next state, $\eta^{(n+1)}$ using the following procedure.

Iteration $n + 1$ of the η -marginal Gibbs algorithm:

1. Draw $\lambda \sim \text{Gamma}(q/2 + a_1, b_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta_0 / \sqrt{q})^2)$.
2. Draw $\tau \sim \text{Gamma}(N/2 + a_2, b_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta_i)^2)$.
3. Draw $\eta_{00}^{(n+1)} \sim N_p(v, \frac{q}{\tau} Q)$.
4. Draw $\eta_0^{(n+1)} \sim N\left(\frac{\sqrt{q} \sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00}^{(n+1)} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}, \frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}\right)$.
5. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$, draw $\eta_i^{(n+1)} \sim N\left(\frac{\lambda \eta_0^{(n+1)}}{\sqrt{q} t_i} + \frac{r_i \tau}{t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00}^{(n+1)} / \sqrt{q}), 1/t_i\right)$.

Steps 1 and 2 simulate from $\pi_2(\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y)$, while steps 3, 4, and 5 simulate from $\pi_1(\eta | \lambda, \tau, Y)$.

Let $k^{(n)}(\eta, \cdot)$ denote the n -step Markov transition density (Mtd); i.e., the density of $\eta^{(n)}$ given that $\eta^{(0)} = \eta$. The chain Γ is said to be geometrically ergodic if there exist a function $M : \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a constant $\rho \in [0, 1)$ such that for all n and all η , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{q+p+1}} |k^{(n)}(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) - \pi(\tilde{\eta} | Y)| d\tilde{\eta} \leq M(\eta) \rho^n. \quad (2)$$

The left-hand side of (2) is the total variation distance between the distribution of $\eta^{(n)}$ (given that $\eta^{(0)} = \eta$) and the invariant distribution. (A more general development of these concepts is provided in Section 2.) The *geometric rate of convergence*, ρ_* , is defined to be the smallest $\rho \in [0, 1]$ that satisfies (2) with some $M(\cdot)$. Results in Román and Hobert (2012) imply that, under mild regularity conditions, Γ is indeed geometrically ergodic, but their result is *qualitative* in the sense that they do not provide an explicit upper bound for ρ_* . Our interest here centers on the deeper issue of convergence complexity, i.e., on an understanding of how ρ_* scales as the underlying data set increases in size. More specifically, it is clear that ρ_* depends on the underlying data, which is comprised of Y , X , q , p , and the r_i s. We consider a sequence of data sets of increasing size, and show that, under regularity conditions concerning the relative rates at which q , p , and the r_i grow, not only is ρ_* bounded away from unity as the data set grows, but it actually converges to 0. Keep in mind that a convergence rate of 0 corresponds to immediate convergence, as if making iid draws from the target. Our main result (Theorem 3 in Section 3) is a generalization of Proposition 25 in (Qin and Hobert, 2021b), who consider the Gibbs sampler for a Bayesian random effects model that is a simplified version of our mixed model in which there are no covariates, and the data set is balanced, i.e., $r_i \equiv r$. Our proofs are similar in structure to those of Qin and Hobert (2021b), but there are substantial differences due to the fact that our mixed model is markedly more complex than the model that they considered.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains general background on Markov chain convergence, as well as statements of results from Qin and Hobert (2021b) and Madras and Sezer (2010), which we use to analyze Γ . Section 3 contains a statement and proof of the main result. The proof relies on three preparatory results, also stated in Section 3, that are proven in subsequent sections. In particular, Section 4 contains a proof of Proposition 5, which allows us to convert Wasserstein bounds into total variation bounds. Sections 5 and 6 contain proofs of Proposition 6 (a drift condition) and Proposition 7 (a contraction condition), respectively. Proofs of some technical lemmas are relegated to the Appendix.

2 Markov Chain Background

Let $\mathsf{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let \mathcal{B} denote its Borel σ -algebra. Suppose that $K : \mathsf{X} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a Markov transition kernel (Mtk). For any $n \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, let K^n be the n -step transition kernel, so that $K^1 = K$. For any probability measure $\nu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, denote $\int_{\mathsf{X}} \nu(dx) K^n(x, \cdot)$ by $\nu K^n(\cdot)$. If δ_x denotes a point mass at x , then $\delta_x K^n(\cdot) = K^n(x, \cdot)$, and we will abbreviate this to $K_x^n(\cdot)$.

Assume that the Markov chain corresponding to K is irreducible, aperiodic, and positive Harris recurrent (see, e.g., (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009)), and let Π denote its unique invariant probability distribution. The goal of convergence analysis is to understand how quickly νK^n converges to Π as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for a large class of ν s. The difference between νK^n and Π is usually measured using the total variation (TV) distance, which is now defined. For two probability measures on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B})$, ν and ϕ , the TV distance between them is

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\nu, \phi) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}} [\nu(A) - \phi(A)].$$

(If ν and ϕ each have a density with respect to a common measure, then TV distance can be computed by integrating the absolute difference between the densities - see, e.g., (2).) The Markov chain defined by K is *geometrically ergodic* if there exist $\rho < 1$ and $M : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that, for each $x \in \mathbf{X}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(K_x^n, \Pi) \leq M(x) \rho^n. \quad (3)$$

Define the *geometric convergence rate* of the chain as

$$\rho_* = \inf \{ \rho \in [0, 1] : (3) \text{ holds for some } M : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty) \}.$$

The chain is geometrically ergodic if and only if $\rho_* < 1$.

The standard technique for developing upper bounds on ρ_* requires the construction of drift and minorization (d&m) conditions for the Markov chain under study (Rosenthal, 1995; Roberts and Rosenthal, 2004; Baxendale, 2005). Unfortunately, the d&m-based methods are often overly conservative, especially in high-dimensional situations (see, e.g., (Rajaratnam and Sparks, 2015; Qin and Hobert, 2021a)), and there is mounting evidence suggesting that convergence complexity analysis becomes more tractable when TV distance is replaced with Wasserstein distance (see, e.g., (Hairer et al., 2011; Durmus and Moulines, 2015; Qin and Hobert, 2021b)). In the remainder of this section, we describe a method of bounding ρ_* indirectly using Wasserstein distance.

Assume that \mathbf{X} together with the usual Euclidean distance (based on the usual Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$) constitutes a Polish metric space. For two probability measures on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B})$, ν and ϕ , their Wasserstein distance is defined as

$$d_{\text{W}}(\nu, \phi) = \inf_{\xi \in \tau(\nu, \phi)} \int_{\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}} \|x - y\| \xi(dx, dy),$$

where $\tau(\nu, \phi)$ is the set of all couplings of ν and ϕ ; i.e., the set of all probability measures $\xi(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $(\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B})$ having marginals ν and ϕ . Here is a result that provides a connection between Wasserstein distance and TV distance.

Theorem 1 (Madras and Sezer (2010)). *Assume that $K_x(\cdot)$ has a density $k(x, \cdot)$ with respect to some dominating measure μ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$. If there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathsf{X}$,*

$$\int_{\mathsf{X}} |k(x, z) - k(y, z)| \mu(dz) \leq C \|x - y\| ,$$

then, for all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$, we have

$$d_{TV}(K_x^n, \Pi) \leq \frac{C}{2} d_W(K_x^{n-1}, \Pi) .$$

Suppose that the hypothesis of Theorem 1 holds, and that the Markov chain driven by K is geometrically ergodic with respect to Wasserstein distance, i.e., we have $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ and $M : \mathsf{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $d_W(K_x^m, \Pi) \leq M(x) \gamma^m$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows immediately from Theorem 1 that $\rho_* \leq \gamma$.

One way to bound Wasserstein distance is through coupling, and coupling is often achieved via random mappings, which we now describe. On a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , let $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Theta$ be a random element, and let $\tilde{f} : \mathsf{X} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathsf{X}$ be a Borel measurable function. Define $f(x) = \tilde{f}(x, \theta)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$. Then f is called a random mapping on X . The evolution of a Markov chain can often be viewed as being driven by a random mapping. If $f(x) \sim K_x(\cdot)$ for all $x \in \mathsf{X}$, then we say that f induces K . For example, suppose that $\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{R}$ and $K(x, dy) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp\{-(y - x/2)^2/2\} dy$. Let Z be standard normal, and define $\tilde{f}(x, Z) = x/2 + Z$. Then the random mapping $f(x) = x/2 + Z$ induces K . A random mapping f is called *differentiable* if, with probability 1, for each $x, y \in \mathsf{X}$, $\frac{d}{dt} f(x + t(y - x))$, as a function of $t \in [0, 1]$, exists and is integrable (Qin and Hobert, 2021b). The following result provides a constructive method of forming a bound on the Wasserstein distance to stationarity.

Theorem 2 (Qin & Hobert, 2021b). *Suppose that X is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d , and assume that the following three conditions hold.*

(A₁) *There exist $c \in (0, \infty)$, $\zeta \in [0, 1)$, $L \in [0, \infty)$, and a function $V : \mathsf{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathsf{X}} V(x') K(x, dx') \leq \zeta V(x) + L \tag{4}$$

for each $x \in \mathsf{X}$, and

$$c^{-1} \|x - y\| \leq V(x) + V(y) + 1 \tag{5}$$

for each $(x, y) \in \mathsf{X} \times \mathsf{X}$.

(A₂) There exist a differentiable random mapping f that induces K , some $\xi > 2L/(1 - \zeta)$, $\gamma < 1$ and $\gamma_0 < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} f(x + s(y - x)) \right\| \leq \begin{cases} \gamma \|x - y\| & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{C} \\ \gamma_0 \|x - y\| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} : V(x) + V(y) \leq \xi\}$.

(A₃) Either $\gamma_0 \leq 1$ or

$$\frac{\log(2L + 1)}{\log(2L + 1) - \log(\gamma)} < \frac{-\log [(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]}{\log(\gamma_0) - \log [(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]}.$$

Then for each $x \in \mathbf{X}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and any real number a such that

$$\frac{\log(2L + 1)}{\log(2L + 1) - \log(\gamma)} < a < \frac{-\log [(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]}{\log(\gamma_0 \vee 1) - \log [(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]},$$

we have

$$d_W(K_x^n, \Pi) \leq c \left(\frac{(\zeta + 1)V(x) + L + 1}{1 - \rho_a} \right) \rho_a^n,$$

where

$$\rho_a = [\gamma^a(2L + 1)^{1-a}] \vee \left[\gamma_0^a \left(\frac{\zeta\xi + 2L + 1}{\xi + 1} \right)^{1-a} \right] < 1.$$

We refer to conditions (A₁) and (A₂) as the *drift* and *contraction* conditions, respectively. In the next section, we apply Theorems 1 and 2 to Γ .

3 Main Result

In order to state our main result, we must introduce a few definitions and some notation. Let $K(\eta, \cdot)$ denote the Mtk corresponding to the Mtd $k(\eta, \cdot)$ defined at (1), and let $K_\eta^n(\cdot)$ denote the probability measure associated with the n -step Mtd $k^{(n)}(\eta, \cdot)$. So, for a Borel set $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, $K(\eta, B) = \int_B k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) d\tilde{\eta}$ and $K_\eta^n(B) = \int_B k^{(n)}(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) d\tilde{\eta}$. Also let $\Pi(\cdot)$ denote the invariant probability measure of Γ , i.e., $\Pi(\cdot)$ is the probability measure corresponding to the marginal posterior density $\pi(\eta | Y)$. (The conditions that we will impose in our main result imply posterior propriety.) Define $V : \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as follows:

$$V(\eta) = \frac{1}{\bar{r}q} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} + \frac{1}{\bar{r}q} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{y} = q^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i$ and $\bar{r} = q^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i$. This will serve as our drift function.

For two non-negative functions $g(z)$ and $h(z)$, we write $g(z) = \mathcal{O}(h(z))$ if there exist positive numbers c and z_0 such that $g(z) \leq ch(z)$ for all $z \geq z_0$. We write $g(z) = \Theta(h(z))$ if $g(z) = \mathcal{O}(h(z))$ and $h(z) = \mathcal{O}(g(z))$. Let $r_{\max} = \max\{r_1, \dots, r_q\}$ and $r_{\min} = \min\{r_1, \dots, r_q\}$. Let $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ denote the smallest eigenvalue of the (square symmetric matrix) argument, and define $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ analogously.

We envision a sequence of growing data sets with q , $p = p(q)$, and $r_{\min} = r_{\min}(q)$ all diverging. Our basic assumptions about the manner in which the data set grows are as follows.

(B₁) There exists a positive constant m , not depending on q , such that for all q ,

$$\frac{r_{\max}}{r_{\min}} \leq m .$$

(B₂) There exist positive constants k_1 and k_2 , not depending on q , such that for all large q ,

$$k_1 \leq \lambda_{\min} \left[\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top \bar{X}) \right] \leq \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} X^\top X \right) \leq k_2 .$$

(B₃) There exists a positive constant ℓ , not depending on q , such that for all q ,

$$\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} y_{ij}^2 \leq \ell .$$

(B₄) $p = \mathcal{O}(q)$.

(B₅) There exists a positive constant δ , not depending on q , such that

$$\frac{\bar{r}}{q^{2+\delta}} \rightarrow \infty$$

as $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Here is our main result:

Theorem 3. *Under conditions (B₁)-(B₅), there exist positive constants C , C' and L_0 (all independent of q), a rate $\rho = \rho(q)$ satisfying $\rho(q) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$, and a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$, all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, and all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$,*

$$d_{TV}(K_\eta^n, \Pi) \leq Cq\bar{r}^{3/2}d_W(K_\eta^{n-1}, \Pi) \leq C'q^2\bar{r}^{3/2}(V(\eta) + L_0)\rho^{n-1} .$$

Remark 4. *It follows from (3) that if $\rho = 0$, the Markov chain becomes stationary after one iteration (no matter where it is started). Given such a chain, one could produce an exact draw from Π by running a single iteration (from any starting point). According to Theorem 3, the geometric convergence rates of our sequence of Gibbs samplers converge to 0 as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Unfortunately, this*

does not imply that a single iteration (or even several iterations) of the Gibbs sampler will provide an exact (or even a near exact) draw from the posterior distribution, even when the underlying data set is extremely large. Indeed, Theorem 3 states that the total variation distance to stationarity after n iterations of the Gibbs sampler is bounded above by $C'q^2\bar{r}^{3/2}(V(\eta) + L_0)\rho^{n-1}$, where $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Even if ρ is very small, the term $C'q^2\bar{r}^{3/2}(V(\eta) + L_0)$ may be very large - so large that n needs to be large before the entire upper bound on the total variation distance to stationarity is small. The point is this: While we are able to say that $\rho_* \rightarrow 0$ as the sample size increases, we are not able to parlay this into a statement about fixed Gibbs samplers approaching stationarity in one (or even a few) iterations.

We will prove Theorem 3 using Theorems 1 and 2. We begin by stating three standalone results (each proved in a subsequent section) that we will use in the proof. The first allows for conversion (Theorem 1), and the other two concern drift and contraction (Theorem 2). Here is the conversion condition, which is established using Theorem 1 in Section 4.

Proposition 5. *Under conditions (B_1) and (B_2) , there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$,*

$$d_{TV}(K_\eta^n, \Pi) \leq Cq\bar{r}^{3/2}d_W(K_\eta^{n-1}, \Pi)$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$ and all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$.

Here is the drift condition, which is established in Section 5.

Proposition 6. *Under conditions (B_1) - (B_5) , there exist $\zeta = \zeta(q) = \mathcal{O}(q^{-1})$, a constant L independent of q , and a positive integer q_0 such that for all $q \geq q_0$ and all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta})K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) \leq \zeta V(\eta) + L.$$

The contraction condition involves a random mapping that induces Γ , and we now describe this mapping. (We note that this mapping is also exploited in the proof of Proposition 6.) Let $N_{00} \sim N_p(0, I)$, $N_i \sim N(0, 1)$, $i = 0, \dots, q$, $J_1 \sim \text{Gamma}(q/2 + a_1, 1)$, and $J_2 \sim \text{Gamma}(N/2 + a_2, 1)$, and assume these are all pairwise independent. Denote the current state of Γ as $\eta = (\eta_{00}^\top, \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q)^\top$. Then the next state $\tilde{\eta} = (\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top, \tilde{\eta}_0, \tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_q)^\top$ can be expressed as the following random mapping:

$$f(\eta) = \tilde{\eta}(\eta) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta)} \\ \tilde{\eta}_0^{(\eta)} \\ \tilde{\eta}_1^{(\eta)} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\eta}_q^{(\eta)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta)} &= v^{(\eta)} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau^{(\eta)}}} (Q^{(\eta)})^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \\ \tilde{\eta}_0^{(\eta)} &= \sqrt{q} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta)} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i^{(\eta)}}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i^{(\eta)}} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i^{(\eta)}}} N_0 \\ \tilde{\eta}_i^{(\eta)} &= \frac{\lambda^{(\eta)}}{t_i^{(\eta)}} \tilde{\eta}_0^{(\eta)} / \sqrt{q} + \frac{r_i \tau^{(\eta)}}{t_i^{(\eta)}} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta)} / \sqrt{q}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_i^{(\eta)}}} N_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, q,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{(\eta)} &= \frac{J_1}{b_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta_0 / \sqrt{q})^2} \\ \tau^{(\eta)} &= \frac{J_2}{b_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_0 / \sqrt{q} - \eta_i)^2} \\ t_i^{(\eta)} &= r_i \tau^{(\eta)} + \lambda^{(\eta)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, q \\ z_i^{(\eta)} &= \frac{t_i^{(\eta)}}{r_i \tau^{(\eta)} \lambda^{(\eta)}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, q \\ D_c^{(\eta)} &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{r_i \tau^{(\eta)}}{t_i^{(\eta)}} I_{r_i} \\ M^{(\eta)} &= D_c^{(\eta)} + \frac{(I - D_c^{(\eta)}) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c^{(\eta)})}{\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c^{(\eta)}) \mathbf{1}} \\ Q^{(\eta)} &= (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M^{(\eta)} \bar{X})^{-1} \\ v^{(\eta)} &= \sqrt{q} Q^{(\eta)} (X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M^{(\eta)} \bar{Y}).\end{aligned}$$

Here is the contraction condition, which is established in Section 6.

Proposition 7. *Assume that (B₁)-(B₅) hold, and define*

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(\eta, \eta') \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} : V(\eta) + V(\eta') \leq q^{\delta/3}\},$$

where $V(\cdot)$ is the drift function defined in (6), and δ is given in (B₅). Let f be the random mapping defined above. There exist

$$\gamma = \gamma(q) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}}} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_0 = \gamma_0(q) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{q})$$

and a positive integer q_0 such that for all $q \geq q_0$, we have

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} f(\eta + s(\eta' - \eta)) \right\| \leq \begin{cases} \gamma \|\eta' - \eta\| & (\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C} \\ \gamma_0 \|\eta' - \eta\| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 8. Under (B_5) , $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(q) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3. We will show that there exist positive constants C'' and L_0 (both independent of q), a rate $\rho = \rho(q)$ satisfying $\rho(q) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$, and a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$, all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, and all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$,

$$d_W(K_\eta^n, \Pi) \leq C'' q (V(\eta) + L_0) \rho^n. \quad (7)$$

The result then follows immediately from Proposition 5. The Wasserstein bound in (7) will be established using Theorem 2 in conjunction with Propositions 6 and 7. We begin by showing that assumption (A_1) holds. Proposition 6 provides the inequality (4), and shows that we can choose $\zeta = \zeta(q) = \Theta(q^{-1})$ and $L = L(q) = \Theta(1)$. However, we still need to establish the second inequality, (5), which relates the drift function to the Euclidean norm. Fix $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1}$. We have

$$\|\eta - \eta'\| \leq \|\eta - \eta'\|^2 + 1 = (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + (\eta_0 - \eta'_0)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 + 1.$$

For two non-negative definite matrices, M_1 and M_2 , we write $M_1 \preceq M_2$ if $M_2 - M_1$ is non-negative definite. Now, $X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top \bar{X} \preceq X^\top X$, so $\lambda_{\min}(X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top \bar{X}) \leq \lambda_{\min}(X^\top X)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} X^\top X)} (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} X^\top X \right) (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top \bar{X}))} (\eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \eta'_{00}/\sqrt{q})^\top \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} x_{ij} x_{ij}^\top \right) (\eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \eta'_{00}/\sqrt{q}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\bar{r}k_1} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\bar{r}k_1} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{2}{\bar{r}k_1} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from (B_2) . Continuing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 & \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta'_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{r_{\min}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + \frac{2}{r_{\min}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta'_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2m}{\bar{r}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + \frac{2m}{\bar{r}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta'_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2. \end{aligned}$$

So we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\eta - \eta'\| \\
& \leq (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + (\eta_0 - \eta'_0)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 + 1 \\
& \leq \frac{2}{\bar{r}k_1} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{2}{\bar{r}k_1} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 + 2\eta_0^2 + 2(\eta'_0)^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{2m}{\bar{r}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + \frac{2m}{\bar{r}} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta'_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 1 \\
& = \mathcal{O}(q) [V(\eta) + V(\eta') + 1].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (5) is satisfied when q is large, and we can take c in (5) to be $c_1 q$, where c_1 is a constant (not depending on q).

Now since $\zeta = \zeta(q) = \Theta(q^{-1})$ and $L = L(q) = \Theta(1)$, it's clear that $q^{\delta/3} > 2L/(1 - \zeta)$ for all large q . Thus, Proposition 7 implies that (A_2) holds with $\xi = q^{\delta/3}$ when q is large. We now show that (A_3) holds when q is large. If $\gamma_0 \leq 1$, then there's nothing to prove, so we assume that $\gamma_0 > 1$. Define

$$\text{LHS} = \frac{\log(2L + 1)}{\log(2L + 1) - \log(\gamma)},$$

and

$$\text{RHS} = \frac{-\log[(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]}{\log(\gamma_0) - \log[(\zeta\xi + 2L + 1)/(\xi + 1)]}.$$

We must show that, for large q , $\text{LHS} < \text{RHS}$. Since $L \geq 0$ and $L = \Theta(1)$, it follows that $\log(2L + 1) \geq 0$ and $\log(2L + 1) = \Theta(1)$. Remark 8 implies that $\log(\gamma) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\text{LHS} \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Next we show that RHS is bounded from below by a positive constant. It's clear from (B_5) that we can assume (without loss of generality) that $\delta < 3$, and it follows that

$$\frac{\zeta\xi + 2L + 1}{\xi + 1} = \frac{\zeta q^{\delta/3} + 2L + 1}{q^{\delta/3} + 1} = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{q^{\delta/3}}\right).$$

Then since $\gamma_0 = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{q})$, we have that, for large q , $\text{RHS} \geq g(q)$, where $g(q) \rightarrow \frac{2\delta}{3+2\delta}$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. We conclude that, for large q , $\text{LHS} < \text{RHS}$, and condition (A_3) is satisfied. According to Theorem 2, we can take the rate to be

$$\rho_a = [\gamma^a (2L + 1)^{1-a}] \vee \left[\gamma_0^a \left(\frac{\zeta\xi + 2L + 1}{\xi + 1} \right)^{1-a} \right]$$

for any $a \in (\text{LHS}, \text{RHS})$. We now demonstrate that there exists an $a \in (\text{LHS}, \text{RHS})$ for which $\rho_a \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Clearly, for any fixed $a \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma^a (2L + 1)^{1-a} \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover,

$$\gamma_0^a \left(\frac{\zeta\xi + 2L + 1}{\xi + 1} \right)^{1-a} = [\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{q})]^a \left[\Theta\left(\frac{1}{q^{\delta/3}}\right) \right]^{1-a} = \mathcal{O}(q^{(\frac{\delta}{3} + \frac{1}{2})a - \frac{\delta}{3}}).$$

Thus, as long as $a < \frac{2\delta}{3+2\delta}$, we have

$$\gamma_0^a \left(\frac{\zeta\xi + 2L + 1}{\xi + 1} \right)^{1-a} \rightarrow 0$$

as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for such a value of a , $\rho_a \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, for q large enough, there exists a constant L_0 such that, for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{(\zeta + 1)V(\eta) + L + 1}{1 - \rho_a} \right) \leq 2(V(\eta) + L_0).$$

This analysis, in conjunction with Theorem 2, shows that there exists a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$, all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, and all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$,

$$d_W(K_\eta^n, \Pi) \leq c_1 q \left(\frac{(\zeta + 1)V(\eta) + L + 1}{1 - \rho} \right) \rho^n \leq 2c_1 q (V(\eta) + L_0) \rho^n,$$

and $\rho = \rho(q) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. □

4 Conversion Condition: Proof of Proposition 5

In this section, we use Theorem 1 to prove Proposition 5, which is restated here for convenience.

Proposition 9. *Under conditions (B_1) and (B_2) , there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$,*

$$d_{TV}(K_\eta^n, \Pi) \leq C \bar{r}^{3/2} q d_W(K_\eta^{n-1}, \Pi)$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$ and all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$.

Proof. According to Theorem 1 it suffices to find a $C > 0$ and a positive integer q_0 such that, for all $q \geq q_0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} |k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) - k(\eta', \tilde{\eta})| d\tilde{\eta} \leq 2C \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|\eta - \eta'\|$$

for all $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$. Fix (η, η') and assume that $\eta \neq \eta'$, otherwise the result is trivial. Recall that in the posterior distribution λ and τ are conditionally independent given (η, Y) . Hence it follows that the density $\pi_2(\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y)$ factors, and we will write $\pi_2(\lambda, \tau | \eta, Y) = \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta, Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y)$. Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \pi_1(\tilde{\eta} | \lambda, \tau, Y) \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta, Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) - \pi_1(\tilde{\eta} | \lambda, \tau, Y) \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y) \right| \\ &= \pi_1(\tilde{\eta} | \lambda, \tau, Y) \left| \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta, Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) - \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y) \right| \\ &= \pi_1(\tilde{\eta} | \lambda, \tau, Y) \left| \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta, Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) - \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) - \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y) \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} |k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) - k(\eta', \tilde{\eta})| d\tilde{\eta} \leq A + B$$

where

$$A = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta, Y) - \pi_{21}(\lambda | \eta', Y)| d\lambda,$$

and

$$B = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y) - \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y)| d\tau.$$

We begin with the second term, B . Recall that $\tau | \eta, Y \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ where $\alpha = N/2 + a_2$ and $\beta = b_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} l_{ij}^2$, where

$$l_{ij} = y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta_i.$$

So, $\tau | \eta', Y \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta')$ where $\beta' = b_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (l'_{ij})^2$, where

$$l'_{ij} = y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\beta' > \beta$. It's easy to show that there is a (unique) number $u \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\pi_{22}(u | \eta', Y) = \pi_{22}(u | \eta, Y)$, and that $\pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y) \geq \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y)$ for $\tau \in (0, u]$.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} B &= 2 \int_0^u [\pi_{22}(\tau | \eta', Y) - \pi_{22}(\tau | \eta, Y)] d\tau \\ &= 2 \int_0^u \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \tau^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta\tau) \left[\left(\frac{\beta'}{\beta} \right)^\alpha \exp((\beta - \beta')\tau) - 1 \right] d\tau \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^u \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \tau^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta\tau) \left[\left(\frac{\beta'}{\beta} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right] d\tau \\ &\leq 2 \left[\left(\frac{\beta'}{\beta} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right] \\ &= 2 \left[\left(\frac{\beta + \Delta}{\beta} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta = \beta' - \beta$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\Delta &= 2(\beta' - \beta) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} ((l'_{ij})^2 - l_{ij}^2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left[\left(y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right)^2 - \left(y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta_i \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left[\left(x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \eta_i - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right)^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \left(y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta_i \right) \left(x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \eta_i - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left(x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \eta_i - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right)^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} l_{ij}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left(x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \eta_i - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right)^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is Cauchy-Schwarz. Now, $\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} l_{ij}^2 \leq 2\beta$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left(x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \eta_i - x_{ij}^\top \eta'_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \eta'_i \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left[\frac{2}{q} (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top x_{ij} x_{ij}^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + 2(\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{2}{q} (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij} x_{ij}^\top) (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 \\
&= \frac{2}{q} (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top X^\top X (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2Nk_2}{q} (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + 2r_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 \\
&\leq 2\bar{r}k_2 (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00})^\top (\eta_{00} - \eta'_{00}) + 2m\bar{r} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta'_i)^2 \\
&\leq 2c_2\bar{r} \|\eta - \eta'\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from assumption (B_2) , and $c_2 := k_2 \vee m$. Thus,

$$\Delta \leq c_2\bar{r} \|\eta - \eta'\|^2 + 2\sqrt{c_2\bar{r}\beta} \|\eta - \eta'\|,$$

and it follows that

$$B \leq 2 \left[\left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}} \|\eta - \eta'\| + \frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2} \|\eta - \eta'\|^2 \right)^\alpha - 1 \right].$$

So if we define $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$f(x) = \left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}}x + \frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}x^2\right)^\alpha - 1,$$

then $B \leq 2f(\|\eta - \eta'\|)$. Note that $f(0) = 0$, and

$$f'(x) = \alpha \left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}}x + \frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}x^2\right)^{\alpha-1} \left[2\sqrt{\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}} + 2\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}x\right]$$

is increasing on $(0, \infty)$. Now assume that $\|\eta - \eta'\| < \bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}$. Then by the mean-value theorem, we have

$$B \leq 2f'(\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1})\|\eta - \eta'\| = 2\left\{\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}f'(\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1})\right\}\bar{r}^{3/2}q\|\eta - \eta'\|. \quad (8)$$

We now examine the behavior of the term in curly brackets as q gets large. It can be shown using L'Hôpital's rule that, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} (1 + ax + o(x))^{1/x} = e^a,$$

where $o(x)$ represents any function $h(x)$ such that $h(x)/x \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$. Using $x = 2/(\bar{r}q)$ and $a = \sqrt{c_2/b_2}$, we have,

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}}\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} + \frac{c_2}{b_2\bar{r}^2q^2}\right)^{\bar{r}q/2+a_2-1} = \exp\left\{\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}}\right\}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}f'(\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}) \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}(\bar{r}q/2 + a_2) \left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}}\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} + \frac{c_2}{b_2\bar{r}^2q^2}\right)^{\bar{r}q/2+a_2-1} \left[2\sqrt{\frac{c_2\bar{r}}{b_2}} + \frac{2c_2}{b_2\sqrt{\bar{r}q}}\right] \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{a_2}{\bar{r}q}\right) \left(1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}}\frac{1}{\bar{r}q} + \frac{c_2}{b_2\bar{r}^2q^2}\right)^{\bar{r}q/2+a_2-1} \left[2\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}} + \frac{2c_2}{b_2\bar{r}q}\right] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}} \exp\left\{\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{b_2}}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists $c_3 < \infty$ such that

$$\max_{q > 2} 2\left\{\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}f'(\bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1})\right\} = c_3.$$

It now follows from (8) that

$$B \leq c_3\bar{r}^{3/2}q\|\eta - \eta'\|$$

whenever $\|\eta - \eta'\| < \bar{r}^{-3/2}q^{-1}$.

A slightly simpler version of this same argument shows that there exists a $c_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that $A \leq c_1 q \|\eta - \eta'\|$ whenever $\|\eta - \eta'\| \leq 1/q$. Putting all of this together shows that, for all $q > 2$ and all pairs (η, η') such that $\|\eta - \eta'\| < \bar{r}^{-3/2} q^{-1}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} |k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) - k(\eta', \tilde{\eta})| d\tilde{\eta} \leq A + B \leq c_1 q \|\eta - \eta'\| + c_3 \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|\eta - \eta'\| \leq (c_1 + c_3) \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|\eta - \eta'\| .$$

Now all that remains is to extend this so it holds for all pairs (η, η') . For an arbitrary pair (η, η') , let $v = (\eta' - \eta)/m^*$ where the integer m^* is chosen such that

$$\|v\| = \left\| \frac{1}{m^*} (\eta' - \eta) \right\| = \frac{1}{m^*} \|\eta' - \eta\| < \bar{r}^{-3/2} q^{-1} .$$

For $j = 0, 1, \dots, m^*$, let $\xi_j = \eta + jv$. Then $\xi_0 = \eta$, $\xi_{m^*} = \eta'$, and $\|\xi_{j+1} - \xi_j\| = \|v\| < \bar{r}^{-3/2} q^{-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} |k(\eta, \tilde{\eta}) - k(\eta', \tilde{\eta})| d\tilde{\eta} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m^*-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} |k(\xi_{j+1}, \tilde{\eta}) - k(\xi_j, \tilde{\eta})| d\tilde{\eta} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m^*-1} (c_1 + c_3) \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|\xi_{j+1} - \xi_j\| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{m^*-1} (c_1 + c_3) \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|v\| \\ &= (c_1 + c_3) \bar{r}^{3/2} q \|\eta - \eta'\| . \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Drift Condition: Proof of Proposition 6

We begin by stating three results, all proven in Appendix B, that will be used to establish the drift and contraction conditions. The first lists a few simple facts about X & Y , the second is a simple matrix result that we could not find stated elsewhere, and the third provides an upper bound on the largest eigenvalue of the square of the derivative of the square root of a matrix.

Lemma 10. *The data, X and Y , satisfy the following:*

- (i) $\bar{X}^\top \bar{X} \preceq X^\top X$
- (ii) $\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \preceq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} \bar{X}^\top \bar{X} \preceq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} X^\top X$
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} Y^\top Y$

$$(iv) \quad \bar{y}^2 \leq \frac{1}{qr_{\min}} Y^\top Y$$

Remark 11. Under (B_1) - (B_3) , the results in Lemma 10 imply that $\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \preceq m q k_2 I$, $\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 = \mathcal{O}(q)$, and $\bar{y}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Lemma 12. If C, D are conformable matrices, then

$$(C + D)^\top (C + D) \preceq 2(C^\top C + D^\top D).$$

Lemma 13. Let $A = A(x)$ be a positive definite matrix that depends on a scalar, x . If $A^{1/2} = A^{1/2}(x)$ is the unique positive definite square root of A , then

$$\lambda_{\max} \left\{ \left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx} \right)^2 \right\} \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max} \left\{ \left(\frac{dA}{dx} \right)^2 \right\}}{4\lambda_{\min}(A)}.$$

We now restate Proposition 6 for convenience.

Proposition 14. Under assumptions (B_1) - (B_5) , there exist $\zeta = \zeta(q) = \mathcal{O}(q^{-1})$, $L = L(q) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and a positive integer q_0 such that for all $q \geq q_0$ and all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta}) K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) \leq \zeta V(\eta) + L.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & V(\tilde{\eta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{q} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\tilde{\eta}_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \bar{y}^2 + \frac{2}{qN} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} x_{ij} x_{ij}^\top \right) \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{q} + \frac{r_{\max}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q (\tilde{\eta}_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\ &\leq 2\bar{y}^2 + \frac{2}{qN} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top (X^\top X) \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{q} + \frac{m}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q (\tilde{\eta}_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where, in the last line, we used the fact that $r_{\max}/\bar{r} \leq m$. We now examine the last term in (9).

Using the definition of $\tilde{\eta}_i$ from the random mapping, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^q (\tilde{\eta}_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{\lambda}{t_i} \tilde{\eta}_0 / \sqrt{q} + \frac{r_i \tau}{t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} / \sqrt{q}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_i}} N_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{\lambda}{t_i} \tilde{\eta}_0 / \sqrt{q} - \frac{r_i \tau}{t_i} \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} / \sqrt{q} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_i}} N_i + \bar{y} - \frac{\lambda}{t_i} \bar{y}_i \right)^2 \\
&\leq 5\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \frac{5}{q} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \right) \tilde{\eta}_{00} + 5 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{t_i} N_i^2 + 5q\bar{y}^2 + 5 \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 \\
&\leq 5\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + 5mk_2 \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} + 5 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{r_i \tau} N_i^2 + \mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}(q) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1)\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(1)\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right) \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q N_i^2 + \mathcal{O}(q),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Remark 11. Hence, by (B_2) and Remark 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\tilde{\eta}) &\leq 2\bar{y}^2 + \frac{2}{qN} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top (X^\top X) \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_0^2}{q} + \frac{m}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q (\tilde{\eta}_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \frac{m}{q} \left(\mathcal{O}(1)\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(1)\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right) \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q N_i^2 + \mathcal{O}(q) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \mathcal{O}((q\bar{r})^{-1}) \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q N_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $A = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} | \eta)$ and $B = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_0^2 | \eta)$, where the expectation is, of course, with respect to the Mtk $K(\eta, \cdot)$. It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta}) K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) = \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) A + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) B + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right) \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right). \quad (10)$$

To bound A , recall that $\eta_{00} | \lambda, \tau, Y \sim \mathbb{N}_p(v, \frac{q}{\tau} Q)$, where $Q = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1}$ and $v = \sqrt{q} Q (X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{Y})$. Let $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ denote the trace of the (square matrix) argument. We have

$$A = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} | \eta) = \mathbb{E}\left[v^\top v + \text{tr}\left(\frac{q}{\tau} Q\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}(v^\top v) + \text{tr}\left[\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{q}{\tau} Q\right)\right]. \quad (11)$$

In order to handle the trace term in (11), we need to look carefully at Q . First,

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= D_c + \frac{(I - D_c) 1 1^\top (I - D_c)}{1^\top (I - D_c) 1} \\
&= D_c + (I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{(I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}} 1 1^\top (I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1^\top (I - D_c) 1} \right) (I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\preceq D_c + (I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1^\top (I - D_c) 1}{1^\top (I - D_c) 1} I \right) (I - D_c)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= D_c + (I - D_c) \\
&= I,
\end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the ‘‘inequality’’ is due to the fact that, for any vector u , $uu^\top \preceq u^\top u I$. It now follows from (B_2) that

$$Q = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1} \preceq (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top \bar{X})^{-1} \preceq [(q\bar{r}k_1)I]^{-1} = \frac{1}{q\bar{r}k_1} I. \quad (13)$$

Therefore,

$$\text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{q}{\tau} Q \right) \right] \leq \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{q}{\tau} \frac{1}{q\bar{r}k_1} I \right) \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \right). \quad (14)$$

We now go to work on the penultimate term in (11). As in Appendix B, let $R = \bigoplus_{i=1}^q r_i^{-1} J_{r_i}$. It’s clear that $RX = \bar{X}$ and $RY = \bar{Y}$, and that R is idempotent. Hence, $R\bar{X} = R^2X = RX = \bar{X}$.

Moreover, R and D_c commute, which implies that R and M also commute. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \sqrt{q}Q(X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{Y}) = \sqrt{q}Q(X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M R Y) = \sqrt{q}Q(X^\top - \bar{X}^\top M R) Y \\ &= \sqrt{q}Q(X - M\bar{X})^\top Y. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q^2 \preceq \lambda_{\max}^2(Q)I \preceq (q\bar{r}k_1)^{-2}I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top v &= qY^\top (X - M\bar{X})Q^2 (X - M\bar{X})^\top Y \\ &\leq \frac{q}{(q\bar{r}k_1)^2} Y^\top (X - M\bar{X})(X - M\bar{X})^\top Y \\ &\leq \frac{2q}{(q\bar{r}k_1)^2} Y^\top (XX^\top + M\bar{X}\bar{X}^\top M) Y \\ &\leq \frac{2q^2\bar{r}k_2}{(q\bar{r}k_1)^2} Y^\top (I + M^2) Y \\ &\leq \frac{4k_2}{\bar{r}k_1^2} Y^\top Y \\ &\leq \frac{4k_2}{\bar{r}k_1^2} (q\bar{r}\ell) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 12, the third inequality follows from (B_2) and Lemma 10, the fourth inequality holds because $M \preceq I$, and the fifth inequality follows from (B_3) . Combining (14) and (15), we have

$$A = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \right) + \mathcal{O}(q). \quad (16)$$

We now move onto B . Recall that

$$\tilde{\eta}_0 = \sqrt{q} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}} N_0.$$

Define $t_{\min} = \lambda + r_{\min}\tau$ and $z_{\min} = t_{\min}/(r_{\min}\lambda\tau)$, and define t_{\max} and z_{\max} analogously. It’s important to note that while t_{\min} is, in fact, the smallest t_i , z_{\min} is actually the largest z_i , but we

find this notation convenient. We have $1 \leq z_{\min}/z_{\max} \leq m$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\eta}_0^2|\eta) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(\sqrt{q}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})/z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}}N_0\right)^2 \\
&= q\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})/z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}\right)^2 + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}\right) \\
&\leq q\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2/z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}\right) \\
&\leq q\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2/z_{\max}}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_{\min}}\right) + \mathbb{E}(z_{\min}) \\
&\leq m\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2\right) + \mathbb{E}(z_{\min}) \\
&\leq 2m\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 + \frac{2m}{q}\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\eta}_{00}^\top\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top\right)\tilde{\eta}_{00}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{t_{\min}}{r_{\min}\lambda\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}(1)A + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right), \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the fact that N_0 has mean 0 and is independent of all of the other random vectors in the random mapping, the first inequality is Jensen's, and the last line follows from Remark 11. Combining (10), (16), and (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta})K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)A + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)B + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)A + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\left[\mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}(1)A + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right)\right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)A + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\left[\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) + \mathcal{O}(q)\right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right), \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (B_4) . Now using the definition of λ from the random mapping, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) &= \frac{2b_1 + \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta_0/\sqrt{q})^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} \\
&\leq \frac{2b_1 + 3\sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 3\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 + \frac{3}{q}\sum_{i=1}^q \eta_0^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} \\
&\leq \frac{2b_1 + 6q\bar{y}^2 + 6\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} + \frac{3\sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 3\eta_0^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} \\
&\leq \frac{2b_1 + 6q\bar{y}^2 + 6\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} + \frac{3\sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 3r_{\min}\eta_0^2}{r_{\min}(q + 2a_1 - 2)} \\
&\leq \frac{2b_1 + 6q\bar{y}^2 + 6\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2}{q + 2a_1 - 2} + \frac{3q\bar{r}V(\eta)}{r_{\min}(q + 2a_1 - 2)} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)V(\eta) .
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) = \frac{2b_2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \eta_i)^2}{N + 2a_2 - 2} .$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \eta_i)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} [(\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i) + (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \bar{y}) + (\bar{y}_i - y_{ij})]^2 \\
&\leq 3\sum_{i=1}^q r_i (\eta_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 3\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \bar{y})^2 + 3\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2 \\
&\leq 3q\bar{r}V(\eta) + 3\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) &\leq \frac{2b_2 + 3q\bar{r}V(\eta) + 3\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_i)^2}{N + 2a_2 - 2} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)V(\eta) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the last line follows from (B_3) and Remark 11. Combining (18), (19), and (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta})K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) &= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\left[\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right)\right] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\left[\mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1)V(\eta)\right] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)V(\eta) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (B_5) . Hence, there exist $\zeta = \zeta(q) = \mathcal{O}(q^{-1})$ and a constant L such that that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}} V(\tilde{\eta})K(\eta, d\tilde{\eta}) \leq \zeta V(\eta) + L,$$

and this completes the proof. \square

6 Contraction Condition: Proof of Proposition 7

We restate Proposition 7 for convenience.

Proposition 15. *Assume that (B_1) - (B_5) hold, and define*

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(\eta, \eta') \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} : V(\eta) + V(\eta') \leq q^{\delta/3}\},$$

where $V(\cdot)$ is the drift function defined in (6), and δ is given in (B_5) . Let f be the random mapping defined in Section 3. There exist

$$\gamma = \gamma(q) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}}} \vee \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_0 = \gamma_0(q) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{q})$$

and a positive integer q_0 such that for all $q \geq q_0$, we have

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s(\eta' - \eta))}{ds} \right\| \leq \begin{cases} \gamma \|\eta' - \eta\| & (\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C} \\ \gamma_0 \|\eta' - \eta\| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We will shorten $(\eta + s(\eta' - \eta))$ to $(\eta + s\alpha)$ where $\alpha = (\eta' - \eta) = (\alpha_{00}^\top, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1}$.

Now

$$f(\eta + s\alpha) = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta+s\alpha)} \\ \tilde{\eta}_0^{(\eta+s\alpha)} \\ \tilde{\eta}_1^{(\eta+s\alpha)} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\eta}_q^{(\eta+s\alpha)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds} \right\| \right\}^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The next part of the proof is an extremely long and tedious development of upper bounds for the three terms on the right-hand side of (21). We relegate these calculations to Appendix C, and

simply state the resulting bound here, but we must first introduce a bit of notation. (In order to simplify notation, we will sometimes omit the superscript $\eta + s\alpha$, which should not cause any confusion.) Define $\phi = \lambda/(\bar{r}\tau)$ and

$$\Phi = \left(\frac{\lambda^3}{\bar{r}^2\tau^2J_1} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\bar{r}\tau J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 = \left(\frac{\phi^2\lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\phi\lambda}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 .$$

Let $e_i = t_i/(r_i\tau)$, and define $e_{\min} = t_{\min}/(r_{\min}\tau)$ and $e_{\max} = t_{\max}/(r_{\max}\tau)$. So e_{\min} and e_{\max} are actually the largest and smallest e_i , respectively. Finally, define

$$U_1 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2}\right), \quad U_2 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4}\right), \quad U_3 = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\phi \wedge 1\right)\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right] \|\alpha\|^2,$$

and

$$U_4 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3}\right).$$

Here is the key bound, which is derived in Appendix C:

$$\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds} \right\| \right\}^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2. \quad (22)$$

The next step is to develop upper bounds on U_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in two different cases: $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$ and $(\eta, \eta') \notin \mathcal{C}$. Define $g : \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as follows

$$g(w) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} [y_{ij} - x_{ij}^\top w_{00}/\sqrt{q} - w_i]^2,$$

where $w \in \mathbb{R}^{q+p+1}$, w_{00} denotes the first p elements of w , and for $i = 0, 1, \dots, q$, w_i denotes the $(p+1+i)$ th element. Recall that our drift function $V : \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is given by

$$V(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y} - x_{ij}^\top w_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{w_0^2}{q} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (w_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2.$$

We now show that g can be bounded by a linear function of V . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} g(w) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left[(w_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i) + (x_{ij}^\top w_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \bar{y}) + (\bar{y}_i - y_{ij}) \right]^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left[(w_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i) + (x_{ij}^\top w_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \bar{y}) \right]^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\bar{y}_i - y_{ij})^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^q r_i (w_i + \bar{y} - \bar{y}_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top w_{00}/\sqrt{q} - \bar{y})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} y_{ij}^2 \\ &\leq 2NV(w) + N\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from the random mapping that

$$\tau = \tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)} = \frac{J_2}{b_2 + g(\eta + s\alpha)},$$

where $J_2 \sim \text{Gamma}(N/2 + a_2, 1)$. Also recall that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(\eta, \eta') \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{p+q+1} : V(\eta) + V(\eta') \leq q^{\delta/3}\}.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that V is a convex function.

Now if $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$, then $V(\eta) \leq q^{\delta/3}$ and $V(\eta') \leq q^{\delta/3}$, and convexity implies that $V(\eta + s(\eta' - \eta)) \leq q^{\delta/3}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Consequently, whenever $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$g(\eta + s\alpha) \leq 2NV(\eta + s\alpha) + N\ell \leq 2\bar{r}q^{1+\delta/3} + \bar{r}q\ell = \mathcal{O}(\bar{r}q^{1+\delta/3}).$$

Note that this bound is free of η , η' and s . Clearly, $\lambda = \lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)} \leq J_1/b_1$. Hence, for $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\phi = \frac{\lambda}{\bar{r}\tau} \leq \frac{J_1 [b_2 + g(\eta + s\alpha)]}{b_1 \bar{r}J_2} = \frac{J_1 \mathcal{O}(\bar{r}q^{1+\delta/3})}{b_1 \bar{r}J_2} = \mathcal{O}(q^{1+\delta/3}) \frac{J_1}{J_2},$$

and

$$\Phi = \left(\frac{\phi^2 \lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\phi \lambda}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O}(q^{1+\delta/3}) \frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \|\alpha\|^2 = \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \|\alpha\|^2.$$

Continuing under the assumption that $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2} \right) \leq \mathbb{E}(\Phi) = \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^2}{\bar{r}^2 q^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} U_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau} \right) = \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{\tau} \frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{b_2 + g(\eta + s\alpha)}{J_2} \frac{J_1^2}{J_2^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathcal{O}(\bar{r}q^{1+\delta/3}) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{J_1^2}{J_2^3} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\bar{r}q^{3+\delta}) \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^2}{\bar{r}^3 q^3} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
U_3 &= \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi \wedge 1) \frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\phi}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{O}(q^{1+\delta/3}) \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q^{1+\delta/3}) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{\delta/3}}{\bar{r}} \right) \|\alpha\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
U_4 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\lambda} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\phi^2}{J_1} + \frac{\phi}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \frac{J_1}{J_2^2} + \mathcal{O}(q^{1+\delta/3}) \frac{J_1}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q^{2+2\delta/3}) \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q}{\bar{r}^2 q^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{1+2\delta/3}}{\bar{r}^2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (22) and (B_5) , when $(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds} \right\| \right\}^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \left[\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{3+\delta}}{\bar{r}^2} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{3+\delta}}{\bar{r}^3} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{2+\delta/3}}{\bar{r}} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{1+2\delta/3}}{\bar{r}^2} \right) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}} \vee \frac{1}{q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Our final major task is to develop bounds for U_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in the case where $(\eta, \eta') \notin \mathcal{C}$. First,

$$e_{\max} = 1 + \frac{\lambda}{r_{\max}\tau} \geq 1 + \frac{\lambda}{m\bar{r}\tau} \geq \frac{1+\phi}{m},$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
U_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{m^2}{(1+\phi)^2} \left(\frac{\phi^2\lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\phi\lambda}{J_2} \right) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \leq m^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\lambda}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq m^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{b_1} + \frac{J_1}{b_1 J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= m^2 \mathcal{O}(1) \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) \|\alpha\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\frac{1}{\bar{r}\tau e_{\max}} = \frac{1}{\bar{r}\tau} \frac{r_{\max}\tau}{t_{\max}} \leq \frac{m}{t_{\max}},$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
U_2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4}\right) = \bar{r}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{\bar{r}\tau e_{\max}^4}\right) \leq \bar{r}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{m}{t_{\max}}\left(\frac{m}{1+\phi}\right)^3\left(\frac{\phi^2\lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\phi\lambda}{J_2}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \bar{r}m^4\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \bar{r}\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\bar{r}}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$U_3 = \mathbb{E}\left[(\phi \wedge 1)\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2.$$

Finally,

$$U_4 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{m}{1+\phi}\right)^3\left(\frac{\phi^2\lambda}{J_1} + \frac{\phi\lambda}{J_2}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \leq m^3\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2.$$

Thus, it follows from (22), (B₄), and (B₅) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{\mathbb{E}\left\|\frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds}\right\|\right\}^2 &= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \left[\mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q)\|\alpha\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Combining (23) and (24), we have

$$\left\{\mathbb{E}\left\|\frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds}\right\|\right\}^2 = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q^{2+\delta}}{\bar{r}} \vee \frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 & \text{if } (\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{C} \\ \mathcal{O}(q)\|\alpha\|^2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the right-hand side does not depend on s , the proposition follows. \square

Appendix

A Derivations of Conditional Distributions

Here we derive the distributions of $\eta_{00} \mid \lambda, \tau, Y$ and $\eta_0 \mid \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y$. Recall that $t_i = \lambda + r_i \tau$. First, the conditional density of (η_{00}, η_0) given (λ, τ, Y) is proportional to the following expression (where the constant of proportionality can depend on λ, τ and Y),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^q} \pi(\eta \mid \lambda, \tau, Y) d\eta_1 \cdots d\eta_q \\
& \propto \int_{\mathbb{R}^q} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i - \eta_0 / \sqrt{q})^2 - \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\eta_i + x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 \right\} d\eta_1 \cdots d\eta_q \\
& = \prod_{i=1}^q \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} (\eta_i - \eta_0 / \sqrt{q})^2 - \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (\eta_i + x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 \right\} d\eta_i \\
& = \prod_{i=1}^q \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} - \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 \right\} \\
& \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{t_i}{2} \left[\eta_i - \frac{\lambda \eta_0 / \sqrt{q} + r_i \tau (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})}{t_i} \right]^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{t_i}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda \eta_0 / \sqrt{q} + r_i \tau (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})}{t_i} \right)^2 \right\} d\eta_i \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \propto \prod_{i=1}^q \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} - \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 \right\} \\
& \quad \times \exp \left\{ \frac{t_i}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda \eta_0 / \sqrt{q} + r_i \tau (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})}{t_i} \right)^2 \right\} \\
& = \prod_{i=1}^q \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} + \frac{\lambda^2}{2t_i} \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} + \frac{r_i \lambda \tau}{\sqrt{q} t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) \eta_0 \right\} \\
& \quad \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 + \frac{(r_i \tau)^2}{2t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 \right\}. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the conditional density of η_i given $(\eta_0, \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y)$ can be gleaned from (25). Now recall that $z_i = t_i / (r_i \lambda \tau)$. It follows from (26) that the conditional density of η_0 given $(\eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y)$ is

proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{i=1}^q \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{t_i}\right) \frac{\eta_0^2}{q} + \frac{r_i \lambda \tau}{\sqrt{q} t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) \eta_0 \right\} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^q \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2qz_i} \eta_0^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{q} z_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) \eta_0 \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ -\eta_0^2 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{2qz_i} + \eta_0 \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{\sqrt{q} z_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\eta_0 \mid \eta_{00}, \lambda, \tau, Y \sim N \left(\frac{\sqrt{q} \sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}, \frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right).$$

The conditional density of η_{00} given (λ, τ, Y) is proportional to the integral of (26) with respect to η_0 , which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i \right)^2 \right\} \\
& \quad \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (x_{ij}^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - y_{ij})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{(r_i \tau)^2}{2t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{\lambda}{t_i} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{\lambda (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})}{t_i} \right)^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\tau}{2} (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y)^\top (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y) + \frac{\tau}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{r_i \tau}{t_i} (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q})^2 \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2} \left(\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) \mathbf{1} \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) (\bar{Y} - \bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q}) \right)^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\tau}{2} (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y)^\top (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y) + \frac{\tau}{2} (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y})^\top D_c (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y}) \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2} (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y})^\top \left(\frac{(I - D_c) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c)}{\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) \mathbf{1}} \right) (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\tau}{2} (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y)^\top (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y) + \frac{\tau}{2} (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y})^\top D_c (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y}) \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2} (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y})^\top \left(D_c + \frac{(I - D_c) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c)}{\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) \mathbf{1}} \right) (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\tau}{2} (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y)^\top (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y) \right\}. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Now recall that

$$M = D_c + \frac{(I - D_c) \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c)}{\mathbf{1}^\top (I - D_c) \mathbf{1}},$$

so we can rewrite (27) as

$$\exp \left\{ \frac{\tau}{2} (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y})^\top M (\bar{X} \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - \bar{Y}) - \frac{\tau}{2} (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y)^\top (X \eta_{00} / \sqrt{q} - Y) \right\}.$$

A simple complete the square argument shows that

$$\eta_{00} \mid \lambda, \tau, Y \sim N_p\left(v, \frac{q}{\tau} Q\right).$$

where $Q = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1}$ and $v = \sqrt{q} Q (X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{Y})$.

B Proofs of Supporting Lemmas

Proof of Lemma 10. Part (i): Let

$$R = \bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{r_i} J_{r_i},$$

where, as usual, J_{r_i} denotes an $r_i \times r_i$ matrix of 1s. Note that R is symmetric and idempotent. It's easy to see that $\bar{X} = RX$ and $\bar{Y} = RY$. Now

$$X^\top X = X^\top (R + I - R)X = X^\top R^2 X + X^\top (I - R)^2 X \succcurlyeq (RX)^\top (RX) = \bar{X}^\top \bar{X}.$$

Part (ii): By part (i),

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \preccurlyeq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top = \frac{1}{r_{\min}} \bar{X}^\top \bar{X} \preccurlyeq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} X^\top X.$$

Part (iii): We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \bar{y}_i^2 = \frac{1}{r_{\min}} \bar{Y}^\top \bar{Y} \leq \frac{1}{r_{\min}} Y^\top Y.$$

Part (iv): Define

$$a^\top = \left(\frac{1}{qr_1} \mathbf{1}_{r_1}^\top, \dots, \frac{1}{qr_q} \mathbf{1}_{r_q}^\top \right),$$

and note that $\bar{y} = a^\top Y$. Now

$$a^\top a = \sum_{i=1}^q r_i \left(\frac{1}{qr_i} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{q^2 r_{\min}} = \frac{1}{qr_{\min}}.$$

Hence,

$$\bar{y}^2 = (a^\top Y)^2 \leq (a^\top a) (Y^\top Y) \leq \frac{Y^\top Y}{qr_{\min}}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 12. For any vector x ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^\top C^\top D x &= x^\top D^\top C x = (Cx)^\top D x \\ &\leq \sqrt{(Cx)^\top C x} \sqrt{(Dx)^\top D x} \\ &= \sqrt{x^\top C^\top C x} \sqrt{x^\top D^\top D x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (x^\top C^\top C x + x^\top D^\top D x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any x ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^\top(C + D)^\top(C + D)x &= x^\top C^\top Cx + x^\top D^\top Dx + x^\top C^\top Dx + x^\top D^\top Cx \\ &\leq 2(x^\top C^\top Cx + x^\top D^\top Dx) \\ &= x^\top 2(C^\top C + D^\top D)x. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 13. We use contradiction. Suppose that there exists an x such that

$$\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\right)^2\right\} > \frac{\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dA}{dx}\right)^2\right\}}{4\lambda_{\min}(A)}.$$

Then either

$$\text{case (1): } \lambda_{\max}\left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\right) > \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(A)}}\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dA}{dx}\right)^2\right\}}, \text{ or}$$

$$\text{case (2): } \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\right) < -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(A)}}\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dA}{dx}\right)^2\right\}}.$$

Suppose that case (1) holds. Then there exists x_0 such that

$$\lambda_{\max}\left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}\right) > \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(A)|_{x=x_0}}}\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dA}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}\right)^2\right\}}.$$

Let $A_0 = A(x_0)$,

$$D_0 = \frac{dA}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0} \quad \text{and} \quad R_0 = \frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}.$$

Let $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\max}(R_0)$, and let ξ_0 denote the corresponding (normalized) eigenvector. Then

$$2\lambda_0\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(A_0)} > \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(D_0^2)}.$$

Now since $A_0^{1/2}$ and R_0 are both symmetric, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0^\top D_0 \xi_0 &= \xi_0^\top \left(\frac{dA}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}\right) \xi_0 \\ &= \xi_0^\top \left\{ \left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}\right) A_0^{1/2} + A_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{dA^{1/2}}{dx}\Big|_{x=x_0}\right) \right\} \xi_0 \\ &= \xi_0^\top \{ R_0 A_0^{1/2} + A_0^{1/2} R_0 \} \xi_0 \\ &= 2\xi_0^\top R_0 A_0^{1/2} \xi_0 \\ &= 2\lambda_0 \xi_0^\top A_0^{1/2} \xi_0 \\ &\geq 2\lambda_0 \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(A_0)} \xi_0^\top \xi_0 \\ &> \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(D_0^2)} \\ &\geq \lambda_{\max}(D_0), \end{aligned}$$

but this is a contradiction. An analogous argument shows that case (2) also leads to a contradiction. \square

C Development of the Upper Bound (22)

In this Appendix, we develop upper bounds for each of the three terms on the right-hand side of (21), which together yield (22). Of course, the components of $f(\eta + s\alpha)$ depend on $\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}$ and $\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)}$, so we begin with these. According to the random mapping, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)} &= \frac{J_1}{b_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})^2} \\ \tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)} &= \frac{J_2}{b_2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} [y_{ij} - x_{ij}^{\mathbb{I}}(\eta_{00} + s\alpha_{00})/\sqrt{q} - (\eta_i + s\alpha_i)]^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We will require upper bounds on $(\frac{d\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds})^2$ and $(\frac{d\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds})^2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} &= \frac{-J_1 \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})(\alpha_i - \alpha_0/\sqrt{q})}{[b_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})^2]^2} \\ &= \frac{-(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^2}{J_1} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})(\alpha_i - \alpha_0/\sqrt{q}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned}& \left(\frac{d\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^4}{J_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})^2 \sum_{i=1}^q (\alpha_i - \alpha_0/\sqrt{q})^2 \\ & \leq \frac{4(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^4}{J_1^2} \left[b_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\eta_i + s\alpha_i - (\eta_0 + s\alpha_0)/\sqrt{q})^2 \right] \sum_{i=1}^q (\alpha_i^2 + \alpha_0^2/q) \\ & \leq \frac{4(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^4}{J_1^2} \frac{J_1}{\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}} \|\alpha\|^2 \\ & = \frac{4(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_1} \|\alpha\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

A similar argument yields

$$\left(\frac{d\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds} \right)^2 \leq \frac{4(\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \alpha_i^2 + \frac{1}{q} \alpha_{00}^{\mathbb{I}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} x_{ij} x_{ij}^{\mathbb{I}} \right) \alpha_{00} \right\}.$$

Using conditions (B_1) , (B_2) and Remark 11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{d\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds}\right)^2 &\leq \frac{4(\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_2} \left\{ r_{\max} \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i^2 + \frac{\bar{r}qk_2}{q} \alpha_{00}^\top \alpha_{00} \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{4(\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_2} \left\{ m\bar{r} \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i^2 + \bar{r}k_2 \alpha_{00}^\top \alpha_{00} \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{4\bar{r}(m+k_2)(\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_2} \|\alpha\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

It now follows from (28) and (29) that there exists a positive constant ℓ_1 such that

$$\left(\frac{d\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\ell_1(\lambda^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_1} \|\alpha\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{d\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)}}{ds}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\ell_1\bar{r}(\tau^{(\eta+s\alpha)})^3}{J_2} \|\alpha\|^2. \tag{30}$$

In order to simplify notation, we omit the superscript $\eta + s\alpha$ in the remainder of the proof. This should not cause any confusion. We now develop an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\|\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\|^2$. Recall that $\tilde{\eta}_{00} = v + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}Q^{1/2}N_{00}$, where $Q = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M\bar{X})^{-1}$ and $v = \sqrt{q}Q(X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M\bar{Y})$. Since $RX = \bar{X}$, $RY = \bar{Y}$, $R^2 = R$, and R and M commute, we have

$$\tilde{\eta}_{00} = \sqrt{q}Q(X^\top Y - \bar{X}^\top M\bar{Y}) + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}Q^{1/2}N_{00} = \sqrt{q}QX^\top(I - MR)Y + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}Q^{1/2}N_{00}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} &= \sqrt{q}\frac{d}{ds}\left(QX^\top(I - MR)Y + \frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}Q^{1/2}N_{00}\right) \\
&= \sqrt{q}\left[\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)X^\top(I - MR)Y - QX^\top\left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right)RY - \frac{1}{2\tau^{3/2}}\left(\frac{d\tau}{ds}\right)Q^{1/2}N_{00} + \frac{1}{\tau^{1/2}}\left(\frac{dQ^{1/2}}{ds}\right)N_{00}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right\|^2 &\leq 4q\left\|\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)X^\top(I - MR)Y\right\|^2 + 4q\left\|QX^\top\left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right)RY\right\|^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{q(\tau')^2}{\tau^3}\left\|Q^{1/2}N_{00}\right\|^2 + \frac{4q}{\tau}\left\|\left(\frac{dQ^{1/2}}{ds}\right)N_{00}\right\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau' = \frac{d\tau}{ds}$. Now define

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{q(\tau')^2}{\tau^3}\left\|Q^{1/2}N_{00}\right\|^2\right\}, \\
T_1 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{q}{\tau}\left\|\left(\frac{dQ^{1/2}}{ds}\right)N_{00}\right\|^2\right\}, \\
T_2 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{q\left\|\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)X^\top(I - MR)Y\right\|^2\right\}, \\
T_3 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{q\left\|QX^\top\left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right)RY\right\|^2\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2 \leq T_0 + 4T_1 + 4T_2 + 4T_3. \quad (31)$$

Using (30) and (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_0 &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{q(\tau')^2}{\tau^3} \left\| Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right\|^2 \right\} \leq \ell_1 \bar{r} q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{J_2} \right) \mathbb{E} (N_{00}^\top Q N_{00}) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\ell_1}{k_1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{J_2} \right) \mathbb{E} (N_{00}^\top N_{00}) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \frac{2\ell_1 p}{k_1(N + 2a_2 - 2)} \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We now develop some bounds that will allow us to handle T_1 , T_2 & T_3 . Recall that $e_i = c_i^{-1} = t_i/(r_i\tau)$, and that $e_{\min} = t_{\min}/(r_{\min}\tau)$ and $e_{\max} = t_{\max}/(r_{\max}\tau)$. So e_{\min} and e_{\max} are actually the largest and smallest e_i , respectively. Now,

$$\frac{dD_c}{ds} = \frac{d}{ds} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{e_i} I_{r_i} \right) = - \bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{e_i^2} \left(\frac{de_i}{ds} \right) I_{r_i}. \quad (33)$$

Recall that

$$\Phi = \left(\frac{\lambda^3}{\bar{r}^2 \tau^2 J_1} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\bar{r} \tau J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2.$$

Then, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{de_i}{ds} \right)^2 &= \left(\frac{d}{ds} \frac{\lambda}{r_i \tau} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{\lambda'}{r_i \tau} - \frac{\lambda \tau'}{r_i \tau^2} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2(\lambda')^2}{(r_i \tau)^2} + \frac{2\lambda^2 (\tau')^2}{r_i^2 \tau^4} \\ &\leq \frac{2\ell_1 \lambda^3}{r_{\min}^2 \tau^2 J_1} \|\alpha\|^2 + \frac{2\ell_1 \bar{r} \lambda^2}{r_{\min}^2 \tau J_2} \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &\leq 2m^2 \ell_1 \left(\frac{\lambda^3}{\bar{r}^2 \tau^2 J_1} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\bar{r} \tau J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \ell_2 \Phi, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the second inequality follows from (30), and $\ell_2 = 2m^2 \ell_1$. So, using (33), we have

$$\left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right)^2 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{e_i^4} \left(\frac{de_i}{ds} \right)^2 I_{r_i} \preceq \bigoplus_{i=1}^q \frac{\ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} I_{r_i} = \left(\frac{\ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) I_N.$$

Now recall that $M = D_c + \frac{(I - D_c)11^\top(I - D_c)}{1^\top(I - D_c)1}$. Define

$$w_1 = (I - D_c)1 \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 = \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right) 1.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \left\{ \frac{(I - D_c)11^\top(I - D_c)}{1^\top(I - D_c)1} \right\} &= \left\{ \frac{(I - D_c)11^\top(I - D_c)}{(1^\top(I - D_c)1)^2} \right\} 1^\top \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right) 1 \\ &\quad - \left\{ \frac{1}{1^\top(I - D_c)1} \right\} \left\{ \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right) 11^\top(I - D_c) + (I - D_c)11^\top \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to

$$\left\{ \frac{w_1 w_1^\top}{(1^\top w_1)^2} \right\} (1^\top w_2) - \left\{ \frac{1}{1^\top w_1} \right\} (w_2 w_1^\top + w_1 w_2^\top).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{dM}{ds} = \frac{dD_c}{ds} + \left\{ \frac{w_1 w_1^\top}{(1^\top w_1)^2} \right\} (1^\top w_2) - \left\{ \frac{1}{1^\top w_1} \right\} (w_2 w_1^\top + w_1 w_2^\top). \quad (35)$$

Note that each of the three terms on the left-hand side of (35) is a symmetric matrix. Several applications of Lemma 12 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right)^2 &= \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} + \left\{ \frac{w_1 w_1^\top}{(1^\top w_1)^2} \right\} (1^\top w_2) - \left\{ \frac{1}{1^\top w_1} \right\} (w_2 w_1^\top + w_1 w_2^\top) \right)^2 \\ &\preceq 2 \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} + \left\{ \frac{w_1 w_1^\top}{(1^\top w_1)^2} \right\} (1^\top w_2) \right)^2 + 2 \left(\left\{ \frac{1}{1^\top w_1} \right\} (w_2 w_1^\top + w_1 w_2^\top) \right)^2 \\ &\preceq 4 \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right)^2 + 4 \left(\frac{w_1 w_1^\top}{(1^\top w_1)^2} (1^\top w_2) \right)^2 + \frac{4}{(1^\top w_1)^2} \left[(w_2 w_1^\top)^\top (w_2 w_1^\top) + (w_1 w_2^\top)^\top (w_1 w_2^\top) \right] \\ &\preceq 4 \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right)^2 + \frac{4(w_1^\top w_1)^2}{(1^\top w_1)^4} (1^\top w_2)^2 I + \frac{8}{(1^\top w_1)^2} (w_1^\top w_1)(w_2^\top w_2) I. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} w_1^\top w_1 &= 1^\top (I - D_c)^2 1 = \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left(\frac{\lambda}{t_i} \right)^2 \leq \bar{r} q \left(\frac{\lambda}{t_{\min}} \right)^2, \\ w_2^\top w_2 &= 1^\top \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right)^2 1 \leq 1^\top \left(\frac{\ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} I_{\bar{r}q} \right) 1 = \ell_2 \bar{r} q \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right), \\ (1^\top w_1)^2 &= [1^\top (I - D_c) 1]^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{\lambda}{t_i} \right)^2 \geq \left(\bar{r} q \frac{\lambda}{t_{\max}} \right)^2, \\ (1^\top w_2)^2 &\leq (w_2^\top w_2)(1^\top 1) \leq \ell_2 (\bar{r} q)^2 \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So, in conjunction with (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right)^2 &\preceq 4 \left(\frac{dD_c}{ds} \right)^2 + \frac{4(w_1^\top w_1)^2}{(1^\top w_1)^4} (1^\top w_2)^2 I + \frac{8}{(1^\top w_1)^2} (w_1^\top w_1)(w_2^\top w_2) I \\ &\preceq \left(\frac{4\ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) I + \left(\frac{4\ell_2 m^4 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) I + \left(\frac{8\ell_2 m^2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) I \\ &\preceq 16\ell_2 m^4 \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) I. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Recall that $Q^{-1} = (X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{dQ^{-1}}{ds}\right)^2 &= \left(-\bar{X}^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right) \bar{X}\right)^2 \\
&= \bar{X}^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right) \bar{X} \bar{X}^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right) \bar{X} \\
&\preceq \bar{r} q k_2 \bar{X}^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds}\right)^2 \bar{X} \\
&\preceq 16 \ell_2 m^4 \bar{r} q k_2 \bar{X}^\top \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} I\right) \bar{X} \\
&\preceq 16 \ell_2 m^4 (\bar{r} q k_2)^2 \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) I_p \\
&= \ell_3 (\bar{r} q)^2 \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) I_p,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first and third inequalities follow from (B2) (and Lemma 10), the second inequality follows from (37), and $\ell_3 = 16 \ell_2 m^4 k_2^2$. Recall from (13) that $Q^2 \preceq (q \bar{r} k_1)^{-2} I$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)^2 &= \left(-Q \left(\frac{dQ^{-1}}{ds}\right) Q\right)^2 \\
&= Q \left(\frac{dQ^{-1}}{ds}\right) Q^2 \left(\frac{dQ^{-1}}{ds}\right) Q \\
&\preceq \frac{1}{(q \bar{r} k_1)^2} Q \left(\frac{dQ^{-1}}{ds}\right)^2 Q \\
&\preceq \frac{\ell_3}{k_1^2} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) Q^2 \\
&\preceq \frac{\ell_3}{\bar{r}^2 q^2 k_1^4} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) I_p, \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

where the formula for dQ/ds in the first line can be derived by applying the matrix version of the product rule to the equation $QQ^{-1} = I$. It's clear that $X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X} \preceq X^\top X$, and it follows that $\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(X^\top X)$. Furthermore, we have $\lambda_{\min}[(X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1}] = [\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})]^{-1}$ and $\lambda_{\min}[(X^\top X)^{-1}] = [\lambda_{\max}(X^\top X)]^{-1}$. It follows that

$$\lambda_{\min}(Q) = \lambda_{\min}[(X^\top X - \bar{X}^\top M \bar{X})^{-1}] \geq \lambda_{\min}[(X^\top X)^{-1}] \geq \frac{1}{\bar{r} q k_2}. \tag{39}$$

Using Lemma 13, (38), and (39), we have

$$\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)^2\right\} \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}\left\{\left(\frac{dQ}{ds}\right)^2\right\}}{4 \lambda_{\min}(Q)} \leq \frac{\bar{r} q k_2}{4} \frac{\ell_3}{\bar{r}^2 q^2 k_1^4} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) \leq \left(\frac{\ell_3 k_2}{4 \bar{r} q k_1^4}\right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right).$$

We are now ready to attack T_1 , T_2 , and T_3 . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{q}{\tau} \left\| \left(\frac{dQ^{\frac{1}{2}}}{ds} \right) N_{00} \right\|^2 \right\} \\
&= q \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\tau} N_{00}^\top \left(\frac{dQ^{\frac{1}{2}}}{ds} \right)^2 N_{00} \right\} \\
&\leq q \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\tau} \left(\frac{\ell_3 k_2}{4\bar{r} q k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) N_{00}^\top N_{00} \right\} \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $T_2 = \mathbb{E} \left\{ q \left\| \left(\frac{dQ}{ds} \right) X^\top (I - MR) Y \right\|^2 \right\}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \left(\frac{dQ}{ds} \right) X^\top (I - MR) Y \right\|^2 \\
&= Y^\top (I - MR) X \left(\frac{dQ}{ds} \right)^2 X^\top (I - MR) Y \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\ell_3}{\bar{r}^2 q^2 k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) Y^\top (I - MR) X X^\top (I - MR) Y \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\ell_3}{\bar{r}^2 q^2 k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) Y^\top Y \lambda_{\max} [(I - MR) X X^\top (I - MR)] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\ell_3}{\bar{r}^2 q^2 k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) (\bar{r} q \ell) \lambda_{\max} [X^\top (I - MR)^2 X] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\ell_3 \ell}{\bar{r} q k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) \lambda_{\max} [2(X^\top X + \bar{X}^\top M^2 \bar{X})] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\ell_3 \ell}{\bar{r} q k_1^4} \right) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) (4\bar{r} q k_2) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from (38), the third uses (B₃) and the fact that for any matrix M , MM^\top has the same non-zero eigenvalues as $M^\top M$ (see, e.g., Horn and Johnson, 2013, Theorem 1.3.22), the fourth follows from Lemma 11, and the last is from (B₂) and the fact that $\bar{X}^\top M^2 \bar{X} \preceq \bar{X}^\top \bar{X} \preceq X^\top X$ (recall from (12) that $M \preceq I$).

Now recall that $T_3 = \mathbb{E} \left\{ q \left\| Q X^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right) R Y \right\|^2 \right\}$. We have

$$\left\| Q X^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right) R Y \right\|^2 = \bar{Y}^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right) X Q^2 X^\top \left(\frac{dM}{ds} \right) \bar{Y} \leq \frac{16\ell\ell_2 k_2 m^4}{k_1^2} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right) = \mathcal{O}(1) \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} \right),$$

where we have used $Q^2 \preceq (q\bar{r}k_1)^{-2}I$, (B₂), (37), and (B₃). Recall that

$$U_1 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad U_2 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4} \right).$$

Since $e_{\max} \geq 1$, $\Phi/e_{\max}^4 \leq \Phi/e_{\max}^2$, so we have $T_1 = \mathcal{O}(\frac{p}{\bar{r}})U_2$, $T_2 = \mathcal{O}(q)U_1$, and $T_3 = \mathcal{O}(q)U_1$. It

now follows from (31) and (32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2 &\leq T_0 + 4T_1 + 4T_2 + 4T_3 \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}q}\right) \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We now develop an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds}\right)^2$, which is the second term on the right-hand side of (21). Recall that $\tilde{\eta}_{00} = v + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}Q^{1/2}N_{00}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_0 &= \sqrt{q} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top \tilde{\eta}_{00} / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}} N_0 \\ &= \sqrt{q} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} - \frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}} N_0. \end{aligned}$$

Now define

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right) \right]^2, \\ T_5 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right) \right]^2, \\ T_6 &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}} N_0 \right) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds} \right)^2 \leq 3T_4 + 3T_5 + 3T_6. \quad (41)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right) \right]^2 \\ &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / e_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i} \right) \right]^2 \\ &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] \sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / e_i}{[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i]^2} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q})}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top (\frac{dv}{ds}) / e_i}{\sqrt{q} \sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i} \right]^2 \\ &\leq 3T_{41} + 3T_{42} + 3T_{43}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{41} &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] \sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q}) / e_i}{[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i]^2} \right]^2, \\ T_{42} &= q\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v / \sqrt{q})}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i} \right]^2, \\ T_{43} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top (\frac{dv}{ds}) / e_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (34) and the fact that $e_{\min}/e_{\max} \leq m$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{41} &= q\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] \sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})/e_i}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i\right]^2}\right]^2 \\
&\leq q\mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^4}{q^4} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{e'_i}{e_i^2}\right)^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{e_i^2}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2\right)\right\} \\
&\leq q\mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^4}{q^4} \left(\frac{q^2 \ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) \left(\frac{q}{e_{\max}^2}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2\right)\right\} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(1)\mathbf{E}\left\{\left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 + \frac{2}{q} v^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top\right) v \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{y}_i^2 + \frac{2mqk_2}{q} v^\top v = \mathcal{O}(q), \quad (42)$$

where the second inequality follows from Remark 11, and the final equality follows from (15) and Remark 11. It follows that $T_{41} = \mathcal{O}(q)U_1$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{42} &= q\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [e'_i/e_i^2] (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i}\right]^2 \\
&\leq q\mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^2}{q^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{(e'_i)^2}{e_i^4}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2\right)\right\} \\
&\leq q\mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^2}{q^2} \left(\frac{q\ell_2 \Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2\right)\right\} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from our work on $\|\frac{d\tilde{y}_{00}}{ds}\|$ that $\mathbf{E}\|\frac{dv}{ds}\|^2 \leq 2(T_2 + T_3)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{43} &= \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top (\frac{dv}{ds})/e_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/e_i}\right]^2 \\
&\leq \mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^2}{q^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{e_i^2}\right) \left(\frac{dv}{ds}\right)^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top\right) \left(\frac{dv}{ds}\right)\right\} \\
&\leq \mathbf{E}\left\{\frac{e_{\min}^2}{q^2} \left(\frac{q}{e_{\max}^2}\right) (mqk_2) \left\|\frac{dv}{ds}\right\|^2\right\} \\
&\leq m^3 k_2 \mathbf{E}\left\|\frac{dv}{ds}\right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2m^3 k_2 (T_2 + T_3) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$T_4 = \mathcal{O}(q)U_1. \quad (43)$$

We now move on to T_5 . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right) \right]^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i / z_i^2] \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i]^2} - \frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i / z_i^2] \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top (\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right]^2 \\
&\leq 3T_{51} + 3T_{52} + 3T_{53} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{51} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i / z_i^2] \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i]^2} \right]^2 , \\
T_{52} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i / z_i^2] \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right]^2 , \\
T_{53} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top (\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right]^2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{51} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i / z_i^2] \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} / z_i}{[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i]^2} \right]^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{z_{\min}^4}{q^4} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i^4} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i^2} \right) \frac{q}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{z_{\min}^4}{q^4} \left(\frac{q^2}{z_{\max}^6} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \frac{q}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{m^4}{q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{z_{\max}^2} \right) \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^2 \right] .
\end{aligned}$$

But we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \left(\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^2 = N_{00}^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \right) Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \leq (mqk_2) N_{00}^\top Q N_{00} \leq \frac{mk_2}{rk_1} N_{00}^\top N_{00} , \quad (44)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{51} &\leq \frac{m^4}{q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{z_{\max}^2} \right) \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{mk_2}{\bar{r}k_1} N_{00}^\top N_{00} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{m^5 k_2}{q \bar{r} k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{z_{\max}^2} \right) \frac{1}{\tau} \right] \mathbb{E} [N_{00}^\top N_{00}] \\
&= \frac{m^5 k_2 p}{q \bar{r} k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\tau z_{\max}^2} \right) \right]. \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $z_i = \frac{t_i}{r_i \lambda \tau} = \frac{1}{r_i \tau} + \frac{1}{\lambda}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(z'_i)^2 &= \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{1}{r_i \tau} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \right]^2 \\
&= \left[-\frac{\tau'}{r_i \tau^2} - \frac{\lambda'}{\lambda^2} \right]^2 \\
&\leq 2 \frac{(\tau')^2}{r_i^2 \tau^4} + 2 \frac{(\lambda')^2}{\lambda^4} \\
&\leq \frac{2m^2 \ell_1}{\bar{r} \tau} \frac{1}{J_2} \|\alpha\|^2 + \frac{2m^2 \ell_1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1} \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= 2m^2 \ell_1 \left(\frac{1}{\bar{r} \tau} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1} \right) \|\alpha\|^2, \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (30). Now

$$\frac{1}{\tau z_{\max}} = r_{\max} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r_{\max} \tau} \right) \leq r_{\max} \left(\frac{\lambda}{r_{\max} \tau} \wedge 1 \right) \leq r_{\max} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\bar{r} \tau} \wedge 1 \right) \leq r_{\max} (\phi \wedge 1),$$

where $\phi = \lambda / (\bar{r} \tau)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{51} &\leq \frac{m^5 k_2 p}{q \bar{r} k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\tau z_{\max}^2} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2m^7 \ell_1 k_2 p}{\bar{r} k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r} \tau} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1} \right) \left(\frac{r_{\max}}{z_{\max}} (\phi \wedge 1) \right) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2m^8 \ell_1 k_2 p}{k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r} \tau} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{z_{\max}} (\phi \wedge 1) \right) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2m^8 \ell_1 k_2 p}{k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{m \lambda}{t_{\max}} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{r_{\max} \tau}{t_{\max}} \frac{1}{J_1} \right) (\phi \wedge 1) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2m^9 \ell_1 k_2 p}{k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right) (\phi \wedge 1) \right] \|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q) \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi \wedge 1) \frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (B₄). Recall that

$$U_3 = \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi \wedge 1) \frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2,$$

then $T_{51} = \mathcal{O}(q)U_3$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{52} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} \sum_{i=1}^q [z'_i/z_i^2] \bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right]^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{z_{\min}^2}{\tau q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i^4} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{z_{\min}^2}{\tau q} \left(\frac{q}{z_{\max}^4} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \frac{mk_2}{\bar{r}k_1} \right] \mathbb{E}[N_{00}^\top N_{00}] \\
&\leq \frac{m^3 k_2 p}{\bar{r}k_1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\tau z_{\max}^2} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2 \right) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

but this is $m^2 q$ times (45), so $T_{52} = \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3$. Continuing, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{53} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i^\top \left(\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right) / z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} \right]^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{z_{\min}^2}{q^2} \frac{q}{z_{\max}^2} \sum_{i=1}^q \left[\bar{x}_i^\top \left(\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right) \right]^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{m^2}{q} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right)^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^q \bar{x}_i \bar{x}_i^\top \right) \left(\frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right) \right] \\
&\leq m^3 k_2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2m^3 k_2 \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q(\tau')^2}{\tau^3} \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}} N_{00}\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{q}{\tau} \left\| \left(\frac{dQ^{\frac{1}{2}}}{ds} \right) N_{00} \right\|^2 \right] \right\} \\
&= 2m^3 k_2 (T_0 + T_1) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) U_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining our bounds on T_{51} , T_{52} , and T_{53} yields

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5 &\leq 3T_{51} + 3T_{52} + 3T_{53} \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}q} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}} \right) U_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

We now move on to T_6 . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6 &= q\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{d}{ds}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}}N_0\right)\right]^2 \\
&= \frac{q}{4}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i}\right)^{-3/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{z'_i}{z_i^2}\right)N_0\right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{q}{4}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i}\right)^{-3}\left(\sum_{i=1}^q (z'_i)^2\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^q \frac{1}{z_i^4}\right)\right]\mathbb{E}[N_0^2] \\
&\leq \frac{q}{4}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{z_{\min}^3}{q^3}\right)\left(\frac{q}{z_{\max}^4}\right)(2qm^2\ell_1)\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}\tau} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{m^5\ell_1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{z_{\max}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}\tau} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1}{J_1}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{m^5\ell_1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{m\lambda}{t_{\max}} \frac{1}{J_2} + \frac{r_{\max}\tau}{t_{\max}} \frac{1}{J_1}\right)\right]\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{m^5\ell_1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{m}{J_2} + \frac{1}{J_1}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2, \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (46), and the last line holds because $\mathbb{E}(J_1^{-1}) = (q/2 + a_1 - 1)^{-1}$ and $\mathbb{E}(J_2^{-1}) = (q\bar{r}/2 + a_2 - 1)^{-1}$. Combining (41), (43), (47), and (48), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds}\right)^2 &\leq 3T_4 + 3T_5 + 3T_6 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right)\|\alpha\|^2 \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

We now go to work on $\sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds}\right)^2$, which is the third term on the right-hand side of (21).

First,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\eta}_i &= \frac{\lambda}{t_i}\tilde{\eta}_0/\sqrt{q} + \frac{r_i\tau}{t_i}(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_i}}N_i \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{e_i}\right)\tilde{\eta}_0/\sqrt{q} + \frac{1}{e_i}(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q}) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{t_i}}N_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using (34),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds}\right)^2 \\
&= \left\{\frac{e'_i}{e_i^2}\tilde{\eta}_0/\sqrt{q} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{e_i}\right)\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds}/\sqrt{q} - \frac{e'_i}{e_i^2}(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q}) - \frac{1}{e_i}\bar{x}_i^\top\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}/\sqrt{q} - \frac{1}{2}t_i^{-\frac{3}{2}}t'_iN_i\right\}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5}{q}\frac{(e'_i)^2}{e_i^4}\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \frac{5}{q}\left(1 - \frac{1}{e_i}\right)^2\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds}\right)^2 + 5\frac{(e'_i)^2}{e_i^4}(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{5}{q}\left(\frac{1}{e_i}\right)^2\left(\bar{x}_i^\top\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right)^2 + \frac{5}{4}t_i^{-3}(t'_i)^2N_i^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5}{q}\frac{\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\tilde{\eta}_0^2 + \frac{5}{q}\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds}\right)^2 + 5\frac{\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{5}{q}\left(\bar{x}_i^\top\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right)^2 + \frac{5}{4}t_i^{-3}(t'_i)^2N_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We now bound $\sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{E}(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds})^2$. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{5\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\tilde{\eta}_0^2 &= \frac{5\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\left(\sqrt{q}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})/z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i} + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}}N_0\right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{10\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\left(\frac{q\left[\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})/z_i\right]^2}{\left[\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i\right]^2} + \frac{q}{\sum_{i=1}^q 1/z_i}N_0^2\right) \\
&\leq \frac{10\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\left(\frac{q\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2\sum_{i=1}^q(1/z_i^2)}{[q/z_{\min}]^2} + z_{\min}N_0^2\right) \\
&\leq \frac{10\ell_2m^2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{10\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}z_{\min}N_0^2,
\end{aligned}$$

but

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^q\left\{\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\left(v + \sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}N_{00}\right)/\sqrt{q}\right\}^2 \\
&\leq 2\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top v/\sqrt{q})^2 + \frac{2}{q}\sum_{i=1}^q\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{\tau}}\bar{x}_i^\top Q^{\frac{1}{2}}N_{00}\right)^2 \\
&= \mathcal{O}(q) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\frac{N_{00}^\top N_{00}}{\tau},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (42) and (44). So finally,

$$\frac{5\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\tilde{\eta}_0^2 = \mathcal{O}(q)\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4}N_{00}^\top N_{00} + \mathcal{O}(1)\frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3}N_0^2,$$

and we have used the fact that $z_{\min}/e_{\max} \leq m/\lambda$. Now,

$$\frac{5\ell_2\Phi}{e_{\max}^4}\sum_{i=1}^q(\bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i^\top\tilde{\eta}_{00}/\sqrt{q})^2 = \mathcal{O}(q)\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right)\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4}N_{00}^\top N_{00},$$

and

$$\frac{5}{q}\sum_{i=1}^q\left(\bar{x}_i^\top\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right)^2 = \frac{5}{q}\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right)^\top\left(\sum_{i=1}^q\bar{x}_i\bar{x}_i^\top\right)\left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right) = \mathcal{O}(1)\left\|\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds}\right\|^2.$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{5}{4}\sum_{i=1}^qt_i^{-3}(t'_i)^2N_i^2 &= \frac{5}{4}\sum_{i=1}^q\left(\frac{1}{r_i\tau + \lambda}\right)^3(\lambda' + r_i\tau')^2N_i^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r_{\min}\tau + \lambda}\right)^3((\lambda')^2 + r_{\max}^2(\tau')^2)\sum_{i=1}^qN_i^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5m^3}{2(\bar{r}\tau + \lambda)^3}\left(\frac{\ell_1\lambda^3}{J_1}\|\alpha\|^2 + \frac{m^2\ell_1\bar{r}^3\tau^3}{J_2}\|\alpha\|^2\right)\sum_{i=1}^qN_i^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5m^5\ell_1}{2}\left(\frac{\lambda^3}{(\bar{r}\tau + \lambda)^3}\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{(\bar{r}\tau)^3}{(\bar{r}\tau + \lambda)^3}\frac{1}{J_2}\right)\|\alpha\|^2\sum_{i=1}^qN_i^2 \\
&\leq \frac{5m^5\ell_1}{2}\left([\phi \wedge 1]\frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2}\right)\|\alpha\|^2\sum_{i=1}^qN_i^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (30) and the fourth follows from the fact that $\phi = \lambda/(\bar{r}\tau)$.

Combining all of these bounds yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds} \right)^2 &= \mathcal{O}(q) \frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\bar{r}}\right) \frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4} N_{00}^\top N_{00} + \mathcal{O}(1) \frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3} N_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(1) \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \left([\phi \wedge 1] \frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right) \|\alpha\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^q N_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$U_4 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\lambda e_{\max}^3} \right),$$

and that

$$U_1 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{e_{\max}^2} \right), \quad U_2 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\Phi}{\tau e_{\max}^4} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad U_3 = \mathbb{E} \left[(\phi \wedge 1) \frac{1}{J_1} + \frac{1}{J_2} \right] \|\alpha\|^2.$$

So, finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds} \right)^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}(1)\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(1)\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (21), (40), and (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{df(\eta + s\alpha)}{ds} \right\| \right\}^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^q \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_i}{ds} \right)^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}(1)\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{d\tilde{\eta}_0}{ds} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(1)\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{\eta}_{00}}{ds} \right\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{q\bar{r}}\right) \|\alpha\|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \|\alpha\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{O}(q)U_1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p}{\bar{r}}\right)U_2 + \mathcal{O}(q^2)U_3 + \mathcal{O}(1)U_4 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \|\alpha\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (B_4) and (B_5) . This is (22).

References

- BAXENDALE, P. H. (2005). Renewal theory and computable convergence rates for geometrically ergodic Markov chains. *Annals of Applied Probability* **15** 700–738.
- DIACONIS, P. (2009). The Markov chain Monte Carlo revolution. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **46** 179–205.

- DIACONIS, P., KHARE, K. and SALOFF-COSTE, L. (2008). Gibbs sampling, exponential families and orthogonal polynomials (with discussion). *Statistical Science* **23** 151–200.
- DURMUS, A. and MOULINES, É. (2015). Quantitative bounds of convergence for geometrically ergodic Markov chain in the Wasserstein distance with application to the Metropolis adjusted Langevin algorithm. *Statistics and Computing* **25** 5–19.
- FLEGAL, J. M., HARAN, M. and JONES, G. L. (2008). Markov chain Monte Carlo: Can we trust the third significant figure? *Statistical Science* **23** 250–260.
- HAIRER, M., MATTINGLY, J. C. and SCHEUTZOW, M. (2011). Asymptotic coupling and a general form of Harris’ theorem with applications to stochastic delay equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **149** 223–259.
- HORN, R. A. and JOHNSON, C. R. (2013). *Matrix Analysis*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press.
- MADRAS, N. and SEZER, D. (2010). Quantitative bounds for Markov chain convergence: Wasserstein and total variation distances. *Bernoulli* **16** 882–908.
- MEYN, S. P. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (2009). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, London.
- QIN, Q. and HOBERT, J. P. (2021a). On the limitations of single-step drift and minorization in Markov chain convergence analysis. *Annals of Applied Probability* (to appear) .
- QIN, Q. and HOBERT, J. P. (2021b). Wasserstein-based methods for convergence complexity analysis of MCMC with applications. *Annals of Applied Probability* (to appear) .
- RAJARATNAM, B. and SPARKS, D. (2015). MCMC-based inference in the era of big data: A fundamental analysis of the convergence complexity of high-dimensional chains. *arXiv:1508.00947* .
- ROBERTS, G. O. and ROSENTHAL, J. S. (2001). Markov chains and de-initializing processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **28** 489–504.
- ROBERTS, G. O. and ROSENTHAL, J. S. (2004). General state space Markov chains and MCMC algorithms. *Probability Surveys* 20–71.
- ROMÁN, J. C. and HOBERT, J. P. (2012). Convergence analysis of the Gibbs sampler for Bayesian general linear mixed models with improper priors. *Annals of Statistics* **40** 2823–2849.

ROSENTHAL, J. S. (1995). Minorization conditions and convergence rates for Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90** 558–566.

YANG, J. and ROSENTHAL, J. S. (2019). Complexity results for MCMC derived from quantitative bounds. *arXiv:1708.00829* .