
OVERLAP OF OLS REGRESSION AND PRINCIPAL LOADING ANALYSIS

Jan O. Bauer

Bernhard Drabant

Baden-Wuerttemberg Cooperative State University Mannheim
Coblitzallee 1-9
68163 Mannheim, Germany
jan.bauer@dhbw-mannheim.de; bernhard.drabant@dhbw-mannheim.de

March 11, 2021

ABSTRACT

Principal loading analysis is a dimension reduction method that discards variables which have only a small distorting effect on the covariance matrix. Potentially, principal loading analysis and ordinary least squares regression coincide by construction. We contribute conditions under which both methods intersect. Further, we provide bounds for the cut-off value in principal loading analysis for the case of intersection. This gives a choice for such a threshold based on the perturbation matrices.

Keywords Dimensionality Reduction, Matrix Perturbation Theory, Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Principal Loading Analysis, Principal Component Analysis
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 62J05, 47H14, 62H25, 15A18

1 Introduction

Principal loading analysis (PLA) is a tool developed by [Bauer and Drabant \(2021\)](#) to reduce dimensions. The method chooses a subset of observed variables by discarding the other variables based on the impact of the eigenvectors on the covariance matrix. [Bauer \(2021\)](#) extended the method to correlation based PLA in order to provide a scale invariant approach. By nature, some parts of PLA correspond with principal component analysis (PCA) which is a popular dimension reduction technique first formulated by [Pearson \(1901\)](#) and [Hotelling \(1933\)](#). Despite the intersections however, the outcome is different since PCA yields a reduced set of variables by transforming the original variables. Still, PLA adopts techniques from PCA, and because PCA has been extended to a linear regression context ([Jolliffe \(2002\)](#) and [Kendall \(1957\)](#)), it is natural to also compare PLA with regression techniques.

Therefore, we check for intersections of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and PLA in this work. We provide necessary as well as necessary and sufficient conditions for those intersections. [Anderson \(1963\)](#), [Kollo and Neudecker \(1993\)](#) and [Neudecker and Wesselman \(1990\)](#) provide convergence rates for the sample noise of covariance and correlation matrices which are useful for our results because OLS and PLA coincide only in the sample case except for the trivial case of no perturbation of the covariance matrix. Our results are based on matrix perturbation theory which originally comes from algebraic fields such as in [Ipsen and Nadler \(2009\)](#) and [Stewart and Sun \(1990\)](#) because sample values can be interpreted as their perturbed population counterparts.

We further contribute bounds for the cut-off value in PLA based on the Davis-Kahan theorem ([Davis and Kahan \(1970\)](#) and [Yu et al. \(2015\)](#)) that ensure discarding by both methods. We refer to the case that the regression coefficient of the respective variable is not significantly different from zero by 'discarding by OLS'.

This article is organized as follows: Section 2 provides notation needed for the remainder of this work. In Section 3, we recap PLA and introduce the concept of our approach for comparison. An intuition for our conclusions is provided

by Theorem 4.1 in Section 4 which is the base for all remaining results. Further, we contribute bounds for the perturbation matrices under which PLA and OLS intersect. In Section 5, we provide bounds for the cut-off value in PLA under which both methods coincide. Section 6 widens the obtained results to correlation based PLA and we summarize our work in Section 7.

2 Setup

We first state some notation used in this work. We consider $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1 \cdots \mathbf{x}_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ to be a independent and identically distributed (IID) sample containing $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ observations of a random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1 \cdots X_M)$ with covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\sigma_{i,j})$ for defined indices $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ throughout this work. Analogously, we introduce the IID sample $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 \cdots \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ drawn from a random vector $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}_1 \cdots \tilde{X}_M)$ with covariance matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}$. The intuition is that \mathbf{X} and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$, hence also \mathbf{x} and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, behave similarly however with the distinction that $\tilde{\Sigma} \equiv \Sigma + \mathbf{E}$ is slightly perturbed by a sparse matrix $\mathbf{E} = (\varepsilon_{i,j})$. \mathbf{E} is a technical construction that contains small components extracted from Σ hence $\varepsilon_{i,j} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \sigma_{i,j} = 0$. The sample counterparts of Σ and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ are given by

$$\hat{\Sigma} \equiv \Sigma + \mathbf{H} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}} \equiv \tilde{\Sigma} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \equiv \Sigma + \mathbf{E} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}} \quad (2.2)$$

respectively. \mathbf{H} and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ are perturbations in the form of random noise matrices. The noise is due to a finite number of sample observations. We consider to predict the sample realisations $\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ which are drawn from the random variables Y and \tilde{Y} . Predictions are generated using the linear models $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}\beta + \mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. We denote the estimators for β and $\tilde{\beta}$ by $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\beta}}$ respectively. In an analogue manner to \mathbf{x} and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, we introduce the IID samples $\mathbf{x}_y = (\mathbf{x}_1 \cdots \mathbf{x}_M \ \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (M+1)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\tilde{y}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 \cdots \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_M \ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (M+1)}$ with corresponding covariance matrices $\hat{\Sigma}_Y \equiv \Sigma_Y + \mathbf{H}_Y$ and $\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}_Y \equiv \tilde{\Sigma}_Y + \mathbf{E}_Y + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_Y$ respectively. Similarly as (2.1) and (2.2), the sample covariances between the covariates and the variables to be predicted are perturbed as well:

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}\text{ov} \equiv \mathbf{C}\text{ov} + \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{C}\text{ov}} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \text{Cov}(X_1, Y) \\ \vdots \\ \text{Cov}(X_M, Y) \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{C}\text{ov}} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}\text{ov} \equiv \mathbf{C}\text{ov} + \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{C}\text{ov}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{C}\text{ov}}. \quad (2.4)$$

In general, for any set $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_S\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $s_1 < \dots < s_S$ we denote the elements of any vector \mathbf{v} by $\mathbf{v} = (v^{(1)} \cdots v^{(M)})$ and its subvector by $\mathbf{v}_{[\mathcal{S}]} \equiv (v^{(s_1)} \cdots v^{(s_S)})$, both for row vectors and column vectors. A vector $M_{[r, \bullet]}$ denotes the r th row of any matrix M whilst $M_{[r, \mathcal{S}]}$ displays the r th row with column elements s_1, \dots, s_S . The notations $M_{[\bullet, c]}$ and $M_{[\mathcal{S}, c]}$ for column vectors are analogue. We use the \mathcal{L}_2 vector norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \equiv (\sum_i (v^{(i)})^2)^{1/2}$, $\|\mathbf{M}\|_2$ as its induced matrix norm and the Frobenius norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F$ as a subordinate extension for matrices. $\mathcal{O}_p(\cdot)$ denotes stochastic boundedness. We use the symbol " \perp " as a short cut for uncorrelation hence not necessarily for independence. Further, $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a matrix containing zeros, and $*$ denotes a matrix containing elements not necessarily equal to zero. The dimensions of both are always self-explanatory.

Variables or blocks of variables are linked to eigenvectors in PLA. Hence, for practical purposes we define $\mathcal{D} \subset \{1, \dots, M\}$ with $1 \leq |\mathcal{D}| < M$. \mathcal{D} will contain the indices of the variables $\{X_d\} \equiv \{X_d\}_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$ we discard according to PLA and we introduce the quasi-complement $\mathcal{D}^c \equiv \{1, \dots, M\} \setminus \mathcal{D}$. In an analogue manner, Δ with $|\Delta| = |\mathcal{D}|$ will be used to index eigenvectors with respective eigenvalues linked to the $\{X_d\}$. The Cartesian product of two sets \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ hence $\mathcal{D} \times \Delta \equiv \{(d, \delta) : d \in \mathcal{D}, \delta \in \Delta\}$ contains all possible combinations of paired indices d linked to δ .

Given the notation above, the following assumption are made:

Assumption 1. *OLS assumptions for the linear models $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}\beta + \mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ are satisfied.*

Since we are comparing PLA and OLS it is assumed that the regression coefficients can be estimated using OLS in the first place. Any assumptions that allow for OLS are valid. $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\beta}}$ are implicitly assumed to be estimated by OLS.

Assumption 2. *$E(\mathbf{X}) = E(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{0}$ and the samples \mathbf{x} as well as $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ are mean-centred.*

We assume mean zero variables for convenience purposes because most of the covariance terms will be shortened throughout this work nonetheless. Further, this simplifies the estimators of the covariance matrices to $\hat{\Sigma} = (N - 1)^{-1} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}} = (N - 1)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ respectively. All results in this work would remain valid without Assumption 2 because the shapes of the matrices would not change, however derivations would become more tedious.

Assumption 3. $E(\mathbf{X}^4) < \infty$ and $E(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^4) < \infty$.

We assume non-explosiveness because OLS as well as the estimators $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ are sensitive to outliers. Further, Assumption 3 allows to obtain the rate of convergence for the sample covariance matrices by applying the Lindeberg-Lévi central limit theorem.

3 Methodology

In this section, we recap PLA and state our general approach for comparing PLA and OLS. The following summary of PLA is based on the works of [Bauer and Drabant \(2021\)](#) and [Bauer \(2021\)](#) and we refer to those for a more elaborate explanation.

PLA is a tool for dimension reduction where a subset of existing variables is selected while the other variables are discarded. The intuition is that blocks of variables are discarded which distort the covariance matrix only slightly. This is done by checking if $|\mathcal{D}^c|$ elements $d^c \in \mathcal{D}^c$ of $|\Delta|$ eigenvectors $\{v_\delta^{(d^c)}\}_{\delta \in \Delta}$ of the covariance matrix are smaller in absolute terms than a certain cut-off value τ for all eigenvectors indexed by $\delta \in \Delta$. i.e. we check if $|v_\delta^{(d^c)}| \leq \tau$ for all $(d^c, \delta) \in \mathcal{D}^c \times \Delta$. If this is the case, then most distortion of the variables $\{X_d\}$ is geometrically represented by the eigenvectors $\{v_\delta\}_{\delta \in \Delta}$. The explained variance of the $\{X_d\}$ can then be evaluated either by

$$\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{\delta \in \Delta} \lambda_\delta \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (v_\delta^{(d)})^2 + \sum_{\delta^c \notin \Delta} \lambda_{\delta^c} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (v_{\delta^c}^{(d)})^2 \right)$$

or by an approximation

$$\left(\sum_i \lambda_i \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{\delta \in \Delta} \lambda_\delta \right)$$

where λ_i is the eigenvalue corresponding to the eigenvector v_i . If the explained variance is sufficient small for the underlying purpose of application, the variables $\{X_d\}$ are discarded. In correlation based PLA we check if the elements of the eigenvectors of the correlation matrix are below the threshold τ . In practice, the population eigenvectors and eigenvalues are replaced by their sample counterparts.

Considering the extreme case that a variable is discarded according to PLA using a threshold $\tau = 0$. According to this, the eigenvectors need to contain zeros which reflect uncorrelated variables. In OLS on the other hand, a variable that is uncorrelated with both the dependent variable and the covariates is discarded as well. Therefore, there is a natural link between PLA and OLS based on the correlation structure. There also exist different constructions than pure uncorrelation to drop a variable by OLS, however not for PLA. Hence, we cover this underlying structure for possible intersection of PLA and OLS. To be more precise, we consider the case when PLA is conducted on a sample that contains both, the independent variable as well as the covariates and compare PLA with the case when regressing the independent variable on the covariates using OLS. By construction of our results, if a type one error occurs in OLS in practice it will also occur in PLA.

We shall emphasize that we do not take the explained variance into account despite of it being elementary for PLA. This is because the explained variance is nonrelevant in a regression context. We refer to [Jolliffe \(1982\)](#) for an elaborate illustration concerning explained variance in principal component regression because PLA intersects with PCA in this step. Hence, his explanation is also valid for PLA.

4 Intersection of Linear Regression and Principal Loading Analysis

In this section, we derive conditions for the perturbation matrices that have to hold in order to obtain identical results for PLA and OLS. To be more precise: we provide conditions under which discarding variables using PLA results in classifying those variables as non-significant covariates.

We consider a bundle of variables to be uncorrelated with the remaining variables: $\{X_d\} \perp\!\!\!\perp (\{X_{d^c}\}_{d^c \in \mathcal{D}^c}, Y)$. For now, we assume those to be the first variables hence $\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{D}|\}$ for illustration purposes. This yields covariance matrices of shape

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} * & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & * \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Sigma_Y = \begin{pmatrix} * & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

Further, we consider that the $\{X_d\}$ are discarded according to PLA. We note that it is unlikely that PLA and OLS intersect in the absence of noise, i.e. in the population case, because

$$\hat{\tilde{\beta}} \stackrel{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}=0}{=} \tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Cov}} = \begin{pmatrix} * \\ * \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.1)$$

hence the $\{\tilde{\beta}^{(d)}\}_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$ do not all necessarily equal zero except if $\tilde{\Sigma}_{[d, \bullet]}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Cov}} = 0$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$ which appears to be the case in rare occurrence or in artificially constructed data only. Therefore, an intersection of PLA and OLS exists most likely only in the sample case. The following theorem provides a visualization of the relationship between the perturbation matrices:

Theorem 4.1. *Let the variables $\{X_d\}$ be discarded according to PLA. The $\{X_d\}$ are considered to be non-significant covariates according to OLS if for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$*

$$1 \geq \frac{(\Sigma^{-1})_{[d, \mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*) \mathbf{Cov}^*}{(\Sigma^{-1})_{[d, \mathcal{D}]} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^* \mathbf{Cov}^*} \geq -1,$$

where $\mathbf{E}^* \equiv (\mathbf{E}^{\text{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} \quad \mathbf{E}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]})$, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^* \equiv (\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\text{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]})$, $\mathbf{H}^* \equiv (\mathbf{H}^{\text{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} \quad \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]})$ and $\mathbf{Cov}^* \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\Sigma_{[\mathcal{D}^c, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{-1} \mathbf{Cov}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix}^\top$.

The intuition is that the perturbation together with the noise of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ shall not billow more than pure noise itself. Simply put, this can either happen in the trivial case when $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{\text{Cov}} = \mathbf{0}$, or when \mathbf{E}_d^* and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_d^*$ fluctuate towards different directions hence pull themselves back below \mathbf{H}_d^* . However, strictly spoken the perturbations are sandwiched hence we have to take multiplication with $(\Sigma^{-1})_{[d, \mathcal{D}]}$ and \mathbf{Cov}^* into account. Nonetheless, Theorem 4.1 provides an intuition regarding the perturbations.

More technical results are given in Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 which follow from Theorem 4.1. The results provide necessary as well as necessary and sufficient conditions under which PLA and OLS intersect.

Lemma 4.1. *Let the variables $\{X_d\}$ be discarded according to PLA. The $\{X_d\}$ are considered to be non-significant covariates according to OLS if for all $d, d^* \in \mathcal{D}$*

$$\|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2 \cdot |\cos \theta_d|$$

where \mathbf{E}^* , $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*$, \mathbf{H}^* as well as \mathbf{Cov}^* are as in Theorem 4.1 and θ_d is the angle between $(\Sigma^{-1})_{[d, \mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^*$ and \mathbf{Cov}^* .

Corollary 4.1. *Let the variables $\{X_d\}$ be discarded according to PLA. A necessary condition that the $\{X_d\}$ are considered to be non-significant covariates according to OLS is*

$$\|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2 \in [0, \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2]$$

for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ where \mathbf{E}^* , $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and \mathbf{H}^* are as in Theorem 4.1.

In (4.1) we indicated that an intersection of PLA and OLS is unlikely in the population case, except for the trivial case when the perturbation equals zero. Our results from Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 are even more strict and provide no space for equality between PLA and OLS in absence of noise. Hence, the perturbation is bounded because the noise is bounded as well which is stated in the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Let Lemma 4.1 hold. Then $\mathbf{E}^* = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$.*

5 Implications for the Cut-Off Value

Choosing an appropriate cut-off value τ is relevant for PLA. In previous work we provide feasible thresholds for PLA based on simulations (Bauer and Drabant (2021)). In this section, we translate our results between PLA and OLS from Section 4 to the choice of τ and provide bounds for the threshold that ensure discarding according to PLA as well as according to OLS.

Lemma 5.1. *Let τ be the cut-off value for PLA and $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{M+1}$ the eigenvalues of Σ_Y with $\lambda_0 \equiv \infty$ and $\lambda_{M+2} \equiv -\infty$. The variables $\{X_d\}$ are discarded both by PLA and OLS if for all $(d, d^*, \delta) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \times \Delta$*

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}_Y + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_Y\|_F}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2 \cdot |\cos \theta_d|}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})}$$

where \mathbf{H}^* is as in Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 5.1. Let τ be the cut-off value for PLA and $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{M+1}$ the eigenvalues of Σ_Y with $\lambda_0 \equiv \infty$ and $\lambda_{M+2} \equiv -\infty$. Satisfaction of the equations

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}_Y + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_Y\|_F}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})}$$

for all $(d^*, \delta) \in \mathcal{D} \times \Delta$ is a necessary condition that the variables $\{X_d\}$ are discarded both by PLA and OLS.

We note that the number of equations to check is $|\mathcal{D}|^3$ in Lemma 5.1 and $|\mathcal{D}|^2$ for the necessary condition in Corollary 5.1 respectively. The amount of equations is reduced to one for the case of discarding blocks of size one hence single variables according to PLA. The reason for reduction is trivial because the number of variables to discard is reduced, but also since the link between the variable and the eigenvector hence eigenvalue is evident in this case. For a bundle of variables it is not obvious which variable is reflected by which eigenvector, if such an obvious connection exists at all. This yields the additional multiplication by $|\Delta| = |\mathcal{D}|$ hence the cubed and squared term respectively. Nonetheless, the number of necessary conditions in Corollary 5.1 can be reduced to

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}_Y + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_Y\|_F}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_Y\|_F}{\min(\lambda_{\delta+1} - \lambda_\delta, \lambda_\delta - \lambda_{\delta-1})} \quad (5.1)$$

for all $\delta \in \Delta$ because $\|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_Y\|_F$ for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ which might be more convenient for application however comes at the price of less tight bounds.

6 Correlation Based Principal Loading Analysis

Bauer (2021) suggested to conduct PLA based on the correlation matrix rather than on the covariance matrix. Hence, we extend the results from Section 4 and Section 5 to correlation based PLA in this section. Accordingly, we introduce the sample correlation matrices $\hat{\mathbf{P}} \equiv \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} \equiv \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}}$ of the samples \mathbf{x} and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ respectively. The sample correlation matrices are perturbed similarly as the covariance matrices in (2.1) and (2.2). Same holds for the sample correlations with the dependent variable: $\hat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Corr}} \equiv \mathbf{C}^{\text{Corr}} + \mathbf{H}^{\text{Corr}}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}^{\text{Corr}} \equiv \mathbf{C}^{\text{Corr}} + \mathbf{E}^{\text{Corr}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\text{Corr}}$ are analogue to (2.3) and (2.4) respectively. The sample correlation matrices for \mathbf{x}_y and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_y$ are denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_Y \equiv \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}^Y}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}_Y \equiv \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}^Y} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}^Y}$. Since the intuition regarding the perturbation matrices remains the same as for the covariance case, we skip a theorem to visualize intuition analogue to Theorem 4.1 and start straight away by providing conditions for the intersection of correlation based PLA and OLS:

Lemma 6.1. Let the variables $\{X_d\}$ be discarded according to correlation based PLA. The $\{X_d\}$ are considered to be non-significant covariates according to OLS if for all $d, d^* \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2 \cdot |\cos \phi_d|$$

where $\mathbf{E}^\dagger \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}^{\text{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} & \mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^\dagger \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\text{Corr}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} & \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{H}^\dagger \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}^{\text{Corr}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} & \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix}$ and ϕ_d is the angle between $(\Sigma^{-1})_{[d, \mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^\dagger$ and $\mathbf{C}^{\text{Corr}^\dagger} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\Sigma_{[\mathcal{D}^c, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{-1} \mathbf{C}^{\text{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix}^\top$.

Corollary 6.1. Let the variables $\{X_d\}$ be discarded according to correlation based PLA. A necessary condition that the $\{X_d\}$ are considered to be non-significant covariates according to OLS is

$$\|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2 \in \left[0, \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2\right]$$

for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ where \mathbf{E}^\dagger , $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^\dagger$ and \mathbf{H}^\dagger are as in Lemma 6.1.

As for covariance based PLA, correlation based PLA and OLS do not intersect in the population case that is in the absence of noise. This results in a bound for the perturbation matrix like in Corollary 4.2:

Corollary 6.2. Let Lemma 6.1 hold. Then $\mathbf{E}^\dagger = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$.

Bauer (2021) indicated that Theorem 4.1 of Bauer and Drabant (2021), hence the bounds for the cut-off value can be translated to the correlation case. Similarly to Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 6.1 we provide restrictions for the threshold to ensure discarding by both, correlation based PLA, and OLS.

Lemma 6.2. Let τ be the cut-off value for correlation based PLA and $\omega_1 \geq \dots \geq \omega_{M+1}$ the eigenvalues of \mathbf{P}_Y with $\omega_0 \equiv \infty$ and $\omega_{M+2} \equiv -\infty$. The variables $\{X_d\}$ are discarded both by correlation based PLA and OLS if for all $(d, d^*, \delta) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \times \Delta$

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}_Y} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}_Y}\|_F}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2 \cdot |\cos \theta_d|}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})}$$

where \mathbf{H}^\dagger is as in Lemma 6.1.

Corollary 6.3. Let τ be the cut-off value for correlation based PLA and $\omega_1 \geq \dots \geq \omega_{M+1}$ the eigenvalues of \mathbf{P}_Y with $\omega_0 \equiv \infty$ and $\omega_{M+2} \equiv -\infty$. Satisfaction of the equations

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}_Y} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}_Y}\|_F}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*, \bullet]}^\dagger\|_2}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})}$$

for all $(d^*, \delta) \in \mathcal{D} \times \Delta$ is a necessary condition that the variables $\{X_d\}$ are discarded both by correlation based PLA and OLS.

Like in Corollary 5.1 i.e. in (5.1), the necessary conditions of Corollary 6.3 can be replaced by the following conditions with looser bounds

$$\frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{P}_Y} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{P}_Y}\|_F}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})} \leq \tau \leq \frac{2^{2/3} \|\mathbf{H}_Y\|_F}{\min(\omega_{\delta+1} - \omega_\delta, \omega_\delta - \omega_{\delta-1})}$$

for all $\delta \in \Delta$ to reduce the number of equations that have to be checked.

7 Concluding Remarks

We have provided conditions under which PLA and OLS intersect in a sense that both discard the same variables. The intuition of those conditions is that the perturbation of PLA together with the noise shall not billow more than pure noise itself. Further, we have contributed bounds for the threshold τ in PLA that ensure discarding by both PLA and OLS. This helps to adjust τ according to the underlying data rather than applying fixed cut-off values. Since the number of conditions to check can be large in practice, we have also provided conditions based on fewer equations. However, this comes at the price of less tight bounds. All our results have been supplementary extended to correlation based PLA.

A Proofs

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Firstly, we recap approximations for the inverse sample covariance matrices (see e.g. Stewart and Sun (1990)):

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{H} \Sigma^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_p(\|\mathbf{H}\|^2) \approx \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{H} \Sigma^{-1} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{E} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}) \Sigma^{-1} + \mathcal{O}_p(\|\mathbf{E} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}\|^2) \approx \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{E} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}) \Sigma^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The approximation error is bounded by $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ which is shown in Corollary 4.2. Due to (A.1), (A.2), and Assumption 2, the OLS estimators for the the linear models $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}\beta + \mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ are approximately given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &\approx (\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{H} \Sigma^{-1}) \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \\ \hat{\tilde{\beta}} &\approx (\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{E} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}) \Sigma^{-1}) \hat{\tilde{\mathbf{Cov}}} \end{aligned}$$

with known approximation error bounded by $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$. The $\{\hat{\beta}^{(d)}\}$ are discarded according to OLS by construction since $\{X_d\} \perp\!\!\!\perp (\{X_{d^c}\}_{d^c \in \mathcal{D}^c}, Y)$. Hence, the $\{\hat{\tilde{\beta}}^{(d)}\}$ are discarded if $|\hat{\beta}^{(d)}| \geq |\hat{\tilde{\beta}}^{(d)}|$ for all d .

Due to the uncorrelation it further holds for each $\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}^{(d)} &= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\bullet]} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} - (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\bullet]} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{[d,\mathcal{D}]}^{-1} (\mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[\mathcal{D},\bullet]} (\mathbf{Cov} + \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{Cov}}) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{[d,\mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}^c]} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[\mathcal{D}^c,\mathcal{D}^c]} \mathbf{Cov}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} + \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1}) \\
&= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \left(\mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} \quad \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}^c]} \right) \left(- (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[\mathcal{D}^c,\mathcal{D}^c]}^1 \mathbf{Cov}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \right) + \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1}) \\
&\equiv (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^* \mathbf{Cov}^* + \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1}) \\
&\approx (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^* \mathbf{Cov}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

The approximation is due to the implicit multiplication of \mathbf{H} and $\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{Cov}}$. Analogously, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}^{(d)} &\approx (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^{\mathbf{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{\mathbf{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} \quad \mathbf{E}_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}^c]} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}^c]}) \left(- (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[\mathcal{D}^c,\mathcal{D}^c]}^1 \mathbf{Cov}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \right) \\
&\equiv (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*) \mathbf{Cov}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

For the case that $\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \geq 0$ the condition $|\hat{\beta}^{(d)}| \geq |\hat{\beta}^{(d)}|$ is satisfied if $\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \geq \hat{\beta}^{(d)} \geq -\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$. Using in our derivations for $\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$ yields the desired result. The case that $\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \leq 0$ remains analogously. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Using the derivations for $\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{(d)}$ from the proof of Theorem 4.1, we see that $|\hat{\beta}^{(d)}| \approx |(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^* \mathbf{Cov}^*| = \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^*\|_2 \|\mathbf{Cov}^*\|_2 \cos \theta_d$ by definition of the dot product. Further, $|\hat{\beta}^{(d)}| \approx |(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*) \mathbf{Cov}^*| \leq \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*)\|_2 \|\mathbf{Cov}^*\|_2$ by Hölder's inequality. Hence, the condition that $|\hat{\beta}^{(d)}| \geq |\hat{\beta}^{(d)}|$ is satisfied if $\|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}^*\|_2 \cos \theta_d \geq \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,\mathcal{D}]} (\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*)\|_2$ which is satisfied if $|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,d^*]}| \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^*\|_2 \cos \theta_d \geq |(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,d^*]}| \cdot \|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^*\|_2$ for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$. The result follows by shortening $|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{[d,d^*]}|$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.1. The corollary is an immediate result of Lemma 4.1 since $|\cos \theta_d| \in [0, 1]$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.2. In Theorem 1 of Neudecker and Wesselman (1990) it is concluded that both, \mathbf{H}_Y and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_Y$ are $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$ by applying the Lindeberg-Lévi central limit theorem. Hence $\mathbf{E}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^* = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$ as well for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ in order to satisfy the equation in Lemma 4.1. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.1. The $\{X_d\}$ are discarded according to OLS if $\|\mathbf{E}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^*\|_2 \cdot |\cos \theta_d|$ for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ as shown in Lemma 4.1. The inequality also is satisfied if $\|\mathbf{E}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{H}_{[d^*,\bullet]}^*\|_2 \cdot |\cos \theta_d|$. The remainder holds due to Theorem 2 of Bauer and Drabant (2021) which is based on Corollary 1 of Yu et al. (2015). \square

Proof of Corollary 5.1. The corollary is an immediate result of Lemma 5.1 since $|\cos \theta_d| \in [0, 1]$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{Diag}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{Diag}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})^{1/2}$, we obtain from the proof of Theorem 4.1 that

$$\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \approx \left(\mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \right)_{[d]} - \left(\mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \right)_{[d]}$$

where the approximation error is bounded by $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$. The first term reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \right)_{[d]} \\
&= (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d,\mathcal{D}]}^{-1} (\mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2})_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}]} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}}_{[\mathcal{D}]} \\
&= (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d,\mathcal{D}]}^{-1} (\mathbf{Diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2})_{[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}]} \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} \\
&= \sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d,\mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_Y \equiv \text{Var}(Y)$. The second term simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \hat{\mathbf{Cov}} \right)_{[d]} \\
&= \left(\text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \right)_{[d, \bullet]} \mathbf{Cov} + \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1}) \\
&\approx \left(\text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2} \right)_{[d, \bullet]} \mathbf{Cov} \\
&= (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d, \mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{[d, \bullet]}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{P}^{-1} (\text{Diag}(\Sigma)^{-1/2})_{[\bullet, \mathcal{D}^c]} \mathbf{Cov}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \\
&= \sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d, \mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{[d, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{P}_{[\mathcal{D}^c, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{-1} \mathbf{Corr}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} .
\end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{Cov}} = \mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1})$ is due to Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 of [Neudecker and Wesselman \(1990\)](#). Hence, the d^{th} sample regression coefficient can be expressed as

$$\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \approx \sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d, \mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} \quad \mathbf{H}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{\mathbf{P}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\mathbf{P}_{[\mathcal{D}^c, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{-1} \mathbf{Corr}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Analogously

$$\hat{\beta}^{(d)} \approx \sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_{[d, \mathcal{D}]}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{E}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[\mathcal{D}]}^{\mathbf{Cov}} \quad \mathbf{E}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{\mathbf{P}} + \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{\mathbf{P}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\mathbf{P}_{[\mathcal{D}^c, \mathcal{D}^c]}^{-1} \mathbf{Corr}_{[\mathcal{D}^c]} \end{pmatrix} .$$

Following the remaining steps in an analogue manner as in the proof of [Theorem 4.1](#) yields the final result because the terms $|\sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2}| = \sigma_Y^{1/2} (\sigma_{d,d})^{-1/2}$ can be shortened on both sides of the inequality. \square

Proof of Corollary 6.1. The corollary is an immediate result of [Lemma 6.1](#) since $|\cos \phi_d| \in [0, 1]$. \square

Proof of Corollary 6.2. The proof follows the structure of [Corollary 6.2](#) however by applying [Theorem 2](#) of [Neudecker and Wesselman \(1990\)](#) which gives us that the noise matrices of $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_Y \equiv \text{Diag}(\hat{\Sigma}_Y)^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_Y \text{Diag}(\hat{\Sigma}_Y)^{-1/2}$ and $\hat{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}}_Y \equiv \text{Diag}(\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}_Y)^{-1/2} \hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}_Y \text{Diag}(\hat{\tilde{\Sigma}}_Y)^{-1/2}$ are $\mathcal{O}_p(N^{-1/2})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.2. The proof is analogue to the one for [Lemma 4.1](#). \square

Proof of Corollary 6.3. The corollary is an immediate result of [Lemma 5.1](#) since $|\cos \theta_d| \in [0, 1]$. \square

References

References

- Anderson, T. W., 1963. Asymptotic Theory for Principal Component Analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 34 (1), 122–148.
- Bauer, J. O., 2021. Correlation Based Principal Loading Analysis. *Proceedings of the 2021 4th International Conference on Mathematics and Statistics (Accepted)*.
- Bauer, J. O., Drabant, B., 2021. Principal Loading Analysis. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis (Accepted)*.
- Davis, C., Kahan, W. M., 1970. The Rotation of Eigenvectors by a Perturbation. III. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 7 (1), 1–46.
- Hotelling, H., 1933. Analysis of a Complex of Statistical Variables into Principal Components. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 24 (6), 417–441.
- Ipsen, I. C. F., Nadler, B., 2009. Refined Perturbation Bounds for Eigenvalues of Hermitian and Non-Hermitian Matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 31 (1), 40–53.
- Jolliffe, I., 2002. *Principal Component Analysis*, 2nd Edition. Springer Series in Statistics.
- Jolliffe, I. T., 1982. A Note on the Use of Principal Components in Regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)* 31 (3), 300–303.
- Kendall, M., 1957. *A Course in Multivariate Analysis*. London: Griffin.

- Kollo, T., Neudecker, H., 1993. Asymptotics of Eigenvalues and Unit-Length Eigenvectors of Sample Variance and Correlation Matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 47 (2), 283–300.
- Neudecker, H., Wesselman, A., 1990. The Asymptotic Variance Matrix of the Sample Correlation Matrix. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 127, 589–599.
- Pearson, K., 1901. On Lines and Planes of Closest Fit to Systems of Points in Space. *Philosophical Magazine* 2, 559–572.
- Stewart, G. W., Sun, J., 1990. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Academic Press.
- Yu, Y., Wang, T., Samworth, R. J., 2015. A Useful Variant of the Davis–Kahan Theorem for Statisticians. *Biometrika* 102 (2), 315–323.