
The Parametric Stability of Well-separated Spherical Gaussian Mixtures

Hanyu Zhang
 Department of Statistics
 University of Washington
 Seattle, WA 98115
 hanuyz6@uw.edu

Marina Meilă
 Department of Statistics
 University of Washington
 Seattle, WA 98115
 mmp@stat.washington.edu

Abstract

We quantify the parameter stability of a spherical Gaussian Mixture Model (sGMM) under small perturbations in distribution space. Namely, we derive the first explicit bound to show that for a mixture of spherical Gaussian P (sGMM) in a pre-defined model class, all other sGMM close to P in this model class in total variation distance has a small parameter distance to P . Further, this upper bound only depends on P . The motivation for this work lies in providing guarantees for fitting Gaussian mixtures; with this aim in mind, all the constants involved are well defined and distribution free conditions for fitting mixtures of spherical Gaussians. Our results tighten considerably the existing computable bounds, and asymptotically match the known sharp thresholds for this problem.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of fitting spherical Gaussian Mixture Models (sGMM) to an unknown distribution Q . Without assuming knowledge about the target Q , what kind of guarantees can we give about an estimated sGMM? And under what condition are guarantees possible?

Previous work (e.g., [6, 27, 1, 20], etc) established estimation guarantees for the mixture parameters under model assumptions about the data source Q (being, e.g., a mixture of well separated Gaussians). Specifically, W.r.t. the scope of this paper, when Q is a mixture of K spherical Gaussians, satisfying two criteria: (i) non-vanishing component proportions, and (ii) sufficient separation between components, polynomial run-time estimation algorithms exist.

Our work asks the question: what can be said without such precise knowledge of Q ? We assume instead *indirect* knowledge of Q , namely that a well-separated mixture model P was fit to Q , and that *the model fit is good*. The main difference is that now Q is not required to belong to the model class, but to be “close” to it, in a way to be defined (specifically, in this paper, the model fit is measured by the *total variation distance* between P and Q , $TV(P, Q)$). We also assume that P is a mixture of well-separated Gaussians, with component proportions bounded below. As it turns out, knowing that Q is close to a “good” model class, is almost as useful as knowing Q is in the model class. Under these conditions on P and Q , we prove that P ’s parameters are unique up to perturbations that we upper bound. In summary, we aim to prove a statement the following form.

Theorem 1 (Generic (ϵ, δ) –Stability). *For distribution Q and a class \mathcal{M} of sGMM, if a given model $P \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfies $TV(Q, P) \leq \epsilon$, then, for any $P' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $TV(Q, P') \leq \epsilon$, it holds that $d_{param}(P, P') \leq \delta$, where $d_{param}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a divergence defined in parameter space.*

This type of statement was proposed earlier by [23] in the context of loss-based clustering, but to date it has not been instantiated for any parametric model fitting problem.




Figure 1: Stable and unstable spherical Gaussian Mixtures in 1D. **Left:** A well separated mixture of $K = 2$ Gaussians, $P = 0.5N(-3, 1) + 0.5N(3, 1)$, with separation $c = 3$ (as defined in Section 2, A3), superimposed on a distribution Q such that $TV(P, Q) \leq 0.001$. Our Theorem 4 in Section 2 guarantees that any mixture P' with $K = 2$ components, minimal weights 0.45, and separation constants 3 that fits Q equally well must have parameters close to P ; namely (see Section 2 for the parameter definitions) μ'_i within 0.0200 of -3 and 3 , $\max\{1/\sigma_i'^2, \sigma_i'^2\} \leq 1.034$, and $|0.5 - \pi'_i| \leq 0.004$. **Right:** Two spherical Gaussian mixtures P, P' which are unstable, in the sense that while they are close in TV distance, they have very different parameters; $P = 0.0625N(-3, \sigma^2) + 0.4375N(-1, \sigma^2) + 0.4375N(1, \sigma^2) + 0.0625N(3, \sigma^2)$, $P' = 0.0078125N(-4, \sigma^2) + 0.21875N(-2, \sigma^2) + 0.546875N(0, \sigma^2) + 0.21875N(2, \sigma^2) + 0.0078125N(4, \sigma^2)$, with $\sigma^2 = 2.25$. In this example, the mixture components are less separated, and some of the mixture proportions are small as well.

A distribution P that satisfies Theorem 1 will be called stable. Obviously, such a distribution is generally not unique or distinguished in \mathcal{M} , hence stability should be defined as a property of (a subset of) \mathcal{M} . This also follows from setting $Q = P^* \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore, we define parametric stability of a model class as follows.

Definition 2. Let \mathcal{M} be a class of spherical Gaussian Mixtures and $d_{param}(\cdot, \cdot)$ be a divergence between parameters; for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, P is (ϵ, δ) -stable in \mathcal{M} if any model $P' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $d_{TV}(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$ satisfies that $d_{param}(P, P') \leq \delta$.

The technical contribution of our paper is to formulate conditions on \mathcal{M} and establish upper bounds $\delta(\epsilon, \mathcal{M})$ for any $P \in \mathcal{M}$, in the population regime. These are given in Theorem 4. The upper bounds on $\delta(\epsilon, \mathcal{M})$ we obtain are *tractable*, with explicit constants depending on the model class only. As a statistical procedure, the bound $\delta(\epsilon, \mathcal{M})$ provides quantitative post-estimation evaluation or diagnostic analysis for fitting a Gaussian Mixture Model, without any prior knowledge. For example, for an arbitrary population Q (with density q) on \mathbb{R}^d , let $\hat{P} = \sum_{i=1}^K \hat{\pi}_i N_d(\hat{\mu}_k, \hat{\sigma}_k^2 I_d)$ be a learned sGMM. Figure 1 shows an example of stable and unstable distribution sGMMs, and further for the stable sGMM it constructs good-fit region such that all sGMM within small total variation distance to the population must have parameters located in these regions. These regions can be reported as the usual confidence regions are reported in a regular parametric estimation problem.

Furthermore, Definition 2 concerns only the model class \mathcal{M} , a subset of spherical Gaussian mixtures. Hence, one can obtain distribution free stability results generically, by studying the stability of distributions inside a model class, such as that of sGMM. While this remark is nearly obvious, suprisingly little work has attended to the possibility of obtaining distribution free guarantees as a side effect of consistency or identifiability proofs. We hope that one contribution of this paper be at the conceptual level, in drawing attention to this possibility, which remains the primary motivator for this work.

In Section 2 we define model classes \mathcal{M} of interest, and instantiate $d_{param}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and all other parameters, then state our main stability result in Theorem 4. Section 3 illustrates the result with some numeric examples. In the supplementary materials, Section A provides the detailed proof of our main result Theorem 4, with additional lemmas proved in Section B.

2 Problem Formulation and Main Results

We first pose the problem in formal terms. Then, we state the main result in Theorem 4, namely that if two well-separated mixtures of spherical Gaussians are close as distributions, in total variation distance, their parameters are also close.

2.1 Problem Setup

In the problem formulation, we identify three key components: (i) model class \mathcal{M} , (ii) distance or divergence between the models in parameter space $d_{param}(P, P')$, and (iii) goodness of fit measure.

Model Class A spherical Mixture of Gaussians P over \mathbb{R}^d can be written in the form

$$P = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k N_d(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2 I_d), \quad \text{with } \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k = 1, \quad \pi_k \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

In the above, we have adopted the standard notation, whereby $N_d(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2 I_d)$, called *mixture components*, are normal distributions with means $\mu_{1:K} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and diagonal covariance matrices $\sigma_{1:K}^2 I_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, while $\pi_{1:K}$ are called *mixture proportions*.

Further on, we assume the number of components K is fixed, and we add restrictions on the smallest component proportion and the component separation. Thus the model classes we consider are denoted $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$.

Definition 3. An sGMM P is in model class $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$ iff the following holds:

- A1 $K \geq 2$
- A2 $\min_{k \in [K]} \pi_k \geq \pi_{\min}, \max_{k \in [K]} \pi_k \leq \pi_{\max}$
- A3 $\|\mu_i - \mu_j\| > c(\sigma_i + \sigma_j)$ for any $i, j \in [K]$ and $i \neq j$

For $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$, the maximal proportion is always less than or equal to $1 - (K-1)\pi_{\min}$. Therefore, we abbreviate the model class notation to be $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$ when $\pi_{\max} = 1 - (K-1)\pi_{\min}$. The separation constant c is necessary. Theorem 3.1 in [26] points out that as K increase, when separation constant c is $o(\sqrt{\log K})$, it is possible to find two sGMMs so that their parameters are $\Omega(1)$ different but their total variation distance is superpolynomially small in K . We rule out this difficulty by deriving assumptions on the separation constant c , which regularizes the model class.

The divergence of model parameters between any two models P, P' with K components is

$$d_{param}(P, P') = \min_{\text{perm} \in \mathbb{S}_K} \max_{k \in [K]} \frac{|\pi_i - \pi'_{\text{perm}(i)}|}{\min\{\pi_i, \pi'_{\text{perm}(i)}\}} + \frac{\|\mu_i - \mu'_{\text{perm}(i)}\|}{\max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_{\text{perm}(i)}\}} + \frac{|\sigma_i^2 - \sigma'^2_{\text{perm}(i)}|}{\min\{\sigma_i^2, \sigma'^2_{\text{perm}(i)}\}} \quad (2)$$

In the above, $\text{perm} \in \mathbb{S}_K$ is a permutation of the set $[K]$; d_{param} is not necessarily a metric¹. Theorem 4 presented below provides upper bounds on each of the three terms of (2) separately.

Consider $G = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \delta_{(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2)}$ with δ being the point mass. One can also view each sGMM distribution $P_G = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k N(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2 I_d)$ as a smoothed distribution of discrete probability on the parameter space. Let G, G' be two such distributions on the parameter space, then Wasserstein-1 distance defined by

$$W_1(G, G') = \inf_{\Pi} \int d((\mu_k, \sigma_k^2), (\mu'_k, \sigma'^2_k)) \Pi(G, G') \quad (3)$$

¹ d_{param} is also not a divergence in the information geometric sense.

is considered. This is shown to be a natural parameter divergence in several previous papers (e.g., [16, 15, 31, 11]). Our d_{param} does not capture the same topology as the W_1 distance on parameters. Consider two sequences $P_n = 0.5N(-1, (n+1)^2) + 0.5N(1, (n+1)^2)$ and $Q_n = 0.5N(-1, n^2) + 0.5N(1, n^2)$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $d_{param}(P_n, Q_n)$ converges to zero, but $W_1(n^2, (n+1)^2)$ diverges. On the other hand it can also be shown that for a fixed G and corresponding P_G , when $W_1(G, G') \rightarrow 0$, it holds that

$$d_{param}(P_G, P_{G'}) \asymp W_1(G, G') \asymp \min_{\text{perm} \in \mathbb{S}^K} \sum_{i=1}^K |\pi_i - \pi_{\text{perm}(i)}| + \|\mu_i - \mu'_{\text{perm}(i)}\| + |\sigma_i^2 - \sigma'_{\text{perm}(i)}|^2. \quad (4)$$

Hence our definition of d_{param} is in better agreement with the model fit criterion, does not need the assumption that the parameter space is compact [16] and there will be a direct way to construct good-fit regions or confidence regions since we provide upper bounds on the terms in d_{param} separately. Also, d_{param} is invariant w.r.t. rescaling, and this will be useful in, e.g. model-based clustering.

Goodness of fit can be measured by various criteria (e.g. likelihood or KL divergence, W_2 distance), but in this paper total variation distance [14] is used for its convenience. For two probability distributions P, Q on \mathbb{R}^d , the *total variation distance* is given by

$$TV(P, Q) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}} |P(A) - Q(A)|, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{B} is all Borel sets on \mathbb{R}^d .

2.2 Preparation for main result: defining the constants

Before we formulate Theorem 1 for the specific case of mixtures of spherical Gaussian, we introduce several constants depending on the model class $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$ and ϵ , but independent of the actual distributions considered. These parametrize the upper bounds on the terms of d_{param} (2) we are about present. The constants η_0, η^* , to be defined below, represent ratios between standard deviations; $\eta^* > 1$ will bound the perturbation in σ_i , and the aim is to bring it as close to 1 as possible. The constant c_0 , together with η_0 gives the minimum sufficient value for the separation c , while c^* bounds the perturbation of the components' means.

Denote by $\Phi(x)$ the CDF of the standard normal distribution in one dimension and by F_d the CDF of Gamma($\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}$) distribution.

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\right) dt, \quad F_d(x) = \int_0^x \frac{(\frac{d}{2})^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} t^{\frac{d}{2}-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d}{2}t\right) dt. \quad (6)$$

Constants c_0, η_0 determined by $\pi_{\min}, \epsilon, \pi_{\max}$ (or K) are defined by

$$c_0 = 2\Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{2}\right); \quad (7)$$

η_0 satisfies $\eta_0 \geq 1$ and

$$1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\max})}{\pi_{\max}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta_0 c_0\right) = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_0^2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right). \quad (8)$$

Lemma 19 (Supplement) will show that the right hand side of (8) is in fact $TV(N(0, I_d), N(0, \eta^2 I_d))$ and is lower bounded by $1 - (2\eta/(\eta^2 + 1))^{d/2}$.

With the values c_0, η_0 one can establish upper bounds for the three terms of equation (2); in particular $c_0 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_{\text{perm}(i)}\}$ bounds the first term, representing the means' variation. This is shown in detail in Section A.3. We call c_0, η_0 *initial bounds* because, in fact, they can be further reduced, by a technique that we present in Section A.4. Thus, we obtain *refined* parameter distance upper bounds depending on constants c^*, η^* which satisfy $0 \leq c^* \leq c_0, 1 \leq \eta^* \leq \eta_0$ and the following conditions

$$1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{c^*}{2}\right) = \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[c\left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^*}\right) - c^*\right]\right), \quad (9)$$

$$F_d\left(\frac{2(\eta^*)^2 \log \eta^*}{(\eta^*)^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta^*}{(\eta^*)^2 - 1}\right) = \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[c\left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^*}\right) - c^*\right]\right). \quad (10)$$

Note that through equations (9) and (10), c^*, η^* are also determined by π_{\min}, ϵ, c and π_{\max} . The following section shows that the four constants c_0, η_0, c^*, η^* exist and are unique.

2.3 Main Theorem: Good Fits of sGMM Can Only Be Close to a Good Fit.

Now we are ready to state our main result.

Theorem 4. *Let $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$. Suppose P' is any model in $\mathcal{M}(K', \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$ such that $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$ where $\max\{K, K'\} \leq 1/\pi_{\min}$, $\pi_{\max} \leq 1 - (\min\{K, K'\} - 1)\pi_{\min}$. Let c_0, η_0 be defined as in (7) and (8). Then, if $c \geq c_0\eta_0$ and $\pi_{\min} > 2\epsilon$, we have $K = K'$ and further, there exists a permutation $\text{perm} \in \mathbb{S}_K$ and constants $c^* \in [0, c_0], \eta^* \in [1, \eta_0]$ satisfying (9) and (10), such that for each $i \in [K]$,*

$$\|\mu_i - \mu'_{\text{perm}(i)}\| \leq c^* \eta^* \sigma_i \quad (11)$$

$$\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_{\text{perm}(i)}, \sigma'_{\text{perm}(i)}/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta^* \quad (12)$$

$$|\pi_i - \pi'_{\text{perm}(i)}| \leq 2\epsilon + (1 - \pi_{\min} + \pi_{\max})\Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)), \quad (13)$$

where $C(c, c^*, \eta^*)$ is defined by

$$C(c, c^*, \eta^*) := \sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*}(c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{c^*}{2}}. \quad (14)$$

This theorem extends the usual identifiability result. See Section 4 for more discussion with previous works. Furthermore, this upper bound is tractable since all the constants are explicit or computable and it does not assume prior knowledge on parameters. Computability opens up the possibility of applying our result to finite samples.

The following proposition gives an estimate of the constants c_0, η_0, c^*, η^* in the asymptotic regime that $K \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 5. *Given $\pi_{\min} > 2\epsilon > 0$, then c_0, η_0, c^*, η^* defined in equations (7)–(9) exist and each is unique. Further suppose there are nonnegative constants α, β and sufficiently large positive constant γ such that $\beta \leq 1 + \alpha$, $\pi_{\min} = \Omega(K^{-(1+\alpha)})$, $\pi_{\max}/\pi_{\min} = O(K^\beta)$ and $2\epsilon/\pi_{\min} \leq K^{-\gamma}$. When $K \rightarrow \infty$, we have the initial separation condition $c_0 = O(\sqrt{\log K})$, $\eta_0 = O(K^{2\beta/d})$. With any separation $c > c_0\eta_0$, the ultimate upper bound $c^* = O(K^{-\gamma} + K[\sqrt{\log K}/K]^4)$ and $\eta^* = O(K^{-\gamma} + K[\sqrt{\log K}/K]^4)$.*

We make several remarks here. First, specifically, for balanced model classes where $\pi_{\max}/\pi_{\min} = 1$, we conclude that the minimal separation condition is $c > c_0\eta_0 = O(\sqrt{\log K})$. With the prior knowledge of ratios between standard deviations, our result matches the sharp separation threshold $O(\sqrt{\log K})$ established in [26] for learning well-separated mixture of Gaussians. Second, [26] also shows that for sufficiently large C and $K > C^8$, there exist two mixtures P, P' in the model class $\mathcal{M}(K, 1/K, C^{-24}\sqrt{\log K})$ with unit variance for every components, such that their parameter distance is at least $C^{-24}\sqrt{\log K}$ but $d_{TV}(P, P') \leq K^{-C}$. However, with larger multipliers of $\sqrt{\log K}$ in the separation constants, our result further shows that the parameter distance is not diverging as $K \rightarrow \infty$. That is, the mixtures can be identified componentwisely no matter how many clusters there are under our separation conditions.

Third, when K is fixed, the separation lower bound $c_0\eta_0$ decreases in d . Informally, with the same $K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}$, it is easier to distinguish two Gaussians mixtures in higher dimension. This is an instance of the *blessing of dimensionality* for Gaussian Mixture Models [2].

Fourth, constraints on maximal and minimal standard deviation of each components also provide a valid way of regularization. If the components of P, P' satisfy the relation $c > \rho_\sigma c_0$ where $\rho_\sigma = \max_{i,j}\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_j\}/\min_{i,j}\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_j\} \leq \eta_0$, then the one to one correspondance also holds. Finally, when Theorem 4 applies, the two mixtures must have same number of components. This further leads to the following corollary showing that a well-separated Gaussian mixtures cannot be close in total variation distance to a single spherical Gaussian. In the proof in Section A, we prove this corollary and specify the constants.

Corollary 6. *For any $\epsilon < \pi_{\min}$, there is a positive constant c_{single} depending on π_{\min} and ϵ such that when $c > c_{\text{single}}$, no spherical Gaussians are within total variation distance 2ϵ from any P in $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$.*

We shall point out that the upper bounds in Theorem 4 do not tend to 0 as $d_{TV}(P, P') \rightarrow 0$. Ideally, for a fixed mixture distribution $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$, it holds that $\liminf TV(P, P')/d_{param}(P, P') > 0$ as $d_{param}(P, P') \rightarrow 0$, due to a local Taylor expansion analysis proposed in [16]. On the other hand, our ultimate bound c^* and η^* have two parts: the first part coming from the total variation distance between two Gaussians and the second part coming from not-far-enough separation between components. According to the author’s knowledge it is not known if one can obtain computable parameter distance bound between P, P' which scales as $O(TV(P, P'))$ as the total variation distance $TV(P, P')$ tends to zero.

2.4 Theorem 4 Proof Sketch

The detailed proofs of all theorems and lemmas mentioned here are in the Supplement. There is an initial stage in the proof, where bounds c_0, η_0 are obtained, followed by a refinement stage.

Initial stage First, we show in Theorem 15 that if π_{\min} is large and ϵ is small, then for each component P'_j of P' , there exists a “matched” component P_i of P such that $\|\mu'_j - \mu_i\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma'_j, \sigma_i\}$, where c_0 is given by (7).

Next in Theorem 16, we show that if separation is sufficiently large ($c > \eta_0 c_0$), for each component P'_j of P' , the matched component P_i is unique. This implies that $K = K'$. Relabeling the components of P'_j we obtain the initial bounds (c_0, η_0) such that $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_i\}$ and $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_0$ hold for all i .

Refinement We show that if $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_b \max\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_i\}$ and $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_b$ hold for some (c_b, η_b) and for all corresponding pairs in two sGMM from $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \epsilon)$, the separation lower bound of μ_i, μ'_j for $j \neq i$ (i.e. with the components of P' that are not matched with P_i) can be improved. With this, Lemma 12 implies a new upper bound $UB(c_b, \eta_b)$ on the total variation distance between each pair $TV(P_i, P'_i)$ of matched Gaussian components, where

$$UB(c_b, \eta_b) := \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi \left(-\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_b} - c_b\right)/2 \right) \quad (15)$$

is defined for all $c_b \in [0, c_0]$ and $\eta_b \in [1, \eta_0]$.

Therefore from (c_0, η_0) we obtain a new pair of upper bound constants (c_1, η_1) from Lemma 13, with $c_1 < c_0, \eta_1 < \eta_0$. They let us upper bound the total variation distance $TV(P_i, P'_i)$ by $UB(c_1, \eta_1) < UB(c_0, \eta_0)$, which produces tighter constants (c_2, η_2) , and so on.

The sequence of upper bounds (c_t, η_t) , where both $\{c_t\}$ and $\{\eta_t\}$ are positive and decreasing in t , converges to η^*, c^* . These limits are in equation (9), and the proof is in Supplement A.4. Together with the component-wise comparison of proportions Lemma 14, the proof of Theorem 4 can now be completed.

3 Numerical Examples

The upper bounds as well as the conditions in Theorem 4 are computable and here we evaluate them on a variety of examples.

Minimum Separation Recall that for Theorem 4 to apply, both Gaussian mixtures P, P' need to have well separated components, with relative separation $c \geq c_0 \eta_0$. Here we calculate the minimal separation $c_0 \eta_0$ in the limit case $\epsilon = 0$. This will give a view of the domain of applicability of the theorem.

We consider mixtures of spherical Gaussians in $d = 5, 20, 35$ dimensional Euclidean spaces with the number of components K from 2 to 40. For each d and K , the ratio $\eta_\pi = \pi_{\max}/\pi_{\min}$ is set to 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16. From K and η_π , we set π_{\min}, π_{\max} so that $\pi_{\max} = 1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}$. Figure 3 illustrates what the minimal separation requirements are so that Theorem 4 can be applied. We observe that the heterogeneity of mixture proportions η_π indeed has a large effect on the separation requirement; with η_π as large as 16, one may need separation constant $c \geq 12$ to apply Theorem 4 in dimension 5 even with 2 clusters. On the other hand, for balanced mixtures, the requirement is not so severe. For mixtures in $\mathcal{M}(2, 1/2, c)$ namely with two equal components, even for $d = 1$ the lower bound for c is




Figure 2: **Sufficient minimal separation** $c_0\eta_0$ in Theorem 4 under different settings. **Top left, Top right, Bottom Left** show the dependence of $c_0\eta_0$ on K and $\eta_\pi = \pi_{\max}/\pi_{\min}$ in dimensions $d = 5, 20, 35$, respectively. **Bottom right** shows that the dependence of $c_0\eta_0$ on K asymptotes to $\sqrt{\log K}$.

2.29. As expected [2], when d increases, this requirement decreases as low as $c = 1.55$ when $d = 35$. When K increases, $c_0\eta_0$ increases at the rate of approximately $\sqrt{\log K}$.

Upper Bounds for parameter divergence Here we present the numerical values of the upper bounds c^*, η^* as well as of the upper bound on the relative difference $|\pi_i - \pi'_{\text{perm}(i)}|/\pi_{\min}$ from equation (13), for different levels of model fit ϵ . We consider $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, 1/(K+1), c)$ on \mathbb{R}^{20} , and vary $K = 2, 5, 10$, and $c = 3, 4, 5, 6$. Figure 3 shows the values of the three bounds in this scenario. For example, a mixture of $K = 2$ components in $d = 20$ dimensions requires a separation $c \approx 3$ for $\epsilon \approx 0.01$ by Theorem 4. Once this condition holds, we have good guarantees: for each pair of corresponding components,

$$\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq 0.151 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}, \quad \frac{\max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}}{\min\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}} \leq 1.035, \quad |\pi_i - \pi'_i| \leq 0.02 \approx 0.06\pi_{\min}. \quad (16)$$

From Figure 3 we see that when ϵ is small, all bounds are dominated by the separation c . As ϵ increases, we observe that all three bounds are dominated by ϵ . Note the relation between these graphs and the orange curve $\eta_\pi = 2$ from Figure 3.

4 Discussion

Comparisons with recent robust identifiability results Theorem 4 is the first result to our knowledge to provide computable *global* parameter stability upper bounds of mixtures of well-separated sGMMs. This result can also be seen as a *robust identifiability* result for $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$.

When $TV(P, P') \rightarrow 0$, some identifiability result exists using W_1 distance of parameters: [16],[15], etc, show that for two sets of parameter distributions G, G' with $W_1(G, G')$ small, $TV(P_G, P_{G'})$ is asymptotically greater than the $W_1(G, G')$ distance (without assuming separation). This result is almost the converse of our Theorem 4.




Figure 3: **Upper Bounds** on the distance between corresponding means c^* (top row), ratio of standard deviations η^* minus one (middle row) and the difference in mixture proportions measured in multiples of π_{\min} (bottom row) from Theorem 4 for different values of K , and of separation $\text{Sep} = c$, in $d = 20$ dimensions. Some curves don't appear because the separation is not large enough to obtain the upper bound, as indicated by the Top, Left panel of Figure 3 (orange curve).

The closest related works are the parameter identifiability theorems in robust learning of Gaussian mixtures, namely Theorem B.1 in [10], Theorem 8.1 in [22], Theorem 9.1 in [3], which are based on newly developed methods of moments proof techniques.

Consider two mixtures of general Gaussians P, P' with maximal number of components being K . The assumptions made are that $TV(P, P') \leq \epsilon$, minimal weights of P, P' are greater than ϵ^{b_1} and different components of P, P' have separation in total variation distance greater than ϵ^{b_2} , for sufficiently small constants $b_1, b_2 > 0$ depending only on K . The key observation used in the proofs is that the parameters distances of $P_k, P'_{\text{perm}(k)}$ are bounded by $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$ if the Hermite moment polynomials is bounded by $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$, which is guaranteed by the assumption that the total variation distance between P, P' is upper bounded by ϵ . Their proof technique can be directly modified into proving that P is $(\epsilon, \tilde{\delta}(\epsilon))$ stable with $\tilde{\delta}(\epsilon) = O_k(\epsilon^{b_3^K})$, where b_3 is another sufficiently small positive constant.

When P is fixed (the case of interest both for us and for robust identifiability in general), if $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ these results are tighter than ours as the bound $\tilde{\delta} \rightarrow 0$. In this case, the assumptions on P become more relaxed than ours. However, it is not known how to determine the unspecified constants in $\tilde{\delta}$ from their proof techniques, and the dependence on K and exponent of ϵ are not optimal ([26], respectively in the discussion in Section 2).

For larger, more realistic ϵ , the rate $\tilde{\delta}(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{b_3^K}$ is much slower than what our numerical simulations achieve, which appears as $\delta(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}) \sim \epsilon$. In this case, the assumptions on π_{\min} and separation of Theorem 4 remain fixed, while the assumptions in [22, 3] become more restrictive (or may even not apply) with larger ϵ . Hence, our results are more useful for robust recovery, where extending stability to larger ϵ is desired, while [22, 3] are useful in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and for *algorithmic* stability (the main goal of these works). This growth of $\delta(\epsilon, \mathcal{M}) \sim \epsilon$ matches the sharp threshold of [16], which is obtained asymptotically for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, suggesting that [16] may hold for larger ϵ and that our worst case bound may match it at least under certain conditions.

Regarding the dependence on K , a sharp threshold for sGMM was obtained by [26], who show that $\Omega(\sqrt{\log K})$ separation is necessary and sufficient to recover this class of GMM in polynomial sample size and time. Our Theorem 4 is approximately matching this threshold.

Results on other related problems Solving for exact MLE in Spherical Gaussian Mixture Models has been proved to be NP-hard [30]. The current mainstream approach to fitting GMM is the *Expectation-Maximization* (EM) algorithm [8]; One cannot prove that EM will converge to the global maximum of log-likelihood function without further assumptions, and in fact, EM can converge to bad local maxima with high probability [19], even for well-separated Gaussians; the same paper also confirms the existence of local maxima in the population likelihood function. This negative result makes it the more necessary to have a post-processing validation stage, in which to be able to reject bad local optima. The results in our paper can fulfill this role, in the population sense.

A second approach to estimating GMM parameters with consistency guarantees relies on *Methods of Moments* (MOM) [24], and is exemplified in [17, 31]. [17] used moments up to the third order to learn an sGMM. They don't require separation conditions, but need the means of different components to be linear independent. Therefore, this method cannot be applied to low d and large K scenario. [31] used an semi-definite programming based denoising procedure of moments up to order $O(K)$.

When the cluster components are well-separated, a different line of research proposed in the seminal paper [6] and refined in [27, 1, 20], etc, and [7], provides an accurate estimation of GMM parameters with high probability. All these results are predicated on the data being sampled from a mixture of well separated Gaussians.

Also, previously very few results have been established on evaluating the result of a Gaussian Mixture fit. In these works, e.g. [12], [18]), the main target is model selection, especially consistently estimating the number of components in a Gaussian Mixture population.

Bootstrap stability A series of papers [21, 25, 5, 4, 28, 29] discuss the properties of "bootstrap stability" of K-means and Gaussian Mixtures, focusing on the stability of a clustering under resampling of the data, or perturbations in the clustering algorithm. The goal in these work was to use bootstrap stability in selecting the number of clusters K .

In conclusion, this paper obtains the first *computable* robust identifiability bounds for spherical Gaussian mixtures, in the population setting. Our bounds can be extended to Gaussian mixtures with full covariance matrices Σ_k , and bounded excentricity. The bounds $\tilde{\delta}(\epsilon, \mathcal{M})$ match the known sharp threshold w.r.t K from [26], and are uniform over the model class $\mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, c)$.

In the proof we introduce an iterative approach for tightening the bounds which is original, to our knowledge. Several other results of our Lemmas can be of independent interest, such as a tighter bounds on parameter variation for a single Gaussian, that remain informative for larger perturbations in TV distance than the previous bound of [9].

Acknowledgment

The author acknowledges support from NSF DMS award 1810975.

References

- [1] Dimitris Achlioptas and Frank McSherry. On spectral learning of mixtures of distributions. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Learning Theory, COLT'05*, page 458–469, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3540265562. doi: 10.1007/11503415_31. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11503415_31.
- [2] Joseph Anderson, Mikhail Belkin, Navin Goyal, Luis Rademacher, and James R. Voss. The more, the merrier: the blessing of dimensionality for learning large gaussian mixtures. In *COLT*, 2014.
- [3] Ainesh Bakshi, Ilias Diakonikolas, He Jia, Daniel M. Kane, Pravesh K. Kothari, and Santosh S. Vempala. Robustly learning mixtures of k arbitrary gaussians. *CoRR*, abs/2012.02119, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.02119>.
- [4] S. Ben-David and U. von Luxburg. Relating clustering stability to properties of cluster boundaries. In *COLT 2008*, pages 379–390, Madison, WI, USA, July 2008. Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Omnipress.
- [5] Shai Ben-David, Dávid Pál, and Hans Ulrich Simon. Stability of k -means clustering. In Nader H. Bshouty and Claudio Gentile, editors, *Learning Theory*, pages 20–34, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [6] Sanjoy Dasgupta. Learning mixtures of gaussians. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '99*, page 634, USA, 1999. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN 0769504094.
- [7] Sanjoy Dasgupta and Leonard Schulman. A probabilistic analysis of em for mixtures of separated, spherical gaussians. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(7):203–226, 2007. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v8/dasgupta07a.html>.
- [8] A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–22, 1977. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01600.x>. URL <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01600.x>.
- [9] Luc Devroye, Abbas Mehrabian, and Tommy Reddad. The total variation distance between high-dimensional gaussians, 2020.
- [10] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, and Alistair Stewart. Statistical query lower bounds for robust estimation of high-dimensional gaussians and gaussian mixtures. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 73–84, 2017. doi: 10.1109/FOCS.2017.16.
- [11] Natalie Doss, Yihong Wu, Pengkun Yang, and Harrison H. Zhou. Optimal estimation of high-dimensional gaussian mixtures. 2020.
- [12] Mathias Drton and Martyn Plummer. A bayesian information criterion for singular models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(2):323–380, Feb 2017. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12187.
- [13] Harley Flanders. Differentiation under the integral sign. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 80(6):615–627, 1973. ISSN 00029890, 19300972. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2319163>.
- [14] Alison L. Gibbs and Francis Edward Su. On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique*, 70(3):419–435, 2002. ISSN 03067734, 17515823. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1403865>.
- [15] Philippe Heinrich and Jonas Kahn. Strong identifiability and optimal minimax rates for finite mixture estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2844 – 2870, 2018. doi: 10.1214/17-AOS1641. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOS1641>.

- [16] Nhat Ho and XuanLong Nguyen. Convergence rates of parameter estimation for some weakly identifiable finite mixtures. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(6):2726 – 2755, 2016. doi: 10.1214/16-AOS1444. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/16-AOS1444>.
- [17] Daniel Hsu and Sham M. Kakade. Learning mixtures of spherical gaussians: Moment methods and spectral decompositions. In *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS '13*, page 11–20, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450318594. doi: 10.1145/2422436.2422439. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2422436.2422439>.
- [18] Tao Huang, Heng Peng, and Kun Zhang. Model selection for gaussian mixture models. *Statistica Sinica*, 27(1):147–169, 2017. ISSN 10170405, 19968507. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44114365>.
- [19] Chi Jin, Yuchen Zhang, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, Martin J. Wainwright, and Michael I. Jordan. Local maxima in the likelihood of gaussian mixture models: Structural results and algorithmic consequences. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'16*, page 4123–4131, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2016. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 9781510838819.
- [20] Ravindran Kannan, Hadi Salmasian, and Santosh Vempala. The spectral method for general mixture models. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(3):1141–1156, 2008. doi: 10.1137/S0097539704445925.
- [21] Tilman Lange, Volker Roth, Mikio L. Braun, and Joachim M. Buhmann. Stability-based validation of clustering solutions. *Neural Comput.*, 16(6):1299–1323, 2004. ISSN 0899-7667. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089976604773717621>.
- [22] Allen Liu and Ankur Moitra. Settling the robust learnability of mixtures of gaussians. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2021*, page 518–531, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450380539. doi: 10.1145/3406325.3451084. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451084>.
- [23] Marina Meilă. The uniqueness of a good optimum for k-means. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '06*, page 625–632, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 1595933832. doi: 10.1145/1143844.1143923. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1143844.1143923>.
- [24] Karl Pearson. Iii. contributions to the mathematical theory of evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. (A.)*, 185:71–110, 1894.
- [25] Alexander Rakhlin and Andrea Caponnetto. Stability of k-means clustering. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS'06*, pages 1121–1128, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2006. MIT Press.
- [26] Oded Regev and Aravindan Vijayaraghavan. On learning mixtures of well-separated gaussians. *CoRR*, abs/1710.11592, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.11592>.
- [27] Arora Sanjeev and Ravi Kannan. Learning mixtures of arbitrary gaussians. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '01*, page 247–257, New York, NY, USA, 2001. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 1581133499. doi: 10.1145/380752.380808. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/380752.380808>.
- [28] Ohad Shamir and Naftali Tishby. On the reliability of clustering stability in the large sample regime. In D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, pages 1465–1472. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- [29] Ohad Shamir and Naftali Tishby. Stability and model selection in k-means clustering. *Machine Learning*, 80(2):213–243, Sep 2010.
- [30] Christopher Tosh and Sanjoy Dasgupta. Maximum likelihood estimation for mixtures of spherical gaussians is np-hard. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(175):1–11, 2018. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-657.html>.

- [31] Yihong Wu and Pengkun Yang. Optimal estimation of Gaussian mixtures via denoised method of moments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(4):1981 – 2007, 2020. doi: 10.1214/19-AOS1873. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-AOS1873>.

A Proof of Main Results

A.1 Proof of Proposition 5

Proof of Proposition 5. First c_0 exists and is unique from (7). The definition of c_0 shows that

$$\Phi(-c_0/2) = 1 - \Phi(c_0/2) = 1 - \Phi(\Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{2})) = \frac{1}{2}(\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon). \quad (17)$$

Consider $R(\eta)$ to be a function defined by the the R.H.S. of (8) tending to zero, i.e.

$$R(\eta) = F_d \left(\frac{2\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) - F_d \left(\frac{2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) \quad (18)$$

and $R(\eta) \rightarrow 0$ when $\eta \rightarrow 1^+$. According to Lemma 21, $R(\eta)$ is increasing in η and tends to one when $\eta \rightarrow \infty$. Denote

$$L(\eta) = 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi} + \frac{1 - \pi}{\pi} 2\Phi(-\frac{\eta_0 c_0}{2}). \quad (19)$$

Then the L.H.S. of (8) can both be written as $L(\eta)$. Since

$$L(1) = 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi} + \frac{1 - \pi}{\pi} (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon) \quad (20)$$

$$= 1 - (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon) \left(-\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi} - 1 \right) \quad (21)$$

$$= 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon > 0 \quad (22)$$

and when $\eta \rightarrow \infty$, $L(\eta)$ tends to $1 - (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon)/\pi < 1$. Therefore since $L(\eta)$ is decreasing in η and $R(\eta)$ is increasing, there exists a unique η_0 that satisfies equation (8).

For the second part of this lemma, we now consider the case $\pi_{\min} = \Omega(K^{-(1+\alpha)})$ for some $\alpha \geq 0, \pi_{\max}/\pi_{\min} = O(K^\beta)$ for some $0 \leq \beta \leq 1 + \alpha$ and ϵ small enough such that $\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon = \Omega(K^{-(1+\alpha)})$. By (7), it holds that

$$\Phi(-\frac{1}{2}c_0) = \Omega \left(\frac{1}{2K^{1+\alpha}} \right). \quad (23)$$

Note that for any constant $\zeta > 0$,

$$\Phi(-\frac{1}{2}2\sqrt{2\log(2K^{1+\alpha}/\zeta)}) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{8}(2\sqrt{2\log(2K^{1+\alpha}/\zeta)})^2 \right) = \frac{\zeta}{2K^{1+\alpha}} \lesssim \Phi(-\frac{1}{2}c_0) \quad (24)$$

where $a \lesssim b$ means there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that $a \leq A \cdot b$. Hence there exists some $\zeta_0 > 0$ such that

$$c_0 \leq 2\sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{2K^{1+\alpha}}{\zeta_0}\right)} = O(\sqrt{\log K})$$

Now we upper bound η_0 . Note that for any $t > 0$, let

$$g(t) = 1 - \Phi(t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{t}{t^2 + 1} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2). \quad (25)$$

Since $g'(t) = -2e^{-t^2/2}/(t^2 + 1)^2$, $g(t)$ is strictly decreasing. Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t) = 0$, we have $g(t) \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$1 - \Phi(t) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{t}{t^2 + 1} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2) > \frac{1}{5\sqrt{2\pi}t} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2) \quad (26)$$

holds for all $t \geq 1/2$. Therefore since $\Phi(-c_0/2) \leq 1/2K \leq 1/4$ or $c_0/2 \geq 0.67 > 0.5$

$$\frac{1}{2K} \geq \Phi(-\frac{1}{2}c_0) \geq \frac{1}{5\sqrt{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}c_0} \exp(-\frac{1}{8}c_0^2), \quad (27)$$

we conclude that $\exp(-\frac{1}{8}c_0^2) = O(\sqrt{\log K}/K)$. Therefore,

$$L(\eta) = 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} + \frac{1 - \pi_{\max}}{\pi_{\max}} 2\Phi(-\frac{1}{2}\eta c_0) \quad (28)$$

$$\leq 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} + 2K \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta^2 c_0^2\right) \quad (29)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} + O\left(K \left[\frac{\sqrt{\log K}}{K}\right]^{4\eta^2}\right). \quad (30)$$

On the other hand the R.H.S. of (8) is lower bounded by

$$R(\eta) > 1 - \left(\frac{2\eta}{\eta^2 + 1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} > 1 - \left(\frac{2}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (31)$$

Hence take $\tilde{\eta} = 2(2\pi_{\max}/(\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon))^{2/d} = O(K^{2\beta/d})$, it holds that

$$R(\tilde{\eta}) - L(\tilde{\eta}) > \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} - \Omega\left(K \left[\frac{\sqrt{\log K}}{K}\right]^{4\tilde{\eta}^2}\right). \quad (32)$$

However by the selection of $\tilde{\eta}$, $R(\tilde{\eta}) - L(\tilde{\eta})$ has to be positive for sufficiently large K . Therefore $\eta_0 < \tilde{\eta}$ and we conclude that for sufficiently large K $\eta_0 = O(K^{2\beta/d})$.

Finally we will consider the estimates of c^* and η^* . To start with, the R.H.S. of (9) is always upper bounded by

$$\frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[c\left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^*}\right) - c^*\right]\right) \leq \gamma + 2K \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}c_0^2\eta_0^2\right) \quad (33)$$

$$= \frac{1}{K^\gamma} + O\left(K \left[\frac{\sqrt{\log K}}{K}\right]^{4\eta_0^2}\right). \quad (34)$$

The R.H.S. of (9) and (10) is $O(1)$ and smaller than 1 for sufficiently large K . Note that for two spherical Gaussians $P_1 = N_d(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2 I_d)$, $P_2 = N_d(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2 I_d)$, from Lemma 7 and conclude the bounds on c^* and η^* . \square

A.2 Technical Tools for Proving Theorem 4

Instead of directly diving into the proof of Theorem 4, we start by some observations in mixture models and analysis on total variation distances between spherical Gaussians. It is worthwhile noticing that in the lemmas in this subsection, we don't require the two mixture models P, P' to have the same number of components.

A.2.1 Total Variation Distance Between Spherical Gaussians

We develop a lemma upper bounding parameter distances between spherical Gaussians given their total variation distance. For this, one can use Hellinger distance, which includes an analytical expression as a natural lower bound Gibbs and Su [14], but they are usually not tight in constants and therefore they cannot separate the bound in mean parameter and variance parameter. Devroye et al. [9] proposes another lower bound starting from the definitions but their results are only meaningful when the total variation distance is sufficiently small.

Lemma 7. *Suppose $P_1 = N_d(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2 I_d)$ and $P_2 = N_d(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2 I_d)$. Let $C_0(\rho) = 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{\rho}{2})$ and $\eta_0(\rho)$ be the solution of*

$$1 - \rho = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right). \quad (35)$$

Then the following holds:

- If $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| \geq C_0(\rho)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/2$, then $TV(P_1, P_2) \geq 1 - \rho$. Equality holds iff $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| = C_0(\rho)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/2$.
- If $\max\{\sigma_1/\sigma_2, \sigma_2/\sigma_1\} \geq \eta_0(\rho)$, then $TV(P_1, P_2) \geq 1 - \rho$. Equality holds iff $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\max\{\sigma_1/\sigma_2, \sigma_2/\sigma_1\} = \eta_0(\rho)$.

We separate the Gaussian total variation lower bound into three different lemmas and prove them.

Lemma 8. Suppose $P_1 = N_d(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2 I_d)$ and $P_2 = N_d(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2 I_d)$. Let Φ be the CDF of standard normal distribution and define for each $0 < \rho < 1$,

$$C_0(\rho) = 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{\rho}{2}) \quad (36)$$

If $C = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| / \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \geq C_0(\rho)$, then there exists a set A such that $P_1(A) - P_2(A) \geq 1 - \rho$. Equality holds iff $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $C = C_0(\rho)$.

Proof of Lemma 8. Let p_1, p_2 be the density of P_1, P_2 and random variables X_1, X_2 follow P_1, P_2 respectively.

WLOG assume that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$. If the statement holds under this case, then when $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2$, one can select \bar{A} such that $P_2(\bar{A}) - P_1(\bar{A}) > 1 - \rho$. Then take $A = \bar{A}^c$ and the desired result holds.

To start with, we consider the case $d = 1$ and assume $\mu_2 - \mu_1 = C\sigma_2 = C\eta\sigma_1 > 0$. When $\sigma_2 > \sigma_1$, let A be the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x_{0,-} \leq x \leq x_{0,+}\}$ where

$$x_{0,\pm} = \frac{\frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\mu_2}{\sigma_2^2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2} + 2(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}) \log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}}}{\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}} \quad (37)$$

$x_{0,\pm}$ are the two roots of the equation that the two normal densities equal, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} \exp\left\{-\frac{(x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2} \exp\left\{-\frac{(x - \mu_2)^2}{2\sigma_2^2}\right\} \quad (38)$$

Denote $\eta = \sigma_2/\sigma_1 \geq 1$, when $\eta > 1$ it holds that

$$x_{1,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} = \frac{-C\eta \pm \eta\sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1)\log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} \quad (39)$$

$$x_{2,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} = \frac{-C\eta^2 \pm \sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1)\log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} \quad (40)$$

Let φ be the density function of standard normal distribution then $\varphi(x_{2,+}) = \eta\varphi(x_{1,+})$, $\varphi(x_{2,-}) = \eta\varphi(x_{1,-})$ by the selection of $x_{0,\pm}$. Since the desired expression

$$P_1(A) - P_2(A) = Pr(x_{1,-} \leq \frac{x - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} \leq x_{1,+}) - Pr(x_{2,-} \leq \frac{x - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} \leq x_{2,+}) \quad (41)$$

$$= \Phi(x_{1,+}) - \Phi(x_{1,-}) - \Phi(x_{2,+}) + \Phi(x_{2,-}) \quad (42)$$

is implicitly a function of C, η , we denote it as $h_+(C, \eta)$. Note that since

$$x_{0,\pm} = \frac{\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\mu_2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)^2 - \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2} - 2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}\right) \log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}}{\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}\right) \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\mu_2}{\sigma_2^2} \mp \sqrt{\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2} + 2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}\right) \log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}}\right)} = \frac{\frac{\mu_1^2}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\mu_2^2}{\sigma_2^2} - 2\log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}}{\frac{\mu_1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\mu_2}{\sigma_2^2} \mp \sqrt{\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{\sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2} + 2\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}\right) \log \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}}} \quad (43)$$

Consider the limit $\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1$ with σ_1 fixed and recall that $\mu_2 - \mu_1 = C\sigma_2 > 0$, it holds that $\lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1} x_{0,-} = -\infty$ and $\lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1} x_{0,+} = (\mu_1 + \mu_2)/2$. And further

$$\lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1^+} x_{1,+} = \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1 - 1}{2\sigma_1} = \frac{C}{2}, \quad \lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1^+} x_{1,-} = -\infty \quad (44)$$

$$\lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1^+} x_{2,+} = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{2\sigma_2} = -\frac{C}{2}, \quad \lim_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \sigma_1^+} x_{2,-} = -\infty \quad (45)$$

which implies, since Φ is continuous,

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1^+} h_+(C, \eta) = 1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{C}{2}\right) \quad (46)$$

Observe that $x_{1,\pm} - \eta x_{2,\pm} = C\eta$ or $x_{2,\pm} = x_{1,\pm}/\eta - C$. Then

$$\frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \frac{\partial x_{2,\pm}}{\partial \eta} = \frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \left[-\frac{1}{\eta^2} x_{1,\pm} + \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} \right] = \frac{1}{\eta} x_{1,\pm}. \quad (47)$$

(38) shows that $\eta\varphi(x_{1,\pm}) = \varphi(x_{2,\pm})$. Then, by taking partial derivative with η , it holds that

$$\frac{\partial h_+(C, \eta)}{\partial \eta} = \varphi(x_{1,+}) \frac{\partial x_{1,+}}{\partial \eta} - \varphi(x_{1,-}) \frac{\partial x_{1,-}}{\partial \eta} - \varphi(x_{2,+}) \frac{\partial x_{2,+}}{\partial \eta} + \varphi(x_{2,-}) \frac{\partial x_{2,-}}{\partial \eta} \quad (48)$$

$$= \varphi(x_{1,+}) \left[\frac{\partial x_{1,+}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \frac{\partial x_{2,+}}{\partial \eta} \right] - \varphi(x_{1,-}) \left[\frac{\partial x_{1,-}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \frac{\partial x_{2,-}}{\partial \eta} \right] \quad (49)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\eta} (x_{1,+} \varphi(x_{1,+}) - x_{1,-} \varphi(x_{1,-})) \quad (50)$$

$$> 0. \quad (51)$$

where in the last inequality we use the observation that $x_{1,-} < 0 < x_{1,+}$, $|x_{1,-}| > |x_{1,+}|$. Therefore $h_+(C, \eta)$ is increasing with η when C is fixed. And when $C > C_0(\rho)$ it holds that $h_+(C, \eta) > 1 - 2\Phi(-C_0(\rho)/2) = 1 - \rho$.

When $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = C\sigma_2 > 0$ again define

$$x_{1,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} = \frac{C\eta \pm \eta \sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} \quad (52)$$

$$x_{2,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} = \frac{C\eta^2 \pm \sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1}. \quad (53)$$

Consider $h_-(C, \eta) = P_1(A) - P_2(A) = \Phi(x_{1,+}) - \Phi(x_{1,-}) - \Phi(x_{2,+}) + \Phi(x_{2,-})$. First we observe that $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1^+} x_{1,+} = +\infty$ and $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1^+} x_{1,-} = -C/2$. This shows that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1^+} h_-(C, \eta) = 1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{C}{2}\right) \quad (54)$$

still holds. Note that we still have $x_{2,\pm} = x_{1,\pm}/\eta + C$. Taking derivatives w.r.t. η with same argument we have

$$\frac{\partial h_-(C, \eta)}{\partial \eta} = \frac{1}{\eta} (x_{1,+} \varphi(x_{1,+}) - x_{1,-} \varphi(x_{1,-})). \quad (55)$$

Since $x_{1,-} < 0 < x_{1,+}$, the partial derivative is still positive. Therefore the result holds with similar arguments. Combining the two cases we complete the proof for the case $d = 1$.

Finally when $d \geq 2$, we consider the set of x projected on to the one dimensional space spanned by $\mu_2 - \mu_1$.

When $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1$, the set $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : p_1(x) \geq p_2(x)\}$ is the half space

$$A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left\langle x, \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1}{\|\mu_2 - \mu_1\|} \right\rangle \leq \frac{\mu_1 + \mu_2}{2} \right\}$$

Therefore $P_1(A) - P_2(A) = 1 - 2\Phi(-\frac{C}{2}) \geq 1 - \rho$ since $C \geq C_0(\rho) = 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \rho/2)$. Equality holds iff $C = C_0(\rho)$.

When $\sigma_2/\sigma_1 > 1$, consider $\tilde{P}_1 = N(\tilde{\mu}_1, \sigma_1^2)$ with $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \langle \mu_1, \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1}{\|\mu_2 - \mu_1\|} \rangle$ and $\tilde{P}_2 = N(\tilde{\mu}_2, \sigma_2^2)$ with $\tilde{\mu}_2 = \langle \mu_2, \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1}{\|\mu_2 - \mu_1\|} \rangle$. Compute $\tilde{x}_{0,\pm}$ by equation (37) with \tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_2 and let set

$$A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tilde{x}_{0,-} \leq \left\langle x, \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1}{\|\mu_2 - \mu_1\|} \right\rangle \leq \tilde{x}_{0,+} \right\}, \quad \tilde{A} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \tilde{x}_{0,-} \leq x \leq \tilde{x}_{0,+}\}. \quad (56)$$

Note that $|\tilde{\mu}_2 - \tilde{\mu}_1| = \|\mu_2 - \mu_1\| = C \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ and thus

$$P_1(A) - P_2(A) = \tilde{P}_1(\tilde{A}) - \tilde{P}_2(\tilde{A}) > 1 - \rho. \quad (57)$$

□

Lemma 9. *Under the same setting of lemma 8, if $C = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|/(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \geq C_0(\rho)/2$, then there exists a set A such that $P_1(A) - P_2(A) \geq 1 - \rho$. Equality holds iff $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $C = C_0(\rho)/2$.*

Proof of lemma 9. The proof is mostly unchanged compared with lemma 8. We still consider the case $d = 1$ and assume $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ first. Once this is established, the remaining can be obtained from similar argument as in the proof of lemma 8. Let $x_{0,\pm}$ be the same as in proof of lemma 8.

When $\mu_2 - \mu_1 = C(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) > 0$, now we should define

$$x_{1,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_1}{\sigma_1} = \frac{-C(\eta + 1) \pm \eta \sqrt{C^2(\eta + 1)^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} \quad (58)$$

$$x_{2,\pm} = \frac{x_{0,\pm} - \mu_2}{\sigma_2} = \frac{-C\eta(\eta + 1) \pm \sqrt{C^2(\eta + 1)^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1}, \quad (59)$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 8, it holds that

$$h_+(C, \eta) = \Phi(x_{1,+}) - \Phi(x_{1,-}) - \Phi(x_{2,+}) + \Phi(x_{2,-}), \quad (60)$$

and

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1^+} h_+(C, \eta) = 1 - 2\Phi(-C). \quad (61)$$

Since $x_{1,\pm} - \eta x_{2,\pm} = C(\eta + 1)$ or $x_{2,\pm} = x_{1,\pm}/\eta - C(1 + 1/\eta)$, then

$$\frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \frac{\partial x_{2,\pm}}{\partial \eta} = \frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} - \eta \left[-\frac{1}{\eta^2} x_{1,\pm} + \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\partial x_{1,\pm}}{\partial \eta} + \frac{C}{\eta^2} \right] = \frac{1}{\eta} x_{1,\pm} - \frac{C}{\eta}. \quad (62)$$

By the same computation as in equation (51) we have

$$\frac{\partial h_+(C, \eta)}{\partial \eta} = \frac{1}{\eta} ((x_{1,+} - C)\varphi(x_{1,+}) - (x_{1,-} - C)\varphi(x_{1,-})). \quad (63)$$

Note that

$$x_{1,+} - C = \frac{-C(\eta + 1) - C(\eta^2 - 1) + \eta \sqrt{C^2(\eta + 1)^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} \quad (64)$$

$$= \frac{-C\eta(\eta + 1)}{\eta - 1} + \frac{\eta \sqrt{C^2(\eta + 1)^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} > 0 \quad (65)$$

$$x_{1,-} - C = \frac{-C\eta(\eta + 1)}{\eta - 1} - \frac{\eta \sqrt{C^2(\eta + 1)^2 + 2(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}}{\eta^2 - 1} < 0 \quad (66)$$

Hence the derivative in (63) is positive. By the same argument, it holds that $h_+(C, \eta) \geq 1 - 2\Phi(-C) > 1 - \rho$.

A similar argument can be applied to the case $\mu_1 > \mu_2$ and is omitted. For the equality case, when $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $C = C_0(\rho)/2$, it is the same as in the proof in Lemma 8. □

Lemma 10. *Suppose $P_{1,2} = N_d(\mu_{1,2}, \sigma_{1,2}^2 I_d)$, $0 < \rho < 1$. Let F_d be the CDF of $\text{Gamma}(\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2})$, and $\eta_0(\rho)$ is the solution of*

$$1 - \rho = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right). \quad (67)$$

If $\eta := \max\{\sigma_1/\sigma_2, \sigma_2/\sigma_1\} > \eta_0(\rho)$, then there exists a set A such that $P_1(A) - P_2(A) > 1 - \rho$.

To prove Lemma 10, we need to invoke a generalization of Reynolds' transportation theorem. The following lemma and required definitions can be found as equation 7.2 in Flanders [13]

Lemma 11. Let Ω_t be an ℓ -dimensional time-variant domain of integration in \mathbb{R}^d , and can be given by the image of a smooth map $(u, t) \rightarrow x(u, t)$, where u runs over a fixed domain in a \mathbb{R}^ℓ . Let ω be an exterior ℓ -form that can be represented in local coordinates as

$$\omega = \sum_H a_H(x, t) dx^H, \quad dx^H = dx^{h_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{h_\ell}. \quad (68)$$

where H is the multi-index and $1 \leq h_1 < h_2 < \cdots < h_\ell \leq n$. Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_t} \omega = \int_{\Omega_t} i_v(d_x \omega) + \int_{\Omega_t} \dot{\omega} + \int_{\partial \Omega_t} i_v \omega \quad (69)$$

where $v = \partial x / \partial t$, i_v denotes the interior product with v , $d_x \omega$ is the exterior derivative of ω with respect to x and $\dot{\omega} = \sum_H \frac{\partial a_H(x, t)}{\partial t} dx^H$

Proof of lemma 10. The proof is with the similar but more complicated technique as in the proof of lemma 8. WLOG assume that $\sigma_2 = \eta \sigma_1 \geq \eta_0(\rho) \sigma_1 > \sigma_1$ and

$$\mu_1 = (\mu_{11}, \cdots, \mu_{1d}), \quad \mu_2 = (C\sigma_2 + \mu_{21}, \cdots, \mu_{2d}). \quad (70)$$

By symmetricity, we can further assume $C \geq 0, \mu_{22} = \mu_{12}, \cdots, \mu_{2d} = \mu_{1d}$.

Let p_1, p_2 be the densities of P_1, P_2 respectively. Note that p_1 is just the density of standard d -dimensional Gaussian, which we will denote as φ_d . Then algebraic computation shows that the set

$$A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : p_1(x) \geq p_2(x)\} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left\| x - \frac{\eta^2 \mu_1 - \mu_2}{\eta^2 - 1} \right\| \leq \frac{\sigma_2}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta} \right\}. \quad (71)$$

Note that A is a ball in d -dimension. Write

$$A_1(C, \eta) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left\| x - \left(-\frac{C\eta}{\eta^2 - 1}, 0, \cdots, 0 \right) \right\| \leq \frac{\eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta} \right\}, \quad (72)$$

we can compute the probability directly by

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(A) &= \int_{x: \left\| x - \frac{\eta^2 \mu_1 - \mu_2}{\eta^2 - 1} \right\| \leq \frac{\sigma_2}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}} \sigma_1^d} \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - \mu_1\|^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right) dx \\ &= \int_{y: \left\| y + \frac{C\eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \right\| \leq \frac{\eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y\|^2}{2}\right) dy \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

$$= \int_{A_1(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(x) dx, \quad (74)$$

where φ_d is the density of $N_d(0, I_d)$ distribution, and Similarly let $A_2(C, \eta) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left\| x - \left(-C\eta^2/(\eta^2 - 1), 0, \cdots, 0 \right) \right\| \leq \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}/(\eta^2 - 1)\}$ we have

$$P_2(A) = \int_{A_2(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(x) dx. \quad (75)$$

Let $h(C, \eta) = P_1(A) - P_2(A)$, as the latter is only determined by C and η . We now prove that for any fixed $\eta \geq \eta_0(\rho)$, $h(C, \eta)$ is monotonically increasing in $C \geq 0$.

To show this, we consider taking partial derivative of $h(C, \eta)$ with respect to C .

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C} h(C, \eta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_1(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(x) dx - \frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_2(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(x) dx, \quad (76)$$

We first tackle $\frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_1(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(x) dx$. $A_1(C, \eta)$ is a hyperball. Let n be the normal vector given in polar coordinates, then one can perform the following change of variable

$$x : (n, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \quad (77)$$

$$x_1 = o_1 + r \cos \theta_1 \quad (78)$$

$$x_2 = r \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \quad (79)$$

$$\cdots \quad (80)$$

$$x_{d-2} = r \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} \cos \theta_{d-1} \quad (81)$$

$$x_d = r \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} \sin \theta_{d-1} \quad (82)$$

where $o_1 = -C\eta/(\eta^2 - 1)$ and $0 \leq r \leq R_1$ with

$$R_1 = \frac{\eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}. \quad (83)$$

For each $C > 0$, there is a small neighborhood of $C \in (C_a, C_b)$ such that $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is a continuously differentiable map on $[0, R_1] \times [0, \pi]^{d-2} \times [0, 2\pi] \times (C_a, C_b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Here is where lemma 11 kicks in. Consider the d -form $\omega = \varphi_d(x) dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_d$. Then since ω is a d -form on \mathbb{R}^d , its exterior derivative w.r.t. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is zero. And since φ_d is independent of C , $\dot{\omega} = 0$.

Therefore equation (69) is simplified to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_1(C, \eta)} \omega = \int_{\partial A_1(C, \eta)} i_{v_1}(\omega). \quad (84)$$

where $v_1 = \partial x / \partial C$.

We shall now identify $i_{v_1}(\omega)$. As $\partial A_1(C, \eta)$ is a hypersphere with dimension $d - 1$, it is orientable. Further, consider the following bases of tangent space of $\partial A_1(C, \eta)$

$$e_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d - 1 \quad (85)$$

and outward pointing unit normal $n = \partial / \partial r$. Then for any vector field $t = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} t_i e_i + t_d n$, by the definition of interior product and the fact that ω is an alternating d -linear tensor, it holds that

$$i_t(\omega)(e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) = \omega(t, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (86)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} t_i \omega(e_i, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) + t_d \omega(n, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (87)$$

$$= \varphi_d(x) t_d (dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_d)(n, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (88)$$

$$= \varphi_d(x) \langle t, n \rangle d\Sigma(n)(e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (89)$$

where we denote $d\Sigma(n) = i_n(dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n)$ to be the area element. In other words, $d\Sigma(n)$ is the differential form such that

$$d\Sigma(n)(e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) = (dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_d)(n, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (90)$$

$$= R_1^{d-1} \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_{d-2} (dr \wedge d\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\theta_{d-1})(n, e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}) \quad (91)$$

$$= R_1^{d-1} \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_{d-2}, \quad (92)$$

which shows that $d\Sigma(n) = R_1^{d-1} \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_{d-2} d\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\theta_{d-1}$. Then since $i_{v_1}(\omega) = \varphi_d(x) \langle v_1, n \rangle d\Sigma(n)$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_1(C, \eta)} \omega = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} R_1^{d-1} \varphi_d(x(n, R_1)) \langle v_1, n \rangle d\Sigma(n). \quad (93)$$

Similarly $A_2(C, \eta)$ is given by

$$y : (n, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \quad (94)$$

$$y_1 = o_2 + r \cos \theta_1 \quad (95)$$

$$y_2 = r \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \quad (96)$$

$$\dots \quad (97)$$

$$y_{d-1} = r \sin \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_{d-2} \cos \theta_{d-1} \quad (98)$$

$$y_d = r \sin \theta_1 \dots \sin \theta_{d-2} \sin \theta_{d-1} \quad (99)$$

with $o_2 = -C\eta^2/(\eta^2 - 1)$ and $0 \leq r \leq R_2$, where

$$R_2 = \frac{1}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{C^2\eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}. \quad (100)$$

By the same argument, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C} \int_{A_2(C, \eta)} \omega = \int_{\partial A_2(C, \eta)} \varphi_d(y(n, R_2)) \langle v_2, n \rangle d\Sigma(n) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} R_2^{d-1} \varphi_d(y(n, R_2)) \langle v_2, n \rangle d\Sigma(n). \quad (101)$$

where $v_2 = \partial y / \partial C$.

We observe two identities. First, for the same

$$n = (\cos \theta_1, \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2, \dots, \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} \cos \theta_{d-1}, \sin \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-1})$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\varphi_d(x(n, R_1))}{\varphi_d(y(n, R_2))} \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|x(n, R_1)\|^2\right)}{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|y(n, R_2)\|^2\right)} \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

$$= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [o_1^2 + R_1^2 + 2o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1]\right)}{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [o_2^2 + R_2^2 + 2o_2 R_2 \cos \theta_1]\right)} \quad (103)$$

$$= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{C^2 \eta^2}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} + \frac{\eta^2}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} (C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta) - 2 \frac{C \eta^2}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta} \cos \theta_1 \right]\right)}{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{C^2 \eta^4}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} + \frac{1}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} (C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta) - 2 \frac{C \eta^2}{(\eta^2 - 1)^2} \sqrt{C^2 \eta^2 + 2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta} \cos \theta_1 \right]\right)} \quad (104)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} 2d \log \eta\right) \quad (105)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\eta^d} \quad (106)$$

Second, for same \mathbf{n} , it holds that $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1) - \eta \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{n}, R_2) = (C\eta, 0, \dots, 0)$. This shows $\mathbf{v}_1 - \eta \mathbf{v}_2 = (\eta, 0, \dots, 0)$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial h(C, \eta)}{\partial C} \quad (107)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (R_1^{d-1} \varphi_d(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1)) \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{n} \rangle - R_2^{d-1} \varphi_d(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{n}, R_2)) \langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{n} \rangle) d\Sigma(\mathbf{n}) \quad (108)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left(R_1^{d-1} \varphi_d(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1)) \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{n} \rangle - \left(\frac{R_1}{\eta}\right)^{d-1} \eta^d \varphi_d(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1)) \langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{n} \rangle \right) d\Sigma(\mathbf{n}) \quad (109)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} R_1^{d-1} \varphi_d(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1)) \langle \mathbf{v}_1 - \eta \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{n} \rangle d\Sigma(\mathbf{n}) \quad (110)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} R_1^{d-1} \eta \cos \theta_1 \varphi_d(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n}, R_1)) d\Sigma(\mathbf{n}) \quad (111)$$

$$= R_1^{d-1} \eta \int_0^\pi \cdots \int_0^\pi \int_0^{2\pi} \cos \theta_1 \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [o_1^2 + R_1^2 + 2o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1]\right) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 \cdots \sin \theta_{d-2} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \cdots d\theta_{d-1} \quad (112)$$

$$= \Xi \int_0^\pi \cos \theta_1 \exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1, \quad (113)$$

where Ξ is a positive constant. Finally,

$$\int_0^\pi \cos \theta_1 \exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 \quad (114)$$

$$= \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos \theta_1 \exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^\pi \cos \theta_1 \exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 \quad (115)$$

$$= \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos \theta_1 \exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 - \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos \theta_1 \exp(o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 \quad (116)$$

$$= \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos \theta_1 \sin^{d-2} \theta_1 [\exp(-o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1) - \exp(o_1 R_1 \cos \theta_1)] d\theta_1 > 0 \quad (117)$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that $o_1 < 0$ and for any $x > 0$, $e^x > 1 > e^{-x}$. This shows that when $C > 0$, $h(C, \eta)$ is increasing in C . Therefore as long as $h(0, \eta) > 1 - \rho$, $P_1(A) - P_2(A) > 1 - \rho$. It remains to show that $h(0, \eta) \geq 1 - \rho$ as long as $\eta \geq \eta_0$. This is direct, when $C = 0$,

$$A_1 = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2d\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}} \right\} \quad (118)$$

$$A_2 = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2d \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}} \right\} \quad (119)$$

Let $X \sim N_d(0, I_d)$, then $\|X\|^2/d \sim \text{Gamma}(\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2})$. Then

$$h(0, \eta) = Pr \left(\|X\|^2 \leq \frac{2d\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) - Pr \left(\|X\|^2 \leq \frac{2d \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right). \quad (120)$$

By Lemma 21, $h(0, \eta)$ is increasing in η . Therefore $h(0, \eta) \geq h(0, \eta_0(\rho)) = 1 - \rho$, and this completes the proof. \square

A.2.2 Component-wise comparison theorem

The second key ingredient for proving our result is a group of component-wise comparison lemmas on two mixture distributions with small total variation distance. In the following lemmas, consider two mixture distributions $P = \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i P_i$ and $P' = \sum_{j=1}^{K'} \pi'_j P_j$ and denote $\pi_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \{\pi_i, \pi'_j\}$ and $\pi_{\max} = \max_{i,j} \{\pi_i, \pi'_j\}$. The proofs can be found in Section A; these lemmas essentially show that (1) the weighted sum of component-wise total variation difference is upper bounded if the two mixtures are close and (2) when two well-separated mixtures have same number of components, under particular correspondence conditions, their mixture proportions are close.

Lemma 12. *Suppose $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$. For any $j \in [K']$, if there exists a collection of sets $\{A_{ij}\}_{i \in [K]}$ such that $\rho_{ij} = 1 - P_i(A_{ij}) + P'_j(A_{ij}) \in [0, 1]$ for all $i \in [K]$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho_{ij} \geq \pi'_j - 2\epsilon, \quad \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i \rho_{ij} \geq \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon. \quad (121)$$

Similarly, if there exists a collection of sets $\{B_{ij}\}_{i \in [K]}$ such that $\rho_{ij} = 1 - P'_j(B_{ij}) + P_i(B_{ij}) \in [0, 1]$ for all $i \in [K]$, equation also holds.

This lemma stems from the fact that there cannot be a set that has a large probability mass of a component in P_i of P but has small probability mass from every component P'_j of P' . A_{ij} is the set that has a large probability mass under P_i but small under P'_j , while B_{ij} vice versa. A symmetric result can be obtained by switching the role of P and P' .

Lemma 12 is particularly useful when, for some component P'_j , all components P_i , $i \neq j$ are far away from P'_j in total variation distance; then by Lemma 12 one can upper bound the total variation distance between P'_j and the remaining component P_j of P .

Lemma 13. Suppose $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$ and denote $\pi_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \{\pi_i, \pi'_j\}$. Consider two components P_{j_0}, P'_{j_0} with $\pi_{j_0} \leq \pi'_{j_0}$. If for all $i \in [K], i \neq j_0$, there is a set A_{ij} such that $P_i(A_{ij}) - P'_i(A_{ij}) \geq 1 - \rho$ with some constant ρ satisfying $0 \leq \rho \leq (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon)/(1 - \pi_{\min})$, it holds that

$$TV(P_{j_0}, P'_{j_0}) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}} \rho. \quad (122)$$

Now, we obtain a component-wise comparison result for the differences in mixture proportions between corresponding components.

Lemma 14. Suppose $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$. Denote $\pi_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \{\pi_i, \pi'_j\}$ and $\pi_{\max} = \max_{i,j} \{\pi_i, \pi'_j\}$. If there is a pair of components P_i, P'_i and a set A such that for some $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\min\{P_i(A), P'_i(A)\} \geq 1 - \rho$ and $\max_{j \neq i} \{P_j(A), P'_j(A)\} \leq \rho$, then

$$|\pi_i - \pi'_i| \leq 2\epsilon + (1 + \pi_{\max} - \pi_{\min})\rho \quad (123)$$

Proof of Lemma 12. Let $Q = (P + P')/2$. Then $TV(P, Q) \leq \epsilon$, $TV(P', Q) \leq \epsilon$. Let P'_j be an arbitrary component of P' . We will first show by contradiction the first half of (121) holds. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^K \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho_{ij} < \pi'_j - 2\epsilon$. Now consider the set $A = \cap_{i=1}^K A_{ij}^c$. On one hand,

$$Q(A) \geq \pi'_j P'_j((\cup_{i=1}^K A_{ij})^c) - \epsilon \geq \pi'_j (1 - \sum_{i=1}^K P'_j(A_{ij})) - \epsilon = \pi'_j - \pi'_j \sum_{i=1}^K P'_j(A_{ij}) - \epsilon := LB \quad (124)$$

Meanwhile,

$$Q(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i P_i(A_i^c) + \epsilon = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i P_i(A_i) + \epsilon := UB \quad (125)$$

Since for every $i \in [K]$ it holds that $P_i(A_{ij}) - P'_j(A_{ij}) = 1 - \rho_{ij}$, then by Lemma 20, $\pi_i P_i(A_{ij}) - \pi'_j P'_j(A_{ij}) \geq \pi_i - \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho_{ij}$. Therefore, applying Lemma 20 to all components $i \in [K]$, it holds that

$$LB - UB = \pi'_j - 1 - 2\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^K (\pi_i P_i(A_{ij}) - \pi'_j P'_j(A_{ij})) \quad (126)$$

$$\geq \pi'_j - 1 - 2\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^K (\pi_i - \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho_{ij}) \quad (127)$$

$$= \pi'_j - 1 - 2\epsilon + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^K \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho_{ij} > 0. \quad (128)$$

This is a contradiction since $Q(A) \geq LB > UB \geq Q(A)$. So the first half of (121) holds for P'_j .

For the second half of (121), if $\sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i \rho_{ij} < \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon$, then consider a different lower bound of $Q(A)$

$$Q(A) \geq \pi'_j P'_j((\cup_{i=1}^K A_{ij})^c) - \epsilon \geq \pi_{\min} P'_j((\cup_{i=1}^K A_{ij})^c) - \epsilon \geq \pi_{\min} - \pi_{\min} \sum_{i=1}^K P'_j(A_{ij}) - \epsilon := LB';, \quad (129)$$

then notice that

$$LB' - UB \geq \pi_{\min} - 1 - 2\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i P_i(A_{ij}) - \pi_{\min} P'_j(A_{ij}) \quad (130)$$

$$\geq \pi_{\min} - 1 - 2\epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i (1 - \rho_{ij}) \quad (131)$$

$$= \pi_{\min} - 1 - 2\epsilon + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i \rho_{ij} > 0, \quad (132)$$

which is a contradiction and completes the proof of the second half of (121). \square

Proof of Lemma 13. Define

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} - \frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}} \rho \quad (133)$$

Note that $0 \leq \rho \leq (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon)/(1 - \pi_{\min})$ implies that $0 \leq \rho_1 \leq 1$. We will show by contradiction that the total variation distance $TV(P_{j_0}, P'_j) \leq 1 - \rho_1$. If otherwise $TV(P_{j_0}, P'_j) > 1 - \rho_1$, one can select a set A_{j_0j} such that $P_{j_0}(A_{j_0j}) - P'_j(A_{j_0j}) > 1 - \rho_1$. Define function

$$f(x) = x(\rho_1 - 1) + \sum_{\substack{i \in [K] \\ i \neq j_0}} \max\{\pi_i, x\} \rho, \quad (134)$$

then $f(x)$ is a piecewise linear function, with its slope upper bounded by

$$\rho_1 - 1 + \sum_{i:i \neq j} \rho = \rho_1 + (K - 1)\rho - 1 \leq \rho_1 + \left(\frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}}\right) \rho - 1 = \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} - 1 < 0. \quad (135)$$

Hence $f(x)$ is decreasing in x . Since $\pi_{j_0} \leq \pi'_j$, according to the remark after Lemma 12, we have

$$f(\pi'_j) = \pi'_j \rho_1 + \sum_{\substack{i \in [K] \\ i \neq j_0}} \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} \rho - \pi'_j \quad (136)$$

$$> \sum_{i=1}^K \max\{\pi_i, \pi'_j\} (1 - P_i(A_{ij}) + P'_j(A_{ij})) - \pi'_j \quad (137)$$

$$\geq -2\epsilon. \quad (138)$$

Then we conclude that $f(\pi_{\min}) \geq f(\pi'_j) > -2\epsilon$. But we can explicitly compute that

$$f(\pi_{\min}) = \pi_{\min} \left(\frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} - \frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}} \rho - 1 \right) + \sum_{\substack{i \in [K] \\ i \neq j_0}} \max\{\pi_i, \pi_{\min}\} \rho \quad (139)$$

$$= -2\epsilon - (1 - \pi_{\min})\rho + \rho \sum_{\substack{i \in [K] \\ i \neq j_0}} \pi_i \quad (140)$$

$$\leq -2\epsilon - (1 - \pi_{\min})\rho + (1 - \pi_{\min})\rho \quad (141)$$

$$= -2\epsilon. \quad (142)$$

This contradiction completes the proof of (122). \square

Proof. Proof of Lemma 14] Note that $\pi_i(A^{\mathbb{G}}) \leq \rho$ and $\pi'_i(A^{\mathbb{G}}) \leq \rho$

$$|\pi_i - \pi'_i| = |\pi_i P_i(A) - \pi'_i P'_i(A) + \pi_i P_i(A^{\mathbb{G}}) - \pi'_i P'_i(A^{\mathbb{G}})| \quad (143)$$

$$\leq |P(A) - \sum_{j \neq i} \pi_j P_j(A) - P'(A) + \sum_{j \neq i} \pi'_j P'_j(A)| + |\pi_i P_i(A^{\mathbb{G}}) - \pi'_i P'_i(A^{\mathbb{G}})| \quad (144)$$

$$\leq 2\epsilon + \max\left\{ \sum_{j \neq i} \pi_j P_j(A), \sum_{j \neq i} \pi'_j P'_j(A) \right\} + \max\{\pi_i P_i(A^{\mathbb{G}}), \pi'_i P'_i(A^{\mathbb{G}})\} \quad (145)$$

$$\leq 2\epsilon + (1 - \pi_{\min} + \pi_{\max})\rho. \quad (146)$$

\square

A.3 Initialization

Let c_0 be defined as in (7), then the following theorem guarantees that for each component of P' , there exists a component of P that is close to it in total variation distance. Starting from here and in the remaining of Section A, we will assume the following:

B1 $P \in \mathcal{M}(K, \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$ and $P' \in \mathcal{M}(K', \pi_{\min}, \pi_{\max}, c)$.

B2 There exists a distribution Q such that $TV(P, Q) \leq \epsilon$ and $TV(P', Q) \leq \epsilon$.

B3 $\max\{K, K'\} \leq 1/\pi_{\min}$, $\pi_{\max} \leq 1 - (\min\{K, K'\} - 1)\pi_{\min}$.

Theorem 15. *Suppose B1-B3 hold. For any component P'_j , there must be a component P_i such that $TV(P_i, P'_j) \leq 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon$*

Proof of Theorem 15. WLOG we prove the statement for P'_1 . Assume that the conclusion of the theorem does not hold, that for any component P_i , it holds that $TV(P_i, P'_1) > 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon$, implying the existence of a set A_i such that $P_i(A_i) - P'_1(A_i) > 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon$, or $\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon > 1 - P_i(A_i) + P'_1(A_i)$. Then applying Lemma 12 to the collection of sets $\{A_i\}_{i \in [K]}$, we have

$$\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon > \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i (1 - P_i(A_i) + P'_1(A_i)) \geq \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon. \quad (147)$$

Therefore, the desired result holds. \square

The second theorem states that, if both P and P' are well-separated and have nearly balanced components, then the matching established in theorem 15 is one-to-one. Specifically, for any component in P' , there is one and only one component in P such that their centers are close.

Theorem 16. *Suppose B1-B3 hold, If $c > \eta_0 c_0$, where c_0, η_0 are defined in (7) and (8) respectively, then $K = K'$ and there is a permutation $\theta : [K] \rightarrow [K]$ such that $\|\mu_i - \mu'_{\theta(i)}\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_{\theta(i)}\}$ and $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_{\theta(i)}, \sigma'_{\theta(i)}/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_0$.*

Proof of Theorem 16. According to Theorem 15 and Lemma 8 each P'_j must be matched to at least one component P_i in the sense that their center distance $\|\mu_i - \mu'_j\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_j\}$. Note that Theorem 15 is symmetric on both P and P' . For each P_i , there must be a P'_j such that their centers are close.

We now considering the following removing procedure. For a component P_j , if there is a unique P'_j that is matched to P_j , and P_j is the only component in P that is matched to P'_j , then remove both P_j and P'_j . For a removed pair P_j, P'_j , one can upper bound the ratio between their standard deviations by $\max\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\} \leq \eta_0$. To see this WLOG we assume that $\sigma_j \leq \sigma'_j$. Then for any $i \neq j$, let P'_i be a component matched with P_i . The distances between centers are

$$\|\mu'_i - \mu_j\| \geq \|\mu'_i - \mu'_j\| - \|\mu'_j - \mu_j\| \geq c(\sigma'_i + \sigma'_j) - c_0\sigma'_j = c\sigma'_i + (c - c_0)\sigma'_j. \quad (148)$$

- If $\sigma'_i \geq \sigma_j$, it holds that $\|\mu'_i - \mu_j\| \geq c \max\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_j\}$. By Lemma 8, one can select a set A_{ij} such that $P'_i(A_{ij}) - P_j(A_{ij}) > 1 - 2\Phi(-c/2) \geq 1 - 2\Phi(-c_0\eta_0/2)$
- If $\sigma'_i < \sigma_j$, then since P'_i is not matched with P_j

$$\|\mu'_i - \mu_j\| \geq c_0 \max\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_j\} = c_0\sigma_j. \quad (149)$$

Adding (148) and (149), we have

$$\|\mu'_i - \mu_j\| \geq \frac{1}{2} (c\sigma'_i + (c - c_0)\sigma'_j + c_0\sigma_j) \quad (150)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} c(\sigma'_i + \sigma_j). \quad (151)$$

By Lemma 9, one can select a set A_{ij} such that $P'_i(A_{ij}) - P_j(A_{ij}) \geq 1 - 2\Phi(-c_0\eta_0/2)$.

Hence in both cases, for any $i \neq j$ there $P'_i(A_{ij}) - P_j(A_{ij}) \geq 1 - \rho_2$ with $\rho_2 = 2\Phi(-c_0\eta_0/2) \in (0, 1)$.

Now suppose $\max\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\} / \min\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\} > \eta_0$, by Lemma 10, one can select a set A_{jj} such that $P'_j(A_{jj}) - P_j(A_{jj}) > 1 - \rho_1$, where ρ_1 is defined as

$$\rho_1 := \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\max}} - \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\max})}{\pi_{\max}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta_0 c_0\right). \quad (152)$$

Note that $1 - \rho_1$ is the left hand side of equation (8). Further, $\rho_1 < \pi_{\min}/\pi_{\max} < 1$ and

$$\rho_1 > (\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon) \left(\frac{1}{\pi_{\max}} - \frac{1 - \pi_{\max}}{\pi_{\max}} \right) = \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon > \rho_2 \quad (153)$$

According to Lemma 12,

$$\pi'_j \rho_1 + \sum_{i:i \neq j} \pi'_i \rho_2 > \sum_{i=1}^K \pi'_i (1 - P'_i(A_{ij}) + P_j(A_{ij})) \geq \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon; \quad (154)$$

However the L.H.S of proceeding (154) satisfies that

$$\pi'_j \rho_1 + \sum_{i:i \neq j} \pi'_i \rho_2 = \pi'_j (\rho_1 - \rho_2) + \rho_2 \leq \pi_{\max} \rho_1 + (1 - \pi_{\max}) \rho_2 = \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon \quad (155)$$

The contradiction shows that $\max\{\sigma_j/\sigma'_j, \sigma'_j/\sigma_j\} \leq \eta_0$.

Suppose now we complete this removing procedure and there are still remaining components, without loss of generosity we can assume that P_1 is the component that has smallest standard deviation among all remaining components in both P and P' . Since it is not removed, there is a P'_1 and a P_2 such that both P_1 and P_2 are matched to P'_1 . Since we assumed that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$, by triangle inequality

$$c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \leq \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| \leq \|\mu'_1 - \mu_1\| + \|\mu'_1 - \mu_2\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} + c_0 \max\{\sigma_2, \sigma'_1\}. \quad (156)$$

Note that $c > c_0 \eta_0 > c_0$ by the assumption of the theorem, we consider three cases:

- $\sigma'_1 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$. Then $c_0(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) < c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \leq c_0(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)$ and this is impossible.
- $\sigma_1 < \sigma'_1 \leq \sigma_2$. Then $c\sigma_1 + c_0\sigma_2 < c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \leq c_0\sigma'_1 + c_0\sigma_2$, implying that $\sigma'_1/\sigma_1 \geq c/c_0 > \eta_0$.
- $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 < \sigma'_1$. Then $2c\sigma_1 \leq c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \leq 2c_0\sigma'_1$, also implying that $\sigma'_1/\sigma_1 \geq c/c_0 > \eta_0$.

We conclude that $\sigma'_1/\sigma_1 \geq c/c_0$. By Lemma 10 and definition of η_0 in (8), the total variation distance of P_1, P'_1 can be lower bounded by

$$TV(P_1, P'_1) > F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_0^2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right) = 1 - \rho_1, \quad (157)$$

where ρ_1 is the same as in (152).

On the other hand, notice that P_1 cannot be matched with any components in P' other than P'_1 . This is because if there is a P'_2 that is not removed and is matched to P_1 , by the same argument above one can show that $\sigma'_2 < \sigma_1 \leq \sigma'_1$. This contradicts the minimal variance selection of σ_1 .

Therefore, for any P'_j unremoved with $j \geq 2$, denote P_j be a different component (not P_1) in P that matched to P'_j , then

$$\|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| \geq \|\mu'_j - \mu'_1\| - c_0 \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (158)$$

$$\geq c(\sigma'_j + \sigma'_1) - c_0 \sigma'_1 \quad (159)$$

$$\geq c\sigma'_j + (c - c_0)\sigma'_1 \quad (160)$$

$$> c\sigma'_j \quad (161)$$

Also again by selection of σ_1 $\|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| > c\sigma'_j \geq c\sigma_1$. Hence $\|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| > c \max\{\sigma'_j, \sigma_1\}$.

For any P'_j that has been removed, still denote P_j to be the unique component matched to P'_j , (161) still holds. We now show that $\|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| > c \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_j\}$. If $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma'_j$, then it trivially holds. When $\sigma'_j < \sigma_1$, if otherwise $\|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| \leq c\sigma_1$, then

$$c(\sigma_j + \sigma_1) \leq \|\mu_j - \mu_1\| \leq \|\mu_j - \mu'_j\| + \|\mu'_j - \mu_1\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\} + c\sigma_1, \quad (162)$$

implying that $\max\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\}/\sigma_j \geq c/c_0 > \eta_0$. This is impossible, therefore for any P'_j that has been removed, $\|\mu_1 - \mu'_j\| \geq c \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_j\}$.

Combining the two cases together, again we can find sets A_i such that

- For $i \neq 1$, whether P'_i is removed or not, $P'_i(A_i) - P_1(A_i) > 1 - \rho_2$.
- For $i = 1$, $P'_1(A_1) - P_1(A_1) > 1 - \rho_1$.

The same arguments in (154) and (155) lead to a contradiction, further showing that all components should have been removed, i.e. when $c > c_0\eta_0$ the match is one-to-one and hence $K = K'$. The upper bounds on center distances and standard deviation ratios have been established earlier. \square

A.4 Iterative Refinements on Mean and Standard Deviations

Theorem 16 provides conditions on separation, minimal proportion, and maximal proportion such that one can establish a one-to-one correspondence between components of P and P' . In this section, we are going to show that once this is done $K = K'$, we can further iteratively improve the bounds. Hence we can complete the proof of Theorem 4. We assume all assumptions in Theorem 16 hold.

Proof of Theorem 4: Upper bounds on mean and standard deviations. By $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$, take $Q = (P + P')/2$, we have $TV(P, Q) \leq \epsilon, TV(P', Q) \leq \epsilon$, therefore we can apply Theorem 16, which confirms a one-to-one correspondence in the sense that centers are close. Out of simplicity in notation, we re-order components of μ'_j so that P_i, P'_i are correspondence. Specifically, for any pair P_i, P'_i , according to the assumption $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_0 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}$ and $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_0$.

Now consider a pair P_i, P'_i . WLOG assume that $\pi_i \leq \pi'_i$, otherwise one can switch the role of P and P' . For all $j \neq i$,

$$\|\mu_j - \mu'_i\| \geq c(\sigma'_j + \sigma'_i) - c_0 \max\{\sigma_j, \sigma'_j\} \geq c\sigma'_i + \left(\frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right) \max\{\sigma'_j, \sigma_j\} \geq c\sigma'_i + \left(\frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right) \sigma_j; \quad (163)$$

$$\|\mu_j - \mu'_i\| \geq c(\sigma_j + \sigma_i) - c_0 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\} \geq c\sigma_j + \left(\frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right) \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\} \geq c\sigma_j + \left(\frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right) \sigma'_i. \quad (164)$$

Therefore adding these two equation together we have

$$\|\mu_j - \mu'_i\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right) (\sigma_j + \sigma'_i). \quad (165)$$

Note that $c > \eta_0 c_0$, and hence $\|\mu_j - \mu'_i\| \geq \frac{1}{2} c_0 \eta_0 (\sigma_j + \sigma'_i)$. According to Lemma 9, there exists a set A_j such that $P_i(A_j) - P'_j(A_j) > 1 - \rho$, where

$$\rho = 2\Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right)\right) < 2\Phi(-\eta_0 c_0/2) < 2\Phi(-c_0/2) = \pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon$$

. Then by Lemma 13, the total variation distance between P_i and P'_i is upper bounded by

$$TV(P_i, P'_i) \leq UB(c_0, \eta_0) := \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right)\right) < 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon. \quad (166)$$

This further implies, by Lemma 8, $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_1 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}$, $c_1 = 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{1-UB(c_0, \eta_0)}{2})$. Note that $UB(c_0, \eta_0) < 1 - \pi_{\min} + 2\epsilon$, therefore $c_1 < c_0$. Also by Lemma 10, $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_1$, where η_1 solves

$$F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_1^2 \log \eta_1}{\eta_1^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_1}{\eta_1^2 - 1}\right) = UB(c_0, \eta_0) \quad (167)$$

Since $1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min} \geq \pi_{\min}$,

$$F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_0^2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_0}{\eta_0^2 - 1}\right) \quad (168)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(K - 1)\pi_{\min}}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta_0 c_0\right) \quad (169)$$

$$> 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(K - 1)\pi_{\min}}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_0} - c_0\right)\right) \quad (170)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon - [1 - (1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min})]\rho}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} \quad (\text{recall } \rho = 2\Phi(-(c + c/\eta_0 - c_0)/2)) \quad (171)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon - \rho}{1 - (K - 1)\pi_{\min}} - \rho \quad (172)$$

$$\geq 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon - \rho}{\pi_{\min}} - \rho \quad (173)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - 2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{1 - \pi_{\min}}{\pi_{\min}} \rho \quad (174)$$

$$= F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_1^2 \log \eta_1}{\eta_1^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_1}{\eta_1^2 - 1}\right), \quad (175)$$

it holds that $\eta_1 < \eta_0$. To conclude, for now starting with c_0, η_0 , we are able to provide refined upper bounds c_1, η_1 . Note that by the same argument of (166), one can use c_1, η_1 to refine the upper bound by

$$TV(P_i, P'_i) \leq UB(c_1, \eta_1) := \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_1} - c_1\right)\right). \quad (176)$$

And similarly $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_2 \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}$, $c_2 = 2\Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1 - UB(c_1, \eta_1)}{2}\right)$. $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta_2$, where η_2 solves

$$F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_2^2 \log \eta_2}{\eta_2^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_2}{\eta_2^2 - 1}\right) = UB(c_1, \eta_1). \quad (177)$$

As $UB(c_1, \eta_1) < UB(c_0, \eta_0)$, we have $c_2 < c_1, \eta_2 < \eta_1$. This procedure can be repeated. Let

$$UB(c_t, \eta_t) := \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c + \frac{c}{\eta_t} - c_t\right)\right) \quad (178)$$

Then one can find

$$c_{t+1} = 2\Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1 - UB(c_t, \eta_t)}{2}\right) = 2\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}UB(c_t, \eta_t)\right) \quad (179)$$

and η_{t+1} solves

$$F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_{t+1}^2 \log \eta_{t+1}}{\eta_{t+1}^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta_{t+1}}{\eta_{t+1}^2 - 1}\right) = UB(c_t, \eta_t) \quad (180)$$

such that

$$\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c_{t+1} \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}, \quad \max\{\sigma'_i/\sigma_i, \sigma_i/\sigma'_i\} \leq \eta_{t+1}. \quad (181)$$

The L.H.S. of (180) is a strictly increasing function in η_{t+1} and it has a continuous inverse. Therefore we conclude that there is a continuous mapping $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, c_0] \times [1, \eta_0]$ such that

$$(c_{t+1}, \eta_{t+1}) = g(c_t, \eta_t) \quad (182)$$

By induction one shows that $UB(c_t, \eta_t) < UB(c_{t-1}, \eta_{t-1})$ for $t \geq 1$, therefore, $c_{t+1} < c_t, \eta_{t+1} < \eta_t$. Hence $\{c_t\}, \{\eta_t\}$ are two decreasing sequences, both lower bounded. Therefore their limits exist. Denote the limits as (c^*, η^*) , then it must be a fixed point of g , namely they solve (9). Further, $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c^* \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}$, $\max\{\sigma'_i/\sigma_i, \sigma_i/\sigma'_i\} \leq \eta^*$.

The upper bounds on proportions $|\pi_i - \pi'_i|$ are established with the components c^*, η^* will be proved in the next section, where we establish additional techniques to complete the proof of Theorem 4. \square

Before we display the proof on difference in proportions, we provide the proof to corollary 6.

Proof of Corollary 6. Suppose P' is a single spherical Gaussians such that $TV(P, P') \leq 2\epsilon$. Consider two new mixtures of spherical Gaussians

$$\tilde{P} = \frac{1}{2}P + \frac{1}{2}Q \quad (183)$$

$$\tilde{P}' = \frac{1}{2}P' + \frac{1}{2}Q \quad (184)$$

where Q is a sufficiently large far away Gaussian components. To be specific, for any component $N_d(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 I_d)$ in P or P' , $Q = N_d(\mu, \sigma^2 I_d)$ is selected such that $\|\mu - \mu_i\| \geq c \max\{\sigma, \sigma_i\}$. Therefore $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{M}(K+1, \pi_{\min}/2, c)$ and $\tilde{P}' \in \mathcal{M}(2, \pi_{\min}/2, c)$. However since $TV(\tilde{P}, \tilde{P}') \geq 2\epsilon/2 = \epsilon$, and the maximal proportion of \tilde{P}, \tilde{P}' is upper bounded by $1/2$. Let η'_0 be defined as the solution to

$$1 - \pi_{\min} + \epsilon + 2\Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta'_0 c'_0\right) = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta_0'^2 \log \eta'_0}{\eta_0'^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta'_0}{\eta_0'^2 - 1}\right) \quad (185)$$

where $c'_0 = 2\Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\pi_{\min} - \epsilon}{4}\right)$, then if $c > c'_0 \eta'_0$, according to Theorem 16, $K+1 = 2$, which implies that $K = 1$ and this is a contradiction. \square

A.5 Difference in Proportions

Finally given η^*, c^* established previously, we will complete the proof of Theorem 4 by upper bounding the differences in proportions. For a corresponding pair π_i, π'_i where $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c^* \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}$ and $\max\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_i\} / \min\{\sigma'_i, \sigma_i\} \leq \eta^*$, we upper bound $|\pi_i - \pi'_i|$ by constructing the set A such that we can apply Lemma 14.

To start with, we introduce a geometric lemma.

Lemma 17. *Let x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 be for different points in \mathbb{R}^d , where*

$$\tilde{x} = \alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2, \quad (186)$$

$$\tilde{y} = \beta y_1 + (1 - \beta)y_2. \quad (187)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|^2 &= \alpha\beta\|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)\|x_2 - y_2\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)\beta\|x_2 - y_1\|^2 + \alpha(1 - \beta)\|x_1 - y_2\|^2 \\ &\quad - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\|x_1 - x_2\|^2 - \beta(1 - \beta)\|y_1 - y_2\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

The proof of this lemma is postponed to Section B. Then consider two pairs of components P_i, P'_i and P_j, P'_j , one can find a hyperplane that is far away from all four centers.

Lemma 18. *Let $P_i = N_d(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2 I_d)$, $i = 1, 2$ and $P'_i = N_d(\mu'_i, \sigma_i'^2 I_d)$ be two pairs of spherical Gaussian distributions such that with three constants $c^* \geq 0, \eta^* \geq 1, c \geq c^* \eta^*$ such that*

$$\max\left\{\frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma'_1}, \frac{\sigma'_1}{\sigma_1}\right\} \leq \eta^*, \quad \max\left\{\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma'_2}, \frac{\sigma'_2}{\sigma_2}\right\} \leq \eta^* \quad (188)$$

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu'_1\| \leq \frac{c^*}{2}(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1), \quad \|\mu_2 - \mu_1\| \geq c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) \quad (189)$$

$$\|\mu_2 - \mu'_2\| \leq \frac{c^*}{2}(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2), \quad \|\mu'_1 - \mu'_2\| \geq c(\sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2) \quad (190)$$

There exists a hyperplane H such that the distance

$$\text{dist}(\mu_i, H) \geq C(c^*, \eta^*, c)\sigma_i, \quad \text{dist}(\mu'_i, H) \geq C(c^*, \eta^*, c)\sigma'_i, \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (191)$$

where

$$C(c^*, \eta^*, c) = \sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*}\left(c - \frac{c^*}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{c^*}{2}} \quad (192)$$

Proof of Lemma 18. Consider two points

$$\tilde{\mu}_i = \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i + \sigma'_i} \mu_i + \frac{\sigma'_i}{\sigma_i + \sigma'_i} \mu'_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (193)$$

Note that for both $i = 1, 2$,

$$\|\tilde{\mu}_i - \mu_i\| = \frac{\sigma'_i}{\sigma_i + \sigma'_i} \|\mu'_i - \mu_i\| \leq \frac{c^* \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}}{2}, \quad \|\tilde{\mu}_i - \mu'_i\| = \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i + \sigma'_i} \|\mu'_i - \mu_i\| \leq \frac{c^* \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}}{2} \quad (194)$$

that is, μ_i, μ'_i both lies in a ball centered at $\tilde{\mu}_i$ with radius $c^* \max\{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i\}/2$. The hyperplane we consider is

$$H : \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle x - \tilde{\mu}_1, \tilde{\mu}_2 - \tilde{\mu}_1 \rangle = \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1}{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2} \|\tilde{\mu}_2 - \tilde{\mu}_1\| \right\} \quad (195)$$

By Lemma 17, the distance

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2\|^2 &= \underbrace{\frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|^2 + \frac{\sigma'_1 \sigma'_2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)} \|\mu'_1 - \mu'_2\|^2}_{LB_1} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{\sigma_1 \sigma'_2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)} \|\mu_1 - \mu'_2\|^2 + \frac{\sigma'_1 \sigma_2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)} \|\mu'_1 - \mu_2\|^2}_{LB_2} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\frac{\sigma_1 \sigma'_1}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)^2} \|\mu_1 - \mu'_1\|^2 - \frac{\sigma_2 \sigma'_2}{(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2} \|\mu_2 - \mu'_2\|^2}_{UB} \end{aligned}$$

We will establish a lower bound on $\|\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2\|$ by separately lower bounding LB_1, LB_2 and UB .

First, by the separation condition

$$LB_1 \geq c^2 \frac{\sigma_1 \sigma_2 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)^2 + \sigma'_1 \sigma'_2 (\sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2)^2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2)^2} (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2)^2 \quad (196)$$

Note that $\max\{\sigma_i/\sigma'_i, \sigma'_i/\sigma_i\} \leq \eta^*, i = 1, 2$, we denote

$$\alpha = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1}, \quad \beta = \frac{\sigma'_2}{\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2}, \quad (197)$$

then since $1/(1 + \eta^*) \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma \leq \eta^*/(1 + \eta^*)$, it holds that

$$\frac{LB_1}{c^2 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2)^2} = \alpha \beta \gamma^2 + (1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)(1 - \gamma)^2 \quad (198)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*} \right)^2 [\gamma^2 + (1 - \gamma)^2] \quad (199)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*} \right)^2. \quad (200)$$

namely

$$LB_1 \geq \frac{c^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*} \right)^2 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2)^2 \quad (201)$$

For the second term, start by observing that

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu'_2\| \geq c(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2) - \frac{c^*}{2}(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2), \quad \|\mu_1 - \mu'_2\| \geq c(\sigma'_1 + \sigma'_2) - \frac{c^*}{2}(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1) \quad (202)$$

Adding these two equations we obtain that

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu'_2\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(c - \frac{c^*}{2} \right) (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2). \quad (203)$$

and similarly $\|\mu'_1 - \mu_2\| \geq (c - \frac{c^*}{2})(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)/2$. Hence

$$\frac{LB_2}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2} \geq \frac{1}{4}(c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2[\alpha(1 - \beta) + \beta(1 - \alpha)]. \quad (204)$$

Write $g(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha(1 - \beta) + \beta(1 - \alpha) = \beta(1 - 2\alpha) + \alpha$.

- If $\alpha = 1/2$ then $g(\alpha, \beta) = 1/2$.
- If $1/(1 + \eta^*) \leq \alpha < 1/2$, then $g(\alpha, \beta) \geq g(\alpha, 1/(1 + \eta^*))$ since it is an affine function in β with positive linear term. When $\beta = 1/(1 + \eta^*) < 1/2$, by same argument we know that $g(\alpha, \beta)$ is an affine function in α with positive linear term. Hence the minimum is

$$g(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*}, \frac{1}{1 + \eta^*}) = \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2}. \quad (205)$$

- If $1/2 < \alpha \leq \eta^*/(1 + \eta^*)$, the same arguments show that the minimum is

$$g(\frac{\eta^*}{1 + \eta^*}, \frac{\eta^*}{1 + \eta^*}) = \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2}. \quad (206)$$

As a conclusion we have

$$LB_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2} (c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2 \quad (207)$$

Finally, we establish an upper bound for UB ,

$$UB = \frac{\sigma_1 \sigma'_1}{(\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)^2} \|\mu_1 - \mu'_1\|^2 - \frac{\sigma_2 \sigma'_2}{(\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2} \|\mu_2 - \mu'_2\|^2 \quad (208)$$

$$\leq \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)^2 + \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} (\sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2 \quad (209)$$

$$\leq \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)^2 \quad (210)$$

Therefore

$$\|\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2} (c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2)} \quad (211)$$

The distance of μ_1, μ'_1 to H is then lower bounded by

$$dist(\mu_1, H) \geq \|\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_2\| \frac{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1}{\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma'_2} - \frac{c^*}{2} \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (212)$$

$$\geq \sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2} (c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} (\sigma_1 + \sigma'_1)} - \frac{c^*}{2} \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (213)$$

$$\geq \sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \eta^*}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \frac{2\eta^*}{(1 + \eta^*)^2} (c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2}{16} \left(\frac{1}{\eta^*} + 1\right) \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\}} - \frac{c^*}{2} \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (214)$$

$$\geq \left(\sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*} (c - \frac{c^*}{2})^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{c^*}{2}} \right) \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (215)$$

$$:= C(c^*, \eta^*, c) \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma'_1\} \quad (216)$$

Note that since $c > c^*\eta^*$ and $\eta^* \geq 1$,

$$\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*} \left(c - \frac{c^*}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{(c^*)^2}{4} \quad (217)$$

$$> \frac{(c^*)^2}{2} + \frac{(c^*)^2(\eta^* - \frac{1}{2})^2}{2\eta^*} - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{(c^*)^2}{4} \quad (218)$$

$$= (c^*)^2 \left[\frac{4(\eta^*)^2 + 8\eta^*(\eta^* - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} \right] \quad (219)$$

$$= \left(\frac{c^*}{4\eta^*}\right)^2 [8(\eta^*)^3 - 5(\eta^*)^2 - 1] > 0 \quad (220)$$

The coefficient $C(c^*, \eta^*, c)$ in (216) is positive, so

$$\text{dist}(\mu_1, H) \geq \left(\sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*} \left(c - \frac{c^*}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{c^*}{2}} \right) \sigma_1 \quad (221)$$

$$\text{dist}(\mu'_1, H) \geq \left(\sqrt{\frac{c^2}{2(\eta^*)^2} + \frac{1}{2\eta^*} \left(c - \frac{c^*}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{(c^*)^2(1 + \eta^*)^2}{16(\eta^*)^2} - \frac{c^*}{2}} \right) \sigma'_1 \quad (222)$$

This also shows that μ_1, μ'_1 are both with the same side of H as $\tilde{\mu}_1$. μ_2, μ'_2 can be similarly shown to be with the same side of H as $\tilde{\mu}_2$, which is different from μ_1, μ'_1 and and the other two distance $\text{dist}(\mu_2, H), \text{dist}(\mu'_2, H)$ can be lower bounded similarly. \square

Proof of Theorem 4: Difference in Proportions. Now we can finish the proof to Theorem 4. Let P_i, P'_i be two corresponding pairs such that

$$\max\left\{\frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma'_i}, \frac{\sigma'_i}{\sigma_i}\right\} \leq \eta^*, \quad \|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq \frac{c^*}{2}(\sigma_i + \sigma'_i). \quad (223)$$

Here the center distance is slightly different. In fact for the corresponding pairs, it holds that

$$TV(P_i, P'_i) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\pi_{\min}} + \frac{2(1 - \pi_{\min})}{\pi_{\min}} \Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(c + \frac{c}{\eta^*} - c^*\right)\right) = 1 - 2\Phi\left(-\frac{c^*}{2}\right). \quad (224)$$

According to Lemma 9, it also holds that $\|\mu_i - \mu'_i\| \leq c^*(\sigma_i + \sigma'_i)/2$. Consider an arbitrary different corresponding pair P_j, P'_j , then P_i, P'_i, P_j, P'_j satisfy the conditions of Lemma 18, hence we can select a hyperplane H such that P_i, P'_i and P_j, P'_j are on different side of H , and their distance are lower bounded. Let A_j be the halfspace determined by H and including P_j, P'_j , then

$$\max\{P_i(A_j^c), P'_i(A_j^c), P_j(A_j), P'_j(A_j)\} \leq \Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)) \quad (225)$$

where $C(c, c^*, \eta^*)$ is determined in (192). Now take $A = \cap_{j \neq i} A_j$, then

$$P_i(A) = P_i((\cup_{j \neq i} A_j^c)^c) \geq 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} P_i(A_j^c) \geq 1 - (K - 1)\Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)), \quad (226)$$

$$P'_i(A) = P'_i((\cup_{j \neq i} A_j^c)^c) \geq 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} P'_i(A_j^c) \geq 1 - (K - 1)\Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)); \quad (227)$$

$$P_j(A) \leq P_j(A_j) \leq \Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)) \quad (228)$$

$$P'_j(A) \leq P'_j(A_j) \leq \Phi(-C(c, c^*, \eta^*)) \quad (229)$$

And the result is given by Lemma 14. \square

B Auxillary Lemmas

B.1 Lemmas in Section 2

Lemma 19. Let F_d be the cumulative distribution function of a $\text{Gamma}(\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2})$ distribution, then for any $\eta \geq 1$,

$$\text{R.H.S. of (8)} = F_d\left(\frac{2\eta^2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right) - F_d\left(\frac{2 \log \eta}{\eta^2 - 1}\right) \geq 1 - \left(\frac{2\eta}{\eta^2 + 1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}, \quad (230)$$

Proof of Lemma 19. Consider two distributions $P_1 = N_d(0, I_d)$ and $P_2 = N_d(0, \eta^2 I_d)$ with $\eta \geq 1$ and the set

$$A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : p_1(x) \geq p_2(x)\} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \frac{\eta}{\eta^2 - 1} \sqrt{2d(\eta^2 - 1) \log \eta}\right\}. \quad (231)$$

where $p_i, i = 1, 2$ is the density of P_i . Then $P_1(A) - P_2(A)$ is the R.H.S. expression in (8). Further, it is the total variation distance between P_1 and P_2 . Well known result states that total variation distance is lower bounded by Hellinger distance [14], therefore it holds that

$$\text{R.H.S. of (8)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \int (\sqrt{p_1} - \sqrt{p_2})^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{2\eta}{\eta^2 + 1}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (232)$$

□

B.2 Lemmas in Section A

Lemma 20. *If there exists a set A such that $P_1(A) - P_2(A) \geq 1 - \rho \geq 0$. Then for any weights $0 \leq \pi_1, \pi_2 \leq 1$:*

$$\pi_1 - \max\{\pi_1, \pi_2\}\rho \geq \pi_1 P_1(A) - \pi_2 P_2(A) \leq \pi_1 \quad (233)$$

Proof of Lemma 20. Note that

$$\pi_1 P_1(A) - \pi_2 P_2(A) \geq \pi_1(P_2(A) + 1 - \rho) - \pi_2 P_2(A) = \pi_1 + (\pi_1 - \pi_2)P_2(A) - \pi_1 \rho.$$

View this as an affine function in $P_2(A)$. Since $0 \leq P_2(A) \leq \rho$, we have

$$\pi_1 P_1(A) - \pi_2 P_2(A) \geq \min\{\pi_1 + (\pi_1 - \pi_2) \cdot 0 - \pi_1 \rho, \pi_1 + (\pi_1 - \pi_2)\rho - \pi_1 \rho\} = \pi_1 - \max\{\pi_1, \pi_2\}\rho. \quad (234)$$

□

Lemma 21. *When $x > 1$, $f(x) = x \log x / (x - 1)$ is increasing in x and $g(x) = \log x / (x - 1)$ is decreasing in x .*

Proof of Lemma 21. Take derivative

$$f'(x) = \frac{(x-1)(1+\log x) - x \log x}{(x-1)^2} = \frac{x-1-\log x}{(x-1)^2} \geq 0 \quad (235)$$

$$g'(x) = \frac{(x-1)/x - \log x}{(x-1)^2} = \frac{1}{(x-1)^2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{x} + \log \frac{1}{x}\right] \leq 0 \quad (236)$$

□

Proof of Lemma 17. This lemma can be proved by direct computation. First, note that

$$\|y_1 - y_2\|^2 = \|y_1 - x_1\|^2 + \|y_2 - x_1\|^2 - 2\langle y_1 - x_1, y_2 - x_1 \rangle \quad (237)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x_1 - \tilde{y}\|^2 \\ &= \|\beta(x_1 - y_1) + (1 - \beta)(x_1 - y_2)\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (238)$$

$$= \beta^2 \|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \beta)^2 \|x_1 - y_2\|^2 + 2\beta(1 - \beta) \langle x_1 - y_1, x_1 - y_2 \rangle \quad (239)$$

$$= \beta^2 \|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \beta)^2 \|x_1 - y_2\|^2 + 2\beta(1 - \beta) \frac{\|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + \|x_1 - y_2\|^2 - \|y_1 - y_2\|^2}{2} \quad (240)$$

$$= \beta \|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \beta) \|x_1 - y_2\|^2 - \beta(1 - \beta) \|y_1 - y_2\|^2. \quad (241)$$

Similarly we have

$$\|x_2 - \tilde{y}\|^2 = \beta \|x_2 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \beta) \|x_2 - y_2\|^2 - \beta(1 - \beta) \|y_1 - y_2\|^2. \quad (242)$$

Combining all above together, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|^2 \\ &= \alpha\|\tilde{y} - x_1\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)\|\tilde{y} - x_2\|^2 - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{243}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \alpha\beta\|x_1 - y_1\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)\|x_2 - y_2\|^2 + (1 - \alpha)\beta\|x_2 - y_1\|^2 + \alpha(1 - \beta)\|x_1 - y_2\|^2 \\ &\quad - \alpha(1 - \alpha)\|x_1 - x_2\|^2 - \beta(1 - \beta)\|y_1 - y_2\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{244}$$

□