

Estimating Large Precision Matrices via Modified Cholesky Decomposition

Kyoungjae Lee¹ and Jaeyong Lee²

¹Department of Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics,
The University of Notre Dame

²Department of Statistics, Seoul National University

July 6, 2017

Abstract

We introduce the k -banded Cholesky prior for estimating a high-dimensional bandable precision matrix via the modified Cholesky decomposition. The bandable assumption is imposed on the Cholesky factor of the decomposition. We obtained the P-loss convergence rate under the spectral norm and the matrix ℓ_∞ norm and the minimax lower bounds. Since the P-loss convergence rate (Lee and Lee (2017)) is stronger than the posterior convergence rate, the rates obtained are also posterior convergence rates. Furthermore, when the true precision matrix is a k_0 -banded matrix with some finite k_0 , the obtained P-loss convergence rates coincide with the minimax rates. The established convergence rates are slightly slower than the minimax lower bounds, but these are the fastest rates for bandable precision matrices among the existing Bayesian approaches. A simulation study is conducted to compare the performance to the other competitive estimators in various scenarios.

Key words: P-loss Convergence rate; Precision matrix; Modified Cholesky decomposition.

1 Introduction

Due to the technical advances, it is common that the number of variables p of the data sets collected in recent years is much larger than their sample size n . Examples of such high-dimensional data sets arise from genomics, climatology, fMRI and neuroimaging, to name just a few. In this paper, we concentrate on the estimation of the precision matrix, the inverse of the covariance matrix, for a high-dimensional data. In the analysis of dependent data, often the estimation of the covariance or precision matrix is a crucial initial step of subsequent analysis, for example principle component analysis (PCA), linear/quadratic discriminant analysis and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

When the number of variables p tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and is even possibly larger than n , the traditional sample covariance fails to converge to the true covariance matrix (Johnstone and Lu, 2009). It becomes necessary to assume restrictive matrix classes to get a consistent estimator under the ultra high-dimensional setting, $\log p = o(n)$. The restriction on the matrix class includes the sparse, bandable assumption or lower-dimensional structure such as sparse spiked covariance and factor model. The minimax convergence rates under the sparsity or bandable assumption on a covariance/precision matrix itself were established by Bickel and Levina (2008a, 2008b), Cai, Zhang and Zhou (2010), Cai and Zhou (2012a, 2012b), Xue and Zou (2013) and Cai, Liu and Zhou (2016), to just name a few. The convergence rates for precision matrices under the sparsity or bandable assumption via Cholesky decomposition were studied by Bickel and Levina (2008b) and Verzelen (2010). The convergence rates under lower-dimensional structures of covariance matrix such as factor model (Fan, Fan and Lv, 2008) and sparse spiked covariance model (Cai, Ma and Wu, 2015) were also explored. Cai, Liang and Zhou (2015) and Fan, Rigollet and Wang (2015) derived the minimax convergence rates for the functionals of the covariance matrices. Cai, Ren and Zhou (2016) provided a comprehensive review on the convergence rate for large matrices.

The posterior convergence rates for large covariance or precision matrices have been received attention, but there are only a few works available in high-dimensional settings.

Banerjee and Ghosal (2015) showed the posterior convergence rate for the precision matrix under the sparsity assumption. They used a mixture prior for off-diagonal elements of the precision matrix to assign exactly zero. To estimate bandable precision matrices, Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) utilized the G -Wishart prior on the precision matrix and established the posterior convergence rate. Xiang, Khare and Ghosh (2015) extended the result of Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) to decomposable graphical models which contains the bandable precision matrices as a special case. Pati et al. (2014) considered the posterior convergence rate for covariance estimation via the sparse factor model. They obtained nearly optimal rates, the minimax rates with $\sqrt{\log n}$ factor when the number of true factors is bounded. The optimal posterior convergence rate for covariance matrices of sparse spiked covariance model was derived by Gao and Zhou (2015). The above results assumed the ultra high-dimensional setting, $\log p = o(n)$, or its variants. Recently, Gao and Zhou (2016) derived Bernstein-von Mises theorems for functionals of the covariance matrix as well as its inverse, under conditions such as $p = o(n)$ or $p^3 = o(n)$.

Lee and Lee (2017) proposed a new decision theoretical framework for prior selection and obtained the Bayesian minimax rate of the unconstrained covariance matrix under the spectral norm for all rates of p . The Bayesian minimax rates under the Frobenius norm, the Bregman divergence and squared log-determinant loss were also obtained when $p \leq \sqrt{n}$ or $p = o(n)$. Lee and Lee (2017) showed that when $p > n/2$, there is no better prior than the point mass prior δ_{I_p} in terms of the induced posterior convergence rate. Thus, it implies that a certain restriction on the covariance or precision matrix is needed for the consistent estimation.

In this paper, we consider a class of bandable precision matrices via the modified Cholesky decomposition (MCD) under the ultra high-dimensional setting, and derive the P-loss convergence rates under the spectral norm and matrix ℓ_∞ norm. The bandable assumption is imposed on the lower triangular matrix from the MCD, which is called the Cholesky factor. Bickel and Levina (2008b) used a similar assumption: their parameter space is a special case of ours. Our work is also closely related to the works of Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) and Xiang, Khare and Ghosh (2015) for they considered the bandable

precision matrices. However, we emphasize that the convergence rate obtained in this paper is faster than those obtained in the above papers. To the best of our knowledge, the convergence rate in this paper is the fastest rate for the bandable precision matrices among existing Bayesian methods. Although our parameter space is not exactly same as that of Banerjee and Ghosal (2014), they are closely related. Proposition 2.1 describes the relationship between them. Furthermore, we show the minimax lower bound for precision matrices under the k -banded assumption on the Cholesky factor. The lower bounds are derived under the spectral norm as well as matrix ℓ_∞ norm. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result on minimax lower bound for precision matrices under the bandable assumption on the Cholesky factor.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we define our model, matrix norms, the parameter class and the decision theoretic prior selection. The convergence rates for precision matrices under the spectral norm and matrix ℓ_∞ norm are shown in section 3. In section 4, the practical choice of the bandwidth is proposed, and we conduct a simulation study in section 5. Discussion is given in section 6, and the proofs of the main results are in section 7.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Norms and Notations

For any constants a and b , $a \vee b$ denotes the maximum of a and b . For any positive sequences a_n and b_n , we denote $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We denote $a_n \asymp b_n$ if there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that $C_1 \leq a_n/b_n \leq C_2$ for all sufficiently large n , and $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if there exists a positive constant C such that $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for all sufficiently large n . For any $p \times p$ matrix A , $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalue of the matrix A , respectively.

For any p -dimensional vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $p \times p$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, $B_{k,j}(a)$ and $B_k(A)$ are defined by $B_{k,j}(a) := (b_i = a_i I(|i - j| \leq k), 1 \leq i \leq p)$ and

$B_k(A) := (b_{ij} = a_{ij}I(|i - j| \leq k), 1 \leq i, j \leq p)$, respectively.

For any p -dimensional vector a , we define vector norms as follows: $\|a\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^p |a_i|$, $\|a\|_2 := (\sum_{i=1}^p a_i^2)^{1/2}$ and $\|a\|_{\max} := \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |a_i|$. With these norms, we define the operator norms for matrices. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be a $p \times p$ matrix. The spectral norm (or matrix ℓ_2 norm) is defined by

$$\|A\| := \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^p \\ \|x\|_2=1}} \|Ax\|_2 = (\lambda_{\max}(A^T A))^{1/2}.$$

We define the matrix ℓ_1 norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm by

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_1 &:= \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^p \\ \|x\|_1=1}} \|Ax\|_1 = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^p |a_{ij}|, \\ \|A\|_\infty &:= \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^p \\ \|x\|_{\max}=1}} \|Ax\|_{\max} = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}|, \\ \|A\|_F &:= \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. The max norm for matrices is defined by $\|A\|_{\max} := \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$.

2.2 The Model and the Prior

Suppose we observe a data set from the p -dimensional normal distribution

$$X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_p(0, \Sigma_n), \quad (1)$$

where Σ_n is a $p \times p$ positive definite matrix. We assume that $p = p_n$ is a function of n increasing to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and possibly $n = o(p)$. The unknown $p \times p$ true covariance matrix is denoted by $\Sigma_{0,n}$.

For a $p \times p$ positive definite matrix $\Omega_n := \Sigma_n^{-1}$, the MCD guarantees that there uniquely exist a lower triangular matrix $A_n = (a_{jl})$ and a diagonal matrix $D_n = \text{diag}(d_j)$ such that

$$\Omega_n = (I_p - A_n)^T D_n^{-1} (I_p - A_n), \quad (2)$$

where $a_{jj} = 0$ and $d_j > 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$. Note that the model (1) with a precision matrix (2) is equivalent to the following autoregressive model

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i1} &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, d_1), \\ X_{ij} &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} N\left(a_j^T Z_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} a_{jl} X_{il}, d_j\right), \quad i, = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 2, \dots, p, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_j := (a_{j1}, \dots, a_{j,j-1})^T$ and $Z_{ij} := (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i,j-1})^T$. Let $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_p)^T \sim N_p(0, \Sigma)$, $Z_j = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{j-1})^T$ and $\Sigma^{-1} = \Omega = (I_p - A)^T D^{-1} (I_p - A)$, then it is easy to check that, by the construction, the explicit forms of a_j and d_j are

$$\begin{aligned} a_j &= \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j) \text{Cov}(Z_j, Y_j), \\ d_j &= \text{Var}(Y_j) - \text{Cov}(Y_j, Z_j) \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j) \text{Cov}(Z_j, Y_j), \quad j = 2, \dots, p, \end{aligned}$$

where $d_1 = \text{Var}(Y_1)$. Bickel and Levina (2008b) approximated the precision matrix by considering only k closest regressors $Z_{ij}^{(k)} := (X_{i,(j-k \vee 1)}, \dots, X_{i,j-1})^T$ for each X_{ij} . It gives the new coefficient vector $a_j^{(k)} := \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \text{Cov}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j)$. This is the same as assuming the lower triangle matrix A_n in the MCD to be the k -banded lower triangular matrix. The resulting precision matrix $\Omega_n := (I_p - A_n)^T D_n^{-1} (I_p - A_n)$ also becomes a k -banded matrix.

Bickel and Levina (2008b) suggested the ordinary least square estimators for A_n and corresponding variance estimator D_n under the k -banded assumption on A_n . Based on the least square estimators, they showed the convergence rates of covariance and precision matrix when $\log p = o(n)$.

In this paper, we suggest the following prior distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(a_{jl}) &\propto 1, \quad l = (j - k \vee 1), \dots, j - 1, \\ d_j &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} d_j^{\nu_0/2-1} I(0 < d_j < M), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for some non-negative constants M and ν_0 . We call the prior (3) the k -banded Cholesky (k -BC) prior. The appropriate condition on M and ν_0 will be discussed in section 3.

The prior (3) leads to the following joint posterior distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} d_j | \mathbf{X}_n &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} IG^{Tr} \left(d_j \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk}, d_j \leq M \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, p \\ a_j | d_j, \mathbf{X}_n &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} N_{\min(j-1, k)} \left(a_j \mid \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}, \frac{d_j}{n} \widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \right) \quad j = 2, \dots, p, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_n := (X_1, \dots, X_n)^T$, $n_j := n + \nu_0 - \min(j-1, k) - 4$, $\widehat{d}_{1k} := \widehat{\text{Var}}(X_1)$, $\widehat{\text{Var}}(X_j) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}^2$, $\widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ij}^{(k)} X_{ij}$, $\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_j^{(k)}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ij}^{(k)} Z_{ij}^{(k)T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_{jk} &:= \widehat{\text{Var}}(X_j) - \widehat{\text{Cov}}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)}) \widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) \quad \text{and} \\ \widehat{a}_j^{(k)} &:= \widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j), \quad j = 2, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $IG(X \mid a, b)$ is the density function of the inverse-gamma random variable X whose shape and rate parameters are a and b , respectively. We denote $IG^{Tr}(X \mid a, b, A)$ as the truncated version of $IG(X \mid a, b)$ on support A . $N_p(X \mid \mu, \Sigma)$ is the density function of the p -dimensional normal random variable X whose mean vector and covariance matrix are μ and Σ , respectively. The suggested prior on d_{jk} has a compact support for a technical reason.

The zero-pattern of the Cholesky factor is related to the directed acyclic graph (DAG) (Rütimann and Bühlmann, 2009). The use of the k -BC prior (3) implies that we approximate the true model with a directed Gaussian graphical model. Thus, our method can be applied to directed Gaussian graphical models, but applications to graphical models will not be discussed in this paper. For more details about graphical models, see Lauritzen (1996), Koller and Friedman (2009) and Rütimann and Bühlmann (2009).

2.3 Parameter Class

For a given constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a decreasing function $\gamma(k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we define a class of precision matrices

$$\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma) = \mathcal{U}_p(\epsilon_0, \gamma) := \left\{ \Omega = (I_p - A)^T D^{-1} (I_p - A) \in \mathcal{C}_p : \epsilon_0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega) \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}, \right. \\ \left. \|A - B_k(A)\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma(k), \forall 0 < k \leq p-1 \right\},$$

where \mathcal{C}_p is the class of all $p \times p$ dimensional positive definite matrices, and A is a lower triangular matrix from the MCD of Ω . Note that $\|A - B_k(A)\|_\infty \leq \gamma(k)$ is equivalent to $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j < i-k} |a_{ij}| \leq \gamma(k)$ where $A = (a_{ij})$.

We consider the following classes of $\gamma(k)$:

1. (polynomially decreasing) $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$;
2. (exponentially decreasing) $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$ for some $\beta > 0$ and $C > 0$; and
3. (exact banding) for some $k_0 > 0$, $\gamma(k) = 0$ for all $k > k_0$.

Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) considered a similar parameter space for precision matrix defined by

$$\mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma) = \mathcal{U}_p^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma) := \left\{ \Omega = (\omega_{ij}) \in \mathcal{C}_p : 0 < \epsilon_0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega) \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}, \right. \\ \left. \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j: |i-j| > k} |\omega_{ij}| \leq \gamma(k), \forall 0 < k \leq p-1 \right\}.$$

In fact, $\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ and $\mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ are *equivalent*, in terms of the convergence rate over them, if we consider an exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k)$ with $\beta > \log(\epsilon_0^{-2} + 1)$ or an exact banding $\gamma(k)$. The following proposition describes the relation between them and its proof is given in Appendix.

Proposition 2.1 *Suppose γ is a decreasing function defined on positive integers. If γ is exponentially decreasing with $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$ with $\beta > \log(\epsilon_0^{-2} + 1)$ and $C > 0$, or exact banding for some $k_0 > 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, C_1\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, C_2\gamma)$$

for some positive constants C_1 and C_2 not depending on p .

2.4 Bayesian Minimax Rate

Posterior convergence rate is one of the most commonly used measures to show the asymptotic concentration of posterior around the true parameter (Ghosal et al., 2000; Ghosal

and van der Vaart, 2007). The concept of the posterior convergence rate is used to justify priors, but the best possible posterior convergence rate is an elusive concept to define. Motivated by the aforementioned difficulty, Lee and Lee (2017) suggested a new decision theoretic framework for prior selection.

They considered a prior $\pi(\Sigma)$ as a decision rule and defined the P-loss as

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_0, \pi) := \mathbb{E}^\pi(d(\Sigma, \Sigma_0) | \mathbf{X}_n),$$

where $d(\Sigma, \Sigma')$ is a pseudometric on a set of positive definite matrices, Σ_0 is the true covariance matrix, and $\mathbb{E}^\pi(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_n)$ is the expectation under the posterior of Σ when the prior π and observation \mathbf{X}_n are given. The P-risk is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\Sigma_0, \pi) := \mathbb{E}_0 \mathbb{E}^\pi(d(\Sigma, \Sigma_0) | \mathbf{X}_n), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_0 := \mathbb{E}_{\Sigma_0}$ denotes the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{X}_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_p(0, \Sigma_0)$. Let \mathcal{C}_p be a class of $p \times p$ covariance matrices, and Π_n be the class of all priors on \mathcal{C}_p . Then, the Bayesian minimax rate of the posterior for the class $\mathcal{C}_p^* \subset \mathcal{C}_p$ and the space of prior distributions $\Pi_n^* \subset \Pi_n$ is naturally defined as a sequence r_n such that

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_n^*} \sup_{\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{C}_p^*} \mathbb{E}_0 \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_0, \pi(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_n)) \asymp r_n.$$

If a prior π^* satisfies

$$\sup_{\Sigma_0 \in \mathcal{C}_p^*} \mathbb{E}_0 \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_0, \pi^*(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_n)) \lesssim a_n,$$

then π^* is said to have a P-loss convergence rate a_n , and if a_n has the same rate with the Bayesian minimax rate, i.e. $a_n \asymp r_n$, π^* is said to achieve the Bayesian minimax rate. Thus, the use of the P-loss convergence rate enables to define the minimax rate of posterior clearer and makes the prior selection a mathematical problem. The P-loss convergence rate is a stronger measure than the posterior convergence rate, and the frequentist minimax lower bound is also a Bayesian minimax lower bound in general. For more details, see Lee and Lee (2017).

3 Main Results

3.1 P-loss Convergence Rate and Bayesian Minimax Lower Bound under Spectral Norm

In this subsection, we establish the Bayesian minimax lower and upper bounds under the spectral norm. The P-loss convergence rate with the k -BC prior (3) is one of the main results of this paper. It is slightly slower than the rate of the Bayesian minimax lower bound given in Theorem 3.1. The proofs of theorems are given in section 7. Theorem 3.1 describes the frequentist minimax lower bound for precision matrices under the spectral norm.

Theorem 3.1 *Consider model (1) with $p \leq \exp(cn)$ for some constant $c > 0$. Assume that $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ for given $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a decreasing function γ .*

(i) *If there exists a constant $k_0 > 0$ such that $\gamma(k) = 0$ for all $k \geq k_0$, we have*

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2},$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}$ denotes an arbitrary estimator of $\Omega_{0,n}$.

(ii) *If $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$ for some constants $\beta > 0$ and $C > 0$, then we have*

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \gtrsim \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

(iii) *If $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$ for some constants $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$, then we have*

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \gtrsim \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} + n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}, \left(\frac{p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Remark Since a frequentist minimax lower bound is also a P-loss minimax lower bound, Theorem 3.1 implies a P-loss minimax lower bound. For the proof of this argument, see Lee and Lee (2017).

To the best of our knowledge, there is no frequentist minimax lower bound result on this setting. The estimation of precision matrix with polynomially banded Cholesky factor under the spectral norm was studied by Bickel and Levina (2008b), but they did not consider the minimax lower bound. Verzelen (2010) obtained the minimax lower bound, but he considered the sparse Cholesky factor under the Frobenius norm.

Cai and Yuan (2016) considered the estimation of covariance operator for random variables on a lattice graph under the spectral norm. They used both polynomially and exponentially banded assumption for the covariance operator. Although bandable covariance (or precision) matrix classes and bandable Cholesky factor classes are different, if one considers one-dimensional lattice, interestingly the minimax lower bounds in Cai and Yuan (2016) coincide with the minimax lower bounds in Theorem 3.1 (ii) and (iii).

Theorem 3.2 *Consider the model (1) and the k -BC prior (3) with $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. If $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$, $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty$ and $1 \leq k \leq p$,*

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \lesssim k^{3/4} \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right].$$

Here, we use divide and conquer strategy to deal with the P-loss convergence rate. We decompose it into some small terms, which are easier to handle,

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|,$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}$ is a frequentist estimator of $\Omega_{0,n}$ with k -banded assumption. For the first term, we use concentration inequalities for posteriors of parameters around certain frequentist estimators. For the second term, some techniques for the frequentist convergence rate can be adopted. This strategy can be applied for general problems, for example, Castillo (2014) also used the similar technique to obtain the P-loss convergence rate in density estimation.

When $\gamma(k)$ satisfies the exact banding with k_0 , the prior (3) with $k \geq k_0$ not depending n gives the P-loss convergence rate $(\log(n \vee p)/n)^{1/2}$, which is same as the Bayesian minimax rate when $p \geq n$. When $p < n$, if $p = n^{\xi}$ for some constant $0 < \xi < 1$, the prior still achieves the Bayesian minimax rate.

For the exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k)$, the optimal choice of k is $(2\beta)^{-1} \log n$. It gives the P-loss convergence rate

$$(\log n)^{3/4} \left(\frac{\log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

If $p \geq \log n$, the rate of (6) is same with the rate of minimax lower bound up to $(\log n)^{3/4}$.

For the polynomially decreasing $\gamma(k)$, we assume that $p \geq n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}$. The optimal choice of the bandwidth $k = \min\{n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}, (n/\log p)^{1/(2\alpha)}\}$ gives the P-loss convergence rate

$$n^{-(4\alpha-3)/(8\alpha+4)} + \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{(4\alpha-3)/(8\alpha)}. \quad (7)$$

In other words, the P-loss convergence rate is $n^{-(4\alpha-3)/(8\alpha+4)}$ and $(\log p/n)^{(4\alpha-3)/(8\alpha)}$ when $p \leq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$ and $p \geq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$, respectively. Thus, if $p \geq n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}$, the P-loss convergence rate (7) is equal to the rate of the minimax lower bound up to the $\min(n^{3/(8\alpha+4)}, (n/\log p)^{3/(8\alpha)})$ term.

3.2 P-loss Convergence Rate and Bayesian Minimax Lower Bound under Matrix ℓ_∞ Norm

In this subsection, we establish the upper bound and lower bound for Bayesian minimax rate under the matrix ℓ_∞ norm. The P-loss convergence rate with the k -BC prior (3) is one of the main results of this paper. It is slightly slower than the rate of the minimax lower bound given in Theorem 3.3. However, we emphasize that our convergence rate is the fastest rate for bandable precision matrices among the existing Bayesian methods when we consider the exponentially decreasing or exact banding $\gamma(k)$. The proofs of theorems are given in section 7. Theorem 3.3 describes the minimax lower bound for precision matrices under the matrix ℓ_∞ norm.

Theorem 3.3 *Consider the model (1) and let $p \leq \exp(cn)$ for some constant $c > 0$.*

(i) *If there exists a constant k_0 such that $\gamma(k) = 0$ for all $k \geq k_0$, we have*

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

(ii) If $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$ for some constants $\beta > 0$ and $C > 0$, then we have

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \gtrsim \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\log p \cdot \log n}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

(iii) If $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$ for some constants $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$, then we have

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}_n} \sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \gtrsim \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} + n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+2)}, \frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

Theorem 3.4 Consider the model (1) and the k -BC prior (3) with $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. If $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$, $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty$ and $1 \leq k \leq p$,

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \mathbb{E}^\pi (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \lesssim k \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right].$$

Remark The P-loss convergence rate in Theorem 3.4 is sharper than the posterior convergence rate of Banerjee and Ghosal (2014). If we consider an exponentially decreasing or exact banding $\gamma(k)$, then the parameter spaces in two papers are equivalent by Proposition 2.1. In that cases, the convergence rate obtained in Theorem 3.4 is faster than that in Banerjee and Ghosal (2014).

For the exact banding $\gamma(k)$ with k_0 , the results are the same as those under the spectral norm. In words, the prior (3) with $k \geq k_0$ gives P-loss convergence rate $(\log(n \vee p)/n)^{1/2}$, which is same as the optimal minimax rate when $p \geq n$. When $p < n$, if $p = n^\xi$ for some constant $0 < \xi < 1$, the prior achieves the Bayesian minimax rate.

For the exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k)$, the optimal choice of k is $(2\beta)^{-1} \log n$. It gives the P-loss convergence rate

$$\log n \cdot \left(\frac{\log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (8)$$

If $p \geq (\log n \cdot \log p)^{1/2}$, the rate of (8) is same with the rate of the minimax lower bound up to $(\log n \cdot \log(n \vee p)/\log p)^{1/2}$, which is $(\log n)^{1/2}$ provided that $p \geq n^\xi$ for some $\xi > 0$.

For the polynomially decreasing $\gamma(k)$, we assume that $p \geq n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}$. The optimal choice of the bandwidth $k = \min\{n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}, (n/\log p)^{1/(2\alpha)}\}$ gives the P-loss convergence rate

$$n^{-(\alpha-1)/(2\alpha+1)} + \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{(\alpha-1)/(2\alpha)}. \quad (9)$$

In other words, the P-loss convergence rate is $n^{-(\alpha-1)/(2\alpha+1)}$ and $(\log p/n)^{(\alpha-1)/(2\alpha)}$ when $p \leq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$ and $p \geq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$, respectively. Thus, if $n^{1/(2\alpha+2)} \leq p \leq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$, the P-loss convergence rate (9) is equal to the rate of the minimax lower bound up to the $n^{(\alpha+2)/(2(\alpha+1)(2\alpha+1))}$ term. If $p \geq \exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)})$, the P-loss convergence rate (9) is equal to the rate of the minimax lower bound up to the $(n/\log p)^{(\alpha+1)/(4\alpha^2+2\alpha)}$ term.

3.3 The Frequentist Convergence Rates and the Posterior Convergence Rates

In this subsection, we obtain the frequentist convergence rate and the traditional posterior convergence rate of the k -BC prior (3). For the frequentist convergence rate, we propose a plug-in estimator,

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL} := (I_p - \mathbb{E}^\pi(A_n | \mathbf{X}_n))^T \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}}(D_n^{-1} | \mathbf{X}_n) (I_p - \mathbb{E}^\pi(A_n | \mathbf{X}_n)),$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}}(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_n)$ are posterior means using the nontruncated posteriors,

$$\tilde{\pi}(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) = IG\left(d_j \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk}\right), \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

The plug-in estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}$ is more convenient than the posterior mean $\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n | \mathbf{X}_n)$ in practice because of its simple form. Note that $\mathbb{E}^\pi(a_j | d_j, \mathbf{X}_n) = \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}}(d_j^{-1} | \mathbf{X}_n) = n_j \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} / n$. As a justification for the use of nontruncated posterior mean, in Corollary 3.5, we show that $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}$ achieves the same rate with the P-loss convergence rate. The proof of Corollary 3.5 is given in Appendix 7.

According to Proposition 2.1 of Lee and Lee (2017), the P-loss convergence rate is a posterior convergence rate. Thus, the rates obtained in Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.4 in this paper are also the posterior convergence rates.

Corollary 3.5 *Consider the model (1), and assume $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty$, $\nu_0 = o(n)$ and $1 \leq k \leq p$. If $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$,*

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \lesssim k^{3/4} \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right].$$

If $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$,

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \lesssim k \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right].$$

Corollary 3.6 Consider the model (1) and the k -BC prior (3) with $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. Assume $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty$ and $1 \leq k \leq p$. If $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$ and $\epsilon_n = k^{3/4} [(k + \log(n \vee p))/n]^{1/2} + \gamma(k)$, then for any $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\pi(\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \geq M_n \epsilon_n \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

If $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$ and $\epsilon_n^* = k [((k + \log(n \vee p))/n)^{1/2} + \gamma(k)]$, then for any $M_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\pi(\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \geq M_n \epsilon_n^* \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

4 Choice of the Bandwidth k

In this subsection, we suggest using the posterior mode of k as a practical choice of the bandwidth k . Using Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.4, one can calculate the optimal *rate* of the bandwidth k minimizing the P-loss convergence rate, when the rate of $\gamma(k)$ is given. However, in practice $\gamma(k)$ is not known and k can not be chosen based on $\gamma(k)$.

Let $\pi(k)$ be a prior distribution for the bandwidth k and $f(\mathbf{X}_n \mid A_n, D_n, k)$ be the likelihood function based on the observation \mathbf{X}_n . In section 5, the prior distribution of k was set by $\pi(k) \propto \exp(-k^4)$ as in Banerjee and Ghosal (2014). The marginal posterior for k is easily derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(k \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &\propto \pi(k) \int \int f(\mathbf{X}_n \mid A_n, D_n, k) \pi(A_n, D_n) dA_n dD_n \\ &\propto \pi(k) \prod_{j=2}^p \det \left(n \widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_j^{(k)}) / (2\pi) \right)^{-1/2} \Gamma \left(\frac{n_j}{2} \right) \left(\frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk} \right)^{-n_j/2} \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^p F_{IG} \left(M \mid n_j/2, n \widehat{d}_{jk}/2 \right) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

by routine calculations where $F_{IG}(M | a, b)$ is a distribution function of $IG(a, b)$. Since the marginal posterior (10) has a simple analytic form, the posterior mode, say \hat{k} , can be easily obtained. The performance of \hat{k} is described through comparisons with other approaches in the next section.

Note that the Cholesky-based Bayes estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}$ is similar to the banded estimator (Bickel and Levina, 2008b), $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BL}$. The major difference between two estimators is the choice of the bandwidth parameter k . It is worthwhile to compare the practical performances of the two schemes for selecting the bandwidth k . Bickel and Levina (2008b) proposed a resampling scheme to estimate the oracle k . To estimate the minimizer of the risk

$$R(k) = \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BL} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_1, \quad (11)$$

they divided n observations into two groups of sizes $n_1 = n/3$ and $n_2 = n - n_1$, randomly. We computed the banded estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{1,nk}^{BL}$ using the first group as an estimator for $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BL}$. Since the sample precision matrix is computationally unstable for large p , the banded estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{2,nK}^{BL}$ was used instead of the sample precision matrix for the second group as an estimator for $\Omega_{0,n}$. Here, $K = \min(n, p) - 1$, but in the simulation study in this paper, we used $K = 20$ to reduce the computation time. In the same way, t -th random split gives $\widehat{\Omega}_{1,nk}^{BL,(t)}$ and $\widehat{\Omega}_{2,nK}^{BL,(t)}$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$. The risk (11) was approximated by

$$\widehat{R}(k) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{\Omega}_{1,nk}^{BL,(t)} - \widehat{\Omega}_{2,nK}^{BL,(t)}\|_1, \quad (12)$$

and the bandwidth k was selected as $\hat{k}^{BL} = \operatorname{argmin}_k \widehat{R}(k)$. For more detailed description about the resampling scheme, see Bickel and Levina (2008b).

5 Simulation Study

We investigated the performance of the proposed Bayes estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}$ and the posterior mode \hat{k} . The performances of the Bayes estimator based on the G -Wishart prior $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG}$ (Banerjee and Ghosal, 2014), the banded estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BL}$ (Bickel and Levina, 2008b) and

the graphical maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{MLE}$ (Lauritzen, 1996) were compared in various scenarios. For the proposed estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}$, we used $\nu_0 = 2$ throughout this section.

Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) proposed two Bayes estimators corresponding to the Stein's loss and the squared-error loss, respectively. We checked the performances of two Bayes estimators, say $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG1}$ and $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG2}$, with $\delta = 3$. For these estimators, the bandwidth k was chosen by the posterior mode in Banerjee and Ghosal (2014), \hat{k}^{BG} . We examined the performances of two banded estimator (Bickel and Levina, 2008b), $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk_1}^{BL}$ and $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk_2}^{BL}$, where the banding parameter k of the former was chosen by \hat{k}^{BL} and that of the latter was chosen by \hat{k} . For the graphical MLE, the bandwidth k was set by \hat{k} .

The spectral norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm were used as the loss functions. The sample sizes $n = 100, 200$ and 500 and the dimensions $p = 100, 200$ and 500 were investigated. For each settings, the values of the loss function,

$$\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{(s)} - \Omega_{0,n}\|, \quad s = 1, \dots, 100, \quad (13)$$

were calculated with 100 simulated data for each methods $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}$ and loss functions $\|\cdot\|$ where $\Omega_{0,n}$ denotes the true precision matrix. The mean and standard deviation of (13) were used as summary statistics. We considered the following true precision matrices.

Example 5.1 (*AR(1) process*) Assume the true covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is given by

$$\sigma_{ij} = \rho^{|i-j|}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq p$$

with $\rho = 0.3$. Then the true precision matrix is a banded matrix with AR(1) process structure.

Example 5.2 (*AR(4) process*) Assume the true precision matrix $\Omega = (\omega_{ij})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ij} &= I(|i-j|=0) + 0.4 \cdot I(|i-j|=1) + 0.2 \cdot I(|i-j|=2) \\ &+ 0.2 \cdot I(|i-j|=3) + 0.1 \cdot I(|i-j|=4). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the true precision matrix is a banded matrix with the AR(4) process structure. Furthermore, it is always positive definite because of the diagonally dominant property.

Example 5.3 (*Long-range dependence*) The last example deals with the situation where the true precision matrix is not a bandable matrix in $\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$. Consider a fractional Gaussian noise model and the true covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is given by

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (||i - j| + 1|^{2H} - 2|i - j|^{2H} + ||i - j| - 1|^{2H}), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq p$$

with $H \in [0.5, 1]$. The Hurst parameter H indicates the dependency of the process. $H = 0.5$ implies the white noise, while H near 1 means the long-range dependence. We chose $H = 0.7$. In this case, the true precision matrix does not belong to the bandable class.

Table 1–3 show the simulation results for the above three examples, and Figure 1 shows the performance of each estimator when the true precision matrix is $AR(4)$ process and $(n, p) = (500, 500)$. We omitted the estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG2}$ because its performance is quite similar to that of $\hat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG1}$ throughout the all scenarios. BG in table 1–3 and Figure 1 represents $\hat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG1}$. There are two major remarks on the simulation results. First, it seems that the proposed Bayes estimator is practically comparable or better than the method of Banerjee and Ghosal (2014). Since theoretical results in this paper and in Banerjee and Ghosal (2014) are based on the optimal choice of k depending some unknown parameters, the practical performances using the posterior modes \hat{k} are of independent interest. Especially




Figure 1: The average errors for $AR(4)$ process structure precision matrix under the spectral norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm. The sample size n and the dimensionality p are 500.

Table 1: Simulation results for $AR(1)$ model. For each n and p , the mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of three loss functions (the spectral norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm) were calculated.

		LL	BG	BL1	BL2	MLE	
$n = 100$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.720 (0.139)	0.759 (0.141)	1.217 (0.391)	0.786 (0.146)	0.786 (0.146)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.913 (0.176)	0.957 (0.177)	1.905 (0.813)	0.989 (0.184)	0.989 (0.184)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	2.382 (0.171)	2.447 (0.187)	3.837 (1.067)	2.503 (0.196)	2.503 (0.196)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.802 (0.140)	0.842 (0.140)	1.294 (0.353)	0.873 (0.145)	0.873 (0.145)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.025 (0.180)	1.071 (0.180)	2.044 (0.716)	1.108 (0.186)	1.108 (0.186)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	3.395 (0.165)	3.487 (0.179)	5.471 (0.322)	3.567 (0.188)	3.567 (0.188)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.910 (0.147)	0.951 (0.146)	1.504 (0.417)	0.985 (0.152)	0.985 (0.152)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.151 (0.181)	1.196 (0.181)	2.412 (0.928)	1.239 (0.188)	1.239 (0.188)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	5.377 (0.172)	5.521 (0.186)	9.070 (2.353)	5.647 (0.353)	5.647 (0.195)
$n = 200$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.482 (0.090)	0.498 (0.094)	0.585 (0.165)	0.507 (0.096)	0.507 (0.096)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.619 (0.117)	0.636 (0.121)	0.815 (0.315)	0.646 (0.124)	0.646 (0.124)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	1.673 (0.110)	1.696 (0.116)	1.991 (0.442)	1.714 (0.119)	1.714 (0.119)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.537 (0.098)	0.556 (0.100)	0.644 (0.154)	0.567 (0.102)	0.567 (0.102)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.685 (0.127)	0.706 (0.130)	0.896 (0.277)	0.718 (0.133)	0.718 (0.133)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	2.374 (0.113)	2.406 (0.121)	2.851 (0.544)	2.432 (0.124)	2.432 (0.124)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.594 (0.080)	0.615 (0.080)	0.747 (0.156)	0.626 (0.082)	0.626 (0.082)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.755 (0.108)	0.777 (0.109)	1.054 (0.326)	0.792 (0.111)	0.792 (0.111)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	3.762 (0.104)	3.813 (0.111)	4.692 (0.866)	3.855 (0.114)	3.855 (0.114)
$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.287 (0.045)	0.292 (0.046)	0.309 (0.055)	0.295 (0.047)	0.295 (0.047)	
	$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.368 (0.060)	0.373 (0.063)	0.404 (0.084)	0.376 (0.064)	0.376 (0.064)	
	$\ \cdot\ _F$	1.053 (0.065)	1.060 (0.067)	1.110 (0.110)	1.064 (0.067)	1.064 (0.067)	

Table 2: Simulation results for $AR(4)$ model. For each n and p , the mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of three loss functions (the spectral norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm) were calculated.

		LL	BG	BL1	BL2	MLE	
$n = 100$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	1.510 (0.040)	1.475 (0.041)	1.481 (0.340)	1.473 (0.041)	1.473 (0.041)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.854 (0.058)	1.826 (0.061)	2.446 (0.607)	1.827 (0.063)	1.827 (0.063)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	5.130 (0.070)	5.050 (0.065)	4.189 (0.620)	5.046 (0.065)	5.046 (0.065)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	1.541 (0.034)	1.506 (0.035)	1.668 (0.395)	1.504 (0.035)	1.504 (0.035)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.899 (0.065)	1.873 (0.069)	2.873 (0.678)	1.874 (0.071)	1.874 (0.071)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	7.312 (0.072)	7.196 (0.068)	6.015 (0.840)	7.191 (0.068)	7.191 (0.068)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	1.564 (0.029)	1.530 (0.030)	1.884 (0.368)	1.528 (0.030)	1.528 (0.030)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.938 (0.052)	1.913 (0.056)	3.061 (0.654)	1.915 (0.057)	1.915 (0.057)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	11.610 (0.076)	11.426 (0.072)	9.620 (1.288)	11.417 (0.072)	11.417 (0.072)
$n = 200$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	1.313 (0.314)	1.461 (0.027)	0.843 (0.168)	1.288 (0.325)	1.288 (0.325)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.616 (0.273)	1.734 (0.050)	1.366 (0.284)	1.596 (0.280)	1.596 (0.280)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	4.477 (0.980)	4.949 (0.049)	2.513 (0.260)	4.431 (0.972)	4.431 (0.972)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.972 (0.289)	1.482 (0.027)	0.482 (0.171)	0.934 (0.299)	0.934 (0.299)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.343 (0.245)	1.759 (0.043)	1.457 (0.280)	1.319 (0.249)	1.319 (0.249)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	4.574 (1.357)	7.047 (0.054)	3.528 (0.336)	4.502 (1.356)	4.502 (1.356)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.871 (0.052)	1.499 (0.023)	1.015 (0.169)	0.840 (0.059)	0.840 (0.059)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.300 (0.097)	1.800 (0.041)	1.643 (0.303)	1.291 (0.117)	1.291 (0.117)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	6.083 (0.345)	11.200 (0.058)	5.686 (0.554)	6.001 (0.226)	6.001 (0.226)
$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.501 (0.139)	1.052 (0.395)	0.450 (0.084)	0.513 (0.122)	0.513 (0.122)	
	$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	0.767 (0.151)	1.281 (0.355)	0.733 (0.144)	0.784 (0.137)	0.784 (0.137)	
	$\ \cdot\ _F$	1.663 (0.444)	3.573 (1.324)	1.439 (0.118)	1.676 (0.411)	1.676 (0.411)	

Table 3: Simulation results for fractional Gaussian noise model. For each n and p , the mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of three loss functions (the spectral norm, matrix ℓ_∞ norm and Frobenius norm) were calculated.

		LL	BG	BL1	BL2	MLE	
$n = 100$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.837 (0.149)	0.880 (0.149)	1.232 (0.357)	0.911 (0.154)	0.911 (0.154)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.588 (0.194)	1.636 (0.193)	2.284 (0.698)	1.676 (0.200)	1.676 (0.200)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	2.879 (0.194)	2.955 (0.211)	3.980 (0.908)	3.030 (0.222)	3.030 (0.222)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.931 (0.147)	0.973 (0.146)	1.326 (0.335)	1.008 (0.152)	1.008 (0.152)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.752 (0.188)	1.800 (0.187)	2.495 (0.654)	1.843 (0.194)	1.843 (0.194)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	4.100 (0.178)	4.208 (0.194)	5.806 (1.236)	4.315 (0.204)	4.315 (0.204)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	1.043 (0.156)	1.085 (0.155)	1.493 (0.348)	1.124 (0.161)	1.124 (0.161)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.929 (0.196)	1.976 (0.194)	2.800 (0.740)	2.025 (0.202)	2.025 (0.202)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	6.478 (0.185)	6.648 (0.202)	9.321 (0.945)	6.817 (0.212)	6.817 (0.212)
$n = 200$	$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.601 (0.096)	0.622 (0.096)	0.659 (0.126)	0.634 (0.098)	0.634 (0.098)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.269 (0.137)	1.293 (0.138)	1.360 (0.217)	1.307 (0.140)	1.307 (0.140)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	2.287 (0.123)	2.318 (0.131)	2.435 (0.278)	2.347 (0.134)	2.347 (0.134)
	$p = 200$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.665 (0.111)	0.687 (0.111)	0.719 (0.116)	0.699 (0.113)	0.699 (0.113)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.400 (0.148)	1.424 (0.148)	1.484 (0.175)	1.440 (0.150)	1.440 (0.150)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	3.244 (0.131)	3.289 (0.139)	3.465 (0.289)	3.330 (0.143)	3.330 (0.143)
	$p = 500$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.733 (0.092)	0.755 (0.092)	0.801 (0.104)	0.769 (0.094)	0.769 (0.094)
		$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.526 (0.127)	1.551 (0.127)	1.646 (0.181)	1.568 (0.129)	1.568 (0.129)
		$\ \cdot\ _F$	5.141 (0.117)	5.212 (0.124)	5.547 (0.464)	5.277 (0.128)	5.277 (0.128)
$p = 100$	$\ \cdot\ $	0.406 (0.047)	0.434 (0.043)	0.436 (0.046)	0.420 (0.049)	0.420 (0.049)	
	$\ \cdot\ _\infty$	1.004 (0.076)	1.004 (0.073)	1.046 (0.074)	1.020 (0.077)	1.020 (0.077)	
	$\ \cdot\ _F$	1.722 (0.064)	1.875 (0.066)	1.869 (0.084)	1.742 (0.066)	1.742 (0.066)	

when the sample size is large, the performance of $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BL}$ is often better than $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{BG1}$. Second, our selection scheme for k is comparable to that of Bickel and Levina (2008b). The *BL1* columns and *BL2* columns in tables show the results for banded estimators with k chosen by \hat{k}^{BL} and \hat{k} , respectively. They show similar performance in our simulation study.

6 Discussion

We suggested the k -BC prior (3) for bandable precision matrices via the MCD. The P-loss convergence rates for precision matrices under the spectral norm and matrix ℓ_∞ norm were established. Although the P-loss convergence rates are slightly slower than the rate of the Bayesian minimax lower bounds, the proposed approach attains faster posterior convergence rate than those of the other existing Bayesian methods. Simulation study supported that its practical performance is comparable to those of other competitive approaches.

There are a few possible extensions of this paper related to the bandwidth k . Firstly, theoretical results in this paper depend on the unknown parameter of $\gamma(k)$. To choose the optimal k , one should know about the rate of $\gamma(k)$. Thus, developing an adaptive procedure, which simultaneously attains a reasonable convergence rate regardless of $\gamma(k)$, is one of the possible extension. Secondly, the theoretical property of the posterior mode \hat{k} is unexplored. A theoretical result similar to the Theorem 4 in Bickel and Levina (2008a) can be investigated.

7 Proofs

7.1 Proof of Proposition 2.1

Proof We only prove the exponentially decreasing case, $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$ for some $\beta > 0$ and $C > 0$, because the proposition is trivially hold for the exact banding case.

Suppose $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ and let $\Omega = (I_p - A)^T D^{-1} (I_p - A)$ where $A = (a_{ij})$ and $D =$

$diag(d_j)$. One can check that $\|D^{-1}\| \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_{\max} &\leq \max_j \|a_j\|_2 \\ &\leq \max_j \|\text{Var}(Z_j)^{-1}\| \|\text{Var}(Z_{j+1})\| \leq \epsilon_0^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\|A - B_k(A)\|_{\infty} = \max_i \sum_{j < i-k} |a_{ij}| \leq C\gamma(k), \quad (14)$$

$$\|A - B_k(A)\|_1 = \max_j \sum_{i > j+k} |a_{ij}| \leq \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \gamma(m) \leq C'\gamma(k), \quad (15)$$

for some $C' > 1$ because $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$. Note that $\omega_{pp} = d_p^{-1}$ and

$$\omega_{ij} = -d_j^{-1}a_{ji} + \sum_{l=j+1}^p d_l^{-1}a_{li}a_{lj} \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq i < j \leq p. \quad (16)$$

Then for $1 \leq i < p$, define k so that $i = p - k - 1$. Then, $k \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_{ip}| &= d_p^{-1}|a_{pi}| \\ &\leq C\epsilon_0^{-1}\gamma(k) \end{aligned}$$

by (14). On the other hand, for $1 \leq i < j \leq p - 1$, define k so that $j - i = k + 1$. Then, $k \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_{ij}| &= \left| -d_j a_{ji} + \sum_{l=j+1}^p d_l^{-1} a_{li} a_{lj} \right| \\ &\leq d_j^{-1} |a_{ji}| + \sum_{l=j+1}^p d_l^{-1} |a_{li} a_{lj}| \\ &\leq \epsilon_0^{-3} \left(|a_{ji}| + \sum_{l=j+1}^p |a_{li}| \right) \\ &= \epsilon_0^{-3} \sum_{l=j}^p |a_{li}| \leq \epsilon_0^{-3} C' \gamma(k) \end{aligned}$$

by (15). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Omega - B_k(\Omega)\|_\infty &= \max_i \sum_{j:|i-j|>k} |\omega_{ij}| \\
&\leq \max_i \sum_{j>i+k} |\omega_{ij}| + \max_i \sum_{j<i-k} |\omega_{ji}| \\
&\leq 2\epsilon_0^{-3} C'' \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \gamma(m) \leq C'' \gamma(k)
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C'' > 0$. This proves the first inequality.

Suppose $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$. We need to prove that $\max_i \sum_{j<i-k} |a_{ij}| = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^{i-k-1} |a_{ij}| \leq C\gamma(k)$ for some constant $C > 0$. Note that from (16), we have

$$d_p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-1} |a_{pj}| = \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-1} |\omega_{jp}| \leq \gamma(k), \quad (17)$$

for any $0 \leq k \leq p-2$. We will show that

$$d_{p-t}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} |a_{p-t,j}| \leq \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{m=1}^t (1 + \epsilon_0^{-2})^{m-1} \gamma(k+m) \quad (18)$$

for any $1 \leq t \leq p-k-2$ for some $0 \leq k \leq p-3$. Then, (17) and (18) imply $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, C\gamma)$ for some $C > 0$ because $\max_j d_j \leq \max_j \text{Var}(X_j) \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}$ and we assume that $\gamma(k) = e^{-\beta k}$ and $\beta > \log(\epsilon_0^{-2} + 1)$.

By (16) and the assumption $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p-k-2} | -d_{p-1}^{-1} a_{p-1,j} + d_p^{-1} a_{pj} a_{p,p-1} | = \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-2} |\omega_{j,p-1}| \leq \gamma(k) \quad (19)$$

for any $0 \leq k \leq p-3$. Thus, (17) and (19) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{p-1}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-2} |a_{p-1,j}| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-2} | -d_{p-1}^{-1} a_{p-1,j} + d_p^{-1} a_{pj} a_{p,p-1} | + \sum_{j=1}^{p-k-2} |d_p^{-1} a_{pj} a_{p,p-1}| \\
&\leq \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \gamma(k+1)
\end{aligned}$$

because $\Omega \in \mathcal{U}^*(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ means $|a_{p,p-1}| \leq \|A\|_{\max} \leq \epsilon_0^{-2}$. Thus, (18) holds for $t = 1$. Now

assume that (18) holds for $t - 1$ and consider for the case of t . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(k) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} |\omega_{j,p-t}| \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} \left| -d_{p-t}^{-1} a_{p-t,j} + \sum_{l=p-t+1}^p d_l^{-1} a_{lj} a_{l,p-t} \right|,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}& d_{p-t}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} |a_{p-t,j}| \\ &\leq \gamma(k) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} \sum_{l=p-t+1}^p d_l^{-1} |a_{lj} a_{l,p-t}| \\ &\leq \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{l=p-t+1}^p d_l^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} |a_{lj}| \\ &= \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{t_1=0}^{t-1} d_{p-t_1}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-t_1-(k+t-t_1)-1} |a_{p-t_1,j}| \\ &\leq \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \gamma(k+t) \\ &+ \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{t_1=1}^{t-1} \left(\gamma(k+t-t_1) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{m=1}^{t_1} (1 + \epsilon_0^{-2})^{m-1} \gamma(k+t-t_1+m) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

In (20), one can check that the coefficient of $\gamma(k+t-t')$ is

$$\epsilon_0^{-2} + \epsilon_0^{-4} \sum_{m=1}^{t-t'-1} (1 + \epsilon_0^{-2})^{m-1} = \epsilon_0^{-2} (1 + \epsilon_0^{-2})^{t-t'-1}$$

for $0 \leq t-t' \leq t-1$, and the coefficient of $\gamma(k)$ is 1. Thus,

$$d_{p-t}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{p-t-k-1} |a_{p-t,j}| \leq \gamma(k) + \epsilon_0^{-2} \sum_{m=1}^t (1 + \epsilon_0^{-2})^{m-1} \gamma(k+m).$$

This completes the proof by induction. \blacksquare

7.2 Proof of the Minimax Lower Bounds: Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We follow closely the line of a proof in Cai et al. (2010). Consider the polynomially decreasing case, $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$, first. Two parameter classes are

considered depending on the relation between p and n . For $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}) \geq p$ case, we show that

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{U}_{11}} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| \gtrsim \min \left(n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}, \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \right), \quad (21)$$

and for $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}) \leq p$ case, we show that

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{U}_{12}} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad (22)$$

for some $\mathcal{U}_{11} \cup \mathcal{U}_{12} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$.

Consider $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}) \geq p$ case first. Without loss of generality, we assume $k = \min(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}, p)$ is an even number, and define a class of precision matrices

$$\mathcal{U}_{11} := \left\{ \Omega(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \Omega(\theta) = (I_p - A(\theta))^T (I_p - A(\theta)), \right. \\ \left. A(\theta) = -\tau a \sum_{m=1}^{k/2} \theta_m B(m, k), \theta = (\theta_m, 1 \leq m \leq k/2) \in \{0, 1\}^{k/2} \right\}$$

where $B(m, k) := (b_{ij} = I(i = m+1, \dots, k \text{ and } j = m), 1 \leq i, j \leq p)$ is a $p \times p$ matrix and $a := (nk)^{-1/2}$. If we choose sufficiently small constant $\tau > 0$, it is easy to check that for any $\Omega(\theta) \in \mathcal{U}_{11}$, $\epsilon_0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Omega(\theta)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega(\theta)) \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\|A(\theta) - B_{k_1}(A(\theta))\|_{\infty} \leq Ck_1^{-\alpha}$ for any $k_1 > 0$, so that $\mathcal{U}_{11} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ for all sufficiently large n .

We use the Assouad's lemma

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega(\theta) \in \mathcal{U}_{11}} 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta} \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega(\theta)\| \geq \min_{H(\theta, \theta') \geq 1} \frac{\|\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')\|}{H(\theta, \theta')} \cdot \frac{k/2}{2} \cdot \min_{H(\theta, \theta')=1} \|\mathbb{P}_{\theta} \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|$$

where $H(\theta, \theta') := \sum_{m=1}^{k/2} |\theta_m - \theta'_m|$, $\|\mathbb{P}_{\theta} \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\| := \int p_{\theta} \wedge p_{\theta'} d\mu$ and p_{θ} is a density function of observation \mathbf{X}_n which follows $N(0, \Omega(\theta)^{-1})$. If we show that

$$\min_{H(\theta, \theta') \geq 1} \frac{\|\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')\|}{H(\theta, \theta')} \gtrsim a \quad (23)$$

and

$$\min_{H(\theta, \theta')=1} \|\mathbb{P}_{\theta} \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\| \geq c \quad (24)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, it will complete the proof. To show (23), define a p -dimensional vector $v := (I(k/2 \leq i \leq k), 1 \leq i \leq p)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')\| &\geq \frac{\|(\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta'))v\|_2}{\|v\|_2} \\
&\geq \frac{\sqrt{(k/2 \cdot \tau a)^2 H(\theta, \theta')}}{\sqrt{k/2}} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{k/2}{H(\theta, \theta')}} \cdot \tau a H(\theta, \theta') \\
&\geq \tau a H(\theta, \theta').
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown the first part. To show (24), note that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\theta \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\| = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1^2 \leq 1/2$. Also note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1 &\leq 2K(\mathbb{P}_{\theta'} | \mathbb{P}_\theta) \\
&= n [\text{tr}(\Omega(\theta')^{-1}\Omega(\theta)) - \log \det(\Omega(\theta')^{-1}\Omega(\theta)) - p] \\
&= n [\text{tr}(\Omega(\theta')^{-1}D_1) - \log \det(\Omega(\theta')^{-1}D_1 + I_p)] \\
&= n [\text{tr}(\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}) - \log \det(\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2} + I_p)]
\end{aligned}$$

where $K(\mathbb{P}_{\theta'} | \mathbb{P}_\theta) := \int \log(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\theta'}}{d\mathbb{P}_\theta})d\mathbb{P}_{\theta'}$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence and $D_1 := \Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')$. Let $\Omega(\theta')^{-1} = UVU^T$ be the diagonalization of $\Omega(\theta')^{-1}$. U is a orthogonal matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of $\Omega(\theta')^{-1}$, and V is a diagonal matrix whose i th diagonal element is the eigenvalue of $\Omega(\theta')^{-1}$ corresponding to the i th column of U . It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}\|_F^2 &= \|UV^{1/2}U^T D_1 UV^{1/2}U^T\|_F^2 \\
&= \|V^{1/2}U^T D_1 UV^{1/2}\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \|V\|^2 \|U^T D_1 U\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\Omega(\theta')^{-1}\|^2 \|D_1\|_F^2 \\
&\leq Ck(\tau a)^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Since $\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2} + I_p$ is a positive definite matrix and $\|\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}\|_F^2$ is small,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1 \leq nR_n$$

where $R_n \leq C\|\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}\|_F^2$ for some constant $C > 0$, by Lemma A.7 in Lee and Lee (2016). Thus, we have $\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1 \leq 1/2$ for some small $\tau > 0$ because $nka^2 = 1$.

Now consider $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}) \leq p$ case. To show (22), define a class of diagonal precision matrices

$$\mathcal{U}_{12} := \left\{ \Omega_m \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \Omega_m = I_p + \tau \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \left(I(i = j = m) \right), 0 \leq m \leq p \right\}$$

for some small $\tau > 0$. Since $p \leq \exp(cn)$ for some constant $c > 0$, $\mathcal{U}_{12} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ holds trivially. Let $r_{\min} := \inf_{1 \leq m \leq p} \|\Omega_0 - \Omega_m\|$. We use the Le Cam's lemma (Le Cam, 1973)

$$\inf_{\hat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega_m \in \mathcal{U}_{12}} \mathbb{E}_m \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega_m\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot r_{\min} \cdot \|\mathbb{P}_0 \wedge \bar{\mathbb{P}}\|$$

where $\bar{\mathbb{P}} := p^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^p \mathbb{P}_m$ and \mathbb{P}_m is the distribution function of $N(0, \Omega_m^{-1})$ with observation \mathbf{X}_n . Note that $r_{\min} = \tau(\log p/n)^{1/2}$. We only need to show that $\|\mathbb{P}_0 \wedge \bar{\mathbb{P}}\| \geq c$ for some constant $c > 0$. By the same argument with Cai et al. (2010, page 2129), it suffices to show that

$$\int \frac{(p^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^p f_m)^2}{f_0} d\mu - 1 \rightarrow 0, \quad (25)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where f_m is the density function of \mathbb{P}_m with respect to a σ -finite measure μ . Note that

$$\int \frac{(p^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^p f_m)^2}{f_0} d\mu - 1 = \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{m=1}^p \int \frac{f_m^2}{f_0} d\mu + \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{m \neq j} \int \frac{f_m f_j}{f_0} d\mu - 1$$

and $\int f_m f_j / f_0 d\mu = 1$ for any $m \neq j$. Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{f_m^2}{f_0} d\mu &= (1+b)^{n/2} \left(1 - \frac{b}{1+2b} \right)^{n/2} \\ &\leq e^{nb^2/(1+2b)} \\ &\leq e^{nb^2} = e^{\tau^2 \log p} \end{aligned}$$

where $b := \tau(\log p/n)^{1/2}$. Thus, (25) holds for some small $\tau > 0$. It completes the proof for the case of polynomially decreasing $\gamma(k)$.

For the case of exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$, consider $k = \min(\log n, p)$ for \mathcal{U}_{11} instead of $k = \min(n^{1/(2\alpha+1)}, p)$. Then, similar arguments for the lower bounds of \mathcal{U}_{11} and \mathcal{U}_{12} give the desired result.

For the exact banding $\gamma(k)$, consider \mathcal{U}_{11} with $k = k_0$ and $a = (\log p/n)^{1/2}$, then it completes the proof. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We follow closely the line of a proof in Cai and Zhou (2012a). Consider the polynomially decreasing case, $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$, first. Two parameter classes are considered depending on the relation between p and n . For $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}) \geq p$ case, we show that

$$\inf_{\hat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}_{11}} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\infty} \gtrsim \min \left(n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+2)}, \frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \right), \quad (26)$$

and for $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}) \leq p$ case, we show that

$$\inf_{\hat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}_{12}} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\infty} \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)} \quad (27)$$

for some $\mathcal{G}_{11} \cup \mathcal{G}_{12} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$.

Consider $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}) \geq p$ case first. Define a class of precision matrices

$$\mathcal{G}_{11} := \left\{ \Omega(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \Omega(\theta) = (I_p - A(\theta))^T (I_p - A(\theta)), \right. \\ \left. A(\theta) = -\tau a \sum_{s=2}^k \theta_{s-1} G_s, \theta = (\theta_s) \in \{0, 1\}^{k-1} \right\}$$

where $G_s := (I(i = s, j = 1))$ is a $p \times p$ matrix and $a := n^{-1/2}$ and $k := \min(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}, p)$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{G}_{11} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ for some small constant $\tau > 0$ and all sufficiently large n .

We use the Assouad's lemma,

$$\inf_{\hat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega(\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{11}} 2\mathbb{E}_{\theta} \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega(\theta)\|_{\infty} \geq \min_{H(\theta, \theta') \geq 1} \frac{\|\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')\|_{\infty}}{H(\theta, \theta')} \cdot \frac{k-1}{2} \cdot \min_{H(\theta, \theta')=1} \|\mathbb{P}_{\theta} \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\min_{H(\theta, \theta') \geq 1} \frac{\|\Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')\|_\infty}{H(\theta, \theta')} \geq \tau a.$$

To show $\min_{H(\theta, \theta')=1} \|\mathbb{P}_\theta \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\| \geq c$ for some $c > 0$, it suffices to prove that $\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1 \leq 1$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1^2 &\leq 2K(\mathbb{P}_{\theta'} | \mathbb{P}_\theta) \\ &\leq Cn\|\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}D_1\Omega(\theta')^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ where $D_1 := \Omega(\theta) - \Omega(\theta')$. By the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 3.1, one can show that $\|\mathbb{P}_\theta - \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}\|_1^2 \leq C'n(\tau a)^2$ for some constant $C' > 0$, and it is smaller than 1 for some small constant $\tau > 0$. Thus, we have proved the (26) part.

Now consider $\exp(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}) \leq p$ case. To show (27) part, define a class of precision matrices

$$\mathcal{G}_{12} := \left\{ \Omega_m \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \Omega_m = (I_p - A_m)^T(I_p - A_m), A_m = -\tau B_m \left(\frac{\log p}{nk} \right)^{1/2}, 1 \leq m \leq m_* \right\}$$

where $B_m := (I(m+1 \leq i \leq m+k-1, j=m))$ is a $p \times p$ matrix, $m_* = p/k - 1$ and $k = (n/\log p)^{1/(2\alpha+1)}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that p can be divided by k .

By the definition of \mathcal{G}_{12} , tedious calculations yield that $\mathcal{G}_{12} \subset \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$.

Let $\Omega_0 = I_p$ and \mathbb{P}_m be the distribution function of $N(0, \Omega_m^{-1})$ with observation \mathbf{X}_n . It is easy to check that for any $0 \leq m \neq m' \leq m_*$,

$$\|\Omega_m - \Omega_{m'}\|_\infty \geq \tau \left(\frac{k \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} = \tau \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}$$

by the definition of \mathcal{G}_{12} and k . Since $k^2 \leq p$, for any $1 \leq m \leq m_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} K(\mathbb{P}_m | \mathbb{P}_0) &\leq Cn\|\Omega_m^{-1/2}D_1\Omega_m^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \\ &\leq C'\tau^2 \log p \\ &\leq c \log m_* \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C, C' > 0, 0 < c < 1/8$ and small $\tau > 0$, which implies that for any $1 \leq m \leq m_*$,

$$\frac{1}{m_*} \sum_{m=1}^{m_*} K(\mathbb{P}_m | \mathbb{P}_0) \leq c \log m_*$$

for some $0 < c < 1/8$, so we can use Fano's lemma,

$$\inf_{\widehat{\Omega}} \sup_{\Omega_m \in \mathcal{G}_{12}} \mathbb{E}_m \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega_m\|_\infty \geq \min_{0 \leq m \neq m' \leq m_*} \frac{\|\Omega_m - \Omega_{m'}\|_\infty}{4} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{m_*}}{1 + \sqrt{m_*}} \cdot \left(1 - 2c - \sqrt{\frac{2c}{\log m_*}}\right).$$

It completes the proof. For more details about Fano's lemma, see Tsybakov (2008).

For the case of exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$, consider $k = \min([\log n \cdot \log p]^{1/2}, p)$ for \mathcal{G}_{11} instead of $k = \min(n^{1/(2\alpha+2)}, p)$. Then, similar arguments for the lower bound of \mathcal{G}_{11} give the desired result.

For the exact banding $\gamma(k)$, consider \mathcal{G}_{11} with $k = k_0$ and $a = (\log p/n)^{1/2}$, then it completes the proof. ■

7.3 Proof of the P-loss Convergence Rates: Theorem 3.2 and 3.4

Lemma 7.1-7.5 are used to prove the main theorems.

Lemma 7.1 *Let $\mathbf{X}_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_p(0, \Omega_{0,n}^{-1})$ with $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} N_{1n} &:= \left\{ \mathbf{X}_n : \max_j \|\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\| \leq C_1 \right\}, \\ N_{2n} &:= \left\{ \mathbf{X}_n : \max_j \|\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\| \leq C_2 \right\}, \\ N_{3n} &:= \left\{ \mathbf{X}_n : \max_j \|\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) - \text{Var}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\| \leq \sqrt{C_3(k + \log(n \vee p))/n} \right\}, \\ N_{4n} &:= \left\{ \mathbf{X}_n : \max_j \|\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) - \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\| \leq \sqrt{C_4(k + \log(n \vee p))/n} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \epsilon_0^{-1}(2 + \sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2$, $C_2 = 4\epsilon_0^{-1}(1 - \sqrt{(k+1)/n})^{-2}$, $C_4 = C_3 C_2^2 \epsilon_0^{-2}$ and $N_n := \bigcap_{j=1}^4 N_{jn}$. If $k + \log p = o(n)$, then for any large constant C_3 , there exist a positive constant C_5 such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \leq 6pe^{-n(1 - \sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8} + 4 \cdot 5^k e^{-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (\log(n \vee p) + k)},$$

for all sufficiently large n . Here, C_5 does not depend on C_3 .

Proof of Lemma 7.1. We will show that for any large constant C_3 ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{1n}^c) \leq 2pe^{-n/2}, \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{2n}^c) \leq 2pe^{-n(1-\sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{3n}^c) \leq 2 \cdot 5^k e^{-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p))}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{4n}^c) \leq 2 \cdot 5^k e^{-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p))} + 2pe^{-n(1-\sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8}, \quad (31)$$

for some positive constants C_4 and C_5 . The inequalities (28) and (29) follow from Lemma A.5 in Lee and Lee (2017). Note that for any large constant $C_3 > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{3n}^c) \leq p \cdot 5^{k+1} \left(e^{-C_3 C_6 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p))} + e^{-C_3^{1/2} C_7 \epsilon_0 \sqrt{n(k + \log(n \vee p))}} \right) \quad (32)$$

for all sufficiently large n and some absolute constants C_6 and C_7 by Lemma A.4 in Lee and Lee (2017). If we take $C_5 = C_6/2$, the right hand side (RHS) of (32) is bounded by $2 \cdot 5^k \exp(-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p)))$ for any constant $C_3 > 0$ and all sufficiently large n because $k + \log(n \vee p) = o(n)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{4n}^c) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{4n}^c \cap N_{2n}) + \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_{2n}^c) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{0n} \left(\max_j \left\| \widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) - \text{Var}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right\| \geq C_2^{-1} \epsilon_0 \sqrt{C_4 \frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n}} \right) + 2pe^{-n(1-\sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8} \\ & \leq 2 \cdot 5^k e^{-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p))} + 2pe^{-n(1-\sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8} \end{aligned}$$

for $C_4 = C_3 C_2^2 \epsilon_0^{-2}$ and all sufficiently large n . Since the inequalities (30) and (31) also hold, this completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 7.2 Consider model (1) with $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ and $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty$. Define $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} := (I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk})^T \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} (I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk})$, $\widehat{D}_{nk} := \text{diag}(\widehat{d}_{jk})$ and $\widehat{A}_{nk} := (\widehat{a}_{jl}^{(k)})$, where $\widehat{a}_{jl}^{(k)} = 0$ if $1 \leq j \leq l \leq p$. If $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ and $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \lesssim k^{3/4} \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right],$$

and if $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_{\infty} I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \lesssim k \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right],$$

where the set N_n is defined at Lemma 7.1.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Define $\Omega_{0,nk} := (I_p - A_{0,nk})^T D_{0,nk}^{-1} (I_p - A_{0,nk})$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] + \|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{A}_{nk}^T - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|I_p - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| \cdot \|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|I_p - A_{0,nk}^T\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|I_p - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk}^T - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|I_p - A_{0,nk}\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk}^T - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{A}_{nk}^T - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & + \|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

by the triangle inequality (See page 223 of Bickel and Levina (2008b)). Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\|_{\infty} & \leq 1 + \|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_{\infty} + \|A_{0,n}\|_{\infty} \\ & \leq 1 + C(\sqrt{k}\gamma(k) + 1), \\ \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\|_1 & \leq 1 + \|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_{\infty} + \|A_{0,n}\|_1 \\ & \leq 1 + Ck\gamma(k) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ by Lemma A.4, and $\|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \leq \max_j \|\text{Var}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\| \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}$

using the similar argument to (50). If we show that, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (34)$$

$$\|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_1 \lesssim k \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (35)$$

$$\|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (36)$$

$\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \lesssim k^{3/4}\gamma(k)$ and $\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \lesssim k\gamma(k)$, the proof is completed.

To show (34), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_\infty &= \max_j \|\widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - a_{0,j}^{(k)}\|_1 \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \max_j \|\widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - a_{0,j}^{(k)}\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \left\{ \max_j \left\| \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (\widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) - \text{Cov}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j)) \right\|_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max_j \left\| (\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) - \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)})) \widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) \right\|_2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first part of the last line can be bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{k} \max_j \left\| \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (\widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) - \text{Cov}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j)) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \max_j \left\| \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) - \text{Cov}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \max_j \left\| \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) - \text{Var}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right\| \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n). \end{aligned}$$

The second part can be bounded similarly

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{k} \max_j \left\| (\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) - \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)})) \widehat{\text{Cov}}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j) \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{k} \max_j \left\| \widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) - \text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \right\| \left\| \widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right\| \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n). \end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments, we can show that the inequality (35) holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_1 &\leq k \max_j \|\widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - a_{0,j}^{(k)}\|_{\max} \\
&\leq k \max_j \|\widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - a_{0,j}^{(k)}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim k \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n).
\end{aligned}$$

To show (36), note that

$$\|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1} - D_{0,nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|\widehat{D}_{nk} - D_{0,nk}\|_{\infty}$$

where $\|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \leq C_2 \epsilon_0^{-1}$ on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$. The rest part is easily bounded above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{D}_{nk} - D_{0,nk}\|_{\infty} &= \max_j |\widehat{d}_{jk} - d_{0,jk}| \\
&\leq \max_j \left| \widehat{\text{Var}}(X_j) - \text{Var}(X_j) \right| \\
&\quad + \max_j \left| \widehat{\text{Cov}}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot \widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - \text{Cov}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot a_j^{(k)} \right| \\
&\leq \max_j \left| \widehat{\text{Var}}(X_j) - \text{Var}(X_j) \right| + \max_j \left| \widehat{\text{Cov}}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (\widehat{a}_j^{(k)} - a_j^{(k)}) \right| \\
&\quad + \max_j \left| (\widehat{\text{Cov}}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)}) - \text{Cov}(X_j, Z_j^{(k)})) a_j^{(k)} \right| \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (33), we have shown that

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \lesssim k^{3/4} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|$$

when $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$, and

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,nk}\|_{\infty} I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \lesssim k \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_{\infty}$$

when $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$. The conditions $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$ and $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$ are required due to the term $\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|D_{0,nk}^{-1}\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk}^T - A_{0,nk}^T\| \cdot \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right]$ in (33).

If we show that $\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \lesssim k^{3/4}\gamma(k)$ and $\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \lesssim k\gamma(k)$, this completes the proof. By Lemma A.4, we have $\|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{k}\gamma(k)$ and $\|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_1 \lesssim k\gamma(k)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_{0,nk} - D_{0,n}\|_\infty &= \max_j \left| a_j^{(k)T} \text{Var}(Z_j^{(k)}) a_j^{(k)} - a_j^T \text{Var}(Z_j) a_j \right| \\ &= \max_j \left| \left((0^T, a_j^{(k)T}) - a_j^T \right) \text{Var}(Z_j) \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a_j^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} + a_j \right) \right| \\ &\leq \|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_\infty \max_j \left(\|a_j^{(k)}\|_2 + \|a_j\|_2 \right) \|\text{Var}(Z_j)\| \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{k}\gamma(k). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is easy to show that $\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| \lesssim k^{3/4}\gamma(k)$ and $\|\Omega_{0,nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \lesssim k\gamma(k)$ by the triangle inequality in (33). ■

Lemma 7.3 Consider model (1) and the k -BC prior (3). Let

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) &:= IG \left(d_j \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk}, d_j \leq M \right), \\ \widetilde{\pi}(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) &:= IG \left(d_j \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, p$. If $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$, $\nu_0 = o(n)$ and $k + \log p = o(n)$, then on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(A_n, D_n | \mathbf{X}_n) &= \pi(d_1 | \mathbf{X}_n) \prod_{j=2}^p \pi(a_j | d_j, \mathbf{X}_n) \pi(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) \\ &\lesssim \widetilde{\pi}(d_1 | \mathbf{X}_n) \prod_{j=2}^p \pi(a_j | d_j, \mathbf{X}_n) \widetilde{\pi}(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

for all sufficiently large n , where the set N_n is defined at Lemma 7.1.

Proof of Lemma 7.3. By the posterior distribution (4),

$$\pi(d_j | \mathbf{X}_n) = \frac{IG \left(d_j \mid n_j/2, n\widehat{d}_{jk}/2 \right) I(d_j \leq M)}{\int_0^M IG \left(d'_j \mid n_j/2, n\widehat{d}_{jk}/2 \right) dd'_j}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, p$. To show (37), it suffices to prove, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\left[\min_j \widetilde{\pi}(d_j \leq M | \mathbf{X}_n) \right]^{-p} \leq C$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Note that on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$, $C_1^{-1} \leq \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \leq C_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\pi}(d_j \leq M \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &= \tilde{\pi}(M^{-1} \leq d_j^{-1} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \\ &= \tilde{\pi}\left(M^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \leq d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \mid \mathbf{X}_n\right) \\ &= 1 - \tilde{\pi}\left(d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} < M^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \mid \mathbf{X}_n\right).\end{aligned}$$

By Boucheron et al. (2013, page 29), if X is a sub-gamma random variable with variance factor ν and scale parameter c ,

$$\max\left[P(X > \sqrt{2\nu t} + ct), P(X < -\sqrt{2\nu t} - ct)\right] \leq e^{-t} \quad (38)$$

for all $t > 0$. Since a centered $Gamma(a, b)$ random variable is a sub-gamma random variable with $\nu = a/b^2$ and $c = 1/b$, applying $t = nt'$ with $t' = (M - 2C_1)^2/(8M)^2 < 1$ to the inequality (38),

$$\begin{aligned}e^{-nt'} &\geq \tilde{\pi}\left(d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} < -2\sqrt{\frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}} \sqrt{t'} - 2\widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} t' \mid \mathbf{X}_n\right) \\ &\geq \tilde{\pi}\left(d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} < -4\widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \sqrt{t'} \mid \mathbf{X}_n\right) \\ &\geq \tilde{\pi}\left(d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} < M^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \mid \mathbf{X}_n\right)\end{aligned}$$

because $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1} > 2C_1$ for all sufficiently large n and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. Thus, for some constant $C > 0$, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\tilde{\pi}(d_j \leq M \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \geq 1 - e^{-Cn}, \quad (39)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\min_j \tilde{\pi}(d_j \leq M \mid \mathbf{X}_n)\right]^{-p} &\leq (1 - e^{-Cn})^{-p} \\ &= (1 - e^{-Cn})^{-e^{Cn} \cdot p/e^{Cn}} \\ &\leq (C')^{p/e^{Cn}} \rightarrow 1\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some constant $C' > 0$. \blacksquare

Lemma 7.4 Consider the model (1) and the k -BC prior (3) with $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. If $k + \log p = o(n)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|A_n - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_\infty^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) &\leq Ck \left(\frac{k + \log p}{n} \right) \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n), \\ \mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|A_n - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_1^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) &\leq Ck \left(\frac{k + \log p}{n} \right) \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n),\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and all sufficiently large n .

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Let $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$ denote the expectation with respect to $\tilde{\pi}(d_1 \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \prod_{j=2}^p \pi(a_j \mid d_j, \mathbf{X}_n) \tilde{\pi}(d_j \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$ in Lemma 7.3. Note that on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|A_n - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_\infty^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\ &\leq k \cdot \mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\max_j \|a_j - \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\ &\leq k \cdot \mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\max_j \frac{d_j}{n} \left\| \widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_j^{(k)}) \right\| \cdot \left\| \sqrt{\frac{n}{d_j}} \cdot \widehat{\text{Var}}^{1/2}(Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (a_j - \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\ &\leq \frac{kMC_2}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\max_j \left\| \sqrt{\frac{n}{d_j}} \cdot \widehat{\text{Var}}^{1/2}(Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (a_j - \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{k}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\max_j \left\| \sqrt{\frac{n}{d_j}} \cdot \widehat{\text{Var}}^{1/2}(Z_j^{(k)}) \cdot (a_j - \widehat{a}_j^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\ &= \frac{k}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\max_j \chi_{jk}^2 \right)\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 7.3. χ_{jk}^2 is a chi-square random variable with $k_j := \min(j-1, k)$ degree of freedom. By the maximal inequality for chi-square random variables (Boucheron et al., 2013, Example 2.7),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left(\max_j \chi_{jk}^2 \right) &= k_j + \mathbb{E} \left(\max_j \chi_{jk}^2 - k_j \right) \\ &\leq C(k + \log p)\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|A_n - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_\infty^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \leq Ck \left(\frac{k + \log p}{n} \right)$$

on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$, for some constant $C > 0$.

Let $a_{c_j} := (a_{j+1,j}, \dots, a_{\min(j+k,p),j})^T$ be the nonzero column vector of A_n . Since the posterior distributions for a_{c_j} 's are the independent multivariate normal distributions with finite variances whose rate is $1/n$ on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$, it is easy to show that

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|A_n - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_1^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \leq Ck \left(\frac{k + \log p}{n} \right)$$

on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$, for some constant $C > 0$ using similar arguments. \blacksquare

Lemma 7.5 *Consider the model (1) and the k -BC prior (3) with $M \geq 9\epsilon_0^{-1}$ and $\nu_0 = o(n)$. If $k + \log p = o(n)$ and $k^2 = O(n \log p)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|D_n^{-1} - \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_\infty \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \leq C \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and all sufficiently large n .

Proof of Lemma 7.5 By Lemma 7.3, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|D_n^{-1} - \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_\infty \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \leq C \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\|D_n^{-1} - \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_\infty \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\|D_n^{-1} - \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_\infty \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\max_j \left| d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \right| \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) + \max_j \left| \frac{n - n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \exp \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\lambda \max_j \left| d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \right| \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\max_j e^{\lambda |d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}|} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left[p \cdot \max_j \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(e^{\lambda |d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}|} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \right] + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $\lambda > 0$, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$. Let $\lambda < n \widehat{d}_{jk} / 2$. Note that the upper bound for the moment

generating function of $|d_j^{-1} - n_j \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}/n|$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(e^{\lambda |d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}|} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) &= \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda |d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}|} \text{Gamma} \left(d_j^{-1} \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk} \right) dd_j^{-1} \\
&\leq \int_0^{n_j \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}/n} e^{\lambda (\frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} - d_j^{-1})} \text{Gamma} \left(d_j^{-1} \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk} \right) dd_j^{-1} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(e^{\lambda (d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1})} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \\
&\leq e^{\lambda \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda d_j^{-1}} \text{Gamma} \left(d_j^{-1} \mid \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk} \right) dd_j^{-1} \\
&\quad + \exp \left(\frac{n_j \lambda^2}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} (n \widehat{d}_{jk} - 2\lambda)} \right) \\
&\leq e^{\lambda \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}} \left(\frac{n \widehat{d}_{jk}}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} + 2\lambda} \right)^{n_j/2} + \exp \left(\frac{n_j \lambda^2}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} (n \widehat{d}_{jk} - 2\lambda)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follow from page 28 of Boucheron et al. (2013). Since $\lambda < n \widehat{d}_{jk}/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\lambda \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}} \left(\frac{n \widehat{d}_{jk}}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} + 2\lambda} \right)^{n_j/2} &= e^{\lambda n_j / (n \widehat{d}_{jk})} \left(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{n \widehat{d}_{jk}} \right)^{-n_j/2} \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{n \widehat{d}_{jk}} \right)^{\lambda n_j / (2n \widehat{d}_{jk})} \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{n \widehat{d}_{jk}} \right)^{n \widehat{d}_{jk} / (2\lambda) \cdot \lambda^2 n_j / (n^2 \widehat{d}_{jk}^2)} \\
&\leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2 n_j}{n^2 \widehat{d}_{jk}^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma A.1. Thus, on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(\|D_n^{-1} - \widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\|_{\infty} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left[p \cdot \max_j \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\pi}} \left(e^{\lambda |d_j^{-1} - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1}|} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) \right] + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\log p}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \max_j \log \left[\exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2 n_j}{n^2 \widehat{d}_{jk}^2} \right) + \exp \left(\frac{n_j \lambda^2}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} (n \widehat{d}_{jk} - 2\lambda)} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\log p}{\lambda} + \frac{2 \log 2}{\lambda} + \max_j \left(\frac{\lambda n_j}{n^2 \widehat{d}_{jk}^2} + \frac{n_j \lambda}{n \widehat{d}_{jk} (n \widehat{d}_{jk} - 2\lambda)} \right) + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\
&\leq \frac{\log p}{\lambda} + \frac{2 \log 2}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda C_2^2}{n} + \frac{\lambda C_2}{(n C_2^{-1} - 2\lambda)} + \frac{2k}{n} C_2 \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ if we choose $\lambda \asymp (n \log p)^{1/2}$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.2 Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} [\mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)] \quad (40)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{0n} [\mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c)] \quad (41)$$

where the set N_n is defined at Lemma 7.1. The term (41) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{0n} [(\mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|\Omega_n\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) + \|\Omega_{0,n}\|) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c)] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} [(\mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|I_p - A_n\|_1 \|I_p - A_n\|_{\infty} \|D_n^{-1}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) + \|\Omega_{0,n}\|) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c)] \\
&\leq \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{0n} [\mathbb{E}^{\pi} (\|I_p - A_n\|_1 \|I_p - A_n\|_{\infty} \|D_n^{-1}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n)]^2 \right\}^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c)^{1/2} \\
&+ \|\Omega_{0,n}\|_{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \\
&\leq (p^{\kappa} + C) \cdot \left(6pe^{-n(1-\sqrt{(k+1)/n})^2/8} + 4 \cdot 5^k e^{-C_3 C_5 \epsilon_0^2 (k + \log(n \vee p))} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim n^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large n and some positive constants κ, C_3 and C_5 . The third inequality follows from Lemma A.2 and Lemma 7.1.

We decompose the term (40) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{0n} [\mathbb{E}^\pi (\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(\|\Omega_n - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}\| \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk} - \Omega_{0,n}\| I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right]. \quad (43)$$

By Lemma 7.2, the upper bound for (43) is $Ck^{3/4}[(k + \log(n \vee p))/n]^{1/2} + \gamma(k)$ for some constant $C > 0$ because we assume that $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$. Note that the term (42) can be decomposed as (33) and

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_1 & \leq \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\|_1 + \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_1 \\ & \leq 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) + Ck\gamma(k) + Ck \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \\ \|I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_\infty & \leq \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\|_\infty + \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\|_\infty \\ & \leq 1 + \gamma(1) + C\sqrt{k}\gamma(k) + Ck^{1/2} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2}, \\ \|I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk}\| & \leq \|I_p - A_{0,nk}\| + \|\widehat{A}_{nk} - A_{0,nk}\| \\ & \leq 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) + Ck^{3/4}\gamma(k) + Ck^{3/4} \left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and $\|\widehat{D}_{nk}^{-1}\| \leq C_2$ on $(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)$ for some constant $C > 0$. By Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 7.5, it is easy to show that the upper bound for (42) is $Ck^{1/2}((k + \log(n \vee p))/n)^{1/2}$ for some constant $C > 0$ because we assume that $k^{3/2}(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.4 We can use the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.2. It suffices to prove that

$$\|I_p - \widehat{A}_{nk}\|_1 \lesssim \sqrt{k} \text{ on } (\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n).$$

It trivially holds because we assume that $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$. ■

7.4 Proof of Corollary 3.5

Lemma 7.6 is used to prove Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 7.6 Consider the model (1) and $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$. Let \widehat{d}_{jk} and $\widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)}$ be defined as before. If $k = o(n)$, then for given positive integer m ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{0n}(\widehat{d}_{jk}^{-m}) &\lesssim (k+1)^{m+1}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{0n}((\widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)})^m) &\lesssim (k+1)^{2m+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{0n}(\widehat{d}_{jk}^{-m}) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\|^m \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\text{tr} \left(\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right) \right]^m \\ &\leq (k+1)^m \sum_{l=1}^{k+1} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})_{(l)} \right]^m\end{aligned}$$

where for any $p \times p$ matrix A , $A_{(i)}$ is the (i, i) component of A . Also note that $[\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})]_{(l)}$ is a inverse-gamma distribution $IG((n-k)/2, n[\text{Var}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})]_{(l)}/2)$ because diagonal elements of a inverse-Wishart matrix are inverse-gamma random variables (Huang and Wand, 2013). Since $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(k+1)^m \sum_l \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})_{(l)} \right]^m &\leq (k+1)^{m+1} \left(\frac{n\epsilon_0^{-1}}{n-k-2m} \right)^m \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^{m+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{0n}((\widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)})^m) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\|\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\|^m \|\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})\|^m \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left\{ \left[\text{tr} \left(\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right) \right]^m \left[\text{tr} \left(\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right) \right]^m \right\} \\ &\leq \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\text{tr} \left(\widehat{\text{Var}}^{-1}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right) \right]^{2m} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\text{tr} \left(\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)}) \right) \right]^{2m} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim (k+1)^{2m+1}\end{aligned}$$

because diagonal elements of a Wishart matrix are gamma random variables (Rao, 2009), i.e. $[\widehat{\text{Var}}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})]_{(l)} \sim \text{Gamma}(n/2, n[\text{Var}(Z_{j+1}^{(k+1)})]_{(l)}^{-1}/2)$. ■

Proof of Corollary 3.5. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL} - \Omega_{0,n}\| &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n | \mathbf{X}_n) - \Omega_{0,n}\| + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n | \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}\| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \mathbb{E}^\pi(\|\Omega_n - \Omega_{0,n}\| | \mathbf{X}_n) + \mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n | \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}\|,\end{aligned}$$

it suffices to prove

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n | \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}\|_\infty &\leq \frac{Ck^2}{n} \\ &\leq k^{3/4} \left[\left(\frac{k + \log(n \vee p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \gamma(k) \right]\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ because of the assumption $k(k + \log(n \vee p)) = O(n)$.

Let $\widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL} = (\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{LL})$, then for $i < j \leq i + k$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_{n,ij} | \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{LL} \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_j^{-1} a_{ji} | \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)} \right| \quad (44)$$

$$+ \sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} a_{li} a_{lj} | \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_l}{n} \widehat{d}_{lk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{li}^{(k)} \widehat{a}_{lj}^{(k)} \right| \quad (45)$$

by (16). The (44) term can be decomposed by

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_j^{-1} a_{ji} | \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)} \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right| \quad (46)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_j^{-1} a_{ji} | \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)} \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \right|. \quad (47)$$

To deal with the above terms, we need to compute the expectation of truncated distributions. When Y is a truncated gamma distribution $Y \sim \text{Gamma}^{Tr}(\alpha, \beta, c_1 \leq Y \leq c_2)$, the expectation of Y is

$$\mathbb{E}Y = \frac{\alpha \int_{c_1}^{c_2} \text{Gamma}(y | \alpha + 1, \beta) dy}{\beta \int_{c_1}^{c_2} \text{Gamma}(y | \alpha, \beta) dy}$$

(Coffey and Muller, 2000). Thus, one can show that (46) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \frac{n_j}{n} \widehat{d}_{jk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)} \left(\frac{\int_0^M \text{Gamma}(d_j^{-1} | \frac{n_j}{2} + 1, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk}) dd_j^{-1}}{\int_0^M \text{Gamma}(d_j^{-1} | \frac{n_j}{2}, \frac{n}{2} \widehat{d}_{jk}) dd_j^{-1}} - 1 \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right| \\ &\leq C_1 C_2^2 e^{-cn}\end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large n and some positive constant c by the same argument with (39).

On the other hand, (47) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & C \left[\mathbb{E}_{0n}(\widehat{d}_{jk}^{-2}(\widehat{a}_{ji}^{(k)})^2) \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \\ & \lesssim (k+1)^{7/2} \mathbb{P}_{0n}(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and all sufficiently large n by Lemma 7.1, Lemma 7.6 and the choice of large C_3 in the set N_n .

The (45) can be decomposed by

$$\sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} a_{li} a_{lj} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_l \widehat{d}_{lk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{li}^{(k)} \widehat{a}_{lj}^{(k)}}{n} \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right| \quad (48)$$

$$+ \sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} a_{li} a_{lj} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) - \frac{n_l \widehat{d}_{lk}^{-1} \widehat{a}_{li}^{(k)} \widehat{a}_{lj}^{(k)}}{n} \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n^c) \right|. \quad (49)$$

Note that in (48),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} a_{li} a_{lj} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &= \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} \mathbb{E}^\pi(a_{li} a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} \mathbb{E}^\pi(a_{li} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbb{E}^\pi(a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} \text{Cov}^\pi(a_{li}, a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n). \end{aligned}$$

If we prove that $\sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} |\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} \text{Cov}^\pi(a_{li}, a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)| \lesssim k/n$, (48) is bounded above by Ck/n for some constant $C > 0$ by the similar arguments used in (46).

It is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} |\mathbb{E}^\pi(d_l^{-1} \text{Cov}^\pi(a_{li}, a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n)| \\ & \leq \sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left[\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(d_l^{-1} |\text{Cov}^\pi(a_{li}, a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n)| \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{l=j+1}^{i+k} \mathbb{E}_{0n} \left(\mathbb{E}^\pi \left(d_l^{-1} [\text{Var}^\pi(a_{li} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n) \text{Var}^\pi(a_{lj} \mid d_l, \mathbf{X}_n)]^{1/2} \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) I(\mathbf{X}_n \in N_n) \right) \\ & \lesssim \frac{k}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (47), (49) is bounded above by C/n^2 for some constant $C > 0$. Thus, we have shown

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_{n,ij} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{LL} \right| \lesssim \frac{k}{n}$$

for any $i < j \leq i + k$. Since $\Omega_{n,ii} = d_i^{-1} + \sum_{l=i+1}^{i+k} d_l^{-1} a_{li}^2$ for $i < p$ and $\Omega_{n,pp} = d_p^{-1}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \left| \mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_{n,ii} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{ii}^{LL} \right| \lesssim \frac{k}{n}$$

can be shown easily for $1 \leq i \leq p$ by similar arguments. Thus, it implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{0n} \|\mathbb{E}^\pi(\Omega_n \mid \mathbf{X}_n) - \widehat{\Omega}_{nk}^{LL}\|_\infty \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n}. \quad \blacksquare$$

A Appendix: auxiliary results

Lemma A.1 For any $x, n > 0$,

$$e^x \leq \left(1 + \frac{x}{n}\right)^{n+x/2}.$$

The proof can be obtained by a simple algebra.

Lemma A.2 If we assume that $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma(k) < \infty$, then

$$\|\Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty < C$$

for some $C > 0$ not depending on p .

Proof Let $\Omega_{0,n} = (I_p - A_{0,n})^T D_{0,n}^{-1} (I_p - A_{0,n})$ be the MCD of $\Omega_{0,n}$. Since $\|\Omega_{0,n}\|_\infty \leq \|I_p - A_{0,n}\|_1 \|D_{0,n}^{-1}\|_\infty \|I_p - A_{0,n}\|_\infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_p - A_{0,n}\|_\infty &\leq 1 + \|A_{0,n}\|_\infty \leq 1 + \gamma(1), \\ \|D_{0,n}^{-1}\|_\infty &= \max_j d_j^{-1} \\ &= \max_j \left\| \text{Var}^{1/2}(Z_{j+1}) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -a_j \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^{-2} \\ &\leq \max_j \lambda_{\min}(\text{Var}(Z_{j+1}))^{-1} = \max_j \|\text{Var}^{-1}(Z_{j+1})\| \leq \epsilon_0^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

we only need to prove $\|A_{0,n}\|_1 \leq C$ for some $C > 0$. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$, it is easy to show $|a_{ij}| \leq \gamma(i-j)$ for all $i > j$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{0,n}\|_1 &= \max_j \sum_{i=j+1}^p |a_{ij}| \\ &\leq \max_j \sum_{i=j+1}^p \gamma(i-j) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(m) < \infty. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.3 For any positive integers p_1 and p_2 , let A_{11}, A_{12} and A_{22} be a $p_1 \times p_1, p_1 \times p_2$ and $p_2 \times p_2$ matrix,

$$\|A_{12}\| \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^T & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the matrix L_2 norm.

Proof Note

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^T & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right\| &= \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{12}^T & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} x \right\|_2 \\ &= \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}x_1 + A_{12}x_2 \\ A_{22}x_2 + A_{12}^T x_1 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \\ &\geq \sup_{\|x_2\|_2=1} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} A_{12}x_2 \\ A_{22}x_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \geq \sup_{\|x_2\|_2=1} \|A_{12}x_2\|_2 = \|A_{12}\| \end{aligned}$$

where $x = (x_1^T, x_2^T)^T$ and $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma A.4 If we assume that $\Omega_{0,n} \in \mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_\infty &\leq C\sqrt{k}\gamma(k), \\ \|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_1 &\leq Ck\gamma(k) \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$.

Proof of Lemma A.4 We only consider $k < j - 1$ case because $A_{0,nk} = A_{0,n}$ trivially holds when $k \geq j - 1$. Note first that

$$\|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_\infty \leq \|A_{0,nk} - B_k(A_{0,n})\|_\infty + \|B_k(A_{0,n}) - A_{0,n}\|_\infty.$$

The second term is bounded above by $\gamma(k)$ by the definition of $\mathcal{U}(\epsilon_0, \gamma)$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}^{-1}(Z_j) &= \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{11,j} & \Omega_{12,j} \\ \Omega_{21,j} & \Omega_{22,j} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \text{Cov}(Z_j, X_j) &= \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1j} \\ \Sigma_{2j} \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega_{11,j}$ is a $(j-k-1) \times (j-k-1)$ matrix, $\Omega_{22,j}$ is a $k \times k$ matrix and $\Sigma_{2j} = \text{Cov}(Z_j^{(k)}, X_j)$ is a k dimensional vector. Since $\max_j \|a_{0,j} - B_{k-1,j}(a_{0,j})\|_1 \leq \gamma(k)$ by assumption, it directly implies

$$\max_j \|\Omega_{11,j}\Sigma_{1j} + \Omega_{12,j}\Sigma_{2j}\|_1 \leq \gamma(k).$$

With this fact, we have the following upper bound for $\|A_{0,nk} - B_k(A_{0,n})\|_\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_{0,nk} - B_k(A_{0,n})\|_\infty &= \max_j \|a_{0,j}^{(k)} - B_{k-1,j}(a_{0,j})\|_1 \\ &= \max_j \|\Omega_{21,j}\Omega_{11,j}^{-1}(\Omega_{11,j}\Sigma_{1j} + \Omega_{12,j}\Sigma_{2j})\|_1 \\ &\leq \max_j \|\Omega_{21,j}\Omega_{11,j}^{-1}\|_1 \|\Omega_{11,j}\Sigma_{1j} + \Omega_{12,j}\Sigma_{2j}\|_1 \\ &\leq \max_j \sqrt{k} \|\Omega_{21,j}\| \|\Omega_{11,j}^{-1}\| \gamma(k) \\ &\leq C\sqrt{k}\gamma(k)\end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. The last inequality holds by Lemma A.3 because $\|\text{Var}(Z_j)^{-1}\| \leq C$ holds for some $C > 0$. It proves the first part of Lemma A.4.

To show the second argument of Lemma A.4, note that

$$\|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_1 \leq \|A_{0,nk} - B_k(A_{0,n})\|_1 + \|B_k(A_{0,n}) - A_{0,n}\|_1.$$

The first term is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_{0,nk} - B_k(A_{0,n})\|_1 &\leq k \max_j \|a_{0,j}^{(k)} - B_{k-1,j}(a_{0,j})\|_{\max} \\ &\leq k \max_j \|\Omega_{21,j}\Omega_{11,j}^{-1}\| \|\Omega_{11,j}\Sigma_{1j} + \Omega_{12,j}\Sigma_{2j}\|_2 \\ &\leq Ck\gamma(k)\end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_k(A_{0,n}) - A_{0,n}\|_1 &= \sum_{i=j+k}^p |a_{ij}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=j+k}^p \gamma(i-j) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \gamma(m). \end{aligned}$$

If we assume the polynomially decreasing $\gamma(k) = Ck^{-\alpha}$, we have $\sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \gamma(m) \leq C'k\gamma(k)$ for some constant $C' > 0$. If we assume the exact band or exponentially decreasing $\gamma(k) = Ce^{-\beta k}$, it is easy to show that $\sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \gamma(m) \leq C'\gamma(k)$ for some constant $C' > 0$. Thus, $\|A_{0,nk} - A_{0,n}\|_1$ is bounded above by $C''k\gamma(k)$ for some constant $C'' > 0$. ■

References

- [1] Sayantan Banerjee and Subhashis Ghosal. Posterior convergence rates for estimating large precision matrices using graphical models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(2):2111–2137, 2014.
- [2] Sayantan Banerjee and Subhashis Ghosal. Bayesian structure learning in graphical models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 136:147–162, 2015.
- [3] Peter J Bickel and Elizaveta Levina. Covariance regularization by thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2577–2604, 2008a.
- [4] Peter J Bickel and Elizaveta Levina. Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 199–227, 2008b.
- [5] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. OUP Oxford, 2013.
- [6] T Tony Cai, Tengyuan Liang, and Harrison H Zhou. Law of log determinant of sample covariance matrix and optimal estimation of differential entropy for high-dimensional gaussian distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 137:161–172, 2015.

- [7] T Tony Cai, Weidong Liu, and Harrison H Zhou. Estimating sparse precision matrix: Optimal rates of convergence and adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):455–488, 2016.
- [8] T Tony Cai, Zhao Ren, and Harrison H Zhou. Estimating structured high-dimensional covariance and precision matrices: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):1–59, 2016.
- [9] T Tony Cai, Cun-Hui Zhang, and Harrison H Zhou. Optimal rates of convergence for covariance matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(4):2118–2144, 2010.
- [10] T Tony Cai and Harrison H Zhou. Minimax estimation of large covariance matrices under ℓ 1-norm. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1319–1349, 2012a.
- [11] T Tony Cai and Harrison H Zhou. Optimal rates of convergence for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2389–2420, 2012b.
- [12] Tony Cai, Zongming Ma, and Yihong Wu. Optimal estimation and rank detection for sparse spiked covariance matrices. *Probability theory and related fields*, 161(3-4):781–815, 2015.
- [13] Ismaël Castillo. On bayesian supremum norm contraction rates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(5):2058–2091, 2014.
- [14] Christopher S Coffey and Keith E Muller. Properties of doubly-truncated gamma variables. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 29(4):851–857, 2000.
- [15] Jianqing Fan, Yingying Fan, and Jinchi Lv. High dimensional covariance matrix estimation using a factor model. *Journal of Econometrics*, 147(1):186–197, 2008.
- [16] Jianqing Fan, Philippe Rigollet, and Weichen Wang. Estimation of functionals of sparse covariance matrices. *Annals of statistics*, 43(6):2706, 2015.
- [17] Chao Gao and Harrison H Zhou. Rate-optimal posterior contraction for sparse pca. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(2):785–818, 2015.

- [18] Chao Gao and Harrison H Zhou. Bernstein-von mises theorems for functionals of the covariance matrix. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(2):1751–1806, 2016.
- [19] Subhashis Ghosal, Jayanta K Ghosh, and Aad W Van Der Vaart. Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 500–531, 2000.
- [20] Subhashis Ghosal and Aad Van Der Vaart. Posterior convergence rates of dirichlet mixtures at smooth densities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(2):697–723, 2007.
- [21] Alan Huang and Matthew P Wand. Simple marginally noninformative prior distributions for covariance matrices. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(2):439–452, 2013.
- [22] Iain M Johnstone and Arthur Yu Lu. On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(486):682–693, 2009.
- [23] Daphne Koller and Nir Friedman. *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press, 2009.
- [24] Steffen L Lauritzen. *Graphical models*, volume 17. Clarendon Press, 1996.
- [25] Lucien LeCam. Convergence of estimates under dimensionality restrictions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 38–53, 1973.
- [26] Kyoungjae Lee and Jaeyong Lee. Optimal Bayesian Minimax Rates for Unconstrained Large Covariance Matrices. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2017.
- [27] Debdeep Pati, Anirban Bhattacharya, Natesh S Pillai, and David Dunson. Posterior contraction in sparse bayesian factor models for massive covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1102–1130, 2014.
- [28] C.R. Rao. *Linear Statistical Inference and its Applications*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2009.

- [29] Philipp Rütimann and Peter Bühlmann. High dimensional sparse covariance estimation via directed acyclic graphs. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:1133–1160, 2009.
- [30] A.B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 2008.
- [31] Nicolas Verzelen. Adaptive estimation of covariance matrices via cholesky decomposition. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 4:1113–1150, 2010.
- [32] Ruoxuan Xiang, Kshitij Khare, and Malay Ghosh. High dimensional posterior convergence rates for decomposable graphical models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9(2):2828–2854, 2015.
- [33] Lingzhou Xue and Hui Zou. Minimax optimal estimation of general bandable covariance matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 116:45–51, 2013.