

Overlapping Clustering Models, and One (class) SVM to Bind Them All

Xueyu Mao*, Purnamrita Sarkar†, Deepayan Chakrabarti‡
The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract

People belong to multiple communities, words belong to multiple topics, and books cover multiple genres; overlapping clusters are commonplace. Many existing overlapping clustering methods model each person (or word, or book) as a non-negative weighted combination of “exemplars” who belong solely to one community, with some small noise. Geometrically, each person is a point on a cone whose corners are these exemplars. This basic form encompasses the widely used Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodel of networks [1] and its degree-corrected variants [16], as well as topic models such as LDA [9]. We show that a simple one-class SVM yields provably consistent parameter inference for all such models, and scales to large datasets. Experimental results on several simulated and real datasets show our algorithm (called SVM-cone) is both accurate and scalable.

1 Introduction

Clustering has many real-world applications: market segmentation, product recommendation, document clustering, finding protein complexes in gene networks, among others. The simplest form of a clustering model assumes that every record or entity belongs to exactly one cluster. More general forms allow for overlapping clusters, where each entity may belong to different clusters or communities to different degrees. For example, George Orwell’s *1984* belongs to both the dystopian fiction and political fiction genres, and *Pink Floyd’s* music is both progressive and psychedelic. In this paper, we show that many existing overlapping clustering models can be written in a general form, whose parameters can then be inferred using a one-class SVM.

In many clustering problems, overlapping or otherwise, we have access to a data matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, which is a noisy version of an ideal matrix \mathbf{Z} , i.e. $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{R}$ where the norm of the rows of \mathbf{R} is small. Also, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{Z}_P$, where \mathbf{Z}_P are ideal “exemplars” of the various communities, and $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times K}$ gives the community memberships of each entity. We will now give some examples.

Consider the Stochastic Blockmodel (SBM) [13] for networks. In this model, each node belongs to one of K communities, and the probability \mathbf{P}_{ij} of an edge between nodes i and j is a function of their respective communities. Recent results [22] show that the eigenvectors

*Department of Computer Science. Email: xmao@cs.utexas.edu

†Department of Statistics and Data Sciences. Email: purna.sarkar@austin.utexas.edu

‡Department of Information, Risk, and Operations Management. Email: deepay@utexas.edu

$\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ of the adjacency matrix concentrate row-wise around the eigenvectors \mathbf{V} of \mathbf{P} . The matrix \mathbf{V} is also blockwise constant, mapping all nodes in one cluster to one point [29]. Hence, $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{V}_P + \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{G} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times K}$ is a binary membership matrix where each row sums to one. The Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodel (MMSB) [1] relaxes this by allowing the entries of \mathbf{G} to be in $[0, 1]$. Since the rows of \mathbf{G} sum to one, the ideal matrix \mathbf{Z} arranges points in a simplex. The corners of this simplex represent the “pure” nodes, i.e. nodes belonging to exactly one community. Most algorithms first find the corners, and then estimate model parameters via regression [21, 22, 16, 25, 30]. Other notable methods include tensor based approaches [14, 2], Bayesian inference [12], etc. Related models and inference methods for overlapping networks have been presented in [26, 17, 28, 19], etc.

The MMSB model does not allow for degree heterogeneity, which can be achieved via the Degree-corrected Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodel (DCMMSB) [16]. In DCMMSB, each node has an extra degree parameter, with a high parameter value leading to more edges for that node. Now, \mathbf{G} is non-negative, but its rows do not sum to one. Thus the points lie inside a cone, and the pure nodes lie on the corner rays of this cone. Other network models also give rise to such cones [36, 17].

Existing algorithms for degree corrected overlapping models use a range of different techniques. OCCAM [36] uses a k -medians step on the regularized eigenvectors of the adjacency matrix to get the corners. While the algorithm is computationally efficient, a key assumption is that the k -medians loss function attains its minimum at the locations of the pure nodes and there is a curvature around this minimum. This condition is typically hard to check. In [16], the authors show an interesting result that the second to K eigenvectors, element-wise divided by the first eigenvector entries form a simplex. The authors provide an algorithm for finding this simplex with K corners in $K - 1$ dimensions. The algorithm requires a combinatorial search step, which is prohibitive for large K .

Topic models [9] are another example of overlapping clustering models. Here the documents can be generated from a mixture of topics, which are the analog of communities in networks. The normalized word co-occurrence matrix forms a simplex structure, with the corners representing anchor words, i.e. words that belong to exactly one topic. While there are many existing inference methods, the ones that provide consistency guarantees are typically based on analyzing tensors or finding corners in simplexes [4, 18, 11, 3, 15, 7, 6, 8].

In this paper, we provide an overarching framework which incorporates all the above problems, from Mixed membership models (with or without degree correction) to topic models. As discussed before, in all the above models, the ideal data matrix lies inside a cone (a simplex is a special type of a cone). The goal is to infer \mathbf{G} , which depends on finding the correct corner rays.

Let us illustrate why seemingly obvious methods fail to obtain the corner rays. The simplest idea would be to generate a random plane (the “simplex”), and project points to the intersection of the line joining these points to this random plane as shown in Figure 1a. Corners of this simplex correspond to the corner rays. However, extending the idea to the sample or empirical cone is difficult, because if the simplex is not good, some points can get projected to arbitrarily far points, which will amplify their error. As Figure 1a shows, the set of good simplexes may be quite limited, and finding a good simplex is difficult.

We will illustrate our idea with the “ideal cone.” First, we row-normalize the ideal data matrix to have unit ℓ_2 norm (similar to Ng et al. [24], Qin and Rohe [27]). This projects all




Figure 1: (a) Simplex-based corner-finding methods require points on a simplex, with uniformly small errors. Projecting points to a simplex with normal vector q works well, but a very similar q' does not. Some points (such as \textcircled{A}) get projected to far-off points, amplifying errors in their positions. (b) Instead, we normalize points to the unit sphere, and (c) find corners from the support vectors of a one-class SVM.

points inside the cone to the surface of the sphere, with the points on the corner rays being projected to the corners (Figure 1b).

Then, we show a rather fascinating result, namely, for all the above models, the corners can be obtained via the support vectors of a one class SVM [31], where all normalized points are in the positive class, and the origin is in the negative class (Figure 1c). Observe that a hyperplane through the corners separates all the points from the origin. We also show that if the row-wise error of \mathbf{R} is small, the SVM approach can be used to infer \mathbf{G} from empirical cones. Finally, we show that since the row-wise error of \mathbf{R} is indeed small for different degree-corrected overlapping network models and topic models, we can use our algorithm to infer the parameters consistently. We provide error bounds for parameter estimates at the *per-node* and *per-word* level, in contrast to typical bounds for the entire parameter matrix. We conclude with experimental results on simulated and real datasets.

2 Proposed work

Consider a population matrix \mathbf{P} of the form $\mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}$, with $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n \times n}$ being a positive diagonal matrix, $\mathbf{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times K}$ a community-membership matrix, and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{K \times K}$ a cross-community connection matrix. We will make the following assumptions which are common in the literature:

Assumption 2.1. (a) *Pure nodes*: Each community has at least one “pure” node, which belongs solely to that community. (b) *Non-zero rows*: No row of $\mathbf{\Theta}$ is identically 0. (c) \mathbf{B} is full rank.

The form of the population matrix \mathbf{P} , alongside Assumption 2.1, induces a conic structure on the rows of the eigenvectors of \mathbf{P} .

Lemma 2.1. *Let there be K communities ($\text{rank}(\mathbf{P}) = K$), and let \mathcal{I} be indices of K pure nodes, one from each community. Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T$ be the top- K eigen-decomposition of \mathbf{P} , where columns of $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ are the K principal eigenvectors and $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a diagonal matrix of the K principal eigenvalues. Then, $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{V}_P$, where $\mathbf{V}_P = \mathbf{V}(\mathcal{I}, :)$ is full rank and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_P = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$.*

Since $(\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1})_{ij} \geq 0$ for all (i, j) , the rows of \mathbf{V} fall within a cone with corners \mathbf{V}_P . This suggests the following idealized problem:

Problem 1 (Ideal cone problem). *We are given a matrix $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ such that $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{Y}_P$, where $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times K}$, no row of \mathbf{M} is 0, and $\mathbf{Y}_P \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times m}$ corresponds to K (unknown) rows of \mathbf{Z} , each scaled to unit ℓ_2 norm. Infer \mathbf{M} from \mathbf{Z} .*

The rows of \mathbf{Y}_P are unit vectors representing the corner rays of the cone. Each row of \mathbf{Z} is constructed from a non-negative weighted combination of these unit vectors, with the weights being given by the corresponding rows of \mathbf{M} . Rows of \mathbf{Z} that lie on some corner correspond to rows of \mathbf{M} that have zero in all but one component. Observe that \mathbf{M} is invariant to the choice of K corner rows of \mathbf{Z} used to construct \mathbf{Y}_P .

Now consider solving the ideal cone problem with the eigenvector matrix, i.e., $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{V}$. From Lemma 2.1, the corner rows correspond to the pure nodes. Choosing one such row from each corner gives us a set of pure node indices \mathcal{I} . Hence, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{N}_P^{-1}$, where \mathbf{N} is a diagonal matrix with $\mathbf{N}_{ii} = 1/\|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z}\|$ and $\mathbf{N}_P = \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{I}, :)$. We also have the identity $\rho\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P = \mathbf{V}_P\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}_P^T$. Coupled with model-specific identifiability conditions (details are provided in the Appendix), these can be used to infer $\mathbf{\Theta}$ and $\rho\mathbf{B}$ ($\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are typically considered nuisance parameters).

In practice, we only have an observation matrix \mathbf{A} that is stochastically generated from the population matrix \mathbf{P} . Hence, we must actually solve:

Problem 2 (Empirical cone problem). *We are given a matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ such that $\max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T (\mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{Y}})\|_2 \leq \epsilon$, where $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{N}\mathbf{Z}$ is the row-normalized version of \mathbf{Z} , and $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ is constructed similarly from $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$. Again, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{Y}_P$, where $\mathbf{M} \geq 0$, no row of \mathbf{M} is 0, and $\mathbf{Y}_P = \mathbf{Y}(\mathcal{I}, :)$ corresponds to K (unknown) rows of \mathbf{Y} with indices \mathcal{I} . Infer \mathbf{M} from $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$.*

We will first present the solution to the ideal cone problem. We will then show that the same algorithm with some post-processing solves the empirical cone problem up to $O(\epsilon)$ error. Finally, we apply our algorithm to infer parameters for a variety of models, and present error bounds for each.

Notation: We shall refer to the i^{th} row of \mathbf{Z} as \mathbf{z}_i^T expressed using a column vector, i.e., $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{e}_i$. The same pattern will be used for rows \mathbf{m}_i^T of \mathbf{M} , and other matrices as well.

2.1 The Ideal Cone Problem

Observe that given the corner indices \mathcal{I} (i.e., given \mathbf{Y}_P), finding \mathbf{M} such that $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{Y}_P$ is a simple regression problem. Thus, the only difficulty is in finding the corner indices.

Our key insight is that under certain conditions, the ideal cone problem can be solved easily by a **one-class SVM applied to the rows of \mathbf{Y}** . Figure 1 plots the normalized rows \mathbf{y}_i of \mathbf{Y} for an example cone. Observe that a hyperplane through the corners separates all

the points from the origin. This suggests that the normalized corners are the support vectors found by a one-class SVM:

$$\text{maximize } b \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i \geq b \text{ (for } i = 1, \dots, n) \text{ and } \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

We show next that this intuition is correct. Define the following condition.

Condition 1. *The matrix \mathbf{Y}_P satisfies $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} > 0$.*

Theorem 2.2. *Each support vector selected by the one-class SVM (Eq. 1) is a corner of \mathbf{Z} . Also, if Condition 1 holds, there is at least one support vector for every corner.*

Thus, under Condition 1, we can get all the corners from the support vectors, and then find \mathbf{M} via regression of \mathbf{Z} on \mathbf{Y}_P . Condition 1 is always satisfied for our problem setting, as shown next.

Theorem 2.3. *Let \mathbf{P} be a population matrix satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{V}$, where \mathbf{V} is the rank- K eigenvector matrix. Let $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{N}\mathbf{Z}$ as defined above. Then, Condition 1 is true.*

Thus, the ideal cone problem is easily solved by a one-class SVM. Next, we show that the same method suffices for the empirical cone problem too.

2.2 The Empirical Cone Problem

Now, instead of the normalized eigenvector rows \mathbf{Y} , we are given the empirical matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ with rows $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i^T / \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|$, where $\max_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T (\hat{\mathbf{Y}} - \mathbf{Y})\| \leq \epsilon$. Once again, we focus on finding the corner indices, using which \mathbf{M} can be inferred by regression. We will show that running a one-class SVM on the rows of $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ yields “near-corners,” after some post-processing. We will need a stronger form of Condition 1:

Condition 2. *The matrix \mathbf{Y}_P satisfies $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \eta \mathbf{1}$ for some constant $\eta > 0$.*

It is easy to show that the solution (\mathbf{w}, b) of the population SVM under Condition 1 is given by

$$\mathbf{w} = b^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_P^T \boldsymbol{\beta} \quad b = \left(\mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \right)^{-1/2} \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} = \frac{(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, Condition 1 implies that \mathbf{w} is a convex combination of the corners, while Condition 2 additionally requires a minimum contribution from each corner.

Lemma 2.4 (SVM solution is nearly ideal). *Let $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ be the solution for the one-class SVM (Eq. 1) applied to the rows of $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$. Under Condition 2, we have $|\hat{b} - b| \leq \epsilon$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}\| \leq \zeta \epsilon$, for $\zeta = \frac{4}{\eta b^2 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}} \leq \frac{4K}{\eta (\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}$.*

Unlike the ideal cone scenario, the rows $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P$ corresponding to the corners need not be support vectors for the empirical cone. However, they are not far off.

Lemma 2.5 (Corners are nearly support vectors). *The corners of the population cone are close to the supporting hyperplane: $\hat{b} \mathbf{1} \leq \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} \leq \hat{b} \mathbf{1} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon \mathbf{1}$.*

This suggests that we should consider all points that are up to $(\zeta + 2)\epsilon$ away from the supporting hyperplane when searching for corners. The next Lemma shows that each such point is a “near-corner.”

Recall that each row $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^T$ is a noisy version of a population row $\mathbf{y}_i^T = \mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P / \|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|$, which can be rewritten as a scaled convex combination of the normalized corners: $\mathbf{y}_i^T = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P$, where $\phi_i^T \mathbf{1} = 1$. Specifically, $r_i = \frac{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}}{\|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|}$ and $\phi_i = \frac{\mathbf{m}_i}{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}}$. For a corner, $r_i = 1$ and $\phi_i = \mathbf{e}_j$ for some j . We now show that every point i that is close to the supporting hyperplane is nearly a corner of the ideal cone.

Lemma 2.6 (Points close to support vectors are near-corners). *If $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$ for some point $i \in [n]$, then $1 \leq r_i \leq 1 + \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{b-\epsilon}$ and $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \frac{2\zeta\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}$ for some $j \in [K]$.*

Consider the set of points $S_c = \{i \mid \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon\}$ that are close to the supporting hyperplane. Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 show that S_c contains all corners, and possibly other points that are all near-corners. This suggests that we can cluster the vectors $\{\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \mid i \in S\}$ into K clusters, each corresponding to one corner and possibly extra near-corners close to that corner. Randomly selecting one point from each cluster gives us the set of inferred corners.

Lemma 2.7 (Each corner has its own cluster). *There exist exactly K clusters in S_c , as long as $\epsilon \leq c_\epsilon \frac{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^3}{K^{1.5} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}$, for some global constant c_ϵ .*

Let C be the indices of the near-corners picked by this clustering step. Since $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Y}_P$, this suggests \mathbf{M} can be obtained via regression: $\mathbf{M} \approx \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C := \hat{\mathbf{Y}}(C, :)$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is a permutation matrix that matches the ordering of ideal corners and the empirical near-corners.

Theorem 2.8. *If Condition 2 and the condition on ϵ in Lemma 2.7 holds, then for any $i \in [n]$, $\|\mathbf{e}_i^T (\mathbf{M} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi})\| \leq \frac{c_M \kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z}\| K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{2.5}} \epsilon$, where c_M is a global constant, and $\kappa(\cdot)$ is the ratio of the largest and smallest nonzero singular values of a matrix.*

Algorithm 1 shows all the steps of our method (SVM-cone). The algorithm requires an estimate of $\delta := (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, and returns the inferred \mathbf{M} and near-corners C . When the row-wise error bound ϵ is unknown, we can start with $\delta = 0$ and incrementally increase it until K distinct clusters are found.

Algorithm 1 SVM-cone

Input: $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, number of corners K , estimated distance of corners from hyperplane δ

Output: Estimated conic combination matrix $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ and near-corner set C

- 1: Normalize rows of $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ by ℓ_2 norm to get $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ with rows $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^T$
 - 2: Run one-class SVM on $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ to get the normal $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ and distance \hat{b} of the supporting hyperplane
 - 3: Cluster points $\{\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \mid \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + \delta\}$ that are close to the hyperplane into K clusters
 - 4: Pick one point from each cluster to get near-corner set C
 - 5: $\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}$
-

3 Applications

Many network models and topic models have population matrices of the form $\mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}$. We have already shown that in such cases, the eigenvector matrix \mathbf{V} forms an ideal cone (Lemma 2.1), and that Condition 1 holds. It is easy to see that the same holds for $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^T$ as well. This suggests that SVM-cone can be applied to the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$, where $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ is the empirical top- K eigenvector matrix. We shall show that this yields *per-node error bounds* in estimating community memberships and *per-word error bounds* for word-topic distributions.

3.1 Network models

Define a ‘‘DCMMSB-type’’ model as a model with population matrix $\mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}$ and an empirical adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} with $\mathbf{A}_{ji} = \mathbf{A}_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbf{P}_{ij})$ for all $i > j$. Assume that rows of $\mathbf{\Theta}$ have unit ℓ_p norm, for $p = 1$ (DCMMSB) or $p = 2$ (OCCAM [36]). Let $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i\|$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|$. Denote $\gamma_{\max} = \max_i \mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii}$ and $\gamma_{\min} = \min_i \mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii}$.

Theorem 3.1 (Small row-wise error in Network Models). *Consider a DCMMSB-type*

model with $\theta_i \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, and $\alpha_0 := \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{1}$. If $\nu := \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_{\min}} \leq \frac{\min(\sqrt{\frac{n}{27 \log n}}, \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 n \rho}{\gamma_{\max}^2})}{2(1 + \alpha_0)}$, $\frac{\lambda^(\mathbf{B})}{\nu} \geq \frac{8(1 + \alpha_0)(\log n)^\xi}{\gamma_{\min}^2 \sqrt{n \rho}}$ for some constant $\xi > 1$, $\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta}) = \Theta(1)$, and $\alpha_0 = O(1)$, then*

$$\epsilon = \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| = \tilde{O} \left(\frac{\gamma_{\max} \min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\} K^{0.5} \nu (1 + \alpha_0)}{\gamma_{\min}^3 \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \sqrt{n \rho}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(Kn^{-2})$. Here $\lambda^(\mathbf{B})$ is the smallest singular value of \mathbf{B} .*

Similar results for the non-Dirichlet case follow easily as long as $n\rho = \Omega((\log n)^{2\xi})$, $\lambda_K(\mathbf{P}) = \Omega(\sqrt{n\rho}(\log n)^\xi)$, and $\max_i \|\mathbf{V}(:, i)\| = O(\sqrt{\rho})$ with high probability. This shows that the rows of $\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$ are close to those of $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}^T$, and the latter forms an ideal cone satisfying Condition 1. Hence, the conic combination for each node can be recovered by Algorithm 1 applied to $\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$. In fact, we can run the algorithm on $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ itself; the output depends only on the SVM dual variables $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ (Eq. 2), which are the same whether the input is $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ or $\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$. The output is the same conic combination matrix $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ and the same set C of nearly-pure nodes.

For **identifiability** of $\mathbf{\Theta}$, we need another condition. We will assume that $\sum \mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii} = n$ and all diagonal entries of \mathbf{B} are equal (details are provided in the Appendix). The next theorem shows that SVM-cone can be used to consistently infer the parameters of DCMMSB as well as OCCAM [36].

Theorem 3.2 (Consistent inference of community memberships for each node). *Consider DCMMSB-type models where the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and $\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta}) = \Theta(1)$.*

Let $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ be a diagonal matrix with entries $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} = \sqrt{\mathbf{e}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{E} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T \mathbf{e}_i}$. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} = \hat{\mathbf{F}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{M}} \hat{\mathbf{D}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{F}}$ is a diagonal matrix with entries $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{ii} = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{M}} \hat{\mathbf{D}}\|_1$ (for DCMMSB) and $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{ii} = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{M}} \hat{\mathbf{D}}\|_2$

(for OCCAM [36]). Then there exists a permutation matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max}K^{2.5}\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}n^{3/2}}{\gamma_{\min}\eta\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K^2(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})\sqrt{\rho}}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(Kn^{-2})$.

Remark 3.1. The error bound is small when the clusters are well separated (large $\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})$), the network is dense (large ρ), there are few blocks (small K), and the membership vectors $\mathbf{\Theta}$ are drawn from a balanced Dirichlet distribution (small ν , and hence small $\kappa(P)$), which leads to balanced block sizes.

Remark 3.2. For DCMMSB-type models, $\eta \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \min_i(\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{1})}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta})}$. Also, under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, $\eta \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2}{3\nu\gamma_{\max}^2}$ with high probability. Proofs are in the Appendix.

Observe that these are **per-node error bounds**, as against a simpler bound on $\|\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\|$. Clearly, the same results extend to the special case of the Mixed Membership Stochastic Blockmodel [1] and the Stochastic Blockmodel [13] as well (the assumption of equal diagonal entries of \mathbf{B} is no longer needed, since $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii} = 1$ is enough for parameter identifiability [22]).

3.2 Topic Models

Let $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{V \times K}$ be a matrix of the word to topic probabilities with unit column sum, and let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{K \times D}$ be the topic to document matrix. Then $\mathcal{A} := \mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}$ is the probability matrix for words appearing in documents. The actual counts of words in documents are assumed to be generated iid as $\mathbf{A}_{ij} \sim \text{Binomial}(N, \mathcal{A}_{ij})$ for $i \in [V], j \in [D]$.

The word co-occurrence probability matrix is given by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T/D = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T/D)\mathbf{T}^T$. Setting $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii} = \|\mathbf{T}(i, :)\|_1$, $\mathbf{\Theta} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{T}$, and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T/D$, we find that $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T/D = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}$ with $\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$. This clearly matches the form of \mathbf{P} in the DCMMSB model. Hence, its eigenvector matrix has the desired conic structure with weight matrix $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{N}_P^{-1}$, with the ‘‘pure nodes’’ being *anchor words* that only occur in a single topic. We now show that the row-wise error between the empirical and population eigenvector matrices decays with increasing number of documents D and number of words in a document N .

Assumption 3.1. Let $g_{ik} = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T \mathbf{e}_k$. We assume that when it is not zero, it goes to infinity, in particular, $g_{ik} \geq N \log \max(V, D)$, which gives $D/N \rightarrow \infty$. We also assume that $\lambda_i(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T) = \Theta(D)$, for $i \in [K]$, and $\kappa(\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^T) = \Theta(1)$.

These assumptions are similar to ones made in other theoretical literature on topic models [18].

We will construct a matrix $\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_2^T$, where \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 are obtained by dividing the words in each document uniformly randomly in two equal parts. This ensures that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_2^T] = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T$, which in turn helps establishing concentration of empirical singular vectors as shown in the following lemma. For simplicity denote $N_1 = N/2$.

Lemma 3.3 (Small row-wise error in Topic Models). *Let $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ denote the matrix of the top- K singular vectors of $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_2^T/N_1^2$, and let the population counterpart of this be \mathbf{V} . Let*

$\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i\|$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|$. Under Assumption 3.1, we have:

$$\epsilon = \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| = \frac{1}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{T}\|_1 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(1/D^2)$.

Thus, Algorithm 1 run on $\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$ (or equivalently, just $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$) can be used to find the conic combination weights $\hat{\mathbf{M}} \approx \mathbf{M}$. Since \mathbf{M} being the product of \mathbf{T} with a diagonal matrix where \mathbf{T} has unit column sum, we can extract $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \hat{\mathbf{M}} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ is a diagonal matrix with $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} = \|\hat{\mathbf{M}}(:, i)\|_1$.

Theorem 3.4 (Consistent inference of word-topic probabilities for each word). *Under Assumption 3.1, there exists a permutation matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}$ such that*

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T (\hat{\mathbf{T}} - \mathbf{T} \mathbf{\Pi}^T)\|}{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|} = O_P \left(\frac{K^4 \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{\eta (\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{T}\|_1)^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - O(1/D^2)$.


Remark 3.3. For topic models, $\eta \geq \min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1 / \lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}) \geq \min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1 / K$. Proofs are in the Appendix.

4 Experiments


We ran experiments on simulated and real-world datasets to verify the accuracy and scalability of SVM-cone. We compared SVM-cone against several competing baselines. For network models, **GeoNMF** detects the corners of a simplex formed by the MMSB model by constructing the graph Laplacian and picking nodes that have large norms in the Laplacian [21]. It assumes balanced communities (i.e., the rows of Θ are drawn from a Dirichlet with identical community weights). **SVI** uses stochastic variational inference for MMSB [12]. **BSNMF** [26] presents a Bayesian approach to Symmetric Nonnegative Matrix Factorization; it can be applied to do inference for MMSB models with $\mathbf{B} = c\mathbf{I}$ where $c \in [0, 1]$. **OCCAM** works on a variant of MMSB where each row of Θ has unit ℓ_2 norm, and the model allows for degree heterogeneity [36]. **SAAC** [17] uses alternating optimization on a version of the stochastic blockmodel where each node can be a member of multiple communities, but the membership weight is binary. For topic models, **RecoverL2** [5] uses a combinatorial algorithm to pick anchor words from the word co-occurrence matrix and then recovers the word-topic vectors by optimizing a quadratic loss function. **TSVD** [7] uses a thresholded SVD based procedure to recover the topics. **GDM** [35] is a geometric algorithm that involves a weighted clustering procedure augmented with geometric corrections. We could not obtain the code for [16, 18].

4.1 Networks with overlapping communities


In this section, we present experiments on simulated and large real networks.




(a) Varying degree heterogeneity for DCMMSB



(b) Varying sparsity for DCMMSB



(c) Varying sparsity for OCCAM model



(d) Varying sparsity for OSBM

Figure 2: Relative error in estimation of community memberships: Plots (a) and (b) compare SVM-cone against the closest baseline (GeoNMF) on the degree-corrected MMSB model. We then compare against (c) OCCAM and (d) SAAC on networks drawn from their generative models.

4.1.1 Simulations

We test the recovery of population parameters (Θ, \mathbf{B}) given adjacency matrices \mathbf{A} generated from the corresponding population matrices \mathbf{P} (Γ are nuisance parameters). We generate networks with $n = 5000$ nodes and $K = 3$ communities. The rows of Θ are drawn from Dirichlet(α) for DCMMSB and OCCAM; for DCMMSB, $\alpha = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$; for OCCAM, $\alpha = (1/6, 1/6, 1/6)$ and the rows are normalized to have unit ℓ_2 norm. We set $\mathbf{B}_{ii} = 1$ and $\mathbf{B}_{ij} = 0.1$ for all $i \neq j$. The default degree parameters for DCMMSB are as follows: for all nodes i that are predominantly in the j -th community ($\theta_{ij} > 0.5$), we set Γ_{ii} to 0.3, 0.5, and 0.7 for the 3 respective communities; all other nodes have $\Gamma_{ii} = 1$. For OCCAM, we draw degree parameters from a Beta(1, 3) distribution.

Varying degree parameters Γ : We set the degree parameters for predominant nodes in the 3 communities as $0.5 + \epsilon_\Gamma$, 0.5, and $0.5 + \epsilon_\Gamma$ respectively. Figure 2a shows SVM-cone outperforms GeoNMF consistently for all choices of ϵ_Γ .

Varying network sparsity ρ : Figure 2b shows the relative error in estimating Θ as a

Table 1: Network statistics

(a) DBLP coauthorship networks.

Dataset	DBLP1	DBLP2	DBLP3	DBLP4	DBLP5
# nodes n	30,566	16,817	13,315	25,481	42,351
# communities K	6	3	3	3	4
Average Degree	8.9	7.6	8.5	5.2	6.8
Overlap %	18.2	14.9	21.1	14.4	18.5

(b) DBLP bipartite author-paper networks.

Dataset	DBLP1	DBLP2	DBLP3	DBLP4	DBLP5
# nodes n	103,660	50,699	42,288	53,369	81,245
# communities K	12	6	6	6	8
Average Degree	3.4	3.4	3.6	2.6	3.0
Overlap %	6.3	5.6	5.7	6.9	9.7

function of the network sparsity ρ . Increasing ρ increases the average degree of nodes in the network without affecting the skew induced by their degree parameters $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. As expected, all methods tend to improve with increasing degree. Our method dominates GeoNMF over the entire range of average degrees. Figures 2c and 2d show results for networks generated under the models used by OCCAM and SAAC respectively. SVM-cone is comparable or better than these methods even on their generative models. The smaller error bars on SVM-cone show that it is more stable than SAAC.

4.1.2 Real-world experiments

We tested SVM-cone on large network datasets and word-document datasets. For networks, we used the 5 DBLP coauthorship networks¹ (used in [21], where each ground truth community corresponds to a group of conferences on the same topic). We also use bipartite author-paper variants for these 5 networks. See Table 1 for network statistics. Following [21], we evaluate results by the rank correlation between the predicted vector for community i against the true vector, averaged over all communities: $RC_{avg}(\hat{\Theta}, \Theta) = \frac{1}{K} \max_{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^K RC(\hat{\Theta}(:, i), \Theta(:, \sigma(i)))$, where σ is a permutation over the K communities. We have $-1 \leq RC_{avg}(\hat{\Theta}, \Theta) \leq 1$, with higher numbers implying a better match between $\hat{\Theta}$ and Θ . We do not use metrics like NMI [32] or ExNVI [36] that require binary overlapping membership vectors to avoid thresholding issues on real-valued membership vectors.

We find that SVM-cone outperforms competing baselines on 2 of the 5 DBLP coauthorship datasets, and is similar on the remaining three (Figure 3a). The closest competitor is GeoNMF [21], which assumes that all nodes have the same degree parameter, and the community sizes are balanced. Both assumptions are reasonable for the dataset, since the number of coauthors (the degree) does not vary significantly among authors, and the communities are formed from conferences where no one conference dominates the others. The differences between SVM-cone and the competition is starker on the bipartite dataset (Figure 3c). There is severe degree heterogeneity: an author can be connected to many papers, while each paper

¹<http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~xmao/coauthorship>




Figure 3: Accuracy of estimated community memberships for (a) the DBLP coauthorship network and (c) the bipartite author-paper DBLP network. (b) and (d) The wall-clock time of the competing methods respectively.

only has a few authors at best. Our method is able to accommodate such differences between the nodes, and hence yields much better accuracy than others.

Finally, Figure 3b and 3d shows the wall-clock time for running the various methods on DBLP coauthorship networks and DBLP bipartite author-paper networks respectively. Our method is among the fastest. This is expected; the only computationally intensive step is the one-class SVM and top- K eigen-decomposition (or SVD), for which off-the-shelf efficient and scalable implementations already exist [10].

4.2 Topic Models

We generate semi-synthetic data following [5] and [7] using **NIPS**¹, **New York Times**¹ (NYT), **PubMed**¹, and **20NewsGroup**² (20NG). Dataset statistics are included in the Appendix. We use Matlab R2018a built-in Gibbs Sampling function for learning topic models to learn the word by topic matrix, which should retain the characteristics of real data distributions. Then we draw the topic-document matrix from Dirichlet with symmetric hyperparameter 0.01. We set $K = 40$ for the first 3 datasets and $K = 20$ for 20NG. The word

¹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Bag+of+Words>

²<http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/>

counts matrix is sampled with $N = 1000, 300, 100, 200$ respectively, which matches the mean document length of the real datasets. We evaluate the performance of different algorithms using ℓ_1 reconstruction error $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i,j} |\mathbf{T}(i, j) - \hat{\mathbf{T}}(i, \pi(j))|$, where $\pi(\cdot)$ is a permutation function that matches the topics. Table 2 shows the ℓ_1 reconstruction error and wall-clock running time of different algorithms with datasets generated from different number of documents. Each setting is repeated 5 times, and we report the mean and standard deviation of the results. SVM-cone is much faster than the other methods. Its accuracy is comparable to RecoverL2, and significantly better than TSVD and GDM. The Appendix also shows the top-10 words of 5 topics learned from SVM-cone for each dataset.

Table 2: ℓ_1 reconstruction error and wall-clock time on semi-synthetic datasets

Corpus	Documents		RecoverL2	TSVD	GDM	SVM-cone
NIPS	20000	ℓ_1 Error	0.059 (\pm 0.000)	0.237 (\pm 0.017)	0.081 (\pm 0.057)	0.071 (\pm 0.004)
		Time/s	100.11 (\pm 8.81)	18.54 (\pm 2.04)	119.66 (\pm 4.41)	5.33 (\pm 0.39)
	40000	ℓ_1 Error	0.043 (\pm 0.000)	0.250 (\pm 0.045)	0.061 (\pm 0.038)	0.051 (\pm 0.002)
		Time/s	143.34 (\pm 0.53)	21.97 (\pm 1.49)	220.92 (\pm 3.10)	9.07 (\pm 0.00)
	60000	ℓ_1 Error	0.036 (\pm 0.000)	0.269 (\pm 0.064)	0.059 (\pm 0.038)	0.041 (\pm 0.002)
		Time/s	247.34 (\pm 20.84)	35.77 (\pm 3.28)	406.87 (\pm 36.57)	17.63 (\pm 5.29)
NYT	20000	ℓ_1 Error	0.125 (\pm 0.000)	0.207 (\pm 0.025)	0.223 (\pm 0.008)	0.131 (\pm 0.003)
		Time/s	78.15 (\pm 7.14)	25.11 (\pm 6.39)	193.43 (\pm 12.02)	4.51 (\pm 0.70)
	40000	ℓ_1 Error	0.103 (\pm 0.000)	0.197 (\pm 0.045)	0.216 (\pm 0.010)	0.106 (\pm 0.001)
		Time/s	140.84 (\pm 15.50)	50.18 (\pm 13.14)	394.16 (\pm 30.42)	8.04 (\pm 1.15)
	60000	ℓ_1 Error	0.095 (\pm 0.000)	0.166 (\pm 0.028)	0.210 (\pm 0.010)	0.096 (\pm 0.002)
		Time/s	184.69 (\pm 20.65)	42.96 (\pm 7.95)	595.54 (\pm 91.57)	11.82 (\pm 1.91)
PubMed	20000	ℓ_1 Error	0.163 (\pm 0.000)	0.239 (\pm 0.032)	0.277 (\pm 0.051)	0.181 (\pm 0.002)
		Time/s	54.32 (\pm 5.94)	15.75 (\pm 2.34)	205.95 (\pm 11.27)	2.06 (\pm 0.46)
	40000	ℓ_1 Error	0.122 (\pm 0.000)	0.255 (\pm 0.018)	0.251 (\pm 0.041)	0.138 (\pm 0.001)
		Time/s	78.99 (\pm 9.99)	26.44 (\pm 4.49)	459.17 (\pm 30.71)	3.73 (\pm 0.37)
	60000	ℓ_1 Error	0.098 (\pm 0.000)	0.275 (\pm 0.041)	0.269 (\pm 0.052)	0.114 (\pm 0.001)
		Time/s	98.19 (\pm 15.06)	24.57 (\pm 4.59)	649.97 (\pm 26.48)	5.44 (\pm 0.38)
20NG	20000	ℓ_1 Error	0.100 (\pm 0.000)	0.111 (\pm 0.051)	0.137 (\pm 0.071)	0.090 (\pm 0.003)
		Time/s	40.74 (\pm 0.64)	7.51 (\pm 0.42)	102.86 (\pm 4.05)	1.85 (\pm 0.26)
	40000	ℓ_1 Error	0.074 (\pm 0.000)	0.081 (\pm 0.043)	0.131 (\pm 0.072)	0.064 (\pm 0.001)
		Time/s	94.42 (\pm 9.92)	16.04 (\pm 2.28)	273.51 (\pm 16.45)	4.33 (\pm 0.71)
	60000	ℓ_1 Error	0.058 (\pm 0.000)	0.133 (\pm 0.045)	0.096 (\pm 0.063)	0.052 (\pm 0.002)
		Time/s	142.34 (\pm 20.31)	23.36 (\pm 5.85)	388.47 (\pm 43.22)	5.89 (\pm 0.67)

5 Conclusions

We showed that many distinct models for overlapping clustering can be placed under one general framework, where the data matrix is a noisy version of an ideal matrix and each row is a non-negative weighted sum of “exemplars.” In other words, the connection probabilities of one node to others in a network is a non-negative combination of the connection probabilities of K “pure” nodes to others in the network. Each pure node is an exemplar of a single community, and we require one pure node from each of the K communities. This geometrically corresponds to a cone, with the pure nodes being its corners. This subsumes

Mixed-Membership Stochastic Blockmodels and their degree-corrected variants, as well as commonly used topic models. We showed that a one-class SVM applied to the normalized rows of the data matrix can find both the corners and the weight matrix. We proved the consistency of our SVM-cone algorithm, and used it to develop consistent parameter inference methods for several widely used network and topic models. Experiments on simulated and large real-world datasets show both the accuracy and the scalability of SVM-cone.

Acknowledgments

X.M. and P.S. were partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1713082. D.C. was partially supported by a Facebook Faculty Research Award.

References

- [1] Edoardo M Airoldi, David M Blei, Stephen E Fienberg, and Eric P Xing. Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels. *JMLR*, 9:1981–2014, 2008.
- [2] Animashree Anandkumar, Rong Ge, Daniel Hsu, and Sham M. Kakade. A tensor approach to learning mixed membership community models. *JMLR*, 15(1):2239–2312, 2014.
- [3] Animashree Anandkumar, Rong Ge, Daniel Hsu, Sham M Kakade, and Matus Telgarsky. Tensor decompositions for learning latent variable models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2773–2832, 2014.
- [4] Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Ravindran Kannan, and Ankur Moitra. Computing a nonnegative matrix factorization—provably. In *STOC*, pages 145–162. ACM, 2012.
- [5] Sanjeev Arora, Rong Ge, Yonatan Halpern, David Mimno, Ankur Moitra, David Sontag, Yichen Wu, and Michael Zhu. A practical algorithm for topic modeling with provable guarantees. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 280–288, 2013.
- [6] Pranjal Awasthi, Bahman Kalantari, and Yikai Zhang. Robust vertex enumeration for convex hulls in high dimensions. In Amos Storkey and Fernando Perez-Cruz, editors, *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 84, pages 1387–1396. PMLR, 09–11 Apr 2018.
- [7] Trapit Bansal, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and Ravindran Kannan. A provable svd-based algorithm for learning topics in dominant admixture corpus. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1997–2005, 2014.
- [8] Xin Bing, Florentina Bunea, and Marten Wegkamp. A fast algorithm with minimax optimal guarantees for topic models with an unknown number of topics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.06837*, 2018.
- [9] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022, 2003.
- [10] Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin. Libsvm: a library for support vector machines. *ACM transactions on intelligent systems and technology (TIST)*, 2(3):27, 2011.
- [11] Weicong Ding, Mohammad Hossein Rohban, Prakash Ishwar, and Venkatesh Saligrama. Topic discovery through data dependent and random projections. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1202–1210, 2013.

- [12] Prem K Gopalan and David M Blei. Efficient discovery of overlapping communities in massive networks. *PNAS*, 110(36):14534–14539, 2013.
- [13] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks*, 5(2):109–137, June 1983. ISSN 0378-8733.
- [14] Samuel B Hopkins and David Steurer. Bayesian estimation from few samples: community detection and related problems. In *FOCS*, pages 379–390. IEEE, 2017.
- [15] Kejun Huang, Xiao Fu, and Nikolaos D Sidiropoulos. Anchor-free correlated topic modeling: Identifiability and algorithm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1786–1794, 2016.
- [16] Jiashun Jin, Zheng Tracy Ke, and Shengming Luo. Estimating network memberships by simplex vertex hunting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07852*, 2017.
- [17] Emilie Kaufmann, Thomas Bonald, and Marc Lelarge. A spectral algorithm with additive clustering for the recovery of overlapping communities in networks. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 355–370. Springer, 2016.
- [18] Zheng Tracy Ke and Minzhe Wang. A new svd approach to optimal topic estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.07016*, 2017.
- [19] Pierre Latouche, Etienne Birmelé, Christophe Ambroise, et al. Overlapping stochastic block models with application to the french political blogosphere. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5(1):309–336, 2011.
- [20] Jing Lei, Alessandro Rinaldo, et al. Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):215–237, 2015.
- [21] Xueyu Mao, Purnamrita Sarkar, and Deepayan Chakrabarti. On mixed memberships and symmetric nonnegative matrix factorizations. In *ICML*, pages 2324–2333, 2017.
- [22] Xueyu Mao, Purnamrita Sarkar, and Deepayan Chakrabarti. Estimating mixed memberships with sharp eigenvector deviations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00407*, 2017.
- [23] Henryk Minc. Nonnegative matrices. 1988.
- [24] Andrew Y Ng, Michael I Jordan, and Yair Weiss. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 849–856, 2002.
- [25] Maxim Panov, Konstantin Slavnov, and Roman Ushakov. Consistent estimation of mixed memberships with successive projections. In *International Workshop on Complex Networks and their Applications*, pages 53–64. Springer, 2017.
- [26] Ioannis Psorakis, Stephen Roberts, Mark Ebden, and Ben Sheldon. Overlapping community detection using bayesian non-negative matrix factorization. *Physical Review E*, 83(6):066114, 2011.
- [27] Tai Qin and Karl Rohe. Regularized spectral clustering under the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3120–3128, 2013.
- [28] Avik Ray, Javad Ghaderi, Sujay Sanghavi, and Sanjay Shakkottai. Overlap graph clustering via successive removal. In *52nd Annual Allerton Conference*, pages 278–285. IEEE, 2014.
- [29] Karl Rohe, Sourav Chatterjee, and Bin Yu. Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1878–1915, 2011.

- [30] Patrick Rubin-Delanchy, Carey E Priebe, Minh Tang, and Joshua Cape. A statistical interpretation of spectral embedding: the generalised random dot product graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.05506*, 2017.
- [31] Bernhard Schölkopf, John C Platt, John Shawe-Taylor, Alex J Smola, and Robert C Williamson. Estimating the support of a high-dimensional distribution. *Neural computation*, 13(7):1443–1471, 2001.
- [32] Alexander Strehl and Joydeep Ghosh. Cluster ensembles—a knowledge reuse framework for combining multiple partitions. *Journal of machine learning research*, 3(Dec):583–617, 2002.
- [33] Joel A. Tropp. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, 8(1-2):1–230, May 2015. ISSN 1935-8237. doi: 10.1561/22000000048. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/22000000048>.
- [34] Yi Yu, Tengyao Wang, and Richard J Samworth. A useful variant of the davis–kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102(2):315–323, 2015.
- [35] Mikhail Yurochkin and XuanLong Nguyen. Geometric dirichlet means algorithm for topic inference. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2505–2513, 2016.
- [36] Yuan Zhang, Elizaveta Levina, and Ji Zhu. Detecting overlapping communities in networks using spectral methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3432*, 2014.

Appendix

A Geometric structure of normalized points from a cone

Lemma A.1. Let $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{z}_i / \|\mathbf{z}_i\|$, then $\mathbf{y}_i^T = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P$ for $r_i = \frac{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}}{\|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|} \geq 1$, and $\phi_i = (\phi_{i1}, \phi_{i2}, \dots, \phi_{iK})^T$, $\phi_{ij} = \frac{m_{ij}}{\sum_j m_{ij}}$.

Proof. $\mathbf{y}_i^T = \frac{\mathbf{z}_i^T}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|} = \frac{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P}{\|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|} = \frac{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}}{\|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|} \frac{\mathbf{m}_i^T}{\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{Y}_P = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P$. Clearly $\|\mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| = \|\sum_j m_{ij} \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| \leq \sum_j m_{ij} \|\mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| = \sum_j m_{ij} = \mathbf{m}_i^T \mathbf{1}$, so $r_i \geq 1$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{P}) = K$, we have $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}$. W.L.O.G, let $\mathbf{\Theta}(I, :) = \mathbf{I}$, then $\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}^T = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma}_P \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}$. Now $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{V} = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} (\rho \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}) \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}^T) \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{E}$, right multiplying \mathbf{E}^{-1} gives $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P$. Also consider that $\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_P^T = \rho \mathbf{\Gamma}_P \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P$, \mathbf{V}_P is full rank. \square

B Identifiability of DCMMSB-type Models

Lemma B.1. For DCMMSB-type models such that $f(\theta_i) = 1, \forall i \in [n]$ for some degree 1 homogeneous function f (e.g., $f(\theta) = \|\theta\|_p$), the sufficient conditions for $(\mathbf{\Theta}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{\Gamma})$ to be identifiable up to a permutation of the communities are (a) there is at least one pure node in each community, (b) $\sum_i \gamma_i = n$, (c) \mathbf{B} has unit diagonal.

Proof. From Lema 2.1 we have $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P$ and \mathbf{V}_P is full rank. Suppose two set of parameters $\{\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}, \mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)}, \mathbf{B}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}, \mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)}, \mathbf{B}^{(2)}\}$ yield the same \mathbf{P} (W.L.O.G., we abort ρ in \mathbf{B}) and each has a pure node set P_1 and P_2 and W.L.O.G., assume the permutation of the communities is fixed, i.e., $\mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_2}^{(2)} = \mathbf{I}$. Then,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{P_1} = \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{P_2}. \quad (3)$$

Taking indices P_1 and P_2 respectively on \mathbf{V} , we have,

$$\mathbf{V}_{P_1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{P_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V}_{P_2} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_2}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{P_1}. \quad (4)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{P_1} &= \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_2}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{P_1} \\ \implies \mathbf{I} &= \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_2}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1}, \quad \text{as } \mathbf{V}_{P_1} \text{ is full rank.} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

As $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}_{P_2}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1}$ are all nonnegative, using Lemma 1.1 of [23], they are both generalized permutation matrices. Also since $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)}, (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_2}^{(2)})^{-1}$ are diagonal matrix, $\mathbf{\Theta}_{P_1}^{(2)}$ must be a permutation matrix as $f(\theta_i^{(2)}) = 1, \forall i \in [n]$, and f is homogeneous with degree 1. So nodes in P_1 are also pure nodes in $\mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)}$. With same arguments, nodes in P_2 are also pure nodes in $\mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)}$. So the pure nodes match up.

Now since $\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_P^T = \mathbf{\Gamma}_P \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P$, we have $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)} \mathbf{B}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{V}_{P_1} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_{P_1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} \mathbf{B}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)}$. As $\mathbf{B}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{B}^{(2)}$ both have unit diagonal, we must have $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)} = c \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)}$ for $c = \sqrt{\mathbf{B}_{11}^{(2)} / \mathbf{B}_{11}^{(1)}}$. Now substituting P_2 with P_1 in Eq. (3), and using \mathbf{V}_{P_1} has full rank, we have,

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)} \mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)})^{-1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)})^{-1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} \mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)})^{-1} / c,$$

which gives $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}\mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)} = c\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}\mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)}$, applying $f(\cdot)$ to rows' transpose on both side, since $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(1)}) = f(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(2)}) = 1, \forall i \in [n]$, and f is homogeneous with degree 1, we have $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} = c\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}$. Now as $\mathbf{1}_n^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}\mathbf{1}_n = n$ from condition (b), we must have $c = 1$, then $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(2)}$, and this immediately gives $\mathbf{\Theta}^{(1)} = \mathbf{\Theta}^{(2)}$. Finally, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)}\mathbf{B}^{(1)}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)}\mathbf{B}^{(2)}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(2)} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)}\mathbf{B}^{(2)}\mathbf{\Gamma}_{P_1}^{(1)}$, and this gives $\mathbf{B}^{(1)} = \mathbf{B}^{(2)}$. \square

C Algorithms

In this section we provide the detailed algorithms for parameter estimations of DCMMSB, OCCAM (Algorithm 2) and Topic Models (Algorithm 3). These algorithms both rely on the one class SVM (Algorithm 1) for finding the corner rays and then use those for parameter estimation, the details of which vary from model to model. Note for Algorithm 2, step 7 is to normalize rows of $\mathbf{\Theta}$ by ℓ_1 norm, if we normalize by ℓ_2 norm, then it can be used for estimation of OCCAM.

Algorithm 2 SVM-cone-DCMMSB

Input: Adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, number of communities K

Output: Estimated degree parameters $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$, community memberships $\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$, and community interaction matrix $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$

- 1: Get top- K eigen-decomposition of \mathbf{A} as $\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$
 - 2: Normalize rows of $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ by ℓ_2 norm
 - 3: Use SVM-cone to get pure node set C and estimated $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$
 - 4: $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C = \hat{\mathbf{V}}(C, :)$, get $\hat{\mathbf{N}}_C$ from row norms of $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C$
 - 5: $\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \sqrt{\text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{N}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C^T\hat{\mathbf{N}}_C)}$
 - 6: $\hat{\mathbf{F}} = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{M}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{1}_K)$
 - 7: $\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}} = \hat{\mathbf{F}}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{M}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}$
 - 8: $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = n\hat{\mathbf{F}}/(\mathbf{1}_n^T\hat{\mathbf{F}}\mathbf{1})$, $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_C = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}(C, C)$
 - 9: $\mathbf{B} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_C^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}_C\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_C^{-1}$
 - 10: $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}/\max_{i,j}\mathbf{B}_{ij}$
-

Algorithm 3 SVM-cone-topic

Input: Word-document count matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times D}$, number of topics K

Output: Estimated word-topic matrix $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$

- 1: Randomly splitting the words in each document to two halves to get \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2
 - 2: Normalize columns of \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 by ℓ_1 norm to get $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$
 - 3: Get top- K SVD of $\mathbf{U} = \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2^T$ as $\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$
 - 4: Normalize rows of $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ by ℓ_2 row norm
 - 5: Use SVM-cone to get pure node set C and estimated $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$
 - 6: Normalizing columns of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$ by ℓ_1 norm to get $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$
-

D Corner finding with One-class SVM with population inputs

Lemma D.1. *If $\text{Proj}_{\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)}(\mathbf{0})$ is an interior point in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$, then One-class SVM can find all the K corners with $m_{ij} = 1$ as support vectors given $\mathbf{y}_i, i \in [n]$ as inputs. And a sufficient condition for this to hold is $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. The primal problem of One-class SVM in [31] is

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 - b \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i \geq b, i \in [n].$$

First of all note that $b \geq 0$ because if $b < 0$, we can always make $b = 0$ to satisfy the condition and decreases the value of the object function. From Lemma A.1, we have $\mathbf{y}_i^T = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P$. As $r_i \geq 1$, if there exists (\mathbf{w}, b) that $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i \geq b, i \in I$, we have $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{w} = r_i \sum_j \phi_{ij} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(j)} \geq r_i b \geq b, i \in [n]$. So we can reduce the problem to using points $i \in I$ as inputs. Furthermore, we consider an equivalent primal problem and its dual:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Primal:} \quad \max \quad & b \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\mathbf{w}\| \leq 1, \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i \geq b, i \in I \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Dual:} \quad \min \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \beta_i \beta_j \mathbf{y}_i^T \mathbf{y}_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_i \beta_i = 1, \beta_i \geq 0, i \in I \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The dual problem is basically to find a point in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$ that has the minimum norm (closest to origin). Now denote the optimal function value for the dual problem as $L_{\mathbf{Y}_P}$ and for any subset $\mathcal{S} \subset I$, let $L_{\mathbf{Y}_P(\mathcal{S}, \cdot)}$ be the optimal value when we want to find a point in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_{P(\mathcal{S}, \cdot)}^T)$ that has the minimum norm.

Let $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a diagonal matrix such that $\mathbf{N}_{ii} = 1/\|\mathbf{z}_i\|$, then $\mathbf{Y}_P = \mathbf{N}_P \mathbf{Z}_P$ is also full rank. If for $\beta^* = \arg \min_{\beta} L_{\mathbf{Y}_P}(\beta)$, each coordinate is strictly larger than 0, it is easy to see that $L_{\mathbf{Y}_P} > L_{\mathbf{Y}_P(\mathcal{S}, \cdot)}$ since \mathbf{Y}_P is full rank. So a sufficient condition for One-class SVM to find all K corners of $L_{\mathbf{Y}_P}$ is $\beta^* > \mathbf{0}$, which means the closet point to origin in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$ is an interior point (also the projection of origin to $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$). Now we will show a sufficient condition for this.

Suppose the $\beta^* > \mathbf{0}$. First let us find a hyperplane (\mathbf{w}, d) that is through columns of \mathbf{Y}_P^T with $d < 0$ (since \mathbf{Y}_P is full rank, we must have $d \neq 0$). We have $\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{w} = d \mathbf{1}$. Since the distance from origin to hyperplane (\mathbf{w}, d) is $\frac{|d|}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}$, $\text{Proj}_{\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)}(\mathbf{0})$ is an interior point in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$, we have

$$\mathbf{Y}_P^T \beta^* = \text{Proj}_{\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)}(\mathbf{0}) = \frac{d}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \quad (7)$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{Y}_P^T \beta^* = \frac{d \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} = d.$$

As $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{Y}_P^T = d \mathbf{1}^T$, we have $d \mathbf{1}^T \beta^* = d$, so $\mathbf{1}^T \beta^* = 1$. So the only condition left to be satisfied is that $\beta^* > \mathbf{0}$, using Eq. (7),

$$\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T \beta^* = \frac{d \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} = \frac{d(d \mathbf{1})}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2},$$

so $\beta^* = \frac{d^2}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}$ and all we require is:

$$(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Using Lemma 2.1, we have:

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P \implies (\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T)^{-1} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Since $\mathbf{Y}_P = \mathbf{N}_P \mathbf{V}_P$, we have:

$$(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} = \mathbf{N}_P^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{N}_P^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

On the RHS of Eq. (9), as \mathbf{N}_P^{-1} , $\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are all diagonal matrix with strictly positive diagonal elements, then diagonal of $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}$ must be strictly positive, as the i -th element on its diagonal is proportional to $\|\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta}(:, i)\|^2$, and since $\mathbf{\Theta}$ is nonnegative, we can easily get that $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}$. So for DCMMSB-type models, it is always true that the closet point in $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$ to origin is an interior point of $\text{Conv}(\mathbf{Y}_P^T)$. \square

E Corner finding with One-class SVM with empirical inputs

Lemma E.1. *Let $\epsilon = \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\|$. Denote (\mathbf{w}, b) and $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ be the optimal solution for the primal problem of One-class SVM in (6) with population $(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n)$ and empirical inputs $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n)$ respectively, then $|\hat{b} - b| \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof. First we have $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i \geq b, \forall i \in [n]$, and $\|\mathbf{w}^T (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i)\| \leq \epsilon$. Then $\mathbf{w}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{y}_i + \mathbf{w}^T (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i) \geq b - \epsilon$. As $(\mathbf{w}, b - \epsilon)$ is a feasible solution of the primal problem with empirical inputs, by optimality of \hat{b} , we have $\hat{b} \geq b - \epsilon$. Similarly we can get $b \geq \hat{b} - \epsilon$, so $|\hat{b} - b| \leq \epsilon$. \square

Lemma E.2. *Let (\mathbf{w}, b) , $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ be the hyperplane of the optimal solution of One-class SVM with population and empirical inputs respectively, then $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}\| \leq \zeta \epsilon$, for $\zeta = \frac{4}{\eta b^2 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}} \leq \frac{4K}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}$.*

Proof. Let $\beta_l, l \in I$ be the solution of the dual problem in Eq. (6) with population inputs, from the construction of this dual problem, we know $\mathbf{w} = \frac{\sum_{l \in I} \beta_l \mathbf{y}_l}{\|\sum_{l \in I} \beta_l \mathbf{y}_l\|}$, $\|\sum_{l \in I} \beta_l \mathbf{y}_l\| = b$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} := (\beta_{I(1)}, \beta_{I(2)}, \dots, \beta_{I(p)}) = b^2 (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$, as shown in Lemma D.1. So $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{Y}_P^T \boldsymbol{\beta} / b = b \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$. From the condition of the primal problem, $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} \geq \hat{b} \mathbf{1}$, then we have $\mathbf{Y}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P - \mathbf{Y}_P) \hat{\mathbf{w}} \geq (\hat{b} - \epsilon) \mathbf{1} \geq (b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1}$. Then there exists a vector $\mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $\mathbf{Y}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c}$. Now let $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{Y}_P^T \boldsymbol{\varphi} + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}$, where $\mathbf{Y}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp} = \mathbf{0}$. So $\mathbf{Y}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T \boldsymbol{\varphi} = (b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c}$, which gives $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} ((b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c}) + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}$. Since $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|^2 = ((b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c})^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} ((b - 2\epsilon) \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c}) + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\|^2 \\ &= b^2 \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} + 2b \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{c} + (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon \mathbf{1})^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon \mathbf{1}) + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 = \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = b^2 \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon \mathbf{1})^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon \mathbf{1}) + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\|^2 = -2b \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon \mathbf{1}) \\ &= -2b \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{c} + 4b\epsilon \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which uses that $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}$ is positive definite. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2b \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{c} &\leq 4b\epsilon \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} = 4b\epsilon / b^2 \\ \implies (\min_i \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i) \|\mathbf{c}\|_1 &\leq \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{c} \leq 2\epsilon / b^2, \end{aligned}$$

and by Condition 2 we know $(\min_i \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i) \geq \eta$, so $\|\mathbf{c}\| \leq \|\mathbf{c}\|_1 \leq 2\epsilon / (\eta b^2)$.

Let \hat{P} be the set of support vectors returned by empirical One-class SVM, and $\hat{\beta}$ as the optimal solution for the dual problem, then $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{\hat{P}} \hat{\beta} / \hat{b}$ and $\sum_{j \in \hat{P}} \hat{\beta}_j = 1$. Now we will give an upper bound on $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\|$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{Y}_P)$, we have $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\| \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{v}\|$. Now take $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{Y}_P^T \hat{\beta} / \hat{b}$, since all rows of \mathbf{Y} lie in the span of \mathbf{Y}_P , this choice of \mathbf{v} also lies in the span of \mathbf{Y}_P . Thus,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\| \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{v}\| = \|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{\hat{P}}^T \hat{\beta} - \mathbf{Y}_P^T \hat{\beta}\| / \hat{b} = \left\| \sum_{j \in \hat{P}} \hat{\beta}_j (\mathbf{y}_j - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j) \right\| / \hat{b} \leq \epsilon / (b - \epsilon).$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w} &= \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} ((b - 2\epsilon)\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{c}) + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp} - b \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon\mathbf{1}) + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}, \\ \|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}\|^2 &= (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon\mathbf{1})^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{c} - 2\epsilon\mathbf{1}) + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\perp}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{c}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{c} + 4\epsilon^2/b^2 + \epsilon^2/(b - \epsilon)^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{c}\|^2 \lambda_1((\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}) + 4\epsilon^2/b^2 + \epsilon^2/(b - \epsilon)^2 \leq \left(\frac{4}{\eta^2 b^4 \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + \frac{4}{b^2} + \frac{1}{(b - \epsilon)^2} \right) \epsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Eq. (10) to get that the cross terms are non-negative for the first inequality. First $\frac{4}{\eta^2 b^4 \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + \frac{4}{b^2} + \frac{1}{(b - \epsilon)^2} < \frac{4}{\eta^2 b^4 \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + \frac{8}{b^2} < \frac{12}{\eta^2 b^4 \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}$, using $\epsilon < b/2$, $\eta < 1$, $b \leq 1$, and $\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) < 1$. Then by taking $\zeta = \frac{4}{\eta b^2 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}$, we have $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}\| \leq \zeta \epsilon$. Furthermore, $\zeta \leq \frac{4K}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}$ by using

$$1/b^2 = \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \leq K \lambda_1((\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}) = K/\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T).$$

□

Lemma E.3. Let $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ be the hyperplane of the optimal solution of One-class SVM with empirical inputs, then $\hat{b}\mathbf{1} \leq \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} \leq \hat{b}\mathbf{1} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon\mathbf{1}$.

Proof. Using Lemma E.2,

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{Y}_P \hat{\mathbf{w}} + (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_P - \mathbf{Y}_P) \hat{\mathbf{w}} \leq \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{Y}_P (\hat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}) + \epsilon\mathbf{1} \leq \hat{b}\mathbf{1} + (\zeta\epsilon + \epsilon)\mathbf{1} \leq \hat{b}\mathbf{1} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon\mathbf{1}.$$

□

Lemma E.4. Let (\mathbf{w}, b) , $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ be the hyperplane of the optimal solution of One-class SVM with population and empirical inputs respectively, and S be the set of nodes selected as support vectors in the optimal solution of the dual problem with empirical inputs. Then for r_i defined in Lemma A.1, $r_i - 1 \leq \frac{1}{b/(2\epsilon) - 1}$, $\forall i \in S$. Furthermore, $\forall i \in [n]$, if $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, then $r_i - 1 \leq \frac{(\zeta + 4)\epsilon}{b - 2\epsilon}$.

Proof. First $\forall i \in S$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{b} &= \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \mathbf{y}_i + \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i) = r_i \sum_j \phi_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(j)} + \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i) \\ &= r_i \sum_j \phi_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{I(j)} + r_i \sum_j \phi_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T (\mathbf{y}_{I(j)} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{I(j)}) + \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T (\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i) \\ &\geq r_i \hat{b} - r_i \epsilon - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$r_i \leq \frac{\hat{b} + \epsilon}{\hat{b} - \epsilon} \implies r_i - 1 \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\hat{b} - \epsilon} \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{b - \epsilon - \epsilon} = \frac{1}{b/(2\epsilon) - 1},$$

where the last step uses $b \geq \hat{b} - \epsilon$ from Lemma E.1. Similarly, for $i \in [n]$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, we have $\hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon \geq r_i \hat{b} - r_i \epsilon - \epsilon$ and this gives $r_i - 1 \leq \frac{(\zeta + 4)\epsilon}{b - 2\epsilon}$. □

Lemma E.5. For S defined in Lemma E.4, $\forall i \in S, \exists j \in [K]$ such that for ϕ_{ij} defined in Lemma A.1, $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon_1$, for $\epsilon_1 = \frac{2\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)}$. Furthermore, $\forall i \in [n]$, if $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, then $\exists j \in [K]$, $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$, for $\epsilon_2 = \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{(b+(\zeta+2)\epsilon)\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)} < \frac{2\zeta\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)}$.

Proof. By Lemma E.4 we have $r_i \leq 1 + \frac{1}{b/(2\epsilon)-1} = \frac{1}{1-2\epsilon/b}$. As $\mathbf{y}_i = r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P$, we have $1 = \|\mathbf{y}_i\| = r_i \|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|$, so $\|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| \geq 1 - 2\epsilon/b$. Let $\mathbf{y}_{-k} = \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{\phi_{ij}}{1-\phi_{ik}} \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}, \forall k \in [K]$. then $\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P = \phi_{ik} \mathbf{y}_{I(k)} + (1 - \phi_{ik}) \mathbf{y}_{-k}$. It is easy to see that $\|\mathbf{y}_{-k}\| \leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|^2 &\leq \phi_{ik}^2 + (1 - \phi_{ik})^2 + 2\phi_{ik}(1 - \phi_{ik}) \mathbf{y}_{I(k)}^T \mathbf{y}_{-k}, \\ \mathbf{y}_{I(k)}^T \mathbf{y}_{-k} &= \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{\phi_{ij}}{1 - \phi_{ik}} \mathbf{y}_{I(k)}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(j)} \leq \max_{j \neq k} \mathbf{y}_{I(k)}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(j)} \leq \max_{i \neq l} \mathbf{y}_{I(i)}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(l)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $2\mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_2\|^2 - \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|^2$ for any same length vectors \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_{I(i)} - \mathbf{y}_{I(l)}\|^2 &= \|(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_l)^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|^2 = (\mathbf{e}_l - \mathbf{e}_i)^T \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T (\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_l) \\ &\geq 2 \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T \mathbf{x} = 2\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T), \end{aligned}$$

we have $\max_{i \neq l} \mathbf{y}_{I(i)}^T \mathbf{y}_{I(l)} \leq 1 - \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2\epsilon/b)^2 &\leq \|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\|^2 \leq \phi_{ik}^2 + (1 - \phi_{ik})^2 + 2\phi_{ik}(1 - \phi_{ik})(1 - \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)) \\ &= 1 - 2\phi_{ik}(1 - \phi_{ik})\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T), \end{aligned}$$

which gives $\phi_{ik}(1 - \phi_{ik}) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} := \epsilon_1, \forall k \in [K]$. Since $\sum_k \phi_{ik} = 1$, we must have $\exists j \in [K]$, $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon_1$. Similarly, for $i \in [n]$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, we have $r_i - 1 \leq \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{b-2\epsilon}$ from Lemma E.4, then $\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P = \frac{1}{r_i} \geq 1 - \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{b+(\zeta+2)\epsilon}$, and this gives that $\phi_{ik}(1 - \phi_{ik}) \leq \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{(b+(\zeta+2)\epsilon)\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} := \epsilon_2 < \frac{2\zeta\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}$, using $\zeta \geq 4$ and $(\zeta + 2)\epsilon \geq 0$. Also since $\sum_k \phi_{ik} = 1$, we must have $\exists j \in [K]$, $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$. \square

Remark E.1. Lemma E.5 shows that for One-class SVM with empirical inputs, the support vectors selected are all nearly corner points. Lemma E.3 shows that each corner point is closed to the hyperplane $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ selected by One-class SVM by $(\zeta + 2)\epsilon$, and then Lemma E.5 shows that points close to hyperplane $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ by $(\zeta + 2)\epsilon$ are all nearly corner points. So choosing points that are $(\zeta + 2)\epsilon$ close to $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{b})$ will guarantee us all the K corner points and some nearly corner points.

Lemma E.6. Let $S_c = \{i : \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon\}$, then $\forall i, j \in S_c$, for $\epsilon_3 = \epsilon + \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{b-2\epsilon}$, we have $\|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\epsilon_3 \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j\| \leq \|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + 2\epsilon_3$.

Proof. First we have, $\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| = \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - r_i \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P + (r_i - 1) \phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| \leq \epsilon + \frac{(\zeta+4)\epsilon}{b-2\epsilon} := \epsilon_3$, where last step is by Lemma E.4. This gives $\|(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j) - (\phi_i \mathbf{Y}_P - \phi_j \mathbf{Y}_P)\| \leq 2\epsilon_3$, then we have $\|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P - \phi_j^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| - 2\epsilon_3 \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j\| \leq \|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P - \phi_j^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| + 2\epsilon_3$. Combing with

$$\|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} \leq \|\phi_i^T \mathbf{Y}_P - \phi_j^T \mathbf{Y}_P\| \leq \|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)},$$

we have the result. \square

Lemma E.7. Let $S_c = \{i : \hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leq \hat{b} + (\zeta + 2)\epsilon\}$, then there exists exact K clusters in S_c , given $\epsilon \leq c_\epsilon \frac{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^3}{K^{1.5} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}$, for some constant c_ϵ .

Proof. First because $I \in S_c$ from Lemma E.3, there exists at least K clusters in S_c . By Lemma E.5, $\forall i \in S_c, \exists k_i \in [K], \phi_{ik_i} \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$. If $k_i = k_j$, by Lemma E.6,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j\| \leq \|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + 2\epsilon_3 \leq \sqrt{3}\epsilon_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + 2\epsilon_3.$$

This means if j is a corner point, i will be close to it, and will be in the same cluster as long as there is enough separation between different clusters. Now we will prove this is true. Similarly, if $k_i \neq k_j$,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j\| \geq \|\phi_i - \phi_j\| \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\epsilon_3 \geq \sqrt{2}(1 - 2\epsilon_2) \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\epsilon_3.$$

In order to have enough separation between p clusters, we need

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2}(1 - 2\epsilon_2) \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\epsilon_3 &= \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\sqrt{2}\epsilon_2 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} - 2\epsilon_3 \\ &> c'(\sqrt{3}\epsilon_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + 2\epsilon_3), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c' > 2$. This is equivalent to show

$$\sqrt{2} > (2\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3}c' \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)})\epsilon_2 + \frac{2 + 2c'}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}\epsilon_3.$$

As

$$\begin{aligned} &(2\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3}c' \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)})\epsilon_2 + \frac{2 + 2c'}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}\epsilon_3 \\ &\leq (2\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3}c' \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}) \frac{2\zeta\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + \frac{2 + 2c'}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}} \left(\epsilon + \frac{(\zeta + 4)\epsilon}{b - 2\epsilon} \right) \\ &\leq c_1 \frac{\sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}\zeta\epsilon}{b\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} + \frac{c_2}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} \frac{\zeta\epsilon}{b} \leq c_3 \frac{\sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}\epsilon}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} \frac{4K}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}} \frac{\sqrt{K}}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}} \\ &\leq c_4 \frac{K^{1.5} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^3} \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_i, i \in [4]$ are some constants we do not specify and we use $1/b^2 \leq K/\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)$ in the second last inequality. So a sufficient condition for separated clusters is $c_4 \frac{K^{1.5} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^3} \epsilon < \sqrt{2}$, which is

$$\epsilon \leq c_\epsilon \frac{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^3}{K^{1.5} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)}},$$

for some constant c_ϵ . □

F Consistency of inferred parameters

Lemma F.1. For set C returned by Algorithm 1, there exists a permutation matrix $\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ that $\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P\|_F \leq \epsilon_4$, for $\epsilon_4 = \frac{c_Y K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}} \epsilon$ and c_Y is some constant.

Proof. By Lemma E.5, we know that $\forall i \in S_c, \exists j \in [K]$ such that $\phi_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\| + \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| \leq \epsilon + \|r_i \sum_l \phi_{il} \mathbf{y}_{I(l)} - r_i \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| + \|(r_i - 1) \mathbf{y}_{I(j)}\| \\ &\leq \epsilon + r_i((1 - \phi_{ij}) + \|\sum_{l \neq j} \phi_{il} \mathbf{y}_{I(l)}\|) + (r_i - 1) \\ &\leq \epsilon + \left(1 + \frac{(\zeta + 4)\epsilon}{b - 2\epsilon}\right) (2\epsilon_2) + \frac{(\zeta + 4)\epsilon}{b - 2\epsilon} \quad (\text{by Lemma E.4}) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{4\zeta}{b}\right) \epsilon + 4\epsilon_2 < \frac{c_Y \zeta}{b \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)} \epsilon \leq \frac{c_Y \sqrt{K} \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}} \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\epsilon \leq b/(4\zeta)$ and $\zeta \geq 4$. And c_Y is a constant. Then $\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P\|_F \leq \frac{c_Y K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}} \epsilon$. \square

Lemma F.2. Let $\max_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Z} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}})\| = \epsilon_0$, then $\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|}$.

Proof. First note that by definition $\|\|\mathbf{z}_i\| - \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|\| \leq \epsilon_0$, then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| &= \left\| \frac{\mathbf{z}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|} - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i}{\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\| \mathbf{z}_i - \|\mathbf{z}_i\| \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|} \right\| = \left\| \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|(\mathbf{z}_i - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i) + (\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\| - \|\mathbf{z}_i\|) \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|(\mathbf{z}_i - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i)}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{(\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\| - \|\mathbf{z}_i\|) \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|} \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{\mathbf{z}_i - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\| - \|\mathbf{z}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|} \right\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 2.8. First let us get some important intermediate bounds. Using Weyl's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_i(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{Y}_P)| &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{Y}_P\| \leq \epsilon_4 \\ |\lambda_i(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T) - \lambda_i(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)| &= |\sigma_i^2(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C) - \sigma_i^2(\mathbf{Y}_P)| \leq (\sigma_i(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C) + \sigma_i(\mathbf{Y}_P)) \epsilon_4 \\ &\leq (2\sigma_i(\mathbf{Y}_P) + \epsilon_4) \epsilon_4. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly,

$$\|(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\lambda_K(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) - (2\sigma_K(\mathbf{Y}_P) + \epsilon_4) \epsilon_4} \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)},$$

where we use $(2\sigma_K(\mathbf{Y}_P) + \epsilon_4) \epsilon_4 < \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)/2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}\| &= \|(\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P (\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T)^{-1} - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\| \\ &= \|(\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P (\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T)^{-1} (\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P (\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T - \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T) (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\| \| \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P (\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T - \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T \| \| (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1} \| \\ &\leq 2 \|(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|^2 (\|\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P - \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\| \|(\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\| \|(\mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P)^T - \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T\|) \\ &\leq 2 \|(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|^2 (\|\mathbf{Y}_P\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\|) \|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{Y}_P\| \\ &\leq 2 \|(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|^2 (2\|\mathbf{Y}_P\| \epsilon_4 + \epsilon_4^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Y}_P^T(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}$. Let $\max_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Z} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}})\| = \epsilon_0$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{M} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi})\| = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Y}_P^T(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi})\| \\
& = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T((\mathbf{Z} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}})\mathbf{Y}_P^T(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1})\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{Y}_P - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C)^T(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1})\| \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T(\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi}))\| \\
& \leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Z} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}})\|\|\mathbf{Y}_P\|\|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\|\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{Y}_P\|\|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\| \\
& \quad + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\|\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\|\|\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1}\mathbf{\Pi}\| \\
& \leq (\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Z} - \hat{\mathbf{Z}})\|\|\mathbf{Y}_P\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\|\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C - \mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{Y}_P\|)\|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\| \\
& \quad + 2\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\|\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\|\|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|^2(2\|\mathbf{Y}_P\|\epsilon_4 + \epsilon_4^2) \\
& \leq \|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|(\|\mathbf{Y}_P\|\epsilon_0 + 13\|\mathbf{Y}_P\|^2\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\|\|(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1}\|\epsilon_4) \\
& \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{Y}_P\|\epsilon_0 + 13\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\| \frac{c_Y K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}} \epsilon}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)} \leq \frac{c_M \kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\| K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{2.5}} \epsilon := \epsilon_{M,i}
\end{aligned}$$

where we uses $\epsilon_4 \leq \|\mathbf{Y}_P\|/2$, $\epsilon_0 < \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\|\epsilon/2$ for relaxations. \square

G Equivalence of using $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$ as input of Algorithm 1

Lemma G.1. For DCMMSB-type models, let $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{Y}^T \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i\|$, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{U}}^T \mathbf{e}_i = \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|$, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{Y}}^T \mathbf{e}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|$ where $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)^T$ and $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = (\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_2, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_n)^T$ are population and empirical eigenvectors respectively. One-class SVM using rows of \mathbf{U} (or $\hat{\mathbf{U}}$) and rows of \mathbf{Y} (or $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$) will return the same solution β .

Proof. Since $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i\| = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{v}_i\| = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{u}_i$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\| = \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\| = \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i$, we have $\mathbf{y}_i^T \mathbf{y}_j = \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} \mathbf{u}_j = \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{u}_j$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_j = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T \hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^T \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j$. It is easy to see that One-class SVM using rows of \mathbf{U} (or $\hat{\mathbf{U}}$) and rows of \mathbf{Y} (or $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$) have the same objective function (Eq. 6) and thus will have the same solution of β_i , $i \in [n]$. \square

Remark G.1. By Lemmas G.1, D.1, and Theorem 2.3, One-class SVM with $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{v}_i\|$, $i \in [n]$ as inputs can find all the K corners corresponding to the pure nodes as support vectors for DCMMSB-type models. Furthermore, as $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C = \hat{\mathbf{U}}_C \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$,

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T)^{-1} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C^T(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C)^{-1} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C^T(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C\hat{\mathbf{U}}_C)^{-1},$$

which shows that outputs of Algorithm 1 using $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T$ as input are same.

H DCMMSB-type models properties

Lemma H.1. For DCMMSB-type models, if $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_p = 1$, for $p = 1$ (DCMMSB) or $p = 2$ (OC-CAM), then we have $\gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})} \leq \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \leq \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})}$, and $\gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})} \leq \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \leq \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})}$, $\forall i \in I$.

Proof. Eq. (8) gives $((\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)\|^2 &= \max_i \mathbf{e}_i^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T \mathbf{e}_i \leq \max_{\|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \mathbf{x}^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T \mathbf{x} \\
&= \lambda_1((\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T) = 1/\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \\
\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)\|^2 &= \min_i \mathbf{e}_i^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T \mathbf{e}_i \geq \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|=1} \mathbf{x}^T(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T \mathbf{x} \\
&= \lambda_K((\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)^T) = 1/\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1, $\forall i \in [n]$, if $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_p = 1$, for $p = 1$ or 2 ,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i\| = \gamma_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P \leq \gamma_i \max_i \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\| \|\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P\| \leq \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})},$$

where we use $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_p = 1$ for $0 < p \leq 2$. Similarly,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i\| \geq \gamma_i \min_i \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_1 \min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{V}_P)\| \geq \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})}.$$

Note that if $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_p = 1$, as $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_2 \leq K^{1/2-1/p} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\|_p = K^{1/2-1/p}$, for models with $p > 2$, we need to add a model specifically parameter $\psi = K^{1/2-1/p}$ to the upper bound of $\|\mathbf{v}_i\|$. For simplicity we omit this and only consider cases when $0 < p \leq 2$. \square

Lemma H.2. For DCMMSB-type models whose eigenvectors has the form in Lemma 2.1, if using $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T$, $\mathbf{M} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{N}_P^{-1}$, then:

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \leq \kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \quad \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \geq 1/\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \leq (\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}))^2.$$

Proof. For DCMMSB-type models, we have $\mathbf{V} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{V}_P$, and $(\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P^{-1}$ by Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 (Eq. 8). Note that $\mathbf{Y}_P = \mathbf{N}_P \mathbf{Z}_P$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) &= \lambda_1(\mathbf{N}_P \mathbf{Z}_P \mathbf{Z}_P^T \mathbf{N}_P) = \lambda_1(\mathbf{N}_P \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{N}_P) = \lambda_1(\mathbf{N}_P \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P (\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P \mathbf{N}_P) \\ &\leq (\lambda_1(\mathbf{N}_P \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P))^2 \lambda_1((\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})^{-1}) \leq (\max_{i \in I} \gamma_i / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|)^2 / \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \\ &\leq \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) / \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) = \kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \quad (\text{by proof of Lemma H.1}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{N}_{ii} = 1/\|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z}\| = 1/\|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T\| = 1/\|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{V}\|$. Similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) &= \lambda_K(\mathbf{N}_P \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P (\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P \mathbf{N}_P) \geq (\lambda_K(\mathbf{N}_P \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_P))^2 \lambda_K((\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})^{-1}) \\ &\geq (\min_{i \in I} \gamma_i / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|)^2 / \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \geq \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) / \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \\ &= 1/\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \quad (\text{by proof of Lemma H.1}) \end{aligned}$$

And finally we have,

$$\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \leq (\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}))^2. \quad \square$$

Lemma H.3. For DCMMSB-type models, let $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T \mathbf{e}_i$, $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i$, $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i / \|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i\|$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i / \|\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i\|$, $i \in [n]$. Also let $\epsilon_0 = \max_i \|\mathbf{z}_i - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\|$, then,

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})}}{\gamma_i}.$$

Proof. From Lemma F.2, we have

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{v}_i\|} = \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})}}{\gamma_i},$$

where the last step uses Lemma H.1. \square

Lemma H.4. For DCMMSB-type models, $\lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) \geq \rho \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{B}$, it is easy to see that \mathbf{X} is full rank and positive definite, then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) &= \rho \lambda^*(\Gamma \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma) = \rho \sqrt{\lambda_K(\Gamma \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma)} = \rho \sqrt{\lambda_K(\Gamma \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma)} \\ &= \rho \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{X}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mathbf{X}^{1/2})} = \rho \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})} \geq \rho \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{X}) \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})} \\ &\geq \rho \sqrt{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{B}))^2 (\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}))^2} = \rho \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}), \end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{L}^T$ and $\mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L}$ have the same leading K eigenvalues for a matrix $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ with rank $K < n$. \square

I DCMMSB error bounds

Lemma I.1. For DCMMSB-type models, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, let $\alpha_0 = \mathbf{1}_K^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $\alpha_{\max} = \max_i \alpha_i$, $\alpha_{\min} = \min_i \alpha_i$, $\nu = \alpha_0 / \alpha_{\min}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \leq \frac{3\gamma_{\max}^2 n (\alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2)}{2\alpha_0(1 + \alpha_0)} \right) &\geq 1 - K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 n}{2\nu(1 + \alpha_0)} \right) &\geq 1 - K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \leq 3 \frac{\gamma_{\max}^2 \alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2}{\gamma_{\min}^2 \alpha_{\min}} \right) &\geq 1 - 2K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \lambda^*(\mathbf{B})}{2\nu(1 + \alpha_0)} \rho n \right) &\geq 1 - K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda^*(\mathbf{P})$ is the K -th singular value of \mathbf{P} .

Proof. First note that

$$\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) = \lambda_1(\Gamma \boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma) \leq (\lambda_1(\Gamma))^2 \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T) = (\lambda_1(\Gamma))^2 \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}).$$

Here we use that $\mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}^T$ and $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ have the same leading K eigenvalues for $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ with rank $K < n$. Also, as $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T (\Gamma^2 - \gamma_{\min}^2 \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ is positive semidefinite, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \Gamma^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) &= \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T (\Gamma^2 - \gamma_{\min}^2 \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Theta}) + \gamma_{\min}^2 \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \geq \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T (\Gamma^2 - \gamma_{\min}^2 \mathbf{I}) \boldsymbol{\Theta}) + \lambda_K(\gamma_{\min}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \\ &\geq \gamma_{\min}^2 \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.2 of [22],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \leq \frac{3n (\alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2)}{2\alpha_0(1 + \alpha_0)} \right) &\geq 1 - K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \geq \frac{n}{2\nu(1 + \alpha_0)} \right) &\geq 1 - K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}) \leq 3 \frac{\alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2}{\alpha_{\min}} \right) &\geq 1 - 2K \exp \left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

So $\kappa(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta) = \frac{\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)}{\lambda_K(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \leq \frac{\gamma_{\max}^2}{\gamma_{\min}^2} \kappa(\Theta^T \Theta) \leq 3 \frac{\gamma_{\max}^2}{\gamma_{\min}^2} \frac{\alpha_{\max} + \|\alpha\|^2}{\alpha_{\min}}$ with high probability. Using Lemma H.4, we have,

$$\lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) \geq \rho \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \lambda_K(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \lambda^*(\mathbf{B})}{2\nu(1 + \alpha_0)} \rho n,$$

with probability at least $1 - K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2}\right)$. \square

Lemma I.2. For DCMMSB-type models, we have $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{(\min_i \gamma_i)^2}{\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \Theta^T \mathbf{1}$. Furthermore, if $\theta_i \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$, then $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{(\min_i \gamma_i)^2}{2\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \frac{n}{\nu} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2}{3\gamma_{\max}^2} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbf{1}$ with probability larger than $1 - 1/n^3 - K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2}\right)$, where $\nu = \frac{\sum \alpha_i}{\min \alpha_i}$.

Proof. First note that, for diagonal matrices $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times n}$ that have strictly positive elements on the diagonal, and some matrices $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{H}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m}$, $\mathbf{H}_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n \times m}$ we have

$$\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} \geq (\min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii})^2 \mathbf{G} \mathbf{1}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_1^T \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{1} \geq \min_i \mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii} \mathbf{H}_1^T \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{1}. \quad (12)$$

Eq. (11) is true because

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} - (\min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii})^2 \mathbf{G} \mathbf{1} &= \mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} - \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} + \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} - (\min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii})^2 \mathbf{G} \mathbf{1} \\ &= (\mathbf{D} - \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{G} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1} + \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{G} (\mathbf{D} - \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{1} \geq \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where last step follows that \mathbf{D} , \mathbf{G} and $(\mathbf{D} - \min_i \mathbf{D}_{ii} \mathbf{I})$ are all non-negative. Eq. (12) can be proved in a similar way. Now use these on Eq. (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} &= \mathbf{N}_P^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta \mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1} \mathbf{N}_P^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \left(\min_i \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{I(i)}\|}{\gamma_{I(i)}} \right)^2 \Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta \mathbf{1} \\ &\geq \left(\min_i \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{I(i)}\|}{\gamma_{I(i)}} \right)^2 (\min_i \gamma_i)^2 \Theta^T \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{(\min_i \gamma_i)^2}{\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \Theta^T \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows Lemma H.1. By Lemma C.1. of [21], we know if rows of Θ are from Dirichlet distribution with parameter $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_K)$, $\alpha_0 = \sum_i \alpha_i$, $\nu = \alpha_0 / \min_i \alpha_i$,

$$\Theta^T \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{n}{\nu} \left(1 - O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\nu \log n}{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{1}$$

with probability larger than $1 - 1/n^3$. Now by Lemma I.1, we have, with probability larger than $1 - 1/n^3 - K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} &\geq \frac{(\min_i \gamma_i)^2}{\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \Theta^T \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{(\min_i \gamma_i)^2}{\lambda_1(\Theta^T \Gamma^2 \Theta)} \frac{n}{\nu} \left(1 - O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\nu \log n}{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{1} \\ &\geq \frac{2\gamma_{\min}^2 \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_0)}{3\gamma_{\max}^2 n (\alpha_{\max} + \|\alpha\|^2)} \frac{n}{\nu} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1} = \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \alpha_{\min} (1 + \alpha_0)}{3\gamma_{\max}^2 (\alpha_{\max} + \|\alpha\|^2)} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2}{3\gamma_{\max}^2} \frac{1}{\nu} \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

We use a crucial result from [22] that shows row-wise eigenspace concentration for general low rank matrix.

Theorem I.3 (Row-wise eigenspace concentration [22]). *Suppose \mathbf{P} has rank K , $\max_{i,j} \mathbf{P}_{ij} \leq \rho$. Let $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \mathbf{A}_{ji} \sim \text{Ber}(\mathbf{P}_{ij})$, \mathbf{V} and $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ are \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{A} 's top- K eigenvectors respectively. If $\mathbb{P}(\max_i \|\mathbf{V}_{:,i}\|_\infty > \sqrt{\rho}) \leq \delta_1$, and for some constant $\xi > 1$, $\rho n = \Omega((\log n)^{2\xi})$ and $\mathbb{P}(\lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) < 4\sqrt{n\rho}(\log n)^\xi) < \delta_2$, then for a fixed $i \in [n]$, with probability at least $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2 - O(Kn^{-3})$,*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T)\| = O\left(\frac{\min\{K, \kappa(\mathbf{P})\}\sqrt{Kn\rho}}{\lambda^*(\mathbf{P})}\right) \left((\min\{K, \kappa(\mathbf{P})\} + (\log n)^\xi) \max_i \|\mathbf{V}_{:,i}\|_\infty + (K+1)n^{-2\xi} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First by Lemma H.3,

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0\sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}}{\gamma_i}.$$

Also using Lemma H.1,

$$\max_j \|\mathbf{V}_{:,j}\|_\infty \leq \max_i \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \leq \max_i \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})},$$

By Lemma I.1, we have $\max_j \|\mathbf{V}_{:,j}\|_\infty \leq \max_i \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta_1$ for $\delta_1 \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1+\alpha_0)^2}\right)$. Also from the condition of ν , $\max_i \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})} \leq \sqrt{\rho}$. Then it is easy to see $\mathbb{P}(\max_i \|\mathbf{V}_{:,i}\|_\infty > \sqrt{\rho}) \leq \delta_1$. Also, from the condition of $\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})/\nu$, we have $4\sqrt{n\rho}(\log n)^\xi \leq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \lambda^*(\mathbf{B})}{2\nu(1+\alpha_0)} \rho n$. Then combined with Lemma I.1, $\mathbb{P}(\lambda^*(\mathbf{P}) < 4\sqrt{n\rho}(\log n)^\xi) < \delta_2$ is satisfied with $\delta_2 \leq K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1+\alpha_0)^2}\right)$. Also we have,

$$\max_i \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})} \geq \max_i \gamma_i / \sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})} \geq \sqrt{2/(3n)} \gg (K+1)n^{-2\xi}$$

with high probability. Then by Theorem I.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_0 &= O\left(\frac{\min\{K, \kappa(\mathbf{P})\}\sqrt{Kn\rho}}{\lambda^*(\mathbf{P})}\right) \left((\min\{K, \kappa(\mathbf{P})\} + (\log n)^\xi) \max_i \|\mathbf{V}_{:,i}\|_\infty + (K+1)n^{-2\xi} \right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}\sqrt{Kn\rho}}{\rho\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}\right) \frac{\gamma_{\max}}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}}. \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2 - O(Kn^{-3}) = 1 - O(Kn^{-3})$. So,

$$\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0\sqrt{\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}}{\gamma_i} = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}\sqrt{Kn}}{\sqrt{\rho}\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}\right) \frac{\gamma_{\max}\sqrt{\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})}}{\gamma_i}.$$

And using Lemma I.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &= \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| = \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max} \min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\} \sqrt{\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})} \sqrt{Kn}}{\gamma_{\min} \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \lambda_K(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta}) \sqrt{\rho}}\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max} \min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\} \sqrt{\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2\boldsymbol{\Theta})} K^{0.5} \nu (1+\alpha_0)}{\gamma_{\min}^3 \lambda^*(\mathbf{B}) \sqrt{n\rho}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(Kn^{-2})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Note that $\mathbf{P} = \rho\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T$, we have $\rho\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P = \mathbf{V}_P\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}_P^T$, then $\rho\mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{N}_P = \mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{V}_P\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}_P^T\mathbf{N}_P = \mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{Y}_P^T$. As \mathbf{B} has unit diagonal, let $\mathbf{B}(i, i) = c^2$, then $c^2\rho\gamma_{I(i)}^2/\|\mathbf{V}_{I(i)}\|^2 = \rho\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P\mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{Y}_P^T\mathbf{e}_i := d_i^2$. Since our estimation for $c^2\rho\gamma_{I(i)}^2/\|\mathbf{V}_{I(i)}\|^2$ is $\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{e}_i$, and note that $\|\mathbf{E}\| \leq \max_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{P}\|_1 = O(\rho n)$, $\|\hat{\mathbf{E}}\| \leq \|\mathbf{E}\| + \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P}\| = O(\rho n)$ using Weyl's inequality and Theorem 5.2 of [20], and $\|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T - \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\| \leq \lambda_{K+1}(\mathbf{A}) + \|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{A}\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{A}\| = O(\sqrt{\rho n})$. Let $\hat{d}_i^2 = \mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T\mathbf{e}_i$, then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |d_i^2 - \hat{d}_i^2| &= \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{Y}_P^T\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{e}_i\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Y}_P - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C)\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{Y}_P^T\mathbf{e}_i\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T - \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T)\mathbf{Y}_P^T\mathbf{e}_i\| \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T(\mathbf{Y}_P^T - \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C^T\mathbf{\Pi})\mathbf{e}_i\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Y}_P - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C)\| \|\mathbf{E}\| + \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{V}^T - \hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{E}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{E}}\| \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{Y}_P - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_C)\| \\ &\leq O(\rho n)\epsilon_4/\sqrt{K} + O(\sqrt{\rho n}). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma H.1, $c\sqrt{\rho\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})} \leq d_i \leq c\sqrt{\rho\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}$, and by Lemma I.1, $\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}) \leq \frac{3\gamma_{\max}^2 n(\alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2)}{2\alpha_0(1+\alpha_0)}$, $\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}) \geq \frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 n}{2\nu(1+\alpha_0)}$, then we have $d_i \geq c\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_{\min}^2 \rho n}{2\nu(1+\alpha_0)}}$, and $d_i \leq c\sqrt{\frac{3\gamma_{\max}^2 \rho n(\alpha_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2)}{2\alpha_0(1+\alpha_0)}}$ with probability at least $1 - 2K \exp\left(-\frac{n}{36\nu^2(1+\alpha_0)^2}\right)$. Then, using Lemma H.2,

$$\begin{aligned} |d_i - \hat{d}_i| &\leq \frac{O(\rho n)\epsilon_4/\sqrt{K} + O(\sqrt{\rho n})}{\min_j(d_j + \hat{d}_{\pi(j)})} \leq \frac{O(\rho n)\epsilon_4/\sqrt{K} + O(\sqrt{\rho n})}{\sqrt{\rho\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}} \\ &\leq \frac{O(\rho n/\sqrt{K})\frac{c\gamma K\zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}\epsilon + O(\sqrt{\rho n})}{\sqrt{\rho\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}} = O\left(\frac{K^{0.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^{1.5}\zeta\sqrt{\rho n}\epsilon}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{K^{1.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3\sqrt{\rho n}\epsilon}{\eta\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_K)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{D}} = \text{diag}(\hat{d}_1, \hat{d}_2, \dots, \hat{d}_K)$, then $\mathbf{D} = c\sqrt{\rho}(\mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{\Gamma}_P)$. Now as we estimate $c\sqrt{\rho}(\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta})$ by $\hat{c}\sqrt{\rho}\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}} = \hat{\mathbf{M}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(c\sqrt{\rho}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{c}\sqrt{\rho}\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| &= \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{D} - \hat{\mathbf{M}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| \leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{M} - \hat{\mathbf{M}}\mathbf{\Pi})\mathbf{D}\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{M}}\mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{M} - \hat{\mathbf{M}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| \|\mathbf{D}\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\hat{\mathbf{M}}\| \|\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{\Pi}^T\hat{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{\Pi}\| \leq \epsilon_{M,i} \max_j d_j + (\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{M}\| + \epsilon_{M,i}) \max_j |d_j - \hat{d}_{\pi(j)}| \\ &\leq \epsilon_{M,i} \max_j d_j + (\gamma_i \max_{j \in I} \|\mathbf{v}_j\|/\gamma_j + \epsilon_{M,i}) \max_j |d_j - \hat{d}_{\pi(j)}| \\ &\leq c\sqrt{\rho\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\epsilon_{M,i} + \left(\frac{\gamma_i}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}} + \epsilon_{M,i}\right) O\left(\frac{K^{1.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3\sqrt{\rho n}\epsilon}{\eta\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{M}\| = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Gamma}_P^{-1}\mathbf{N}_P^{-1}\| \leq \gamma_i\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\| \max_{j \in I} \|\mathbf{v}_j\|/\gamma_j$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i\| \leq 1$ for DCMMSB and OCCAM for the last inequality. As

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{M,i} &= \frac{c_M\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\|K\zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{2.5}}\epsilon \leq \frac{c_M\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T)\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\|K}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{2.5}} \frac{4K}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P\mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}\epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{c_1\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{Z}\|(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^6K^2}{\eta}\epsilon \leq \frac{c_1\gamma_i(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^6K^2}{\eta\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_5 &= \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(c\sqrt{\rho}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| \\
&= c\sqrt{\rho\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\epsilon_{M,i} + \left(\frac{\gamma_i}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}} + \epsilon_{M,i}\right) O\left(\frac{K^{1.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3\sqrt{\rho}n}{\eta\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\epsilon\right) \\
&= c\sqrt{\rho\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\frac{c_1\gamma_i(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^6K^2}{\eta\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}}\epsilon + O\left(\gamma_i\frac{K^{1.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3\sqrt{\rho}n}{\eta\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\epsilon\right) \\
&= O\left(\max\left\{K^{0.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^{3.5}, \frac{n}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\right\}\frac{\gamma_iK^{1.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3\sqrt{\rho}}{\eta}\epsilon\right).
\end{aligned}$$

As $|c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i - \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i| = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(c\sqrt{\rho}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\mathbf{1}\| \leq \sqrt{K}\epsilon_5$, let $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^T c\sqrt{\rho}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^T \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi}$, then for DCMMSB, $\|\mathbf{X}_i\|_1 = c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i$, $\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i\| \leq \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i\|_1 = \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i$; for OCCAM, $\|\mathbf{X}_i\| = c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{\Theta}\| = c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i\| = \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i$. So we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| &= \left\|\frac{\mathbf{X}_i}{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i} - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i}{\hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i}\right\| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_i - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i\|}{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i} + \left\|\frac{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i - \hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i}{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i\hat{c}\sqrt{\hat{\rho}}\hat{\gamma}_i}\right\|\|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i\| \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon_5}{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i} + \frac{\sqrt{K}}{c\sqrt{\rho}\gamma_i}\epsilon_5 = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{K}}{\gamma_i\sqrt{\rho}}\epsilon_5\right) \\
&= O\left(\max\left\{K^{0.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^{3.5}, \frac{n}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\right\}\frac{K^2(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^3}{\eta}\epsilon\right) \\
&= \tilde{O}\left(\max\left\{K^{0.5}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^{3.5}, \frac{n}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})}\right\}\frac{\gamma_{\max}K^{2.5}\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}(\kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}))^{3.5}\sqrt{n}}{\gamma_{\min}\eta\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})\sqrt{\rho}}\right) \\
&= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max}K^{2.5}\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}n^{3/2}}{\gamma_{\min}\eta\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K^2(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})\sqrt{\rho}}\right). \quad (\text{when } \kappa(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}) = \Theta(1))
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this bound works for both DCMMSB and OCCAM, and $\lambda_K(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta}) = \Omega(n)$, so the bound is about $\tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{\rho n})$. specifically, for DCMMSB,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\mathbf{\Theta} - \hat{\mathbf{\Theta}}\mathbf{\Pi})\| &= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max}K^{2.5}\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}n^{3/2}}{\gamma_{\min}\eta\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\lambda_K^2(\mathbf{\Theta}^T\mathbf{\Gamma}^2\mathbf{\Theta})\sqrt{\rho}}\right) \\
&= \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma_{\max}K^{2.5}\min\{K^2, (\kappa(\mathbf{P}))^2\}\nu^2(1 + \alpha_0)^2}{\gamma_{\min}^5\eta\lambda^*(\mathbf{B})\sqrt{\rho n}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

J Topic model error bounds

J.1 Eigenspace concentration for topic models

Consider the following setup similar to [4].

$$\mathbf{A}_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Binomial}(N, \mathcal{A}_{ij}) \quad \text{For } i \in [V], j \in [D] \quad (13)$$

Here \mathcal{A} is the probability matrix for words appearing in documents. Furthermore, we have $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{H}$, where \mathbf{T} is the word to topic probabilities with columns summing to 1 and \mathbf{H} is the topic to document matrix with columns summing to 1. Also note that, $\sum_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T\|_1 = D$, since the columns of \mathcal{A} sum to one. We will construct a matrix $\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{A}_2^T$, where \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 are obtained by dividing the words in each document uniformly randomly in two equal parts. For simplicity denote $N_1 = N/2$. Consider the matrix $\mathbf{U} = \frac{\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{A}_2^T}{N_1^2}$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}] = \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T$.

Lemma J.1. For topic models, we have $(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{K} \mathbf{1}$, where \mathbf{T} is the word-topic probability matrix.

Proof. Noting that $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta}$ for topic models, where $\gamma_i = \Gamma_{ii} = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1$. Following the steps of Lemma I.2, we find

$$(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\min_i \gamma_i}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^2 \mathbf{\Theta})} (\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta})^T \mathbf{1} = \frac{\min_i \gamma_i}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{1} = \frac{\min_i \gamma_i}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \mathbf{1} \geq \frac{\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{K} \mathbf{1},$$

where the last step is true because $\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}) \leq \text{trace}(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}) = \sum_i \|\mathbf{T} \mathbf{e}_i\|^2 \leq K$.

$$\text{So } \eta \geq \frac{\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \geq \frac{\min_i \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{T}\|_1}{K}. \quad \square$$

Lemma J.2. Using Eq (13), we see that under Assumption 3.1,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{U} - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T\|_F \geq \sqrt{\frac{50D \log \max(V, D)}{N_1}} \right) \leq \frac{2}{(\max(V, D))^3}.$$

Proof. Recall that from Assumption 3.1, $g_{ik} = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T \mathbf{e}_k$. Let $\mathbf{R} := \mathbf{U} - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^T$.

$$\mathbf{R}_{ik} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^D \mathbf{A}_1(ij) \mathbf{A}_2(kj)}{N_1^2} - g_{ik}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_{ij}] = 0$, and $\mathbf{A}_1(ij) \mathbf{A}_2(kj)/N_1^2$ is bounded by 1. Also $\mathbf{A}_1(i, j)$ and $\mathbf{A}_2(i, j)$ are independent. For independent $X := \mathbf{A}_1(ij)/N_1$, $Y := \mathbf{A}_2(kj)/N_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(XY) &= \text{var}(X) \text{var}(Y) + \text{var}(X) \mathbb{E}[X]^2 + \text{var}(Y) \mathbb{E}[Y]^2 \leq \frac{3 \mathbf{A}_1(ij) \mathbf{A}_2(kj)}{N_1} \\ \text{var}(\mathbf{R}_{ik}) &\leq 3g_{ik}/N_1 \end{aligned}$$

When $g_{ik} = 0$, $\mathbf{U}_{ik} = 0$. When $g_{ik} > 0$, using Bernstein's inequality, we have:

$$\mathbb{P} (|\mathbf{R}_{ik}| \geq t_{ik}) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t_{ik}^2}{2(3g_{ik}/N_1 + t_{ik}/3)} \right),$$

Setting, $t_{ik} = \sqrt{50 \log \max(V, D) g_{ik}/N_1}$, we see that,

$$\sum_{i,k} t_{ik}^2 = 50 \log \max(V, D) \sum_{ik} g_{ik}/N_1 = 50 \log \max(V, D) D/N_1$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{R}\|_F^2 \geq \sum_{i,k} t_{ik}^2 \right) \leq V^2 \max_{i,k} \mathbb{P} (|\mathbf{R}_{ik}| \geq t_{ik}) \leq 2V^2 / (\max(V, D))^5 \leq 2 / (\max(V, D))^3.$$

This yields the result. □

Lemma J.3. *Using Eq (13), we see that, under Assumption 3.1, there exists constants C, r such that,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{U} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T\| \geq C_r \sqrt{\frac{D \log \max(V, D)}{N}} \right) \leq \frac{2}{(\max(V, D))^r}.$$

Proof. We use the Matrix Bernstein bound in [33]. Let $\mathbf{S}_k := \frac{\mathbf{A}_{1k}\mathbf{A}_{2k}^T}{N_1^2} - \mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T$, where \mathbf{M}_k is the k^{th} column of matrix \mathbf{M} . Note that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{S}_k]$ is the $V \times V$ zeros matrix. We also see that by symmetry of the random splitting, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{S}_k\mathbf{S}_k^T] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{S}_k^T\mathbf{S}_k]$.

We will now note some theoretical properties of the \mathbf{S}_k matrices. Let \mathbf{X} be a vector of size V , such that, $\mathbf{X}_i \sim \text{Binomial}(N_1, a_i)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X}]}{N_1^2} &= \sum_{i=1}^V \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_i^2]}{N_1^2} = \sum_{i=1}^V \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_i]^2 + \text{var}(\mathbf{X}_i)}{N_1^2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^V \frac{N_1^2 a_i^2 + N_1 a_i(1 - a_i)}{N_1^2} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_1}\right) \|a\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, let

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{\Sigma}, \quad \Sigma_{ij} = N_1 a_i(1 - a_i)1(i = j) \quad (15)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{S}_k\mathbf{S}_k^T] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{A}_{1k}\mathbf{A}_{2k}^T\mathbf{A}_{2k}\mathbf{A}_{1k}^T}{N_1^4} - \mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T\mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T \right] \\ \text{(By independence)} \quad &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{2k}^T\mathbf{A}_{2k}]\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{1k}\mathbf{A}_{1k}^T]}{N_1^4} - \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2\mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T \\ \text{(By Eq (14) and (15))} \quad &= \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2(1 - \frac{1}{N_1}) \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{\Sigma}_k}{N_1^2} + \mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T \right) - \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2\mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T \\ &= \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2 \frac{\mathbf{\Sigma}_k}{N_1^2} + \frac{1 - \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2}{N_1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{\Sigma}_k}{N_1^2} + \mathcal{A}_k\mathcal{A}_k^T \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{\Sigma}_k\| \leq N_1\|\mathcal{A}_k\|_1 = N_1$, $\|\mathcal{A}\|_F^2 \leq D$,

$$v(\mathbf{S}) = \left\| \sum_k \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{S}_k\mathbf{S}_k^T] \right\| \leq 2 \frac{\|\mathcal{A}\|_F^2}{N_1} + \frac{D}{N_1^2} \leq \frac{D}{N_1} \left(2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \right).$$

Furthermore,

$$\|\mathbf{S}_k\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_k\|^2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_{1k}\| \|\mathbf{A}_{2k}\|}{N_1^2} \leq 2 =: L$$

So the Matrix Bernstein bound gives us:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_k \mathbf{S}_k \right\| \geq t \right) \leq 2V \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{v(\mathbf{S}) + Lt/3} \right) = 2V \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{3D/N_1 + 2t/3} \right)$$

Using $t = C_r \sqrt{D \log \max(V, D)/N}$, and using the condition in Assumption 3.1, we get the bound. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. First note the proof is under Assumption 3.1. Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{U} - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T$. Using the Davis-Kahan Theorem [34], we see that there exists an orthogonal matrix \mathbf{O} :

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{V}\|_F \leq \frac{\sqrt{8}(2\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T) + \|\mathbf{R}\|_2) \min(\sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{R}\|_2, \|\mathbf{R}\|_F)}{\lambda_K^2(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T)},$$

where λ_1 and λ_K are the largest and K^{th} largest singular values (and also eigenvalue) of $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T$ respectively. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{V}\|_F &\leq \frac{\sqrt{8}(2\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T) + \|\mathbf{R}\|_2) \min(\sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{R}\|_2, \|\mathbf{R}\|_F)}{\lambda_K^2(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{8} \frac{2\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T) + C_r \sqrt{D \log \max(V, D)}/N}{\lambda_K(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T)^2} \sqrt{\frac{D \log \max(V, D)}{N}} \max(C_r \sqrt{K}, \sqrt{C}) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_1(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})}{\lambda_K^2(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)\lambda_K^2(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{KD \log \max(V, D)}{N}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows Lemma H.4 with $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^T$, $\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta} = \mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T$ and $\rho = 1$. Now we bound $\epsilon_0 = \max_i \|\mathbf{z}_i - \hat{\mathbf{z}}_i\| = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T)\|$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T)\| &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T\|_2 \leq \|(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{V})\mathbf{O}^T\hat{\mathbf{V}}^T + \mathbf{V}(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{V})^T\| \\ &= \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})}{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma H.3, $\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0}{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_0 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})}}{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}$. So,

$$\epsilon = \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| = \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)(\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T}))^{1.5}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T\mathbf{T})}} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right).$$

□

J.2 Parameter estimation for topic models

Proof of Theorem 3.4. For topic models, $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{D}$, where $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Theta}$, $\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{N}_P\mathbf{\Gamma}_P)^{-1}$, $\gamma_i = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{ii} = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|_1$. For empirical estimation we have $\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \hat{\mathbf{T}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{D}}(i, i) = \|\hat{\mathbf{M}}(:, i)\|_1$. First we have $\forall i \in K$, $\|\mathbf{T}(:, i)\|_1 = 1$, then $\|\mathbf{M}(:, i)\|_1 = \mathbf{D}(i, i) = \|\mathbf{v}_{I(i)}\|/\gamma_{I(i)}$. Let π be the permutation function for permutation matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}$ in Theorem 2.8, then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{D}(i, i) - \hat{\mathbf{D}}(\pi(i), \pi(i))| &= \left| \|\mathbf{M}(:, i)\|_1 - \|\hat{\mathbf{M}}(:, \pi(i))\|_1 \right| \leq \|\mathbf{M}(:, i) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(:, \pi(i))\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^V |\mathbf{M}(j, i) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(j, \pi(i))| \leq \sum_{j=1}^V \|\mathbf{M}(j, :) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(j, :)\mathbf{\Pi}\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^V \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1 \frac{\|\mathbf{M}(j, :) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(j, :)\mathbf{\Pi}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \\ &\leq K \max_j \frac{\|\mathbf{M}(j, :) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(j, :)\mathbf{\Pi}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \leq K^{1.5} \max_j \frac{\|\mathbf{M}(j, :) - \hat{\mathbf{M}}(j, :)\mathbf{\Pi}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \\ &\leq \frac{K^{1.5} \max_j \epsilon_{M,j}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} := \epsilon_D \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, and from Lemma H.1, we know

$$1/\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \leq \|\mathbf{v}_i\|/\gamma_i \leq 1/\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}, \quad \forall i \in [n]$$

Using Lemma H.2, we have $\lambda_1(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \leq \kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) = \kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})$, $\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \geq 1/\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}) = 1/\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})$, and $\kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \leq (\kappa(\boldsymbol{\Theta} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^2 \boldsymbol{\Theta})) = (\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^2$.

Then the error for each row of \mathbf{T} is

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{T}} - \mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\| &= \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{M}}\hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{M}} - \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T(\hat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{M}} - \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\| \max_j 1/\hat{\mathbf{D}}(j, j) + \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{M}\| \max_j \left\| \frac{\mathbf{D}(j, j) - \hat{\mathbf{D}}(\pi(j), \pi(j))}{\mathbf{D}(j, j)\hat{\mathbf{D}}(\pi(j), \pi(j))} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon_{M,i}}{\min_j \mathbf{D}(j, j)} + \frac{2\epsilon_D}{(\min_j \mathbf{D}(j, j))^2} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{M}\| \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon_{M,i}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{v}_{I(j)}\|/\gamma_{I(j)}} + \frac{2\epsilon_D}{\min_j \|\mathbf{v}_{I(j)}\|/\gamma_{I(j)}} \frac{\max_j \mathbf{D}(j, j) \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|}{\min_j \mathbf{D}(j, j)} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}\epsilon_{M,i} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}}{\sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\| \frac{K^{1.5} \max_j \epsilon_{M,j}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \sqrt{\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} \frac{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} K^{1.5} \frac{c_M \kappa(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T) \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{Z}\| K \zeta}{(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{2.5}} \epsilon \\ &\leq c_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} (\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^{5.5} K^{2.5} \frac{\gamma_{\max} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \zeta \epsilon \\ &\leq \frac{c_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} (\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^7 K^{3.5} \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}{\eta} \|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\| \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

(using $\zeta \leq \frac{4K}{\eta(\lambda_K(\mathbf{Y}_P \mathbf{Y}_P^T))^{1.5}}$)

where we use $\epsilon_D \leq \mathbf{D}(j, j)/2$ for relaxation in the 3rd inequality and c_1 and c_2 are some constants. Under Assumption 3.1, by Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\epsilon = \max_i \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i\| = \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)(\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^{1.5}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T(\hat{\mathbf{T}} - \mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\Pi}^T)\|}{\|\mathbf{e}_i^T\mathbf{T}\|} &\leq \frac{c_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} (\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^7 K^{3.5} \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}{\eta \min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \epsilon \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})} (\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^7 K^{3.5} \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}{\eta \min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)(\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^{1.5}}{\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1 \sqrt{\lambda_K(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T})}} O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{K \log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}{(\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1)^2} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T)(\kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}))^9}{\eta} O_P \left(K^4 \sqrt{\frac{\log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right) \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{K^4 \max_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1}{\eta (\min_j \|\mathbf{e}_j^T\mathbf{T}\|_1)^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log \max(V, D)}{DN}} \right) \quad (\text{if } \kappa(\mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{T}) = \Theta(1) \text{ and } \kappa(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T) = \Theta(1)) \end{aligned}$$

□

K Converting SBMO to DCMMSB

Since for stochastic blockmodel with overlaps (SBMO) [17], $\mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{Z}$, where rows of \mathbf{Z} are binary assignments to different communities, we have $\mathbf{P} = \rho \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{Z} = \rho' \mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{\Theta} \mathbf{\Gamma}$, where $\gamma'_i = \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z}\|_1 \in [K]$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z} / \|\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{Z}\|_1$, γ_i is normalized from γ'_i to sum to n for identifiability and $\rho' = (\rho \sum \gamma'_i / n)^2$. We can see each SBMO model is corresponding to an identifiable DCMMSB model, thus we can use SVM-cone to recover SBMO model. The way to get binary assignment can be easily done by setting threshold as $1/K$ for each element in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$.

L Closed form rate for known special cases

For a Stochastic Blockmodel (SBM) with $K = 2$ classes of equal size and standard parameters ($\rho = p$, $\mathbf{B}_{11} = \mathbf{B}_{22} = 1, \mathbf{B}_{12} = \mathbf{B}_{21} = q/p$), our result suggests that as long as $(p - q)/\sqrt{p} = \tilde{\Omega}(1/\sqrt{n})$, SVM-cone will consistently estimate the label of each node uniformly with probability tending to one. This is similar to separation conditions in existing literature for consistent estimation in SBMs, up-to a log factor.

M Statistics of topic modeling datasets

Table 3: Statistics of topic modeling datasets

Corpus	Vocabulary size V	Number of documents D	Total number of words
NIPS ¹	5002	1,491	1,589,280
NYTimes ¹	5004	296,784	68,876,786
PubMed ¹	5001	7,829,043	485,719,597
20NG ²	5000	9,540	886,043
Enron ¹	5003	29,823	4,963,162
KOS ¹	5001	3,412	405,190

N Topics in real data

Table 4: Top-10 word of 5 topics for different topic modeling datasets

Corpus	Top-10 words
NIPS	algorithm data problem method parameter point vector distribution error space
	neuron output pattern signal circuit visual synaptic unit layer current
	data unit training output image information object recognition pattern point
	unit hidden output layer weight object pattern visual representation connection
	error algorithm training weight data parameter method problem vector classifier
NYT	con son solo era mayor zzz_mexico director sin fax sector
	zzz_bush government school campaign show american member country zzz_united_states law
	company companies market stock business billion plan money analyst government
	team game season play player games run coach win won
	file sport zzz_losanjeles notebook internet zzz_calif read output web computer
PubMed	receptor expression gene binding system function region genes dna mechanism
	concentration strain gene dna system expression region genes test function
	tumor gene expression disease genes lesion mutation region dna clinical
	rat concentration plasma day serum animal liver drug response administration
	children disease clinical year test therapy women system diagnosis drug
20NG	key government car chip state including information cs number long
	god jesus bible question things life christian world christ true
	year michael game team cs games win play including car
	drive mb scsi windows card hard disk dos computer drives
	windows window dos file files program card fax run win
Enron	report status changed payment approved approval amount paid due expense
	database error operation perform hourahead data file process start message
	power california customer gas order deal list office forward comment
	message contract corp receive offer free send list received click
	hourahead final file hour data price process error detected variances
KOS	iraq administration military iraqi president american troops bushs officials soldiers
	voting vote senate polls governor electoral voter media voters primary
	percent senate race elections republican party state voters campaign polls
	senate polls governor electoral primary vote ground races voter contact
	dean edwards primary clark gephardt lieberman iowa results polls kucinich

¹<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Bag+of+Words>

²<http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/>