

Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit and Matrix Spiked Covariance Model

Runshi Tang*, Ming Yuan[†] and Anru R. Zhang[‡]

(July 4, 2023)

Abstract

This paper introduces a novel framework called Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit (MOP-UP) to extract hidden variations in both the row and column dimensions for matrix data. To enhance the understanding of the framework, we introduce a class of matrix-variate spiked covariance models that serve as inspiration for the development of the MOP-UP algorithm. The MOP-UP algorithm consists of two steps: Average Subspace Capture (ASC) and Alternating Projection (AP). These steps are specifically designed to capture the row-wise and column-wise dimension-reduced subspaces which contain the most informative features of the data. ASC utilizes a novel average projection operator as initialization and achieves exact recovery in the noiseless setting. We analyze the convergence and non-asymptotic error bounds of MOP-UP, introducing a blockwise matrix eigenvalue perturbation bound that proves the desired bound, where classic perturbation bounds fail. The effectiveness and practical merits of the proposed framework are demonstrated through experiments on both simulated and real datasets. Lastly, we discuss generalizations of our approach to higher-order data.

*Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Email: rtang56@wisc.edu

[†]Department of Statistics, Columbia University. Email: ming.yuan@columbia.edu

[‡]Address of correspondence: Departments of Biostatistics & Bioinformatics and Computer Science, Duke University. Email: anru.zhang@duke.edu

1 Introduction

In modern scientific applications, data are often observed in the form of multiple matrices or tensors that pertain to different subjects from a certain population. For instance, longitudinal gene expression data consist of a matrix of gene expression levels across time for each subject (Liu et al., 2017); MRI imaging data contain one order-3 tensor image for each patient (Zhou et al., 2013); multilayer network can be represented by an order-3 tensor, where each layer (i.e., a matrix) represents one network (Jing et al., 2021); m -uniform hypergraph is typically viewed as an order- m tensor, whose entries denote all hyper-edges (Zhen & Wang, 2022); atomic-resolution 4D scanning transmission electron microscopy data can be expressed as an order-3 tensor with two modes denoting scan location and the other denoting the convergent beam electron diffraction pattern (Zhang et al., 2020). Combining information from all subjects results in a high-order tensor with subject independence along one mode and some covariance structure along the other modes that represent the relationship among the measured covariates.

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is a widely accepted method for analyzing data consisting of vectors associated with individual subjects. Its primary objective is to identify a lower-dimensional subspace within the feature domain that captures the majority of data variance (Pearson, 1901). PCA is a reliable technique for reducing the dimensionality of data. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) is an efficient approach commonly used to compute PCA. However, when the dataset is in the form of a series of matrices, PCA encounters challenges.

In the literature, the tensor SVD framework (also known as tensor PCA in the machine learning and information theory community) is discussed (Richard & Montanari, 2014; Zhang & Xia, 2018; Wang & Li, 2020; Zhou et al., 2022; Han et al., 2022b). This framework revolves around a signal-plus-noise model: $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Z}$, where \mathbf{X} represents a mean tensor with certain low-complexity structures (e.g., CP, Tucker, tubal, tensor-train low-rank, etc.), and \mathbf{Z} denotes mean-zero random observational noise. The goal of tensor SVD (or tensor PCA) is to efficiently extract \mathbf{X} from \mathbf{Y} . However, this approach is not suitable for analyzing high-order covariance structures of tensor data due to several reasons. First, most mean-based SVD methodologies assume that the dataset has some tensor low rankness, but this assumption may not always hold true. Second, tensor SVD or low-rank tensor factorization primarily focuses on the mean struc-

ture of the data tensor, simplifying the problem to a significantly lower number of parameters compared to the covariance structure. To fix ideas, consider for instance repeated observations of matrix data. While n i.i.d. copies of p -by- p matrix result in a data tensor with np^2 entries, the associated covariance tensor includes p^4 entries. Most importantly, tensor SVD or low-rank tensor factorization (Kolda & Bader, 2009; Zhang & Xia, 2018) may not fit for treating the data tensor as information obtained from independent replicates of a certain population. Consequently, achieving good performance in covariance tensor statistical inference using mean-based models cannot be expected.

Since the direct analysis of the covariance tensor of p -by- p observational data matrices involves p^4 parameters and is typically difficult in high-dimensional settings, a number of simplified covariance tensor structures were introduced, including the (approximate) Kronecker product distribution (see, e.g., Dawid (1981); Dutilleul (1999); Yin & Li (2012); Tsiligkaridis & Hero (2013); Zhou (2014); Chen & Liu (2015); Hoff (2015); Ding & Cook (2017); Hoff et al. (2022)):

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \otimes \Sigma_2, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \Sigma_{ijkl} = (\Sigma_1)_{ik} \cdot (\Sigma_2)_{jl},$$

and Kronecker sum distribution (Greenewald et al., 2013, 2017):

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \oplus \Sigma_2 := I_{p_1} \otimes \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_1 \otimes I_{p_2}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \Sigma_{ijkl} = (\Sigma_1)_{ik} \mathbf{1}_{\{j=l\}} + (\Sigma_2)_{jl} \mathbf{1}_{\{i=k\}}, \quad i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, p.$$

These models simplify the entire covariance tensor into two matrices Σ_1 and Σ_2 , which greatly streamline subsequent analysis. Nevertheless, these tensor-to-matrix simplifications can impose certain limitations. Additionally, the simplified covariance tensor fails to discern the direction of covariates with higher variances, unlike the vector-based principal component analysis (PCA) technique. As a consequence, the existing literature does not provide a direct equivalent of PCA specifically designed for tensor data. Therefore, there is a disparity in the current research.

To address this disparity, this paper aims to introduce a novel framework for dimension reduction in a series of matrix data, referred to as Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit (MOP-UP). The primary objective of MOP-UP is to extract concealed variations in both the row and column dimensions of data matrices. Specifically, for a collection of matrix data with a shared dimension, denoted as $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$, we aim to identify the common column and row subspaces represented by semi-orthogonal matrices¹, $U \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times r_1}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times r_2}$, respectively. The objective

¹A semi-orthogonal matrix is defined as a matrix with orthonormal columns.

is to approximate the following decomposition for each matrix X_i :

$$X_i \approx M + UA_i + B_iV^\top, \quad (1)$$

where i ranges from 1 to n and A_i and B_i are score matrices that vary across the indices. Intuitively, the decomposition (1) captures the row-wise and column-wise dimension-reduced subspaces, denoted by U and V respectively, which encompass the majority of the informative features present in X_i .

1.1 Matrix Spiked Covariance Models and Higher-order Generalizations

To establish a statistical foundation for the MOP-UP framework and to serve as a source of inspiration for algorithmic and theoretical development, it is beneficial to review the conventional probabilistic PCA model (Tipping & Bishop, 1999) before delving deeper. Suppose x_1, \dots, x_n are a series of p -dimensional i.i.d. observations with mean vector μ and covariance matrix Σ . The goal of PCA is to seek a few loading vectors that explain most of the variance in data through the following decomposition,

$$x_i = \mu + Ua_i^\top + z_i = \mu + \sum_{j=1}^r u_j a_{ij} + z_i. \quad (2)$$

Here $U = [u_1, \dots, u_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ is a set of fixed and uniform orthogonal vectors for all observations, a_{i1}, \dots, a_{ir} are random values, z_i represents the noise. Particularly, U and a are often referred to as “loading” and “principal component (PC) scores” in the literature. To theoretically analyze the performance of PCA, the following spiked covariance model was introduced and widely studied (Johnstone, 2001; Paul, 2007; Cai et al., 2013; Donoho et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2016),

$$\Sigma = \sigma^2 I + U\Lambda U^\top = \sigma^2 I + \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i u_i^\top, \quad U \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}.$$

An equivalent form of this model can be obtained by algebraic calculation as

$$(\Sigma - \sigma^2 I)U_\perp = 0, \quad U_\perp \text{ is the orthogonal complement of } U. \quad (3)$$

Suppose $\mathbf{X} = [X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is an order-3 dataset, where X_1, \dots, X_n are matrix observations with mean matrix M and covariance tensor Σ . Now we still aim to seek a low-dimensional row

subspace U and a low-dimensional column subspace V that can together explain most of the variance in \mathbf{X} . In analog with the matrix PCA of (2) and (3), we consider the following two models

$$X_i = M + UA_i^\top + B_iV^\top + Z_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4)$$

$$(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)}) \times_1 U_\perp \times_2 V_\perp = 0, \quad \text{for some fixed semi-orthogonal matrices } U_\perp \text{ and } V_\perp. \quad (5)$$

Here, \times_1 and \times_2 represent the tensor-matrix product that will be introduced in Section 2.1. The matrices U and V are analogous to U in the regular PCA (2) and can be referred to as the column and row loading matrices, respectively. The matrices A_i and B_i are random matrices that correspond to the scores a_k in PCA (2), and can be referred to as score matrices. Additionally, Z_i represents the noise involved in the process.

Model (4) provides a rigorous statistical interpretation for the MOP-UP framework. Additionally, Models (4) and (5) correspond to (2) and (3) respectively, which are part of the classical spiked covariance model. Formulations (4) and (5) are proven to be equivalent in the upcoming Theorem 1. Based on this equivalence, this paper introduces and studies the class of **matrix spiked covariance models** that satisfies either decomposition (4) or condition (5). See Figure 1 for an illustration of matrix spiked covariance model.




Figure 1: Illustration of a matrix spiked covariance model in a decomposition form

The definition of the matrix spiked covariance model can be generalized for the order- d tensor variate. Denote $\mathbf{p} = p_1 \times \dots \times p_d$. We say $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$ has a **rank- r high-order spiked covariance** if

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}},$$

or equivalently

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \times_{k=1}^d U_{k\perp} = 0, \quad \text{for } d \text{ fixed semi-orthogonal matrices } U_{k\perp}, k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Here, $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d}$ is the order- $(2d)$ tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}}$ with entries $(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d})_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}} = 1$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d)$, $q_k \in \{1, \dots, p_k\}$, and 0 elsewhere.

In summary, the proposed matrix and higher-order spiked covariance models relax the restrictive assumptions (such as the Kronecker product and sum) while still allowing a large number of free variables in the covariance tensor Σ .

1.2 Our Contributions

We present the Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit (MOP-UP) framework, designed to uncover concealed variations in both the row and column dimensions of data matrices. MOP-UP is supported by a novel class of matrix-variate spiked covariance models, representing a significant generalization beyond the traditional vector-case spiked covariance model. The decomposition formula (4) we introduce offers enhanced flexibility compared to existing dimension reduction formulations in the literature, enabling effective decomposition of a series of matrices. Our framework also extends the spiked covariance model to accommodate matrix and higher-order tensor samples, broadening its applicability from a statistical perspective.

To address dimension reduction for data matrices adhering to the MOP-UP framework and the matrix spiked covariance model, we propose two novel methods: Average Subspace Capture (ASC) and Alternating Projection (AP). The ASC method introduces a new average projector estimator, distinct from the commonly used spectral initialization method found in existing literature. We highlight the geometric interpretations of ASC and provide theoretical guarantees that it achieves precise recovery of singular spaces almost sure in the noiseless scenarios. In contrast, our AP iteration procedure significantly deviates from the prevailing class of power iteration algorithms seen in the literature. We establish that AP essentially performs alternating minimization for an objective function that can be readily interpreted. Furthermore, we derive a statistical upper bound on the estimation error for ASC, AP, as well as their combined usage, providing valuable insights into their performance.

We also study the methods and theory for higher-order spiked covariance models. Our investigation reveals notable differences in the algorithmic procedures for the spiked covariance model across various cases, including vector-variate, matrix-variate, and higher-order-variate scenar-

ios. To provide a comprehensive overview, we summarize a comparison of the decomposition procedures for these different variate cases in Table 1.

	Vector case	Matrix case	Higher-order tensor case
Initialization	SVD	Average Subspace Capture (ASC)	HOSVD
Followup iteration?	No	No (noiseless case) Yes (noisy case)	Yes

Table 1: Comparison of procedures for spiked models in different variate cases

To validate the efficacy of our model, we conduct data experiments on both synthetic and real-world datasets. First, we do simulation studies to show the tightness of our error bounds. Second, we apply the MOP-UP method to preprocess the MNIST dataset, reducing the dimensionality of the digit images before training a classifier. This approach yields interpretable dimension-reduced image features and demonstrated accurate prediction accuracy in the testing set when compared to traditional tensor methods. Third, we utilize the MOP-UP method on a human brain fMRI dataset obtained from a clinical study on cocaine use. Our results clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework in preprocessing the data for the classification of cocaine and non-cocaine users, as well as for clustering region of interest (ROI) tasks. In both cases, our method showcases notable advantages in terms of the best prediction measurement and robustness across different input hyperparameters.

Furthermore, we introduce a new technical tool of a matrix perturbation bound, which greatly aids in the technical analysis of the proposed MOP-UP. Our innovative methodology focuses on deriving a blockwise eigenspace perturbation bound, enabling us to establish our primary result with precision. This approach holds substantial value not only in situations where classical perturbation bounds, such as Davis-Kahan’s theorem, may fall short in accurately assessing errors but also in other scenarios. Its applicability extends beyond the immediate context of our proposed MOP-UP, making it of independent interest.

1.3 Literature Review

In this section, we provide a brief overview of the related literature in the field. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is one of the most well-established dimensionality reduction techniques, and numerous variations and related methods have been extensively studied. Textbooks such as [Jolliffe \(2005\)](#); [Abdi & Williams \(2010\)](#) offer comprehensive coverage of PCA and its variants, including factor analysis, independent component analysis, and projection pursuit. Several studies have investigated the distribution of eigenvalues in PCA under various assumptions. For example, [Johnstone \(2001\)](#) examined the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in PCA when the covariance matrix is an identity matrix under Gaussianity. [Paul \(2007\)](#) analyzed the eigenvalue distribution assuming Gaussianity and a specific covariance matrix structure. Shrinkage methods for eigenvalue regularization were studied by [Donoho et al. \(2018\)](#) under more general settings. Asymptotic properties of eigenvalues and eigenvectors were explored by [Bao et al. \(2022\)](#). Extensions of PCA to matrices and images have also been investigated. Matrix PCA or 2-D PCA methods were developed to analyze matrix objects and images ([Ye et al., 2004](#); [Ye, 2004](#)). [Yang et al. \(2004\)](#) considered applying linear transformations to the right side of observed matrices, while [Ye et al. \(2004\)](#) proposed an algorithm that incorporated spatial correlation of image pixels and applied linear transformations to both the left and right sides of observed matrices. [He et al. \(2005\)](#) introduced the tensor subspace analysis algorithm, which treats input images as matrices residing in a tensor space and detects local geometric structures within that space. Furthermore, studies by [Koltchinskii & Lounici \(2016, 2017\)](#); [Koltchinskii et al. \(2020\)](#) have focused on the spectral distribution of sample covariance matrices. [Zhang et al. \(2022\)](#) proposed HeteroPCA, a variation of PCA that accounts for heteroskedasticity in the data.

PCA relies on the mathematical tool of Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), which is a widely used matrix decomposition method. In recent years, SVD has been extended to tensor objects, leading to various generalizations such as Canonical Polyadic (CP) decomposition ([Anandkumar et al., 2014](#); [Ouyang & Yuan, 2023](#)), tensor train ([Zhou et al., 2022](#)), and Tucker decomposition ([Hitchcock, 1927](#)). To find the best low Tucker rank approximation of a given tensor, [De Lathauwer et al. \(2000a\)](#) introduced Higher Order Singular Value Decomposition (HOSVD), and [De Lathauwer et al. \(2000b\)](#) introduced an alternating least squares algorithm known as High Order Orthogonal Iteration (HOOI). HOOI iteratively projects the tensor into a

lower-dimensional space along each mode. The statistical modeling and performance analysis of HOOI were explored in [Zhang & Xia \(2018\)](#). However, these previous works focused on decomposing a single tensor without considering multiple samples from different subjects. The most relevant paper to our work is [Lu et al. \(2008\)](#), which addressed this limitation by generalizing HOOI to handle multiple tensor observations. Their method, called Multilinear Principal Component Analysis (MPCA), extended the framework to incorporate multiple tensors. Several variations of MPCA have been proposed, including a TTP-based MSL algorithm ([Tao et al., 2008](#)), robust MPCA ([Inoue et al., 2009](#)), nonnegative MPCA ([Panagakis et al., 2009](#)), and others. A survey by [Lu et al. \(2011\)](#) provides a comprehensive summary of methods in this field, including these variations and techniques.

These developments in PCA, SVD, and tensor decomposition methods have partly inspired the framework and algorithms proposed in our work.

1.4 Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we provide notation, preliminaries, and a detailed discussion of the matrix spiked covariance model. We then introduce our algorithm in [Section 3](#) and discuss its interpretation in [Section 3.2](#). We compare our model and algorithm to other methods in [Section 3.3](#). The theoretical properties of the algorithms are developed in [Section 4](#). Specifically in [Section 4.4](#), we introduce a technical lemma, a blockwise eigenspace perturbation bound, which plays a key role in our analysis. Furthermore, we present a simulation study in [Section 5](#) and real data experiments in [Section 6](#). Finally, we discuss the generalization to higher order tensor cases and summarise our results in [Section 7](#).

2 Models

2.1 Notation and Preliminaries

In this work, lowercase letters (u, v, μ , etc.) represent scalars or vectors; uppercase letters (A, B, U , etc.) represent matrices; and bold uppercase letters (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} , etc.) represent tensors.

For variables x and y , $x \lesssim y$ represents that there exists some constant c that does not depend on x or y such that $x \leq cy$. For a vector a , $\|a\|$ denotes its l_2 norm. Let I be the identity matrix with an appropriate dimension based on the context. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, $\sigma_i(A)$ represents the i th singular value of A , and all the singular values are ordered by its magnitude: $\sigma_1(A) \geq \sigma_2(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{p,q\}} \geq 0$; $\text{SVD}_r(A) = [u_1, \dots, u_r]$ represents the matrix consisting of the top r left singular vectors of A , where u_i is the singular vector of matrix A corresponding to the singular value $\sigma_i(A)$; $P_A = A(A^\top A)^\dagger A$ denotes an orthogonal projection matrix onto its column space, where $(\cdot)^\dagger$ is the matrix pseudo-inverse; $\|A\|$ is the spectral norm of A , which is equal to its largest singular value, $\sigma_1(A)$; $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\text{tr}(AA^\top)}$ is the Frobenius norm of A .

The kernel (null space) of A is denoted as $\ker(A) = \{v : Av = 0\}$. The linear space spanned by all columns of A is denoted as $\text{Span}(A) = \{v = Aw : w \in \mathbb{R}^p\}$. The sum of two linear spaces \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} is represented as $\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{W} = \{u = v + w : v \in \mathcal{V}, w \in \mathcal{W}\}$. We define $A\mathcal{V} = \{Av : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ as the range of A constrained to \mathcal{V} . When A is symmetric with dimensions $p = q$, $\lambda_r(A)$ represents its r th eigenvalue, ordered such that $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$, and $\text{Eigen}_r(A) = [u_1, \dots, u_r]$ represents the matrix consisting of the top r eigenvectors of A . Notice when A is positive semi-definite, we have $\text{Eigen}_r(A) = \text{SVD}_r(A)$. For matrices A and B , $A \otimes B$ denotes their Kronecker product. We denote $\mathbb{O}_{p,r} := \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r} : U^\top U = I\}$ as the set of all p -by- r semi-orthogonal matrices, i.e., matrices with orthonormal columns. For $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, U_\perp represents a matrix in $\mathbb{O}_{p,p-r}$ whose columns are orthogonal to the columns of U . In this work, we employ the $\sin \Theta$ distance to characterize the distance between subspaces. For any $U, V \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, we define $\|\sin \Theta(U, V)\| = \|U_\perp^\top V\| = \|UU^\top - VV^\top\|$.

An order- d tensor $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_d}$ can be viewed as a multidimensional array, where (i_1, \dots, i_d) maps to $\mathbf{A}_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \in \mathbb{R}$. For convenience, we define $\mathbf{p} = p_1 \times \dots \times p_d$. For a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k \times r_k}$, the mode- k product of tensor \mathbf{A} by matrix B is denoted as $\mathbf{A} \times_k B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_{k-1} \times r_k \times p_{k+1} \times \dots \times p_d}$ and defined as $(\mathbf{A} \times_k B)_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = \sum_{j=1}^{p_k} \mathbf{A}_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} j i_{k+1} \dots i_d} B_{i_k j}$. The mode- k unfolding of tensor \mathbf{A} is denoted as $\mathcal{M}_k(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_k \times p-k}$ and defined as $(\mathcal{M}_k(\mathbf{A}))_{i_k, h} = \mathbf{A}_{i_1 \dots i_d}$, where $h = i_1 + p_1(i_2 - 1) + \dots + \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} p_j(i_{k+1} - 1) + p_{k+1} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} p_j(i_{k+2} - 1) + \dots + \prod_{j \neq k, j \leq d-1} p_j(i_d - 1)$. When referring to a random tensor \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{X}_i denotes its i.i.d. samples. If the random tensor already has a sub-index (e.g., \mathbf{A}_k), a comma is used to separate the sample index and its original sub-index (e.g., $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}$). The symbol $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}^d}$ represents an order- $(2d)$ tensor in

$\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}}$ with entries $(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d})_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}} = 1$, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d)$, $q_k \in \{1, \dots, p_k\}$, and 0 elsewhere. The symbol $\mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)_2}$ represents an order-4 tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_1 \times p_2}$ with entries $(\mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)_2})_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}} = 1$, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2)$, $q_1 \in \{1, \dots, p_1\}$, $q_2 \in \{1, \dots, p_2\}$, and 0 elsewhere.

Any additional notation will be introduced and defined when they are first used.

2.2 Matrix Spiked Covariance Model

We formally introduce the following matrix spiked covariance model as follows.

Definition 1 (High-order Spiked Covariance Model Matrix Variate Case). Suppose $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ is a random matrix. We say X has a *rank- (r_1, r_2) high-order spiked covariance*, if there exists $\sigma^2 > 0$, $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}$, and $V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X) &= \Sigma_0 + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)}, \quad \Sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times p_1 \times p_2}, \\ \Sigma_0 \times_1 U_\perp \times_2 V_\perp &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem shows that the high-order spiked model can be equivalently written as a decomposition form (6) as depicted in Figure 1.

Theorem 1 (Equivalent Definitions for High-order Spiked Covariance). $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ satisfies the high-order spiked covariance model if and only if there exist a deterministic matrix M , random matrices $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times r_2}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times p_2}$ with mean 0 such that

$$X = M + UA + BV^\top + Z. \quad (6)$$

Here, $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}$, $V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$ are fixed semi-orthogonal matrices, $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ is a random matrix, where all entries of Z are independent with mean zero and covariance σ^2 , and are uncorrelated with A, B .

The question of identifiability is particularly important: if a population covariance tensor $\text{Cov}(X)$ satisfies a high-order spiked covariance model (i.e., (6) holds), when can the subspaces $\text{span}(U)$ and $\text{span}(V)$ be uniquely identified based on X ? The following theorem provides a mild sufficient condition for identifiability.

Theorem 2 (Identifiability Condition for Matrix Spiked Covariance Model). *Suppose $Y = UA + BV^\top$, where $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}$, $V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$ are deterministic matrices and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times p_2}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times r_2}$ are random matrices. Suppose for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ and any affine subspace² $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, either $\mathbb{P}(UA v \in \mathcal{W} | B) = 0$ or $\text{span}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{W}$. Then, U is identifiable in the sense that for any fixed $U' \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}$, if $\|\sin \Theta(U, U')\| \neq 0$, then $\Sigma \times_1 P_{U'_\perp} \times_2 P_{V'_\perp} \neq 0$ for any fixed $V' \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$, where Σ is the covariance tensor of Y .*

Remark 1. *The condition on A is guaranteed if, for any fixed vector $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \setminus \{0\}$, the random vector Av_1 has a conditional density given B . When $d = 1$, this condition reduces to for a random variable A , $P(A = r | B) = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$.*

3 Algorithm: MOP-UP

In this section, we focus on the following key question of MOU-UP: given observations $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ with the high-order spiked covariance, how we can achieve a sufficient dimension reduction by recovering the loading matrices U and V .

3.1 Algorithm

The overall algorithm includes two steps: initialization and iterative update, which are described below. The algorithms will be interpreted in Section 3.2.

Initialization via Average Subspace Capture (ASC). We first centralize $\{X_i\}$ by subtracting their mean matrix $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then we introduce an initialization method as summarized in Algorithm 1. The initialization method builds upon the geometric analysis to be presented in Section 3.2.

Update via Alternating Projection (AP). Next, starting from the initialization $\{\hat{U}_j^{(0)}\}_{j=1}^d$ obtained above, we perform the following iterative steps, summarized in Algorithm 2:

²In this work, affine subspace refers to $\{v + e_1 u_1 + \dots + e_r u_r : e_1, \dots, e_r \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where v, u_1, \dots, u_r are all vectors of the same dimension.

Algorithm 1 Initialization: Average Subspace Capture (ASC)

Input: Data matrices $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$, target rank (r_1, r_2)

Output: Estimation \hat{U}, \hat{V}

Centralization: $X_i \leftarrow X_i - \bar{X}$

if $r_1 + r_2 < p_1$ **then**

$$\hat{U} \leftarrow \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i) \cdot \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i)^\top \right)$$

else

$$\hat{U} \leftarrow I_{p_1}$$

end if

if $r_1 + r_2 < p_2$ **then**

$$\hat{V} \leftarrow \text{Eigen}_{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i^\top) \cdot \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i^\top)^\top \right)$$

else

$$\hat{V} \leftarrow I_{p_2}$$

end if

return \hat{U}, \hat{V}

- Multiply each centralized sample $(X_i - \bar{X})$ by $\hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)}$ on its left or $\hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)}$ on its right, and then multiply the transpose of the resulting matrix: $X_i^\top \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i$ and $X_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i^\top$.
- Define $\hat{U}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{V}^{(t)}$ as the matrix consisting of the first r_1 and r_2 eigenvectors of the sum of the matrices obtained from the previous step:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}^{(t)} &= \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\top \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i \right), \\ \hat{V}^{(t)} &= \text{Eigen}_{r_2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i^\top \right). \end{aligned}$$

We repeat these steps until convergence or a maximum number of iterations is reached. By iterating this procedure, we obtain estimates $\hat{U}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{V}^{(t)}$ that capture the loading matrices U and V in the high-order spiked covariance model. Our algorithm is inspired by alternating minimization, where a detailed explanation is given in Section 3.2.

We further consider how to denoise each matrix observation, i.e., to estimate $X_i - Z_i = UA_i + B_iV^\top$. First, matrices A_i, B_i are not identifiable from X_i even if U and V are known

exactly because there are multiple equivalent decompositions of $UA_i + B_iV^\top$:

$$UA_i + B_iV^\top = U(A_i + U^\top B_iV^\top) + U_\perp U_\perp^\top B_iV^\top = UA_iV_\perp V_\perp^\top + (UA_iV + B_i)V^\top.$$

So, it is infeasible to apply the plugin estimates of A_i, B_i to estimate $UA_i + B_iV^\top$. On the other hand, $UA_i + B_iV^\top$ is in the subspace $\mathcal{P}(U, V) = \{H \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2} : P_U H P_V = 0\}$. Thus, it is natural to apply the projection operator to estimate the signal part $UA_i + B_iV$ of the observation matrix X_i :

$$\hat{X}_i = P_{\mathcal{P}(\hat{U}, \hat{V})}(X_i) = X_i - \hat{U}_\perp \hat{U}_\perp^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) \hat{V}_\perp \hat{V}_\perp^\top. \quad (7)$$

Algorithm 2 Alternating Projection (AP)

Input: Data matrices $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$, target rank (r_1, r_2) , initialization $\hat{U}^{(0)}, \hat{V}^{(0)}$, maximal number of iteration t_0 .

Output: Estimation $\hat{U}^{(t)}, \hat{V}^{(t)}$

Centralization: $X_i \leftarrow X_i - \bar{X}$

for t in $1 : t_0$ **do**

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}^{(t)} &\leftarrow \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\top \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{U}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i \right) \\ \hat{U}^{(t)} &\leftarrow \text{Eigen}_{r_2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i^\top \right) \end{aligned}$$

Break the for loop if converged or maximum number of iteration t_0 reached

end for

return $\hat{U}^{(t)}, \hat{V}^{(t)}$

Rank Selection. The target rank can be determined through two approaches. Suppose $\hat{U}^{(r_1, r_2)}, \hat{V}^{(r_1, r_2)}$ are the output of MOP-UP with the input rank (r_1, r_2) . Firstly, a scree plot of the loss $\sum_{i=1}^n \|P_{\hat{U}_\perp^{(r_1, r_2)}}(X_i - \bar{X})P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(r_1, r_2)}}\|_F^2$ can be utilized. Alternatively, a BIC-type criterion can be employed. Note that for a p -by- r matrix with orthogonal columns, the number of free parameters is given by $(p-1) + (p-2) + \dots + (p-r) = (2p-r-1) \times r/2$. Hence, in our model, the total number of parameters is $(r_1(2p_1 - r_1 - 1) + r_2(2p_2 - r_2 - 1))/2$. Consequently, the penalization term in BIC is defined as $\log(np_1p_2) (r_1(2p_1 - r_1 - 1) + r_2(2p_2 - r_2 - 1))/2$, and

the rank r_1, r_2 can be determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(BIC)} \quad (\hat{r}_1, \hat{r}_2) = \arg \min_{r_1, r_2} & \sum_{i=1}^n \|P_{\hat{U}_\perp^{(r_1, r_2)}}(X_i - \bar{X})P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(r_1, r_2)}}\|_F^2 \\ & + \log(np_1p_2)(r_1(2p_1 - r_1 - 1) + r_2(2p_2 - r_2 - 1))/2. \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Interpretations

In this section, we provide interpretations for both the proposed ASC and AP algorithms.

Interpretation of ASC. We introduce the following key observation.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}, V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$ are semi-orthogonal matrices, A and B are some random matrices with densities in $\mathbb{R}^{p_2 r_1}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 r_2}$ respectively, the population matrix satisfies $X = UA + BV^\top$, and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. copies of X . If $nr_2 \leq (n-1)(p_1 - r_1)$, then $\text{span}(U)$ equals the common subspace of column spaces of all X_i , $\text{span}(U) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$, almost surely.*

Theorem 3 reveals that finding U can be reduced to finding the intersection space of all $\text{span}(X_i)$ in the noiseless matrix spiked covariance model. Note that $\hat{P}_i := \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i) \cdot \text{SVD}_{r_1+r_2}(X_i)^\top$ is a projection matrix and we have $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i/n\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{P}_i/n\| = 1$. Suppose λ_j and e_j are the j -th eigenvalue and eigenvector of $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i/n$, respectively. Then $\lambda_j = 1$ if and only if $e_j \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(\hat{P}_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$. By Theorem 3, we have $\text{span}(U) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$ and hence for $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, $u \in \text{span}(U)$ is equivalent to that u is an eigenvector of $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i/n$ corresponding to the eigenvalue 1. This leads to the following Corollary 1, which shows that ASC exactly recovers U almost surely in the noiseless case under mild conditions.

Corollary 1. *Under the same condition as in Theorem 3, Algorithm 1 (ASC) exactly recovers $\text{span}(U)$ almost surely in the sense that $\hat{U} = UO$ for some orthogonal matrix $O \in \mathbb{O}_{r_1}$ almost surely.*

On the contrary, the classical high-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD) (De Lathauwer et al., 2000a), denoted as

$$\hat{U} = \text{SVD}_{r_1}([X_1 \ X_2 \ \cdots \ X_n]),$$

has often been employed for initialization in various tensor problems (Zhang & Xia, 2018; Han et al., 2022a). However, it fails to exactly recover U . This limitation arises from the fact that $\text{span}(U)$ does not necessarily correspond to the singular subspace of $[X_1 \ X_2 \ \cdots \ X_n]$. This discrepancy can even be observed in a simple scenario when $r_1 = r_2 = 1$, i.e., $X_i = ua_i^\top + b_iv^\top$. If $b_i \neq u$ and $b_i^\top u \neq 0$, u is not the left singular vector of X_i .

Interpretation of AP. Given the nature of the high-order spiked covariance model from Definition 1, it is logical to explore the minimization of the following objective function:

$$\min_{\substack{U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1} \\ V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| U_\perp^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) V_\perp \right\|_F^2. \quad (8)$$

However, the objective function (8) poses a significant challenge as it is highly non-convex and, in general, evaluating it can be NP-hard. To address this computational difficulty, the proposed AP (Algorithm 2) offers a solution that leverages the insights presented in the following proposition: Algorithm 2 (AP) can be viewed as an alternative minimization scheme involving $U^{(t)}$ and $V^{(t)}$.

Proposition 1. *For any given matrices $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ and $V' \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| U_\perp^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) V'_\perp \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\{ \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X}) V'_\perp V'^\top_\perp (X_i - \bar{X})^\top \right) O : \forall O \in \mathbb{O}_{r_k} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar result holds symmetrically for minimization over V .

3.3 Matrix Spiked Covariance Model versus Existing Models

Next, we briefly compare the proposed procedure with the conventional methods in the existing literature. As mentioned in the introduction, the matrix and higher-order spiked covariance model can be viewed as a generalization of the classic spiked covariance model discussed in previous studies (Johnstone, 2001; Donoho et al., 2013; Paul, 2007). In the classic spiked covariance model, we consider a scenario where x_1, \dots, x_n are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) instances of a p -dimensional random vector x , satisfying the condition:

$$\mathbb{E}x = \mu, \quad \text{Var}(x) = \Sigma_0 + \sigma^2 I, \quad \Sigma_0 = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i u_i^\top,$$

where $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r \geq 0$ are the eigenvalues, $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ are orthonormal eigenvectors. Denote $U = [u_1, \dots, u_r]$, and $U_\perp \in \mathbb{O}_{p,p-r}$ as the orthogonal complement of U . Then we have $\Sigma_0 U_\perp = 0$. Meanwhile, the proposed AP (Algorithm 2) in vector-variate case reduces to the regular PCA estimator:

$$\hat{U} = \text{Eigen}_r \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(x_i - \bar{x})^\top \right).$$

There is no need to include any initialization step in this vector-variate case.

The proposed high-order spiked model is also related to the matrix case of MPCA (Lu et al., 2008), which aims to decompose the observation matrices to

$$X_i = U S_i V^\top + Z_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (9)$$

By decomposing X_i into four blocks, we have:

$$X_i = P_U X_i P_V + P_U X_i P_{V_\perp} + P_{U_\perp} X_i P_V + P_{U_\perp} X_i P_{V_\perp}.$$

While MPCA focuses on extracting $P_U X_i P_V$ and treating the other three parts as residuals, our high-order spiked covariance model captures $P_U X_i P_V$, $P_U X_i P_{V_\perp}$, and $P_{U_\perp} X_i P_V$, while reducing the contribution of the fourth block $P_{U_\perp} X_i P_{V_\perp}$. As a result, the proposed MOP-UP outperforms MPCA when the columns and rows of the data contain important information that is not solely derived from their common space $P_U X_i P_V$.

MPCA can be solved using a variant of high-order orthogonal iteration (HOOI; De Lathauwer et al., 2000b), a broader class of algorithms widely employed in Tucker low-rank tensor decomposition. See Lu et al. (2008). In the case of MPCA, $\hat{U}^{(t)}$ is computed at each iteration by projecting X_i^\top onto $\text{span}(\hat{V}^{(t-1)})$. In contrast, Algorithm 2 in our approach projects X_i^\top onto the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}(\hat{V}^{(t-1)})$, denoted as $\text{span}(\hat{V}^{(t-1)})^\perp$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HOOI: } \quad \hat{U}^{(t)} &= \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i \hat{V}^{(t-1)} \hat{V}^{(t-1)\top} X_i^\top \right) \right), \\ \text{AP (Algorithm 2): } \quad \hat{U}^{(t)} &= \text{Eigen}_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)} \hat{V}_\perp^{(t-1)\top} X_i^\top \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This distinction arises from the fact that the matrix spiked covariance model considers only $U_\perp^\top X_i V_\perp$ as the decomposition residual, whereas MPCA treats $U^\top X_i V_\perp$, $U_\perp^\top X_i V$, and $U_\perp^\top X_i V_\perp$ as the decomposition residuals.

4 Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we provide the theoretical guarantees for the proposed algorithm. Specifically, we establish the estimation error bounds for ASC and AP in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively. The combination of these bounds allows us to derive the desired estimation error bound for the proposed MOP-UP estimator in Section 4.3.

4.1 Error Bound for Initialization via ASC

Recall that Corollary 1 demonstrates that ASC achieves exact recovery of U in the absence of noise. The subsequent theorem addresses the scenario where noise is present.

Theorem 4 (Error bound of ASC in the noisy case). *Suppose $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}, V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$ are fixed semi-orthogonal matrices, A and B are random matrices with densities in $\mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times p_2}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times r_2}$ respectively, Z is a random noise matrix with i.i.d. entries in $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ independent of A and B , the population matrix satisfies $X = UA + BV^\top + Z$, $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. copies of X , and $nr_2 \leq (n-1)(p_1 - r_1)$. For any $0 \leq c \leq 1/2$, define $C^* := \frac{c^2}{8} + \mathbb{P}(4\|Z\| > c\sigma_r(UA + BV^\top))$. If we further have*

$$n \geq c_1 \log p_1 \max \left\{ C^{*-2}, \left(1 - \lambda_1 \left(\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp U_\perp^\top B_1} \right) \right)^{-2} \right\}$$

for some constant c_1 , then with probability greater than $1 - \exp\{-(c_1 - 1)\}$, it follows that

$$\|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, U)\| \lesssim \frac{2C^*}{1 - \lambda_1 \left(\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp U_\perp^\top B} \right)}.$$

The determination of the value $\lambda_1 \left(\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp U_\perp^\top B_1} \right)$ is of utmost importance in establishing Theorem 4. To illustrate the calculation of this value, consider the following example involving i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables.

Example 1. *Suppose the entries of B are i.i.d. standard Gaussian distributed. Then, we have $\mathbb{E}P_{P_{U_\perp} B_1} = \min\{1, r_2/(p_1 - r_1)\} \cdot P_{U_\perp}$ and hence $\lambda_1 \left(\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp U_\perp^\top B} \right) = \min\{1, r_2/(p_1 - r_1)\}$.*

4.2 Local Convergence of Iterations of AP

Next, we focus on the theoretical analysis for AP. To this end, we introduce the following assumptions.

Assumption 1 (Conditions on Scores A and B). *Assume in decomposition (6), A and B are independent and there is some μ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mu \leq \frac{\max\{\|A\|, \|B\|\}}{\min\{\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}\}} \right\} \leq \nu, \quad \text{for some small } \nu < 1.$$

Denote

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ \lambda_{\min} \left(\mathbb{E} A P_{V_{\perp}} A^{\top} / p_2 \right), \lambda_{\min} \left(\mathbb{E} B^{\top} P_{U_{\perp}} B / p_1 \right) \right\}.$$

We have $\mu^2/\lambda \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

Here, μ^2/λ can be interpreted as a conditional number reflecting balance among singular values of A and B . So, Assumption 1 essentially means the condition number of the score matrices A and B is bounded.

Define the sub-Gaussian norm of a random variable X as $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf \{c > 0 : \mathbb{E} [\exp(X^2/c^2)] \leq 2\}$ (Vershynin, 2018).

Assumption 2 (Conditions on noise Z). *Z has i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries with mean 0 and sub-Gaussian norm τ .*

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 5. *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of matrices that satisfy the decomposition (6). Suppose the output of Algorithm 2 is $\hat{U}^{(t)}, \hat{V}^{(t)}$ and define the errors as*

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(t)})\|, \|\sin \Theta(V, \hat{V}^{(t)})\| \right\}.$$

Assume that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. For any given $c_1 > 0$, there exist constants $c_2, c_3, c_4 < 1, c_5$ (all independent of any variable in the following inequalities) such that if initialization error $\text{Error}^{(0)} \leq c_3$ and n satisfies:

$$n \geq c_2 r_{\max} p_{\max} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max}^2 \tau^4}{p_{\min}^2 \mu^4}, \frac{p_{\max}^3 \tau^2}{p_{\min}^3 \mu^2}, \frac{p_{\max}^{3/2} \tau}{p_{\min}^{3/2} \mu}, 1 \right\},$$

then with a probability greater than $1 - e^{-c_1 r_{\min} p_{\max}} - \nu$, $\text{Error}^{(t)}$ converges linearly with rate c_4 :

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} - \text{Error} \leq c_4 \left(\text{Error}^{(t-1)} - \text{Error} \right),$$

and the final error is bounded by

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max} \tau}{p_{\min} \mu}, \frac{\tau^2}{\mu^2} \right\},$$

where $r_{\max} = \max\{r_1, r_2\}$, $r_{\min} = \min\{r_1, r_2\}$, $p_{\min} = \min\{p_1, p_2\}$ and $p_{\max} = \max\{p_1, p_2\}$.

4.3 Overall Theory for MOP-UP

The global convergence of Algorithms 1 and 2 can be summarised as

Theorem 6. Suppose $U \in \mathbb{O}_{p_1, r_1}$, $V \in \mathbb{O}_{p_2, r_2}$ are some semi-orthogonal matrices, A and B are some random matrices with densities in $\mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times p_2}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times r_2}$ respectively, Z is a random noise matrix with i.i.d. entries in $\mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$ independent of A and B , the population matrix satisfies $X = UA + BV^\top + Z$, $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. copies of X , and $nr_2 \leq (n-1)(p_1 - r_1)$. Assume the following hold in addition to Assumptions 1 and 2:

1. $\lambda_1 \left(\mathbb{E} P_{U_\perp U_\perp^\top B_1} \right) < 1$;
2. $\exists c \in [0, 1/2]$ such that $C^* := \frac{c^2}{8} + \mathbb{P}(4\|Z\| > c\sigma_r(UA + BV^\top))$ small enough;

Then, for given constant c_1 , there exist constants c_2 and c_3 (do not depend on any variable that appears in the following equations) such that if

$$n \geq c_3 r_{\max} p_{\max} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max}^2 \tau^4}{p_{\min}^2 \mu^4}, \frac{p_{\max}^3 \tau^2}{p_{\min}^3 \mu^2}, \frac{p_{\max}^{3/2} \tau}{p_{\min}^{3/2} \mu}, C^{*-2}, 1 \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_1 r_{\min} p_{\max}} - e^{-c_3} - \nu$, the estimation error at t th iteration of Algorithm 2 initiated by Algorithm 1 converges linearly to the final error which is bounded by

$$\text{Error} \leq c_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max} \tau}{p_{\min} \mu}, \frac{\tau^2}{\mu^2} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

4.4 A Key Technical Tool: Blockwise Eigenspace Perturbation Bound

The subsequent technical tool is crucial in establishing the validity of Theorem 5 and possesses independent interests.

Theorem 7 (Blockwise Eigenspace Perturbation Bound). *Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a symmetric matrix, $\tilde{V} = [V, V_\perp] \in \mathbb{O}_p$ are eigenvectors of A , where $V \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, $V_\perp \in \mathbb{O}_{p,p-r}$ correspond to the first r and last $(p-r)$ eigenvectors of A , respectively. $\tilde{W} = [W, W_\perp] \in \mathbb{O}_p$ is any orthogonal matrix with $W \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, $W_\perp \in \mathbb{O}_{p,p-r}$. Given that $\lambda_r(W^\top A W) > \lambda_{r+1}(A)$, we have*

$$\|\sin \Theta(V, W)\|_F \leq \frac{\|W^\top A W_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)} \wedge \sqrt{r}$$

and

$$\|\sin \Theta(V, W)\| \leq \frac{\|W^\top A W_\perp\|}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)} \wedge 1.$$

Corollary 2 (Perturbation Bound). *Denote the eigenvalue decompositions of X and $X + Z$ as:*

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} U & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} U^\top \\ U_\perp^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{X} = X + Z = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U} & \hat{U}_\perp \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\Sigma}_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}^\top \\ \hat{U}_\perp^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then if $\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) > \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X})$, then

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X})} \wedge 1.$$

If further $\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) > \|P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}\| + \|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|$,

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \|P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}\| - \|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|} \wedge 1. \quad (11)$$

Compared to the classic Davis-Kahan Theorem (Davis & Kahan, 1970)

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|Z\|}{\min\{|\lambda_{r-1}(\hat{X}) - \lambda_r(X)|, |\lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X}) - \lambda_r(X)|\}},$$

our bound offers greater precision, particularly in the numerator of (11), which is $\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|$.

In our proof of Theorem 5, neither Davis-Kahan's nor Wedin's Theorem is sufficiently precise to establish the desired result. The reason is that, for example, in equation (6), a portion of

BV^\top is noise when we attempt to recover U . Therefore, it becomes necessary to decompose BV^\top into blocks, namely $P_U BV^\top$ and $P_{U^\perp} BV^\top$, in order to separate the signal from the noise. As a result, a blockwise perturbation bound as described in (2) can provide more appropriate bounds.

5 Simulation Study

In this section, we assess the performance of the proposed MOP-UP through simulated data in different settings.

In the following experimental setup, we investigate the estimation error under varying values of n , p_1 , and τ . For each combination of n , p_1 , R , and the distribution of Z , we conduct 10 simulations. In each simulation, we fix $p_2 = 30$, $r_1 = 5$, $r_2 = 7$, and generate independent samples for all entries of A_i and B_i from a uniform distribution over the interval $(-1, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We also independently generate a pair of orthogonal matrices U and V . The noise matrices Z_i are sampled independently in three different settings: bounded, normal, and heavy-tail distributions. Specifically, Z_i follows a uniform distribution over the interval $(-R, R)$, a Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance R^2 , or R times a random sample from a central t -distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. Next, we apply Algorithm 1 and 2 with 10 iterations and compute the mean and standard deviation of the estimation error over the 10 simulations. Notably, in Equation (10), $\tau \propto R$ and $\mu \propto 1$. Since we only take $R \leq 1$ and $p_1 \geq p_2$, we can simplify our theoretical upper bound (10) as follows:

$$\text{Error} = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|, \|\sin \Theta(V, \hat{V})\| \right\} \lesssim Rp_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}. \quad (12)$$

We plot the error mean versus parameters of interest and the length of the interval at each point is twice the standard deviation of Errors in Figures 2, 3 and 4. We also scale the axis according to the corresponding order on the right-hand side of the bound (12). In Figure 2, the x-axis is scaled by $p_1 \sqrt{\log p_1}$, R is set to be 0.1, and p_1 varies across the values of 30, 40, 50, 60, 80, and 100. In Figure 3, both axes are scaled by logarithm, p_1 is set to be 40, and R varies across the values of 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2 and 5. In Figure 4, x-axis is scaled by $|-n^{-1/2}|$, R is also set to be 0.1, and n varies across the values of $\{2^i\}_{i=2}^{12}$. We can see the

trending in plots are mostly linear, especially for large n and small p_1 . Since we have scaled the axis according to the right-hand side of (12), it indicates the simulation results are consistent with our error bound.




Figure 2: Estimation error of MOP-UP with the varying value of p_1




Figure 3: Estimation error of MOP-UP with the varying value of R




Figure 4: Estimation error of MOP-UP with the varying value of n

6 Real Data Analyses

To demonstrate the practical applicability of our model, we applied it to two real-world datasets: MNIST and Brain fMRI. We compared our method, referred to as MOP-UP, with MPCA. The results highlight the advantages of our method.

6.1 MNIST

In this section, we apply the MOP-UP method to the MNIST (Modified National Institute of Standards and Technology) database. We select the first 6,000 images out of a total of 60,000 handwritten digit images as our training set. Additionally, we select all 10,000 testing images as our testing set. Each image is represented as a 28 by 28 bounded matrix $X \in [0, 1]^{28 \times 28}$, where each entry corresponds to the grayscale of a pixel in the image (ranging from 0 for white to 1 for black).

We apply MOP-UP to the images in the training set $\{X_i \in [0, 1]^{28 \times 28}\}_{i=1}^{6000}$ for dimensional reduction. By utilizing Algorithms 1 and 2, we obtain the loading estimates $\hat{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{28 \times r_1}$ and $\hat{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{28 \times r_2}$ in the decomposition $X_i = \bar{X} + B_i V^\top + U A_i + Z_i$ with certain rank values (r_1, r_2) ,

where $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^{6000} X_i / 6000$ is the mean matrix of the training set. After that, we map each X_i to $\{\hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}, \hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}_\perp, \hat{U}_\perp^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}\}$, where the dimension of the right-hand side is $28(r_1 + r_2) - r_1r_2$. Similarly, we map the test images $\{\tilde{X}_i \in [0, 1]^{28 \times 28}\}_{i=1}^{10000}$ to $\tilde{X}_i \mapsto \{\hat{U}^\top(\tilde{X}_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}, \hat{U}^\top(\tilde{X}_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}_\perp, \hat{U}_\perp^\top(\tilde{X}_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}\}$.

To illustrate the effectiveness of our model, we utilize the training set after dimension reduction, denoted as $\{\hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}, \hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}_\perp, \hat{U}_\perp^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{V}\}_{i=1}^{6000}$, along with their corresponding labels $\{Y_i \in \{0, \dots, 9\}\}_{i=1}^{6000}$ to train a SVM (Support Vector Machine) classifier. Subsequently, we randomly divide the test set after dimension reduction into 10 folds. For each fold, we evaluate the test accuracy of the classifier, defined as the number of correctly classified samples divided by the total number of samples. We repeat this process for all 10 folds and calculate the mean and variance of the accuracy across the folds. It is important to note that we did not tune the hyperparameters of the SVM classifier, except for selecting the best kernel among linear, polynomial, radial, and sigmoid. We utilize the default settings of the R package `e1071` for the remaining hyperparameters. Based on our evaluation, the polynomial kernel yielded the best performance for the dimension-reduced data processed by MOP-UP.

We have also followed the same procedure, but this time we replaced MOP-UP with MPCA. For MPCA, the best kernel across all folds was found to be radial. We set $r := r_1 = r_2$ in both our model and MPCA, and varied the value of r from 2 to 14. The results of our comparison are presented in Figure 5. It is worth noting that when $r = 2$, the mean and standard deviation of our model were 0.9525 and 0.0050, respectively, while for MPCA, they were 0.5974 and 0.0151. As a result, the data point corresponding to $r = 2$ was excluded from the plot since it was out of scale.

In Figure 6, we visualize the dimension-reduced digit “9” images by MOP-UP with $r = 3$. We observe that $P_{\hat{V}}X$ captures the column information of the digit “9” image, while $XP_{\hat{V}}$ captures the row information. It is also worth noting that the top-left image in Figure 6 corresponds to a rank 6 matrix that captures the main features of the digit “9”. To provide a comparison, we also plot the same digit “9” image after applying MPCA with $r = 13, 6, 3$ in Figure 7. Notably, the dimension-reduced digit “9” images by MPCA with $r = 3$ or 6 ($r = 6$ matches the top-left image of Figure 6) is unidentifiable.




Figure 5: Comparison of accuracy: Mean accuracy across 10 folds versus rank $r = r_1 = r_2$ used as a hyperparameter in MPCA and our proposed MOP-UP. The length of the error bar represents the standard deviation.

6.2 Functional MRI of Cocaine Users

Next, we present the performance of MOP-UP on a Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) dataset, which was derived from a clinical study conducted by Duke University (Hall et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023). The study enrolled adults aged 18-60 with or without a history of cocaine use. Cocaine use was defined as regular cocaine use for more than 1 year, with a minimum of 2 days of use in the past 30 days. Non-cocaine use was defined as follows: no lifetime cocaine use (abuse or dependence), no history of regular cocaine use, no cocaine use in the past year, and a cocaine-negative urine drug screen. The study comprised a total of $n = 293$ subjects, with 94 of them identified as cocaine users. For each subject, an MRI scan was performed, and after preprocessing, a functional MRI (fMRI) matrix was obtained for each subject. Each fMRI matrix X_i , where $i = 1, \dots, 293$, is a symmetric matrix of size 246-by-246. Each row (or column) represents a Region of Interest (ROI), which corresponds to a group of neural nodes in a specific area of the human brain. The entry $(X_i)_{j,k}$ of the matrix represents the connection strength




Figure 6: Visualization of dimension reduced digit “9” images by MOP-UP




Figure 7: Visualization of dimension reduced digit “9” images by MPCA

between two ROIs, namely ROI_j and ROI_k . For further details regarding data acquisition, MRI processing, and background information, please refer to [Hall et al. \(2021\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#).

Classification. The objective of this subsection is to predict cocaine use based on dimension-reduced data obtained using our matrix spiked covariance model and the MOP-UP method. Given

that this is a binary classification problem, we evaluate the performance using the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (AUROC) and the Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve (AUPRC). These metrics are selected because they consider not only accuracy but also factors such as true positive rate and false positive rate, providing a comprehensive evaluation of the model’s performance.

We employ a 10-fold cross-validation procedure to evaluate the performance of our MOP-UP and MPCA methods. The process is as follows: First, we divide all samples into 10 folds, selecting one fold as the test set while pooling the remaining folds into a training set. We then specify the target rank, denoted as r , where in both MOP-UP and MPCA, we set $r_1 = r_2 = r$. The training set is fed into either MOP-UP or MPCA, resulting in the output matrices $\hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{U}$, $\hat{U}^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\hat{U}_\perp$ (due to symmetry) for MOP-UP or S_i for MPCA, where X_i represents the fMRI matrix of subject i , and \bar{X} denotes the sample mean.

Subsequently, we train a support vector machine (SVM) classifier using the output from either MOP-UP or MPCA, and evaluate the classifier’s performance on the test set, recording the AUROC and AUPRC metrics. This procedure is repeated 10 times, with each fold serving as the test set, and we report the mean values of the predictive measures across the 10 tests. We utilize the SVM classifier with four different kernels: linear, polynomial, radial, and sigmoid. The hyperparameters are set to their default values in the R package `e1071` without further tuning. For both MPCA and MOP-UP, we find that the radial and sigmoid kernels perform better, and thus we present the results for these two kernels in Tables 2 and 3.

The combination of MPCA and SVM achieves the best AUROC and AUPRC values of 0.756 and 0.692, respectively, with $r = 23$ and the radial kernel. On the other hand, the combination of MOP-UP and SVM yields the best AUROC and AUPRC values of 0.762 and 0.710, respectively, with $r = 3$ and the sigmoid kernel.

In a related study by [Gowin et al. \(2019\)](#), fMRI data along with demographic and clinic variables were used to train various linear models and a random forest classifier without employing dimension reduction techniques. The AUROC values reported in their study ranged from 0.53 to 0.65 for linear models and 0.62 for the random forest classifier. Both MOP-UP and MPCA outperform the results reported in [Gowin et al. \(2019\)](#), with MOP-UP demonstrating slightly

superior performance compared to MPCA. It is important to note that our approach does not utilize demographic or clinic information, and we did not perform parameter tuning for the SVM classifier.

r	Kernel	AUROC	AUPRC
2	radial	0.758	0.669
2	sigmoid	0.757	0.704
3	radial	0.761	0.696
3	sigmoid	0.762	0.710
4	radial	0.746	0.689
4	sigmoid	0.739	0.670
5	radial	0.739	0.667
5	sigmoid	0.733	0.652

Table 2: Classification result by MOP-UP

Clustering. We further perform unsupervised learning by clustering ROIs (Regions of Interest) based on the output of MOP-UP. As mentioned earlier, each row or column of the fMRI matrix corresponds to an ROI, and the matrix’s entries represent the connections between these ROIs. Therefore, our goal is to cluster the rows (or columns) of the fMRI matrix.

Given that the MOP-UP model achieved high performance in classification with $r = 3$, we expect it to preserve a significant amount of information from the original data. Consequently, we utilize the output $\hat{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{246 \times 3}$, which consists of 246 three-dimensional vectors. Each vector represents an ROI, and its entries represent the loadings of the ROI. We feed this output into the K-means clustering algorithm, which assigns a label vector l to the ROIs. To visualize the clustering result, we map the ROIs to their physical locations in the human brain, assign different colors to each cluster, and plot the result for $K = 6$ in Figure 8. It is important to note that no prior information about the physical locations of the ROIs was used in the clustering process. However, Figure 8 demonstrates that the ROIs belonging to the same clusters according to our method tend to be physically closer to each other.

r	Kernel	AUROC	AUPRC	r	Kernel	AUROC	AUPRC
4	radial	0.631	0.515	22	radial	0.750	0.687
4	sigmoid	0.629	0.542	22	sigmoid	0.742	0.644
12	radial	0.675	0.610	23	radial	0.756	0.692
12	sigmoid	0.627	0.542	23	sigmoid	0.739	0.637
14	radial	0.694	0.603	24	radial	0.742	0.663
14	sigmoid	0.650	0.537	24	sigmoid	0.750	0.644
16	radial	0.710	0.604	25	radial	0.734	0.661
16	sigmoid	0.680	0.573	25	sigmoid	0.746	0.646
17	radial	0.726	0.623	27	radial	0.738	0.664
17	sigmoid	0.697	0.580	27	sigmoid	0.736	0.650
18	radial	0.712	0.613	31	radial	0.731	0.665
18	sigmoid	0.684	0.566	31	sigmoid	0.714	0.638
20	radial	0.736	0.657	35	radial	0.720	0.642
20	sigmoid	0.729	0.626	35	sigmoid	0.701	0.615

Table 3: Classification result by MOP-UP

7 MOP-UP for Higher-order Tensors

In this section, we briefly discuss how the framework of MOP-UP can be extended to higher-order tensor data. Suppose we observe a collection of order- d tensors $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_d}$. Matrix data corresponds to $d = 2$ and we shall now consider the case when $d \geq 3$. We aim to identify mode-wise subspaces $U_k \in \mathbb{O}_{p_k, r_k}$ such that each tensor observation can be decomposed approximately as:

$$\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{M} + \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{ki} \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

To provide a rigorous statistical interpretation for the MOP-UP framework, we discussed briefly the higher-order spiked covariance model in Section 1.1. Denote $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d}$ as the order- $(2d)$ tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}}$ with entries $(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d})_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}} = 1$, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d)$, $q_k \in \{1, \dots, p_k\}$, and 0 elsewhere. Then, the order- d spiked covariance model can be defined as

Definition 2 (Order- d Spiked Covariance Model). Suppose $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is an order- d random




Figure 8: Clustering result of brain regions by MOP-UP and k-means ($k = 6$)

tensor with $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X} = 0$. We say \mathbf{X} has a *rank- \mathbf{r} high-order spiked covariance*, if there exists $\sigma^2 > 0$, $U_k \in \mathcal{O}_{p_k, r_k}$, such that

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) = \Sigma_0 + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d}, \quad \Sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p} \times \mathbf{p}},$$

$$\Sigma_0 \times_{k=1}^d U_{k\perp} = 0.$$

Many of the methods and theories presented in this paper for the matrix spiked covariance model can be extended to the higher-order case. One way to approach this is by considering the order- d spiked covariance model as equivalent to a decomposition form.

Theorem 8 (Equivalent forms for order- d spiked covariance model). $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$ has a *rank- \mathbf{r} high-order spiked covariance* (Definition 2) if and only if \mathbf{X} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z}, \quad (13)$$

where $U_k \in \mathcal{O}_{p_k, r_k}$ are fixed semi-orthogonal matrices, $\mathbf{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_{k-1} \times r_k \times p_{k+1} \times \dots \times p_d}$ are random tensors with mean 0, and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is a noise tensor, where all entries of \mathbf{Z} has mean 0, covariance $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{p}_d}$, and is uncorrelated with random tensors $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_d$.

Furthermore, the concept of identifiability can be extended to the tensor case, allowing for the generalization of Theorem 2. This generalization guarantees the identifiability of the mode-wise principal subspaces $\text{span}(U_k)$, where $k = 1, \dots, d$. The specific details and proof of this result can be found in Supplementary Materials, stated as Theorem 10.

However, in the case of order- d tensors ($d \geq 3$), the ASC algorithm (Algorithm 1) does not work as effectively as it does in the matrix case. In the matrix case, when recovering U , ASC requires two steps of singular value decomposition (SVD). The first SVD involves taking the first $r_1 + r_2$ singular vectors of X_i , where $r_1 + r_2$ is chosen to match the rank of X_i . The second SVD is performed on the average of some projectors. To ensure that the projectors are nontrivial (i.e., not identity operators), we require $r_1 + r_2 < p_1$ (which is implicitly enforced by the condition $nr_2 \leq (n-1)(p_1 - r_1)$ in Corollary 1). In the case of order- d tensors ($d \geq 3$), ensuring the almost sure exact recovery of U_1 would require $r_1 + \sum_{k=2}^d (r_k \prod_{h \neq 1, k} p_h) < p_1$, which is impractical to satisfy. A possible method for initialization is the classic high-order singular value decomposition (HOSVD), represented as

$$\hat{U}_k^{(0)} = \text{SVD}_{r_k} \left(\left[\mathcal{M}_k(\mathbf{X}_1) \ \dots \ \mathcal{M}_k(\mathbf{X}_n) \right] \right).$$

In this context, a possible approach is to matricize or unfold all tensor data along their k -th mode, combining them into a single matrix, and then applying singular value decomposition (SVD). However, the effectiveness of such a method HOSVD is not yet clearly understood. To overcome this limitation and tackle the challenges posed by higher-order spiked covariance models, it would be beneficial for future research to explore initialization methods. Such investigations could potentially lead to the development of more suitable approaches for addressing these challenges.

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that Algorithm 2, referred to as AP, remains applicable and can be further generalized to the tensor case as Algorithm 3. The resulting algorithm, when applied to tensors, provides an iterative projection-based approach for estimating the principal subspaces U_k . The corresponding final error bound in this tensor setting would be

$$\text{Error} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \theta \frac{u}{\mu}, \frac{u^2}{\mu^2} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{p_h}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}; h = 1, \dots, d \right\}$, $u = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z})}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_2}$ and μ is a high-probability

Algorithm 3 Alternating Projection AP for Order- d Data

Input: Data tensors $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_d}$, target rank (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_d) , initialization $\{\hat{U}_j^{(0)}\}_{j=1}^d$, maximal number of iteration t_0 .

Output: Estimation $\{\hat{U}_j^{(t)}\}_{j=1}^d$

Centralization: $\mathbf{X}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}$

for t in $1 : t_0$ **do**

for j in $1 : d$ **do**

$$\hat{U}_j^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{Eigen}_{r_j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_j \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{k \neq j} \left(\hat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t-1)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_j \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{k \neq j} \left(\hat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t-1)} \right)^\top \right)^\top \right)$$

end for

 Break the for loop if converged or maximum number of iteration t_0 reached

end for

return $\{\hat{U}_j^{(t)}\}_{j=1}^d$

upper bound of $\frac{\max_k \|\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_k)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}$. This result is formally stated as Theorem 11 in Supplementary Materials. In summary, the local convergence of Algorithm 3 is guaranteed with high probability given a proper initialization to be studied in the future.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Christina Meade and Ryan Bell for providing the functional MRI data from cocaine users and for helpful discussions. M. Yuan was supported in part by NSF Grants DMS-2015285 and DMS-2052955. A. R. Zhang was supported in part by NSF CAREER-2203741.

References

- Abdi, H. & Williams, L. J. (2010). Principal component analysis. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: computational statistics*, 2(4), 433–459.
- Anandkumar, A., Ge, R., & Janzamin, M. (2014). Guaranteed non-orthogonal tensor decomposition via alternating rank-1 updates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.5180*.

- Bao, Z., Ding, X., Wang, J., & Wang, K. (2022). Statistical inference for principal components of spiked covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(2), 1144–1169.
- Bhatia, R. (1997). Matrix analysis, volume 169 of. *Graduate texts in mathematics*.
- Cai, T. T., Li, X., & Ma, Z. (2016). Optimal rates of convergence for noisy sparse phase retrieval via thresholded wirtinger flow. *The Annals of Statistics*, to appear.
- Cai, T. T., Ma, Z., & Wu, Y. (2013). Sparse pca: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(6), 3074–3110.
- Cai, T. T. & Zhang, A. (2018). Rate-optimal perturbation bounds for singular subspaces with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(1), 60–89.
- Chen, X. & Liu, W. (2015). Statistical inference for matrix-variate gaussian graphical models and false discovery rate control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05453*.
- Chen, Y., Chi, Y., Fan, J., Ma, C., et al. (2021). Spectral methods for data science: A statistical perspective. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 14(5), 566–806.
- Davis, C. & Kahan, W. M. (1970). The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. iii. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 7(1), 1–46.
- Dawid, A. P. (1981). Some matrix-variate distribution theory: notational considerations and a bayesian application. *Biometrika*, 68(1), 265–274.
- De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B., & Vandewalle, J. (2000a). A multilinear singular value decomposition. *SIAM journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 21(4), 1253–1278.
- De Lathauwer, L., De Moor, B., & Vandewalle, J. (2000b). On the best rank-1 and rank-(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n) approximation of higher-order tensors. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 21(4), 1324–1342.
- Ding, S. & Cook, R. D. (2017). Matrix-variate regressions and envelope models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, (accepted).
- Donoho, D. L., Gavish, M., & Johnstone, I. M. (2013). Optimal shrinkage of eigenvalues in the spiked covariance model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.0851*.

- Donoho, D. L., Gavish, M., & Johnstone, I. M. (2018). Optimal shrinkage of eigenvalues in the spiked covariance model. *Annals of statistics*, 46(4), 1742.
- Dutilleul, P. (1999). The mle algorithm for the matrix normal distribution. *Journal of statistical computation and simulation*, 64(2), 105–123.
- Fan, K. (1951). Maximum properties and inequalities for the eigenvalues of completely continuous operators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 37(11), 760.
- Gowin, J. L., Ernst, M., Ball, T., May, A. C., Sloan, M. E., Tapert, S. F., & Paulus, M. P. (2019). Using neuroimaging to predict relapse in stimulant dependence: A comparison of linear and machine learning models. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 21, 101676.
- Greenewald, K., Tsiligkaridis, T., & Hero, A. O. (2013). Kronecker sum decompositions of space-time data. In *Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP), 2013 IEEE 5th International Workshop on* (pp. 65–68): IEEE.
- Greenewald, K., Zhou, S., & Hero III, A. (2017). Tensor graphical lasso (teralasso). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03983*.
- Hall, S. A., Bell, R. P., Davis, S. W., Towe, S. L., Ikner, T. P., & Meade, C. S. (2021). Human immunodeficiency virus-related decreases in corpus callosal integrity and corresponding increases in functional connectivity. *Human Brain Mapping*, 42(15), 4958–4972.
- Han, R., Luo, Y., Wang, M., & Zhang, A. R. (2022a). Exact clustering in tensor block model: Statistical optimality and computational limit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(5), 1666–1698.
- Han, R., Willett, R., & Zhang, A. R. (2022b). An optimal statistical and computational framework for generalized tensor estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(1), 1–29.
- He, X., Cai, D., & Niyogi, P. (2005). Tensor subspace analysis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 18.
- Hitchcock, F. L. (1927). The expression of a tensor or a polyadic as a sum of products. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics*, 6(1-4), 164–189.

- Hoff, P., McCormack, A., & Zhang, A. R. (2022). Core shrinkage covariance estimation for matrix-variate data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12484*.
- Hoff, P. D. (2015). Multilinear tensor regression for longitudinal relational data. *The annals of applied statistics*, 9(3), 1169.
- Inoue, K., Hara, K., & Urahama, K. (2009). Robust multilinear principal component analysis. In *2009 IEEE 12th International Conference on Computer Vision* (pp. 591–597).: IEEE.
- Jing, B.-Y., Li, T., Lyu, Z., & Xia, D. (2021). Community detection on mixture multilayer networks via regularized tensor decomposition. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(6), 3181–3205.
- Johnstone, I. M. (2001). On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *Annals of statistics*, (pp. 295–327).
- Jolliffe, I. (2005). Principal component analysis. *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*.
- Kolda, T. G. & Bader, B. W. (2009). Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM review*, 51(3), 455–500.
- Koltchinskii, V. (2011). Von neumann entropy penalization and low-rank matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(6), 2936–2973.
- Koltchinskii, V., Löffler, M., & Nickl, R. (2020). Efficient estimation of linear functionals of principal components.
- Koltchinskii, V. & Lounici, K. (2016). Asymptotics and concentration bounds for bilinear forms of spectral projectors of sample covariance.
- Koltchinskii, V. & Lounici, K. (2017). Concentration inequalities and moment bounds for sample covariance operators. *Bernoulli*, 23(1), 110–133.
- Koltchinskii, V., Lounici, K., & Tsybakov, A. B. (2011). Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5), 2302–2329.
- Liu, T., Yuan, M., & Zhao, H. (2017). Characterizing spatiotemporal transcriptome of human brain via low rank tensor decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07449*.

- Lu, H., Plataniotis, K. N., & Venetsanopoulos, A. N. (2008). MPCA: Multilinear principal component analysis of tensor objects. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 19(1), 18–39.
- Lu, H., Plataniotis, K. N., & Venetsanopoulos, A. N. (2011). A survey of multilinear subspace learning for tensor data. *Pattern Recognition*, 44(7), 1540–1551.
- Ouyang, J. & Yuan, M. (2023). On the multiway principal component analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07216*.
- Panagakakis, Y., Kotropoulos, C., & Arce, G. R. (2009). Non-negative multilinear principal component analysis of auditory temporal modulations for music genre classification. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 18(3), 576–588.
- Paul, D. (2007). Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica*, (pp. 1617–1642).
- Pearson, K. (1901). Liii. on lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin philosophical magazine and journal of science*, 2(11), 559–572.
- Richard, E. & Montanari, A. (2014). A statistical model for tensor PCA. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (pp. 2897–2905).
- Tao, D., Song, M., Li, X., Shen, J., Sun, J., Wu, X., Faloutsos, C., & Maybank, S. J. (2008). Bayesian tensor approach for 3-d face modeling. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 18(10), 1397–1410.
- Tao, T. (2012). *Topics in random matrix theory*, volume 132. American Mathematical Soc.
- Tipping, M. E. & Bishop, C. M. (1999). Probabilistic principal component analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 61(3), 611–622.
- Tropp, J. A. (2012). User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12(4), 389–434.
- Tsiligkaridis, T. & Hero, A. O. (2013). Covariance estimation in high dimensions via kronecker product expansions. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 61(21), 5347–5360.

- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, M. & Li, L. (2020). Learning from binary multiway data: Probabilistic tensor decomposition and its statistical optimality. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1), 6146–6183.
- Xia, D. (2021). Normal approximation and confidence region of singular subspaces. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(2), 3798–3851.
- Yang, J., Zhang, D., Frangi, A., & Yu Yang, J. (2004). Two-dimensional pca: a new approach to appearance-based face representation and recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 26(1), 131–137.
- Ye, J. (2004). Generalized low rank approximations of matrices. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '04* (pp. 112). New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ye, J., Janardan, R., & Li, Q. (2004). Gpca: An efficient dimension reduction scheme for image compression and retrieval. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (pp. 354–363).
- Yin, J. & Li, H. (2012). Model selection and estimation in the matrix normal graphical model. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 107, 119–140.
- Zhang, A. & Xia, D. (2018). Tensor svd: Statistical and computational limits. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(11), 7311–7338.
- Zhang, A. R., Bell, R., An, C., Tang, R., Hall, S., Chan, C., Al-Khalil, K., & Meade, C. (2023). Cocaine use prediction with tensor-based machine learning on multimodal mri connectome data. *Preprint*.
- Zhang, A. R., Cai, T. T., & Wu, Y. (2022). Heteroskedastic pca: Algorithm, optimality, and applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(1), 53–80.

- Zhang, C., Han, R., Zhang, A. R., & Voyles, P. M. (2020). Denoising atomic resolution 4d scanning transmission electron microscopy data with tensor singular value decomposition. *Ultramicroscopy*, 219, 113123.
- Zhen, Y. & Wang, J. (2022). Community detection in general hypergraph via graph embedding. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, (pp. 1–10).
- Zhou, H., Li, L., & Zhu, H. (2013). Tensor regression with applications in neuroimaging data analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(502), 540–552.
- Zhou, S. (2014). Gemini: Graph estimation with matrix variate normal instances. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(2), 532–562.
- Zhou, Y., Zhang, A. R., Zheng, L., & Wang, Y. (2022). Optimal high-order tensor svd via tensor-train orthogonal iteration. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(6), 3991–4019.

Supplementary Materials to “Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit and Matrix Spiked Covariance Model”

Runshi Tang, Ming Yuan, and Anru R. Zhang

Abstract

This document serves as supplementary material to the paper titled “Mode-wise Principal Subspace Pursuit and Matrix Spiked Covariance Model.” It includes the proofs of the theorems and lemmas presented in the paper, as well as a formal statement of the generalized results in the order- d tensor case along with their proofs.

A Proof of Theorem 1

We firstly provide the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *Given a positive definite (semi-positive definite and non-singular) matrix*

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_x & \Sigma_{xz} \\ \Sigma_{xz}^\top & \Sigma_z \end{bmatrix}$$

and a random vector x with $\mathbb{E}x = 0$ and $\text{var}(x) = \Sigma_x$, there exists a random vector z s.t. $\mathbb{E}z = 0$ and the variance matrix of the joint distribution of (x, z) is Σ .

Proof. Notice

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & -\Sigma_x^{-1}\Sigma_{xz} \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_x & \Sigma_{xz} \\ \Sigma_{xz}^\top & \Sigma_z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -\Sigma_x^{-1}\Sigma_{xz} \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_x & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_z - \Sigma_{xz}^\top \Sigma_x^{-1} \Sigma_{xz} \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, Σ_x and $\Sigma_z - \Sigma_{xz}^\top \Sigma_x^{-1} \Sigma_{xz}$ are positive definite.

There exist $z_0 \sim N(0, I)$ such that $z_0 \perp x$. Let $z = Az_0 + Bx$. Then $\mathbb{E}z = 0$ and $\text{cov}(x, z) = \Sigma_x B^\top = \Sigma_{xz}$ if $B = (\Sigma_x^{-1} \Sigma_{xz})^\top$.

Moreover, we have $\mathbb{E}zz^\top = AA^\top + B\Sigma_x B^\top = \Sigma_z \Rightarrow AA^\top = \Sigma_z - B\Sigma_x B^\top = \Sigma_z - \Sigma_{xz}^\top \Sigma_x^{-1} \Sigma_{xz}$. The existence of such A is guaranteed, since $\Sigma_z - \Sigma_{xz}^\top \Sigma_x^{-1} \Sigma_{xz}$ is positive definite. ■

Now let's go back to the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathbb{E}X = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$. For tensors \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ refers their tensor product in this section.

Assume the decomposition equation

$$X = UA + BV^\top + Z$$

holds. Hence, the covariance tensor

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \mathbb{E}(X \otimes X) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((UA + BV^\top + Z) \otimes (UA + BV^\top + Z)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((UA + BV^\top) \otimes (UA + BV^\top) + \mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\Sigma_0 = \mathbb{E}\left((UA + BV^\top) \otimes (UA + BV^\top)\right)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Sigma_0 \times_1 U_\perp^\top \times_2 V_\perp^\top \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left((UA) \otimes (BV^\top) + (UA) \otimes (UA) + (BV^\top) \otimes (UA) + (BV^\top) \otimes (BV^\top)\right) \times_1 U_\perp^\top \times_2 V_\perp^\top\right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the sufficiency.

To prove the necessity, assume X has spiked covariance. Define

$$A = U^\top(X - Z), \quad B = P_{U_\perp}(X - Z)V,$$

where Z is some random matrix with $\mathbb{E}Z = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(Z \otimes Z) = \mathbb{E}(X \otimes Z) = \mathbf{I}_{(p_1 \times p_2)_2}$. So $\mathbb{E}(A \otimes Z) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(B \otimes Z) = 0$. Here, to see the existence of such Z , we can vectorize X as a random vector. Then, the existence of z is guaranteed by lemma 1.

Now denote $Y = X - Z$. Notice $\mathbb{R}^{p_1} = \text{span}(U) \oplus \text{span}(U_\perp)$ implies that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ we have decomposition $u = u_1 + u_2$ with $u_1 \in \text{span}(U)$, $u_2 \in \text{span}(U_\perp)$ and similar results hold for the case replacing U by V . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &u^\top (Y - UA - BV^\top) v \\ &= u_1^\top (Y - UA - BV^\top) v + u_2^\top (Y - UA - BV^\top) v \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= u_1^\top (Y - P_U Y - P_{U_\perp} Y P_V) v + u_2^\top (Y - P_U Y - P_{U_\perp} Y P_V) v \\
&= u_2^\top (Y - P_U Y - P_{U_\perp} Y P_V) (v_1 + v_2) \\
&= u_2^\top (Y - P_U Y - P_{U_\perp} Y P_V) v_2 \\
&= u_2^\top Y v_2
\end{aligned}$$

Notice $\Sigma_0 \times_1 U_\perp \times_2 V_\perp = 0$ implies that for any $u_2 \in \text{span}(U_\perp), v_2 \in \text{span}(V_\perp), u_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$ and $v_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$, we have $\Sigma_0(u_2, v_2, u_3, v_3) = 0$. Thus, for any vectors u, v, u', v' with suitable dimensions,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\mathbb{E} \left(Y - UA - BV^\top \right) \otimes \left(Y - UA - BV^\top \right) \right) (u, v, u', v') \\
&= \mathbb{E} u^\top \left(Y - UA - BV^\top \right) v u'^\top \left(Y - UA - BV^\top \right) v' \\
&= \mathbb{E} u_2^\top Y v_2 u_2'^\top Y v_2' \\
&= \Sigma_0(u_2, v_2, u_2', v_2') \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the covariance tensor is 0, and hence, the decomposition equation holds a.s. Thus, the theorem is proved. \blacksquare

B Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Assume that for some U', V' we have $P_{U'_\perp} Y P_{V'_\perp} = 0$. Notice that $\|\sin \Theta(U, U')\| = 0$ is equivalent to $P_{U'_\perp} U = 0$. Now assume $P_{U'_\perp} U \neq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= P_{U'_\perp} Y P_{V'_\perp} \\
&= P_{U'_\perp} (UA + BV^\top) P_{V'_\perp} \\
&= P_{U'_\perp} U A P_{V'_\perp} + P_{U'_\perp} B V^\top P_{V'_\perp}.
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, to make the last line 0, we need its two terms to cancel out with each other. However, by the condition in the theorem, the probability for $P_{U'_\perp} U A P_{V'_\perp}$ to cancel out with $P_{U'_\perp} B V^\top P_{V'_\perp}$ for any given B is 0.

To make the statement rigorous, notice that it follows $\text{span} \left(U A P_{V'_\perp} + B V^\top P_{V'_\perp} \right) \subseteq$

$\ker(P_{U'_\perp})$, which implies for any v such that $P_{V'_\perp}v \neq 0$, we have

$$UAP_{V'_\perp}v + BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v \in \ker(P_{U'_\perp}),$$

and hence

$$UAP_{V'_\perp}v \in \mathcal{A},$$

where \mathcal{A} represents the affine space $\{u - BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v : \forall u \in \ker(P_{U'_\perp})\}$.

For given B , if $BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v = 0$, we have $\mathcal{A} = \ker(P_{U'_\perp}) = \text{span}(U') \neq \text{span}(U)$, and thus $\text{span}(U) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

If $BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v \neq 0$, then \mathcal{A} is a shifted r_1 dimensional space. If the shift direction is in the subspace, i.e., $BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v \in \ker(P_{U'_\perp})$, then $\mathcal{A} = \ker(P_{U'_\perp})$, and hence $\text{span}(U) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$. If the shift direction is not in the subspace, i.e., $BV^\top P_{V'_\perp}v \notin \ker(P_{U'_\perp})$, then for any $u \in \text{span}(U)$ with small enough $\|u\|$, we have $u \notin \mathcal{A}$. Thus, $\text{span}(U) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

By the discussion above, we always have $\text{span}(U) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Hence by the condition in the theorem, we have $\mathbb{P}(UAP_{V'_\perp}v \in \mathcal{A}|B) = 0$, which concludes that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(P_{U'_\perp}YP_{V'_\perp} = 0\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}(UAP_{V'_\perp}v \in \mathcal{A}|B)\right) = 0.$$

Thus, by Theorem 1, if the covariance tensor Σ of Y satisfies $\Sigma \times_1 U'_\perp \times_2 V'_\perp = 0$, then there exist some A', B' such that $Y = U'A' + B'V'^\top$, and hence there must be $\mathbb{P}\left(P_{U'_\perp}YP_{V'_\perp} = 0\right) = 1$. Thus, $\Sigma \times_1 U'_\perp \times_2 V'_\perp \neq 0$. \blacksquare

C Proof of Theorem 3

We first introduce the following technical lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Let A and B be two m -by- n matrices. If $\ker(B) + \ker(A) = \mathbb{R}^n$, then we have $\text{span}(A) \subseteq \text{span}(A + B)$. If A and B further satisfy $\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B) = \{0\}$, then $\text{span}(A) \subseteq \text{span}(A + B)$ if and only if $\ker(B) + \ker(A) = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. For any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& u \in \ker(B) + \ker(A) \\
& \Leftrightarrow \exists a_0 \in \ker(A), b_0 \in \ker(B) : u = a_0 + b_0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow -a_0 \in \ker(A) \text{ and } u - a_0 \in \ker(B) \\
& \Rightarrow Au = (A + B)(u - a_0) \\
& \Rightarrow Au \in \text{span}(A + B).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, as u can be arbitrary, it follows that $\text{span}(A) \subseteq \text{span}(A + B)$.

If we further have $\text{span} A \cap \text{span} B = \{0\}$, then for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{span}(A) \subseteq \text{span}(A + B) \\
& \Rightarrow \exists v : (A + B)v = Au \\
& \Leftrightarrow A(u - v) = Bv \\
& \Rightarrow u - v \in \ker(A), v \in \ker(B) \\
& \Leftrightarrow u \in \ker(B) + \ker(A).
\end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 3. *If A is a p -by- r_A random matrix with density in $\mathbb{R}^{p \times r_A}$ and B is a p -by- r_B deterministic matrix, $r_A, r_B \leq p$, then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) = \max\{0, r_A + r_B - p\}) = 1.$$

Proof. Denote $A = [a_1, \dots, a_{r_A}]$ and $B = [b_1, \dots, b_{r_B}]$. Let's prove this by induction. Consider the case that $r_A = 1$. The case when $p = 1$ is trivial. If $p \geq 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) = 1) = \mathbb{P}(a_1 \in \text{span}(B) \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^p) = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) = 0) = \max\{0, r_A + r_B - p\} = 1.$$

Before going to the induction step, notice the following fact: as the joint density of a_1, \dots, a_{r_A} exists, we have the conditional density of $a_{r_A} | A_{-r_A} := a_{r_A} | a_1, \dots, a_{r_A-1}$, i.e., the conditional distribution $a_{r_A} | A_{-r_A}$ is almost surely absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Now we assume the lemma holds for $r_A = m_A - 1$ and $r_B = m_B$. Consider the case $r_A = m_A \geq 2$ and $r_B = m_B$.

If $p \geq r_A + r_B$, then denote $A_{-r_A} = [a_1, \dots, a_{r_A-1}]$ and by induction, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B)) = 0) = 1.$$

And by $p > r_B + r_A - 1$, we have

$$\text{span}(B) + \text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Thus, as the Lebesgue measure of any nontrivial subspace is 0 and $a_{r_A}|A_{-r_A}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure almost surely, we know

$$\mathbb{P}(a_{r_A} \in \text{span}(B) + \text{span}(A_{-r_A})|A_{-r_A}) = 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(a_{r_A} \in \text{span}(A_{-r_A})|A_{-r_A}) = 0.$$

Further notice if for some u such that $0 \neq u \in \text{span}(A) + \text{span}(B)$ but $u \notin \text{span}(A_{-r_A}) + \text{span}(B)$, then $u = a + b$ for some nonzero $a \in \text{span}(A)$, $a \notin \text{span}(A_{-r_A})$ and $b \in \text{span}(B)$. Then, we have $a = a_0 + c \cdot a_{r_A}$ with $a_0 \in \text{span}(A_{-r_A})$ and some nonzero $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, $c \cdot a_{r_A} = u - a_0 - b \in \text{span}(B) + \text{span}(A_{-r_A})$, which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) \geq 1 + \dim(\text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B))) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B) \supsetneq \text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(a_{r_A} \in \text{span}(B) + \text{span}(A_{-r_A})|A_{-r_A})) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) = 0) = 1$.

If $p \leq r_A + r_B - 1$, then we have $\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B)) = 0) = 1$. But this time we have $\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A_{-r_A}) + \text{span}(B)) = \mathbb{R}^p) = 1$ and thus $\mathbb{P}(a_{r_A} \in \text{span}(A_{-r_A}) + \text{span}(B)|A_{-r_A}) = 1$.

We can similarly prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B) = \text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(a_{r_A} \notin \text{span}(B) + \text{span}(A_{-r_A})|A_{-r_A})) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which indicates that $\mathbb{P}(\dim(\text{span}(A) \cap \text{span}(B)) = \dim(\text{span}(A_{-r_A}) \cap \text{span}(B)) + 1 = r_A + r_B - p) = 1$. These complete the induction step and the lemma holds. \blacksquare

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof. Let's first prove $\text{span}(U) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$.

By comparing the dimension of both sides, we have the following facts: 1. $\ker(V^\top) = \ker(BV^\top)$; 2. $\text{span}(U) = \text{span}(UA)$; and 3. $\ker(A) = \ker(UA)$.

Notice Lemma 3 applies to A^\top and V , which yields $\text{span}(A^\top) \cap \text{span}(V) = \{0\}$ almost surely. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}(A^\top) \cap \text{span}(B^\top) &= \{0\} \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p^2} = \{0\}^\perp &= (\text{span}(A^\top) \cap \text{span}(V))^\perp = \text{span}(A^\top)^\perp + \text{span}(V)^\perp \\ &= \ker(A) + \ker(V^\top) = \ker(UA) + \ker(BV^\top) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{Lemma 2})}{\Rightarrow} \text{span}(U) = \text{span}(UA) \subseteq \text{span}(UA + BV^\top). \end{aligned}$$

It proves $\text{span}(U) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$ almost surely.

Before prove the other direction, let's firstly prove $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_i) = \{0\}$. Notice the density of $U_\perp^\top B$ exists, and $\{B_i\}$ are i.i.d. copies of B . So, by Lemma 3, we have $\dim(\text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_1) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_2)) = \max\{0, 2r_2 - (p_1 - r_1)\}$ almost surely. If $2r_2 - (p_1 - r_1) \leq 0$, then it is done. If $2r_2 - (p_1 - r_1) > 0$, then we consider $\dim((\text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_1) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_2)) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_3))$. Notice given B_1 and B_2 , $(\text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_1) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_2)) = \text{span}(D)$ for some $(p_1 - r_1)$ -by- $(2r_2 - (p_1 - r_1))$ matrix D . Then apply Lemma 3 to $U_\perp^\top B_3$ and D , which yields $\dim(\text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_1) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_2) \cap \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_3)) = \max\{0, 3r_2 - 2(p_1 - r_1)\}$. We repeat this procedure until $kr_2 - (k - 1)(p_1 - r_1) \leq 0$ for some k . $nr_2 - (n - 1)(p_1 - r_1) \leq 0$ guarantees that it will stop before (or at) $k = n$, which will yield $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(U_\perp^\top B_i) = 0$ almost surely.

Now let's go back to prove $\text{span}(U) \supseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$. Notice for some vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p^2}$, if $X_i v_i = X_j v_j$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} U_\perp^\top X_1 v_1 &= \dots = U_\perp^\top X_n v_n \\ \Rightarrow U_\perp^\top B_1 V^\top v_1 &= \dots = U_\perp^\top B_n V^\top v_n. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we have proved $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(U_{\perp}^{\top} B_i) = \{0\}$ almost surely, which implies $U_{\perp}^{\top} B_i V^{\top} v_i = 0$ and hence $X_i v_i = (P_U + P_{U_{\perp}}) X_i v_i = P_U X_i v_i \in \text{span}(U)$. Thus, $\text{span}(U) \supseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n \text{span}(X_i)$ almost surely, which finishes the proof. \blacksquare

D Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Denote $r = r_1 + r_2$, $Q_i = \text{SVD}_r(X_i)$, $Y_i = U A_i + B_i V^{\top}$, $\tilde{Q}_i = \text{SVD}_r(Y_i)$, $\tilde{U} = \text{Eigen}_{r_1}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_i^{\top}\right)$ and $\tilde{P}_i = \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_i^{\top}$. Then by Theorem 3, we have $\tilde{P}_i = P_U + \hat{P}_i$, where \hat{P}_i is some projection matrix such that $\text{span}(\hat{P}_i) \subseteq \text{span}(U_{\perp})$ almost surely. Thus, $\lambda_{r_1}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i\right) = 1$ almost surely.

Then we have

$$\|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, U)\| \leq \|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, \tilde{U})\| + \|\sin \Theta(\tilde{U}, U)\| = \|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, \tilde{U})\|,$$

where $\|\sin \Theta(\tilde{U}, U)\| = 0$ is yielded by Corollary 1. To bound $\|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, \tilde{U})\|$, we can use the matrix perturbation theory. In the setup of $\hat{X} = X + Z$, we can let $X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i$ and $\hat{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Q_i Q_i^{\top}$. Davis-Khan Theorem (e.g. Corollary 2.8 in [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#)) yields

$$\|\sin \Theta(\hat{U}, \tilde{U})\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{P}_i - Q_i Q_i^{\top}) \right\|}{\lambda_{r_1}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i\right) - \lambda_{r_1+1}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i\right)}. \quad (14)$$

We are going to upper bound the numerator and lower bound the denominator of (14).

Numerator we can use Matrix Chernoff bound (e.g., [Tropp \(2012\)](#)):

Lemma 4 (Matrix Chernoff). *Consider a finite sequence $\{\mathbf{X}_k\}$ of independent, random, self-adjoint matrices that satisfy*

$$\mathbf{X}_k \succcurlyeq \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}_k) \leq R \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Compute the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of the sum of expectations,

$$\mu_{\max} := \lambda_{\max}\left(\sum_k \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_k\right).$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\lambda_{\max}\left(\sum_k \mathbf{X}_k\right) \geq (1 + \delta)\mu_{\max}\right\} \leq d \cdot \left[\frac{e^{\delta}}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}}\right]^{\mu_{\max}/R} \quad \text{for } \delta \geq 0.$$

Notice here our matrices $\tilde{P}_i - Q_i Q_i^\top$ are not necessarily p.s.d. but they are bounded by $\|\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_i^\top - Q_i Q_i^\top\| \leq 1$ (the operator norm of the difference of projectors are bounded by 1). So, we can let $W_i = \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{Q}_i^\top - Q_i Q_i^\top + I$, then W_i are p.s.d. and we can apply Matrix Chernoff bound to W_i , which yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_k W_k \right) \geq \frac{(1+\delta)\mu_{\max}}{n} \right\} \leq p_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^\delta}{(1+\delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^{\mu_{\max}/2} \quad \text{for } \forall \delta \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

To bound $\mu_{\max} = n\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}W_1) = n\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}\tilde{P}_1 - \mathbb{E}Q_1 Q_1^\top) + n$, we use self adjoint dilation and Theorem 1 in [Xia \(2021\)](#), where we let

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_1 \\ X_1^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_1 \\ Y_1^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Z_1 \\ Z_1^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denote $\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top := \text{diag}(Q_i Q_i^\top, H_i H_i^\top)$, $\Theta\Theta^\top := \text{diag}(\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{H}_i \tilde{H}_i^\top)$, H_i, \tilde{H}_i are the first $r_1 + r_2$ right singular vectors of $UA + BV^\top + Z$ and $UA + BV^\top$ respectively, the event $\mathcal{A} := \{4\|Z\| \leq c\sigma_r(Y)\}$ for some $c < 1$ and $I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}$ is the indicator function of event \mathcal{A} . Then it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\max} - n &= n \left\| \mathbb{E}Q_i Q_i^\top - \mathbb{E}\tilde{P}_i \right\| \\ &\leq n \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \right\| \\ &= n \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) + \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}^c\}}) \right\| \\ &\leq n \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) \right\| + n \mathbb{E} \left\| \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}^c\}}) \right\| \\ &\leq n \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) \right\| + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &= n \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top - \mathcal{S}_{A,1} \right) \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) \right\| + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &\leq n \mathbb{E} \left\| \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) \left(\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top - \mathcal{S}_{A,1} \right) \right\| + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &= n \mathbb{E} \left\| \text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_{A,k} \right\| + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &\leq n \mathbb{E} I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{S}_{A,k}\| + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \\ &\leq n \mathbb{E} I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{4\|Z\|}{\lambda_r(Y)} \right)^k + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq n \mathbb{E} \frac{I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}}{1 - \frac{4\|Z\|^2}{\lambda_r(Y)^2}} \frac{\|Z\|^2}{\lambda_r(Y)^2} + n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{A,k}(X)$ are defined as in [Xia \(2021\)](#), the inequality in the fifth line holds because $\|\hat{\Theta}\hat{\Theta}^\top - \Theta\Theta^\top\| \leq 1$, the equality in the sixth line holds because $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{S}_{A,1}\text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{S}_{A,1}\text{diag}(I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}})|A, B)) = 0$, the equality in the eighth line holds by Theorem 1 in [Xia \(2021\)](#), and the inequality in the tenth line holds by the fact $\|\mathcal{S}_{A,k}\| \leq \left(\frac{4\|Z\|}{\lambda_r(Y)}\right)^k$ given in the discussion after Theorem 1 in [Xia \(2021\)](#) when the event \mathcal{A} happens.

Additionally, we have $\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}\tilde{P}_1 - \mathbb{E}Q_1Q_1^\top) = \mathbb{E}\text{tr}(\tilde{P}_1 - Q_1Q_1^\top) = 0$. Thus, there must be $\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}\tilde{P}_1 - \mathbb{E}Q_1Q_1^\top) \geq 0$, which yields that $\mu_{\max} \geq n$.

Finally, combine (15) and (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\tilde{P}_i - Q_iQ_i^\top) \right) \geq (1 + \delta)C^* + \delta \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\tilde{P}_i - Q_iQ_i^\top + I) \right) \geq (1 + \delta)C^* + \delta + 1 \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i W_i \right) \geq \frac{(1 + \delta)\mu_{\max}}{n} \right\} \\ &\leq p_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^{\mu_{\max}/2} \\ &\leq p_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^{n/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C^* := \mathbb{E} \frac{I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}}{1 - \frac{4\|Z\|^2}{\lambda_r(Y)^2}} \frac{\|Z\|^2}{\lambda_r(Y)^2} + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{A}^c\}$. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_k (Q_kQ_k^\top - \tilde{P}_k) \right) \geq (1 + \delta)C^* + \delta \right\} \leq p_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^{n/2},$$

and hence,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_k (\tilde{P}_k - Q_kQ_k^\top) \right\| \geq (1 + \delta)C^* + \delta \right\} \leq 2p_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^{n/2}. \quad (17)$$

Further notice that $\frac{e^\delta}{(1+\delta)^{1+\delta}} = \exp\{\delta - (1+\delta)\log(1+\delta)\} = \exp\{-\delta^2/2 + o(\delta^2)\}$. Thus, it can be summarized as follows:

For any δ satisfying $\min\{1, C^*\} \geq \delta > 0$, there is constant c_1 such that if $n > c_1 C^{*-2} \log p_1$,

with high probability, the following holds:

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{P}_i - Q_i Q_i^\top) \right\| \lesssim C^* \quad (18)$$

Denominator By Lemma 5, it follows

$$\lambda_{r_1+1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i \right) \leq \lambda_{r_1+1}(P_U) + \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i \right) = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i \right).$$

We need to prove $\lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i \right) \leq 1 - c$ with high probability.

Notice $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i \right) = 0$, $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i \right\| \leq \frac{2}{n}$ and $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i \right)^\top \right\| \leq \frac{4}{n}$. Thus, by Matrix Bernstein, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \hat{P}_i \right) \right) \geq t \right) \leq p_1 \exp \left(\frac{-3nt^2}{32} \right).$$

We have proved the concentration. Hence, for constant $c' = (1 - \|\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1\|)/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_{r_1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i \right) - \lambda_{r_1+1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i \right) \leq (1 - \|\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1\|)/2 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ 1 - \lambda_{r_1+1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{P}_i \right) \leq c' \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i \right) \geq 1 - c' \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i - \mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1 \right) \geq 1 - c' - \lambda_1(\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1) \right\} \\ &\leq p_1 \exp \left(\frac{-3n \left(1 - \lambda_1(\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1) \right)^2}{128} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Finally, combining (14), (18) and (19), we obtained that if

$$n \gtrsim \log p_1 \max \left\{ C^{*-2}, \frac{1}{\left(1 - \lambda_1(\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1) \right)^2} \right\},$$

then with high probability, it follows

$$\| \sin \Theta(\hat{U}_j^{(0)}, U_j) \| \lesssim \frac{C^*}{1 - \lambda_1(\mathbb{E} \hat{P}_1)}.$$

For $0 \leq x < 1/4$, the function $\frac{x^2}{1-4x}$ is convex (its second order derivative is $\frac{2}{(1-4x)^3}$.) Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}}{1 - \frac{4\|Z\|}{\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top)}} \frac{\|Z\|^2}{\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top)^2} = \mathbb{E} \frac{I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}^2}{1 - \frac{4I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}\|Z\|}{\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top)}} \frac{\|Z\|^2}{\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top)^2} \leq \frac{\rho^2}{1-4\rho},$$

where $\rho = \mathbb{E} \frac{I_{\{\mathcal{A}\}}\|Z\|}{\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top)} \leq c/4 < 1/4$. Thus, $C^* \leq \frac{c^2}{16(1-c)} + \mathbb{P}(4\|Z\| > c\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top))$. If further $c \leq 1/2$, then $C^* \leq \frac{c^2}{8} + \mathbb{P}(4\|Z\| > c\sigma_r(UA+BV^\top))$.

Recall that we have $\text{span}(\hat{P}_1) \subseteq \text{span}(U_\perp)$ almost surely. Thus $\|\mathbb{E}\hat{P}_1\| = \|\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp}\hat{P}_1\| = \|\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp}\tilde{P}_1\|$. Also recall that \tilde{P}_1 is the projector to $\text{span}(UA_1 + B_1V^\top) = \text{span}(U) + \text{span}(B_1) = \text{span}(U) + \text{span}(P_{U_\perp}B_1)$. So, for any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, we have $v = b + u + z \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, where $b \in \text{span}(P_{U_\perp}B_1)$, $u \in \text{span}(U)$ and $z \in (\text{span}(UA_1 + B_1V^\top))^\perp$, and hence we have $P_{U_\perp}\tilde{P}_1v = b$. Thus, we have $P_{U_\perp}\tilde{P}_1 = P_{U_\perp}U_\perp^\top B_1$ and $\|\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp}U_\perp^\top B_1\| = \|\mathbb{E}\hat{P}_1\|$. Hence, the theorem holds. \blacksquare

E Proof of Example 1

Proof. Notice $P_{U_\perp}U_\perp^\top B = P_{U_\perp}B(B^\top P_{U_\perp}P_{U_\perp}B)^\dagger B^\top P_{U_\perp} = U_\perp U_\perp^\top B(B^\top U_\perp U_\perp^\top B)^\dagger B^\top U_\perp U_\perp^\top = U_\perp P_{U_\perp^\top B} U_\perp^\top$, where A^\dagger is the generalized inverse of matrix A . Further, notice the entries of $U_\perp^\top B$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian. Denote $W = U_\perp^\top B$. Then, for any orthogonal matrix $O \in \mathcal{O}_{p_1-r_1}$, we have $OW \stackrel{d}{=} W$. Thus, $P_W \stackrel{d}{=} P_{OW}$. Hence, we have $\mathbb{E}P_W = \mathbb{E}P_{OW} = O\mathbb{E}P_W O^\top$. As O can be chosen arbitrarily in $\mathcal{O}_{p_1-r_1}$, we have $\mathbb{E}P_W = aI$ for some a . By calculating trace $a(p_1 - r_1) = \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}P_W) = \mathbb{E}\text{tr}(P_W) = \min\{r_2, p_1 - r_1\}$, we have $a = \min\{1, r_2/(p_1 - r_1)\}$. Thus, $\mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp}U_\perp^\top B = U_\perp \mathbb{E}P_{U_\perp^\top B} U_\perp^\top = \min\{1, r_2/(p_1 - r_1)\} \cdot P_{U_\perp}$. \blacksquare

F Proof of Theorem 5

Let's first introduce notations of set \mathcal{A} of conditions on A_i, B_i, Z_i , and initialization.

Notation 1. Denote

$$T_U = \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2} : \|W\| \leq 1, \text{tr}(W) = 0, W = W^\top, \text{rank}(W) \leq 2r_2 \right\},$$

$$L_U = \frac{1}{np_2} \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i P_{V_\perp} A_i^\top \right),$$

$$M_{1,U} = \frac{1}{np_2} \sup_{E \in T_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i E (B_i V^\top)^\top \right\|,$$

$$M_{3,U} = \frac{1}{np_2} \sup_{E \in T_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \right\|,$$

$$M_{4,U} = \frac{1}{np_2} \sup_{E \in T_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i E Z_i^\top \right\|,$$

$$\Delta_U = L_U - (M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}),$$

$$\xi_U = 10 + M_{1,U} + 3M_{3,U} + 3M_{4,U},$$

$$\Gamma_U = \Delta_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U,$$

$$\kappa_U = \frac{2}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top \right\| + \frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - n\sigma^2(p_2 - r_2)I \right\|,$$

$\xi_V, \Gamma_V, \kappa_V, L_V$ are defined similarly by replacing U, p_2, r_2 by V, p_1, r_1 respectively,

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\Gamma_U > 0, \Gamma_V > 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{ \frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U - 3\kappa_U} \leq \frac{\Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_0, \frac{4\kappa_V}{L_V - \varepsilon_0 \xi_V - 3\kappa_V} \leq \frac{\Gamma_V}{L_V} \varepsilon_0 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \left\{ \max_i \|A_i\| \leq \min\{\sqrt{p_2}, \sqrt{p_1}\}, \max_i \|B_i\| \leq \min\{\sqrt{p_2}, \sqrt{p_1}\} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \mathcal{A}_3$$

The strategy of this proof is to first establish a deterministic upper bound for estimation error given that A_i, B_i, Z_i are nonrandom satisfying conditions $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ (in Section F.1), and then prove these conditions hold with high probability (in Section F.2).

F.1 Deterministic Bound

We first introduce the following technical lemmas that will be used in this section:

Lemma 5 (Weyl's eigenvalue inequality). *For Hermitian matrices A and B , we have*

$$\lambda_{i+j-1}(A+B) \leq \lambda_i(A) + \lambda_j(B). \quad (20)$$

As a result,

$$\lambda_r(A) - \|B\| \leq \lambda_r(A+B) \leq \lambda_r(A) + \|B\|. \quad (21)$$

Proof. See page 40 of [Tao \(2012\)](#) and its references for (20). Then, letting $i = r$ and $j = 1$, we have:

$$\lambda_r(A + B) \leq \lambda_r(A) + \lambda_1(B) \leq \lambda_r(A) + \|B\|.$$

Similarly, we have:

$$\lambda_r(A) - \|B\| \leq \lambda_r(A) + \lambda_r(B) = \lambda_r(A) - \lambda_1(-B) \leq \lambda_r(A + B),$$

which finishes the proof of (21). ■

Lemma 6 (Ky Fan singular value inequality, [Fan \(1951\)](#)). *For any $n \times n$ matrices A, B ,*

$$\sigma_{r+t+1}(A + B) \leq \sigma_{r+1}(A) + \sigma_{t+1}(B),$$

where $t \geq 0, r \geq 0, r + t + 1 \leq n$. Specially, let $r = r_1 - 1$ and $t = 0$:

$$\sigma_{r_1}(A + B) \leq \sigma_{r_1}(A) + \sigma_1(B).$$

Lemma 7 (Exercise VII.I.11 in [Bhatia \(1997\)](#)).

$$\|\sin \Theta(V, \hat{V}^{(t)})\| = \|V^\top \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}\| = \|\hat{V}^{(t)\top} V_\perp\| = \|P_{V_\perp} - P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}}\|.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &= UA_i + B_i V^\top = X_i - Z_i, \\ H &= \frac{1}{np_2} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i V_\perp V_\perp^\top S_i = \frac{1}{np_2} \sum_{i=1}^n UA_i P_{V_\perp} A_i^\top U^\top, \\ \hat{H}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{np_2} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)} \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)\top} X_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following lemma:

Lemma 8. *In the context of Corollary 2, let $\hat{X} = \hat{H}^{(t+1)} - \frac{p_2 - r_2}{p_2} \sigma^2 I$, $X = H$, and denote*

$$\varepsilon_t = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(t)})\|, \|\sin \Theta(V, \hat{V}^{(t)})\| \right\}, \alpha = \lambda_{r_1}(P_U \hat{X} P_U), \beta = \|P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}\|, z_{21} = \|P_U (X - \hat{X}) P_{U_\perp}\|.$$

When A_i, B_i are nonrandom satisfying condition $\{A_i, B_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_3$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\geq L_U - \varepsilon_t(4 + 2M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) - \kappa_U, \\ \alpha &\leq L_U + \varepsilon_t(4 + 2M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) + \kappa_U, \\ \beta &\leq \kappa_U + \varepsilon_t(5 + M_{4,U}), \\ z_{21} &\leq \kappa_U + \varepsilon_t(M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U} + \varepsilon_t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First notice that $\text{rank}(P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}} - P_{V_\perp}) = \text{rank}(P_{\hat{V}^{(t)}} - P_V) \leq 2r_2$. Then by Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
& np_2\alpha \\
&= np_2\lambda_{r_1} \left(U^\top \hat{H}^{(t+1)} U - \sigma^2 \frac{p_2 - r_2}{p_2} \sigma^2 \cdot U_1^\top I U_1 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(21)}{\leq} \lambda_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (U A_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}) (U A_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)})^\top \right) + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (U A_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}) (B_i V^\top \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)})^\top U \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| U^\top \sum_{i=1}^n (B_i V^\top \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}) (B_i V^\top \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)})^\top U \right\| + 2 \left\| U^\top \sum_{i=1}^n (U A_i + B_i V^\top) \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)} (Z_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)})^\top U \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| U^\top \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}) (Z_i \hat{V}_\perp^{(t)})^\top U - n\sigma^2(p_2 - r_2) U^\top I U \right\| \\
&\leq \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i P_{V_\perp} A_i^\top \right) + \varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \frac{P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}} - P_{V_\perp}}{\varepsilon_t} A_i^\top \right\| + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i P_{V_\perp} (B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| \\
&\quad + 2\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \frac{P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}} - P_{V_\perp}}{\varepsilon_t} (B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| + np_2\varepsilon_t^2 + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| \\
&\quad + 2\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \frac{P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}} - P_{V_\perp}}{\varepsilon_t} (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - n\sigma^2(p_2 - r_2) I \right\| \\
&\quad + \varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \frac{P_{\hat{V}_\perp^{(t)}} - P_{V_\perp}}{\varepsilon_t} Z_i^\top \right\| \\
&\leq np_2(L_U + \varepsilon_t(4 + 2M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) + \kappa_U),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$.

By the same procedure, we can similarly derive a lower bound of α : (details are presented in the proof of Lemma 16 in more general setting)

$$\alpha \geq L_U - \varepsilon_t(4 + 2M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) - \kappa_U;$$

a upper bound of β :

$$\beta \leq \kappa_U + \varepsilon_t(5 + M_{4,U});$$

and a upper bound of z_{21} :

$$z_{21} \leq \kappa_U + \varepsilon_t(M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U} + \varepsilon_t).$$

■

We are ready to prove the following:

Theorem 9. In Algorithm 2, let $X_i = UA + BV^\top + Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}, i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote the estimation error $\varepsilon_t = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U, \widehat{U}^{(t)})\|, \|\sin \Theta(V, \widehat{V}^{(t)})\| \right\}$. When $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are nonrandom satisfying condition $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, there is a constant $\chi = \max \left\{ \frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U}, \frac{L_V - \Gamma_V}{L_V} \right\} < 1$, which does not depend on t , such that for $t = 0, 1, \dots, m$,

$$\varepsilon_{t+1} \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

where

$$K_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \xi_U - 3\kappa_U}, \frac{4\kappa_V}{L_V - \xi_V - 3\kappa_V} \right\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\varepsilon_t \leq \chi^t \varepsilon_0 + K_2,$$

where $K_2 = K_1 \frac{1 - \chi^t}{1 - \chi}$.

Proof. We are going to prove this by induction. Assume the statement holds for $m < t$. Consider $m = t$ and we are calculating $\widehat{U}^{(t+1)}$.

By Corollary 2:

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \widehat{U}^{(t+1)})\| \leq \frac{z_{21}}{\alpha - \beta - z_{21}}.$$

Denote

$$\alpha_1 = L_U - \varepsilon_t(4 + 2M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}),$$

$$\beta_1 = \varepsilon_t(5 + M_{4,U}),$$

$$z_1 = \varepsilon_t(M_{1,U} + \varepsilon_t + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}).$$

By Lemma 8,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z_{21}}{\alpha - \beta - z_{21}} &\leq \frac{z_1 + \kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} \\ &= \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} + \frac{\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

To bound the first term on right hand side of (22), notice that the function $f(y) = (x - y)/x$ is monotone decreasing for $y < x$ with any given x and that by $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \frac{z_1}{\varepsilon_t} &= L_U - (M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon_t(10 + M_{1,U} + 3M_{3,U} + 3M_{4,U}) \\ &\geq \Gamma_U > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\frac{z_1/\varepsilon_t}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \Gamma_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1}. \quad (23)$$

Further notice that the function $g(x) = (x - y)/x$ is monotone increasing on $x > y$ for fixed y and that we have $\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 \leq L_U$. So,

$$\frac{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \Gamma_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U}. \quad (24)$$

Thus, combining (23) and (24), we have

$$\frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_t. \quad (25)$$

To bound the remaining two terms of (22), we have

$$\frac{\kappa_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_U} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_U} \leq \frac{4\kappa_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_U},$$

and

$$\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 \geq L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U,$$

which yield

$$\frac{\kappa_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_U} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_U}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_U} \leq \frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U - 3\kappa_U}. \quad (26)$$

Combining (22), (25) and (26), we finally have

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \widehat{U}^{(t+1)})\| \leq \frac{z_{21}}{\alpha - \beta - z_{21}} \leq \frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_t + \frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U - 3\kappa_U} \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1.$$

By $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we further have

$$\frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_t + \frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U - 3\kappa_U} \leq \frac{L_U - \Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_0 + \frac{\Gamma_U}{L_U} \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0.$$

Thus, we have proved

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \widehat{U}^{(t+1)})\| \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Similarly, we can prove $\|\sin \Theta(V, \widehat{V}^{(t+1)})\| \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0$. So the statement holds by induction. ■

F.2 Statistical Bound

In this section, we are going to argue that when $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are random matrices satisfying Assumption 1 and 2 with proper initialization, the probability of \mathcal{A} is high and the estimation error converges to 0 in probability.

Recall Assumption 1:

Assumption 1. *Assume in decomposition (6), A and B are independent and there is a constant μ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mu \leq \frac{\max\{\|A\|, \|B\|\}}{\min\{\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}\}} \right\} \leq \nu, \quad \text{for some small } \nu < 1.$$

Denote λ as

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{p_2} \mathbb{E} A P_{V_\perp} A^\top \right), \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E} B^\top P_{U_\perp} B \right) \right\}.$$

We have $\frac{\mu^2}{\lambda} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

We additionally assume $\mu = 1$ and $\nu = 0$ for now, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_3) = 1$. Denote σ^2 and ζ^4 as the variance and fourth moments of each entry Z_i . Define $u = \max \left\{ \|Z/\sqrt{p_1}\|_{\psi_2}, \|Z/\sqrt{p_2}\|_{\psi_2} \right\}$. The following lemma bounds the sub-Gaussian norm of $\|Z_i\|$.

Lemma 9. *Assume Z is a m by n random matrix with i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries with sub-Gaussian norm K . Then $\|Z\|$ is sub-Gaussian and $\| \|Z\| \|_{\psi_2} \lesssim K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})$.*

Proof. Notice the following two facts:

1. There is an absolute constant C_1 such that for any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|Z\| > C_1 K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n} + t) \right) \leq 2e^{-t^2} \tag{27}$$

2. That a random variable X is sub-Gaussian is equivalent to the following:

$$\mathbb{P}\{|X| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/K_1^2) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

Furthermore, there are absolute constants C_2, C_3 such that $C_2 K_1 \leq K \leq C_3 K_1$.

In (27), let $y = C_1 K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n} + t)$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| > y) \leq 2e^{-\frac{y^2}{C_1^2 K^2} + 2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})\frac{y}{C_1 K}} \leq 2e^{-\frac{y^2}{2C_1^2 K^2}}$$

for $y \geq 4C_1 K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})$. When $y \leq 4C_1 K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| > y) \leq 1 \leq 2e^{-\frac{y^2}{(4C_1 K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n}))^2}}.$$

Hence, by the second fact, $\| \|Z\| \|_{\psi_2} \lesssim K(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})$. ■

let's firstly bound the term L_U in Notation 1 by the well-known Matrix Chernoff inequality (Lemma 4). In our setting, it yields:

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_U \leq (1 - \delta)\lambda\} \leq r_1 \cdot \left[\frac{e^{-\delta}}{(1 - \delta)^{1-\delta}} \right]^{n\lambda}.$$

Taking $\delta = 1/2$, since $e^{-0.5}/0.5^{0.5} \leq 0.86$, we have

Corollary 3.

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_U \leq \lambda/2\} \leq r_1 \cdot \exp\{\log(0.86)n\lambda\}.$$

To bound the terms M 's in Notation 1, we are going to use the strategy called “union bound”. To that end, let's first estimate the covering number.

Lemma 10 (Lemma 7 in Zhang & Xia (2018)). *Let $\mathcal{X}_{p_1, p_2, r} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2} : \text{rank}(X) \leq r, \|X\| \leq 1\}$ be the class of low-rank matrices under spectral norm. Then there exists an ε -net $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_r$ for $\mathcal{X}_{p_1, p_2, r}$ with cardinality at most $((4 + \varepsilon)/\varepsilon)^{(p_1 + p_2)r}$. Specifically, there exists $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(N)}$ with $N \leq ((4 + \varepsilon)/\varepsilon)^{(p_1 + p_2)r}$, such that for all $X \in \mathcal{X}_{p_1, p_2, r}$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfying $\|X^{(i)} - X\| \leq \varepsilon$.*

In our setting, recall

$$T_U = \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times p_2} : \|W\| \leq 1, \text{tr}(W) = 0, W = W^\top, \text{rank}(W) \leq 2r_2 \right\}.$$

We have

Corollary 4. *There exists subset \bar{T}_U of T_U such that for some absolute constant C_0 ,*

$$|\bar{T}_U| \leq \exp(4r_2 p_2 \log(C_0/\varepsilon)),$$

$$M_{1,U} \leq \frac{1}{np_2} \sup_{E \in \mathcal{T}_1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i E \left(B_i V^\top \right)^\top \right\| + \varepsilon,$$

and similar bounds hold for other $M_{i,U}$ for $i = 3, 4$ in Notation 1.

Then, we need the following concentration inequality:

Lemma 11. [Matrix Bernstein, subexponential non-symmetric version] Let Z, Z_1, \dots, Z_n be i.i.d. random matrices with dimensions $m_1 \times m_2$ that satisfy $\mathbb{E}(Z) = 0$. Suppose that $U_Z^{(\alpha)} < \infty$ for some $\alpha \geq 1$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $t > 0$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$

$$\left\| \frac{Z_1 + \dots + Z_n}{n} \right\| \leq C \max \left\{ \sigma_Z \sqrt{\frac{t + \log(m)}{n}}, U_Z^{(\alpha)} \left(\log \frac{U_Z^{(\alpha)}}{\sigma_Z} \right)^{1/\alpha} \frac{t + \log(m)}{n} \right\},$$

where $m = m_1 + m_2$,

$$U_Z^{(\alpha)} \in \inf \{ u > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(\|Z\|^\alpha / u^\alpha) \leq 2 \}, \quad \alpha \geq 1,$$

$$\sigma_Z \geq \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(Z_i Z_i^\top \right) \right\|^{1/2}, \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(Z_i^\top Z_i \right) \right\|^{1/2} \right\}$$

and

$$\sigma_Z \leq U_Z^{(\alpha)}$$

Proof. This is a slight generalization of Proposition 2 in [Koltchinskii et al. \(2011\)](#) and its reference [Koltchinskii \(2011\)](#). First, we can directly generalize the choice of $U_Z^{(\alpha)}$. Then it can be shown that we really only need an upper bound for σ_Z such that equation (3.7) in [Koltchinskii \(2011\)](#) to be well defined. ■

In our case, using union bound, Corollary 4 and Lemma 11 yields the following corollaries for different M 's in Notation 1.

Corollary 5. For given d, c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if

$$n \geq c_3 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^2 (r_2)(p_1 + p_2),$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(c_2)r_2(p_1+p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{1,U} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $W_i = \frac{1}{p_2} A_i E(B_i V^\top)^\top$, then $\|W_i\| \leq 1$ and hence $\exp((\log 2)\|W_i\|) \leq 2$. Also, $\|W_i W_i^\top\| = \|W_i^\top W_i\| \leq 1$. So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C(r_2)(p_1 + p_2)$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = 1/\log 2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-Cr_2(p_1+p_2)}$, the following holds:

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i E(B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| \leq C_2 \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\}.$$

Then by union bound from Corollary 4, it yields that with probability more than

$$1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon))r_2(p_1+p_2)},$$

we have

$$M_{1,U} \leq C_2 \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So for given constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^2 (r_2)(p_1 + p_2),$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C_4)(r_2)(p_1+p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{1,U} \leq C_5 \lambda.$$

■

To deal with $M_{3,U}$, $M_{4,U}$ and κ_U , first notice the following fact:

Lemma 12. *Assume Z is a p by q random matrix whose entries Z_{ij} are i.i.d. with mean 0, variance σ^2 and fourth moment ζ^4 . D is a fixed q by q symmetric matrix. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} Z D Z^\top = \sigma^2 \text{tr}(D) I,$$

$$\mathbb{E} Z D Z^\top Z^\top D Z \preceq p_2 \zeta^4 \text{tr}(D^2) I.$$

Proof. Denote

$$Z^\top = [z_1 \cdots z_p],$$

where z_j is j th column vector of Z^\top . Hence,

$$D Z^\top = [D z_1 \cdots D z_p].$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}ZDZ^\top &= \left[(\mathbb{E}z_h^\top D z_k)_{h,k} \right]_{p \times p} \\ &= \text{diag} \left(\mathbb{E}(D^\top z_h)^\top (z_h) \right)_{h=1, \dots, p},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(D^\top z_h)^\top (z_h) = \text{tr}(D)\sigma^2.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}ZDZ^\top = \sigma^2 \text{tr}(D)I.$$

Further notice $(ZDZ^\top Z^\top DZ)_{i,h} = \sum_{j=1}^p z_i^\top D z_j z_j^\top D z_h$, $\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p z_i^\top D z_j z_j^\top D z_h = 0$ if $i \neq h$,

$$\mathbb{E}((D^\top z_h)^\top (z_h))((D^\top z_h)^\top (z_h))^\top = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i,j} z_{hi} z_{hj} D_{ij}\right)^2 = \sum_i D_{ii}^2 \mathbb{E}z_{hi}^4 + \sum_{i \neq j} D_{ij}^2 \mathbb{E}z_{hi}^2 \mathbb{E}z_{hj}^2 \leq \text{tr}(D^\top D)\zeta^4,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}((D^\top z_h)^\top (z_j))((D^\top z_j)^\top (z_h))^\top = \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}(z_h^\top D^2 z_h) \leq \text{tr}(D^\top D)\zeta^4.$$

Thus, the second statement in the lemma holds. ■

Corollary 6. *For given c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3(r_2)(p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{3,U} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $W_i = \frac{1}{p_2} Z_i E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top$, then $\|W_i\| \leq \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}}$ and

$$\sqrt{\log 2} \cdot \left\| \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq \left\| \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right\|_{\psi_2}.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log 2} \|W_i\|}{u} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log 2} \|Z_i\|}{u \sqrt{p_2}} \right) \leq 2$. Also, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbb{E} W_i W_i^\top \right\| &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(Z_i E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top (U A_i + B_i V^\top) E Z_i^\top \middle| A_i, B_i \right) \right) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \text{tr} \left(E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top (U A_i + B_i V^\top) E \right) I \right) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p_2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \left\| U A_i + B_i V^\top \right\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq 4\sigma^2 \\
&\leq 4C_6^2 u^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbb{E} W_i^\top W_i \right\| &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((U A_i + B_i V^\top) E Z_i^\top Z_i E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \middle| \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right) \right) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 (U A_i + B_i V^\top) E^2 (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \right) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p_2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \left\| U A_i + B_i V^\top \right\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{4p_1}{p_2} \sigma^2 \\
&\leq C_6^2 \frac{4p_1}{p_2} u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_U$, let $t = C(r_2)(p_1 + p_2)$, $\sigma_Z = 2C_6 u \theta$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = 2C_6 u \theta / \sqrt{\log 2}$, where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$. It yields that, there exists constant C_2 such that, with probability more than $1 - e^{-C r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i E (U A_i + B_i V^\top)^\top \right\| \\
&\leq C_2 2u\theta \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$. Then by union bound from Corollary 4, it yields that with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon))r_2(p_1 + p_2)}$:

$$M_{3,U} \leq C_2 2u\theta \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2(p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So, for given constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 r_2 (p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-C_4 r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{3,U} \leq C_5 \lambda.$$

■

Corollary 7. For given c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if

$$n \geq c_3 r_2 (p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda} \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{4,U} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $W_i = \frac{1}{p_2} Z_i E Z_i^\top$, then $\|W_i\| \leq \frac{\|Z_i\|^2}{p_2}$ and hence $\mathbb{E} \exp(\|W_i\|/u^2) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{\|Z_i\|^2}{u^2 p_2}\right) \leq 2$.

Also, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{E} W_i W_i^\top \right\| &= \frac{1}{p_2^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(Z_i E Z_i^\top Z_i E Z_i^\top \right) \right\| \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 12}}{\leq} \frac{1}{p_2} \zeta^4 \text{tr}(E^2) \leq \zeta^4 \|E\|^2 \\ &\leq \zeta^4 \leq C_6^2 u^4. \end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_U$, let $t = C r_2 (p_1 + p_2)$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 u^2$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = 2C_6 u^2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-C r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, the following holds:

$$\frac{1}{n p_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i E Z_i^\top \right\| \leq C_2 u^2 \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\}.$$

Then by union bound from Corollary 4, it yields that with probability more than

$$1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon)) r_2 (p_1 + p_2)},$$

we have

$$M_{4,U} \leq C_2 u^2 \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}{n}}, \frac{r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 r_2 (p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C_4) r_2 (p_1 + p_2)}$, we have

$$M_{4,1} \leq C_5 \lambda.$$

■

Corollary 8. For given c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if

$$n \geq c_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top \right\| \leq c_1 \lambda^3.$$

Proof. Let $W_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top$, then $\|W_i\| \leq \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}}$ and

$$\sqrt{\log 2} \cdot \left\| \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq \left\| \frac{\|Z_i\|}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right\|_{\psi_2}.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|W_i\| \sqrt{\log 2}}{u} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|Z_i\| \sqrt{\log 2}}{u \sqrt{p_2}} \right) \leq 2$. Also, there exists an absolute constant $C_6 > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} W_i W_i^\top \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top (U A_i) P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top \mid A_i, B_i \right) \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \text{tr} \left(P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top (U A_i) P_{V_\perp} \right) I \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \|(U A_i)\|^2 \right) \leq \sigma^2 \leq C_6^2 u^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} W_i^\top W_i \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left((U A_i) P_{V_\perp}^\top Z_i^\top Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top \mid A_i, B_i \right) \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{p_2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 (U A_i) P_{V_\perp}^2 (U A_i)^\top \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \|(U A_i)\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{p_1}{p_2} \sigma^2 \\ &\leq C_6^2 \frac{p_1}{p_2} u^2. \end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_U$, let $t = C \log p_1$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 \theta u$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = C_6 \theta u / \sqrt{\log 2}$, where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$. It yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-C \log p_1}$, the following holds:

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top \right\|$$

$$\leq C_2 u \theta \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, \frac{\log p_1}{n} \right\}, \quad (28)$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}}, 1 \right\}$. So, for given constants C_4 and C_5 if

$$n \geq C_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-C_4 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} (U A_i)^\top \right\| \leq C_5 \lambda^3.$$

■

Corollary 9. *For given c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - n \sigma^2 (p_2 - r_2) I \right\| \leq c_1 \lambda^3.$$

Proof. Let $W_i = \frac{1}{p_2} (Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - \sigma^2 (p_2 - r_2) I)$, then $\|W_i\| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|Z_i\|^2}{p_2}, \sigma^2 r \right\}$, where $r = \frac{p_2 - r_2}{p_2}$. Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|W_i\|}{\tau} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\|Z_i\|^2}{\tau p_2}, \frac{\sigma^2 r}{\tau} \right\} \right) \leq 2$, where $\tau = \max \left\{ u^2, \frac{\sigma^2 r}{\log 2} \right\} \leq u^2 / \log 2$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} W_i W_i^\top &= \frac{1}{p_2^2} \left(\mathbb{E} Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{2\sigma^2 (p_2 - r_2)}{p_2^2} \left(\mathbb{E} Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top \right) + \frac{\sigma^4 (p_2 - r_2)^2}{p_2^2} I \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 12}}{\preceq} \frac{\zeta^4}{p_2} \text{tr} (P_{V_\perp}^2) I - \frac{2\sigma^4 (p_2 - r_2)}{p_2^2} \text{tr} (P_{V_\perp}) I + \frac{\sigma^4 (p_2 - r_2)^2}{p_2^2} I \\ &\preceq \frac{p_2 - r_2}{p_2} \zeta^4 I. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} W_i W_i^\top \right\| \leq \frac{p_2 - r_2}{p_2} \zeta^4 \leq \zeta^4 \leq C_6^2 u^4.$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_U$, let $t = C \log p_1$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 u^2$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = C_6 u^2 / \log 2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability

more than $1 - e^{-C \log p_1}$, the following holds:

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - n\sigma^2 (p_2 - r_2) I \right\| \leq C_2 \max \left\{ u^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, u^2 \frac{\log p_1}{n} \right\}. \quad (29)$$

So, for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 if

$$n \geq C_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-C_4 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{np_2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i P_{V_\perp} Z_i^\top - n\sigma^2 (p_2 - r_2) I \right\| \leq C_5 \lambda^3. \quad \blacksquare$$

Corollaries 3, 5, 6 and 7 imply that with proper choice of c_1 , we have

$$\Delta_U = L_U - (M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) \gtrsim \lambda,$$

and

$$\xi_U \leq 10 + 3(M_{1,U} + M_{3,U} + M_{4,U}) \lesssim 1$$

with high probability. If d is fixed and we set ε_0 as a small constant multiplier of λ , we have

$$\Gamma_U = \Delta_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U \gtrsim \lambda.$$

So, by Corollaries 8 and 9, we have

$$\frac{4\kappa_U}{L_U - \varepsilon_0 \xi_U - 3\kappa_U} \lesssim \lambda^2 \lesssim \frac{\Gamma_U \varepsilon_0}{L_U}$$

with high probability. Additionally, we can bound the error K_2 in Theorem 9 by (28) and (29).

The argument above can be summarized as the following lemma.

Lemma 13. *Given constants $c > 0$ and assuming Assumption 1, 2 hold with $\mu = 1$ in Assumption 1, then there exists constants $c_1, c_4, c_5 < 1, c_6$ (does not depend on any variable appeared in the following equations) such that if $\varepsilon_0 \leq c_4 \lambda$,*

$$n \geq c_1 \log p_{\max} \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3}, \frac{\theta u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

and

$$n \geq c_1 r_{\max}(p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda}, \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_2}{p_1}}, \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{p_2}} \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 r_{\min}(p_1 + p_2)}$, $\{A_i, B_i, Z_i; i = 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Additionally, in Theorem 9, we have $\chi \leq c_5$ and

$$K_2 \leq c_6 \lambda_{\max} \left\{ u\theta \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}}, u\theta \frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}, u^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}}, u^2 \frac{\log p_{\max}}{n} \right\}.$$

Now let's consider general μ (the previous discussion is based on $\mu = 1$). We can let $Y_i = X_i/\mu(\{X_i\})$ and then $\mu(\{Y_i\}) = 1$ and $\lambda(\{Y_i\}) = \lambda(\{X_i\})/\mu(\{X_i\})^2 \geq 1/C$, where $\mu(\{X_i\})$ refers the μ of X_i in Assumption 1, $\mu(\{Y_i\})$ refers the μ of Y_i and $\lambda(\{Y_i\})$ are defined similarly. Then we can apply the above lemma and Theorem 9 to Y_i . And for general ν , we take out the probability that $\mu \leq \frac{\max\{\|A\|, \|B\|\}}{\min\{\sqrt{p_1}, \sqrt{p_2}\}}$ and get:

Lemma 14. *Given constant $c_1 > 0$, matrices $\{X_i\}$ satisfying decomposition (6) and Assumption 1 and 2, then when applying Algorithm 2, there exists constants $c_2, c_3, c_4 < 1, c_5$ (do not depend on any variable appeared in the following equations) such that if $\varepsilon_0 \leq c_3$ and n satisfies the following:*

$$n \geq c_2 r_{\max}(p_1 + p_2) \max \left\{ u^4/\mu^4, \theta^2 u^2/\mu^2, \theta u/\mu, 1 \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_1 r_{\min} p_{\max}} - \nu$, the estimation error defined as

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(t)})\|, \|\sin \Theta(V, \hat{V}^{(t)})\| \right\},$$

in Algorithm 2 converges linearly with rate $\chi \leq c_4$:

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} - \text{Error} \leq \chi \left(\text{Error}^{(t-1)} - \text{Error} \right),$$

and the final error is bounded by

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \theta u/\mu, u^2/\mu^2 \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \{1, p_1/p_2, p_2/p_1\}$, $r_{\max} = \max\{r_1, r_2\}$, $r_{\min} = \min\{r_1, r_2\}$ and $p_{\max} = \max\{p_1, p_2\}$.

As all the entries of Z are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian distributed as z with sub-Gaussian norm τ , by Lemma 9, we have $u = \max \left\{ \|Z/\sqrt{p_1}\|_{\psi_2}, \|Z/\sqrt{p_2}\|_{\psi_2} \right\} \lesssim \tau \sqrt{p_{\max}/p_{\min}}$. The condition for

sample size n can be expressed as

$$n \geq c_2 \tau_{\max} p_{\max} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max}^2 \tau^4}{p_{\min}^2 \mu^4}, \frac{p_{\max}^3 \tau^2}{p_{\min}^3 \mu^2}, \frac{p_{\max}^{3/2} \tau}{p_{\min}^{3/2} \mu}, 1 \right\},$$

and the final error bound becomes

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{p_{\max} \tau}{p_{\min} \mu}, \frac{\tau^2}{\mu^2} \right\}.$$

G Proof of Theorem 7

Without loss of generality, assume A is positive semi-definite, as we can add aI to A without changing its eigen-structure. let's first consider the scenario that A has the block form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1(A_{11}) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_r(A_{11}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

and W, W_{\perp} satisfy

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} I_{r \times r} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_{\perp} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_{(p-r) \times (p-r)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

Hence, We also have $A_{11} = W^{\top} A W$, $A_{12} = W^{\top} A W_{\perp} = A_{21}^{\top}$ and $A_{22} = W_{\perp}^{\top} A W_{\perp}$. Denote the k th eigenvector of A (corresponding to $\lambda_k(A)$) as

$$v^{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(k)} \\ \beta^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\alpha^{(k)}, \beta^{(k)}$ are the first r elements and the rest $p-r$ elements of $v^{(k)}$. Noticing $\lambda_k(A)v^{(k)} = Av^{(k)}$, by comparing coefficients of this identity, we have for $1 \leq i \leq r, r+1 \leq k \leq p$,

$$\lambda_i(A_{11})\alpha_i^{(k)} + (A_{12}\beta^{(k)})_i = \lambda_k(A)\alpha_i^{(k)}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \alpha_i^{(k)} = \frac{-(A_{12}\beta^{(k)})_i}{\lambda_i(A_{11}) - \lambda_k(A)}. \quad (32)$$

By the assumption that $\lambda_r(A_{11}) = \lambda_r(W^{\top} A W) > \lambda_{r+1}(A)$, we have

$$\left(\alpha_i^{(k)} \right)^2 \leq \frac{(A_{12}\beta^{(k)})_i^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2}.$$

Then, we can bound the Frobenius norm of $\sin \Theta(V, W)$ via

$$\left\| \left[\alpha^{(r+1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(p)} \right] \right\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r, r+1 \leq k \leq p} (A_{12}\beta^{(k)})_i^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\left\| A_{12} \begin{bmatrix} \beta^{(r+1)}, \dots, \beta^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\| A_{12,i} \begin{bmatrix} \beta^{(r+1)}, \dots, \beta^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{l_2}^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \beta^{(r+1)}, \dots, \beta^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \left\| A_{12,i}^\top \right\|_{l_2}^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\|A_{12}\|_F^2}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_{12,i}$ is i th row of A_{12} . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sin \Theta(V, W)\|_F &= \|W^\top V_\perp\|_F \\
&= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(r+1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{\|A_{12}\|_F}{(\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A))} \\
&= \frac{\|W^\top A W_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds as a result of Exercise VII.I.11 in [Bhatia \(1997\)](#).

To prove the upper bound of the spectral norm of $\sin \Theta(V, W)$, let $s = [s_{r+1}, \dots, s_p]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p-r}$ be any vector with $\|s\|_{l_2} = 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=r+1}^p s_k \alpha_i^{(k)} \\
\stackrel{(32)}{=} &\sum_{k=r+1}^p \frac{-s_k (A_{12} \beta^{(k)})_i}{\lambda_i(A_{11}) - \lambda_k(A)} \\
&= \sum_{k=r+1}^p \frac{-s_k}{\lambda_i(A_{11})} \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_k(A)/\lambda_i(A_{11})} (A_{12} \beta^{(k)})_i \\
&= \sum_{k=r+1}^p \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{-s_k \lambda_k^l(A)}{\lambda_i^{l+1}(A_{11})} (A_{12} \beta^{(k)})_i \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{-A_{12,i}}{\lambda_i^{l+1}(A_{11})} \left(\sum_{k=r+1}^p s_k \lambda_k^l(A) \beta^{(k)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_{12,i}$ is the i th row of A_{12} .

Hence, by the assumption that $\lambda_r(W^\top A W) > \lambda_{r+1}(A) \geq \lambda_p(A) > 0$, we have

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(r+1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(p)} \end{bmatrix} s \right\|_{l_2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left\| \sum_{k=r+1}^p \alpha^{(k)} s_k \right\|_{l_2} \\
&= \left\| \sum_{k=r+1}^p \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1^{(k)} s_k \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_r^{(k)} s_k \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{l_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} -A_{12,1}/\lambda_1^{l+1}(A_{11}) \\ \vdots \\ -A_{12,r}/\lambda_r^{l+1}(A_{11}) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=r+1}^p s_k \lambda_k^l(A) \beta^{(k)} \right) \right\|_{l_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} -A_{12,1}/\lambda_1^{l+1}(A_{11}) \\ \vdots \\ -A_{12,r}/\lambda_r^{l+1}(A_{11}) \end{bmatrix} \right\| \cdot \left\| \left(\sum_{k=r+1}^p s_k \lambda_k^l(A) \beta^{(k)} \right) \right\|_{l_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \| -A_{12} \| \cdot \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{l+1}(A_{11})} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \frac{1}{\lambda_r^{l+1}(A_{11})} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \cdot \left\| [\beta^{(r+1)} \dots \beta^{(p)}] \begin{bmatrix} s_{r+1} \lambda_{r+1}^l(A) \\ \vdots \\ s_p \lambda_p^l(A) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{l_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{\|A_{12}\|}{\lambda_r^{l+1}(A_{11})} \cdot \left\| [\beta^{(r+1)} \dots \beta^{(p)}] \right\| \cdot \left\| (s_{r+1} \lambda_{r+1}^l(A), \dots, s_p \lambda_p^l(A))^\top \right\|_{l_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{r+1}^l(A) \|A_{12}\|}{\lambda_r^{l+1}(A_{11})} \cdot \|s\|_{l_2} \\
&= \frac{\|A_{12}\|}{\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)},
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sin \Theta(V, W)\| &= \|W^\top V_\perp\| \\
&= \left\| [\alpha^{(r+1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(p)}] \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{\|A_{12}\|}{\lambda_r(A_{11}) - \lambda_{k+1}(A)} \\
&= \frac{\|W^\top A W_\perp\|}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)} \\
&= \frac{\|P_{W^\top A W} W^\top A W_\perp\|}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have proved Theorem 7 for A and W satisfying (30) and (31). Then, for any general

symmetric A and W satisfying (31), let

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W^\top \\ W_\perp^\top \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} W, W_\perp \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{U}^\top & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Sigma} & \bar{U}^\top W^\top A W_\perp \\ W_\perp^\top A W \bar{U} & W_\perp^\top A W_\perp \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\bar{U}\bar{\Sigma}\bar{U}^\top$ is the spectral decomposition of $W^\top A W$.

Then, since $\lambda_r(W^\top B W) = \lambda_r(W^\top A W) > \lambda_{r+1}(A) = \lambda_{r+1}(B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sin \Theta(V_B, W)\|_F &\leq \frac{\|W^\top B W_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(W^\top B W) - \lambda_{r+1}(B)} \\ &= \frac{\|\bar{U}^\top W^\top A W_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(\bar{\Sigma}) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)} \\ &= \frac{\|P_{W^\top A W} W^\top A W_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(W^\top A W) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

Also notice by comparing spectral decomposition of B and A :

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_B, V_{B_\perp} \end{bmatrix} \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} V_B^\top \\ V_{B_\perp}^\top \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_A, V_{A_\perp} \end{bmatrix} \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} V_A^\top \\ V_{A_\perp}^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_1^\top, U_2^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where $U_1 = [\bar{U}, 0]$ and $U_2 = [0, I]$.

Hence

$$V_B = \begin{bmatrix} U_1 V_A \\ U_2 V_A \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$V_B^\top W_\perp = \begin{bmatrix} V_A^\top U_1^\top, V_A^\top U_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} = V_A^\top U_2^\top = V_A^\top W_\perp.$$

Thus,

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_B, W)\|_F = \|V_B^\top W_\perp\|_F = \|\sin \Theta(V_A, W)\|_F,$$

i.e., we have proved Theorem 7 for general A . Finally, for general $W \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$, let $\widetilde{W} = [W, W_\perp]$

and notice that

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_A, W)\|_F = \|\sin \Theta(\widetilde{W}^\top V_A, \widetilde{W}^\top W)\|_F = \left\| \sin \Theta \left(\widetilde{W}^\top V_A, \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|_F.$$

Let

$$B = \widetilde{W}^\top A \widetilde{W} = \begin{bmatrix} W^\top A W & W^\top A W_\perp \\ W_\perp^\top A W & W_\perp^\top A W_\perp \end{bmatrix} = \widetilde{W}^\top \begin{bmatrix} V_A, V_{A_\perp} \end{bmatrix} \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} V_A^\top \\ V_{A_\perp}^\top \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{W},$$

then $V_B = \widetilde{W}^\top V_A$ and $\lambda_r(B_{11}) = \lambda_r(W^\top AW) > \lambda_{r+1}(A) = \lambda_{r+1}(B)$. By previous result,

$$\|\sin \Theta(V_A, W)\|_F = \left\| \sin \Theta \left(V_B, \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\|_F \leq \frac{\|P_{W^\top AW} W^\top AW_\perp\|_F}{\lambda_r(W^\top AW) - \lambda_{r+1}(A)}.$$

Similarly, we can also generalize the upper bound of spectral norm for symmetric A and $W \in \mathbb{O}_{p,r}$.

G.1 Proof of Corollary 2

First, to prove

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X})},$$

let $Y = X + aI$ for sufficient large a , such that both $\hat{Y} = X + aI + Z$ is positive semi-definite.

Notice the structure of eigenspace and eigen-gap do not change, i.e.,

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} U & U_\perp \end{bmatrix} \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} + aI \right) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} U^\top \\ U_\perp^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

is the eigen-decomposition of Y ,

$$\hat{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U} & \hat{U}_\perp \end{bmatrix} \cdot \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\Sigma}_2 \end{bmatrix} + aI \right) \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \hat{U}^\top \\ \hat{U}_\perp^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

is the eigen-decomposition of \hat{Y} and $\lambda_r(P_U \hat{Y} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{Y}) = \lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X})$. So, we can apply Theorem 7 on \hat{Y} , which yields

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{Y} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{Y})} = \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X})}.$$

Since $\hat{X} = \hat{X} P_U + \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}$ and Lemma 2 in Cai & Zhang (2018), we have $\lambda_{r+1}(\hat{X}) \leq \sigma_{r+1}(\hat{X}) \leq \sigma_1(P_{U_\perp} \hat{X}) \leq \sigma_1(P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_U) + \sigma_1(P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}) = \|P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}\| + \|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|$. Thus, the inequality

$$\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\| \leq \frac{\|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}{\lambda_r(P_U \hat{X} P_U) - \|P_{U_\perp} \hat{X} P_{U_\perp}\| - \|P_U Z P_{U_\perp}\|}$$

follows.

H Additional Theory for Order- d MOP-UP

The following theorem presents a mild identifiability condition for the order- d spiked covariance model, expanding upon the findings of Theorem 2.

Theorem 10 (Identifiability of order- d spiked covariance model). *Suppose $\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k$, where $U_k \in \mathbb{O}_{p_r, r_k}$ is a deterministic matrix and $\mathbf{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_{k-1} \times r_k \times p_{k+1} \times \dots \times p_d}$ is a random tensor, $k = 1, \dots, d$. If for any $k = 1, \dots, d$, any $v \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_{k-1} \times r_k \times p_{k+1} \times \dots \times p_d}$ and any affine subspace $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p_k}$, either $\mathbb{P}(U_k \mathcal{M}_k(\mathbf{A}_k)v \in \mathcal{W} | \mathbf{A}_h, h \neq k) = 0$ or $\text{span}(U_k) \in \mathcal{W}$. Then, U_k are identifiable in the sense that for any fixed $V_k \in \mathbb{O}_{p_k, r_k}$, $k = 1, \dots, d$, if $\|\sin \Theta(U_k, V_k)\| \neq 0$ for some k , then $\Sigma \times_{k=1}^d P_{V_{k\perp}} \neq 0$, where Σ is the covariance tensor of \mathbf{Y} .*

The following proposition shows the AP algorithm (Algorithm 3) is essentially performing alternating minimization.

Proposition 2 (Generalization of Proposition 1). *For any given $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, tensors \mathbf{X}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $V_h \in \mathbb{O}_{p_h, r_h}$, $h \neq k$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{V_k \in \mathbb{O}_{p_k, r_k}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \times_{k=1}^d V_k^\top \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\{ \text{Eigen}_{r_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_k \left((\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \times_{h \neq k} V_h^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left((\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \times_{h \neq k} V_h^\top \right)^\top \right) O : \forall O \in \mathbb{O}_{r_k} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can establish the linear convergence and statistical error properties for the AP algorithm (Algorithm 3).

Assumption 3. *Assume in decomposition (13), \mathbf{A}_k 's are independent and there is a constant μ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mu \leq \frac{\max_k \|\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_k)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right\} \leq \nu, \quad \text{for some small } \nu < 1.$$

Denote λ as

$$\lambda = \min_h \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_h) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_h)^\top \right) \right).$$

We have $\frac{\mu^2}{\lambda} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

Here, μ^2/λ can be interpreted as a conditional number reflecting balance among singular values of \mathbf{A}_k . So Assumption 3 essentially means the condition number of the score matrices \mathbf{A}_k is bounded.

Assumption 4. \mathbf{Z} has i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries with sub-Gaussian norm τ and mean 0.

Define $u = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z})}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_2}$. We can now present the following theoretical guarantee for AP, which can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 5.

Theorem 11 (Local Convergence and Statistical Error Bound). *Let tensors $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ satisfy the decomposition (13). Suppose the output of Algorithm 3 is $\{\hat{U}_k^{(t)}\}_{k=1}^d$ and define the error at t th iteration as*

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} = \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \left\{ \left\| \sin \Theta(U_k, \hat{U}_k^{(t)}) \right\| \right\}.$$

Assume Assumptions 3 and 4 hold and $d \geq 2$. For any given $c_1 > 0$, there exist constants $c_2, c_3, c_4 < 1, c_5$ (all independent of any variable in the following inequalities) such that if initialization error $\text{Error}^{(0)} \leq c_3$ and n satisfies:

$$n \geq c_2 r_m (p_m + p_{-m}) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\mu^4}, \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\mu}, 1 \right\},$$

then we have that with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_1 r_m (p_m + p_{-m})} - \nu$, the estimation error in Algorithm 3 converges linearly with rate c_4 :

$$\text{Error}^{(t)} - \text{Error} \leq c_4 \left(\text{Error}^{(t-1)} - \text{Error} \right),$$

where Error is bounded by

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \theta \frac{u}{\mu}, \frac{u^2}{\mu^2} \right\}. \quad (33)$$

Here, $r_{-h} = \prod_{k \neq h} r_k$, $p_{-h} = \prod_{k \neq h} p_k$, $\theta = \max \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{p_h}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}; h = 1, \dots, d \right\}$, $m = \arg \max_k \{r_{-k}(p_k + p_{-k})\}$ and $p_{\max} = \max_k \{p_k\}$.

Remark 2. In the context of Theorem 11, θ represents the balance of orders of \mathbf{X} – as long as there is no one dimension greater than the product of the others, then $\theta = 1$.

Now, assume the orders of \mathbf{X} are balanced such that $\theta \leq C$ for some constant C . If all the entries of \mathbf{Z} are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian distributed as z is with sub-Gaussian norm τ , then by

Lemma 9, we can conclude that $u = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z})}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \tau \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{p_h}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right) \lesssim \tau$. The condition for sample size n can be simplified to

$$n \geq c_2 r_{-m} (p_{-m} + p_m) \max \left\{ \frac{\tau^4}{\mu^4}, 1 \right\},$$

and the error bound (33) is simplified to

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \frac{\tau}{\mu}, \frac{\tau^2}{\mu^2} \right\}. \quad (34)$$

H.1 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X} = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$. And for tensors \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ refers to their tensor product in this section.

Assume the decomposition equation

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{X} + \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z}$$

holds. Notice the facts:

1. Consider a random tensor \mathbf{X} as a multilinear transformation. Then for fixed v ,

$$(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{X})(v) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}v).$$

2. Consider a random tensor \mathbf{A} as a multilinear transformation:

$$\mathbb{A} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbf{P}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $\mathbf{A} \times_k U_k$ is the multilinear transformation after changing the base of \mathbb{R}^{p_k} by linear transformation U_k and hence, the order of tensor product and n-mode product with a matrix is changeable. And,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{A} \times_k U_k) = (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \times_k U_k.$$

Hence, the covariance tensor

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Sigma} &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{X}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) + \mathbf{I}_p.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \times_1 U_{1\perp}^\top \times_2 \cdots \times_d U_{d\perp}^\top \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_i \times_i U_i) \otimes (\mathbf{A}_j \times_j U_j) \times_1 U_{1\perp}^\top \cdots \times_d U_{d\perp}^\top \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^d \left((\mathbf{A}_i \times_i U_i \times_i U_{i\perp}^\top) \otimes (\mathbf{A}_j \times_j U_j) \times_1 U_{1\perp}^\top \cdots \times_{i-1} U_{i-1\perp}^\top \times_{i+1} U_{i+1\perp}^\top \cdots \times_d U_{d\perp}^\top \right) \right) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which proved the sufficiency.

To prove the necessity, assume \mathbf{X} has spiked covariance. Define

$$\mathbf{A}_k = (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Z}) \times_1 (U_{1\perp} U_{1\perp}^\top) \cdots \times_{k-1} (U_{k-1\perp} U_{k-1\perp}^\top) \times_k U_k^\top,$$

where \mathbf{Z} is some random tensor with $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{Z} = 0, \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z} \otimes \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X} \otimes \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{I}$. So $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{A}_k \otimes \mathbf{Z}) = 0$. Here, to see the existence of such \mathbf{Z} , without loss of generality, assume $\mathbf{X} = x$ is a random vector. Then, the existence of z is guaranteed by lemma 1.

Now denote $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Z}$. Notice $\mathbb{R}^{p_i} = \text{span}(U_i) \oplus \text{span}(U_{i\perp})$ implies that for any $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ we have decomposition $v_i = u_i + u_i^\perp$ with $u_i \in \text{span}(U_i), u_i^\perp \in \text{span}(U_{i\perp})$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (v_1, \cdots, v_d) \\
&= \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (u_1, v_2, \cdots, v_d) + \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (u_1^\perp, v_2, \cdots, v_d) \\
&= \left(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{Y} \times_1 P_{U_1} - \sum_{k=2}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (u_1, v_2, \cdots, v_d) + \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=2}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (u_1^\perp, v_2, \cdots, v_d)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=2}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (u_1^\perp, v_2, \dots, v_d) \\
&= \dots \\
&= \mathbf{Y}(u_1^\perp, \dots, u_d^\perp).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice $\Sigma_0 \times_1 U_{1\perp} \times_2 \dots \times_d U_{d\perp} = 0$ implies that for any $u_i^\perp \in \text{span}(U_{i\perp}), v_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$, we have $\Sigma_0(u_1^\perp, \dots, u_d^\perp, v_{d+1}, \dots, v_{2d}) = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) \otimes \left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) \right) (v_1, \dots, v_{2d}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (v_1, \dots, v_d) \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{Y} - \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \right) (v_{d+1}, \dots, v_{2d}) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{Y}(u_1^\perp, \dots, u_d^\perp) \right) \left(\mathbf{Y}(u_{d+1}^\perp, \dots, u_{2d}^\perp) \right) \\
&= \Sigma_0(u_1^\perp, \dots, u_{2d}^\perp) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the covariance tensor is 0, and hence, the decomposition equation holds a.s. and the Theorem is proved. \blacksquare

H.2 Proof of Theorem 10

Proof. Assume that for some V_k we have $\mathbf{Y} \times_{k=1}^d P_{V_{k\perp}} = 0$. Notice that $\|\sin \Theta(U_k, V_k)\| = 0$ is equivalent to $P_{V_{k\perp}} U_k = 0$. Without loss of generality, assume $P_{V_{1\perp}} U_1 \neq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{Y} \times_{h=1}^d P_{V_{h\perp}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_k \times_k U_k \times_{h=1}^d P_{V_{h\perp}} \right) \\
&= P_{V_{1\perp}} U_1 \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1) Q + P_{V_{1\perp}} \sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k) Q_k
\end{aligned}$$

where $Q = \bigotimes_{j=d}^2 P_{V_{j\perp}}$ and $Q_k = Q \bigotimes_{j=d}^{k+1} I_{p_j} \otimes U_k^\top \bigotimes_{j=k-1}^2 I_{p_j}$. Intuitively, to make the last line 0, we need its two terms to cancel out with each other. However, by the condition in the theorem, the probability for $P_{V_{1\perp}} U_1 \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1) Q$ to cancel out with $P_{V_{1\perp}} \sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k) Q_k$ for any given $\mathbf{A}_k, k \geq 2$ is 0.

To make the statement rigorous, notice that it follows $\text{span}\left(U_1\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1)Q + \sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_k\right) \subseteq \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}})$, which implies for any v such that $Qv \neq 0$, we have

$$U_1\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1)Qv + \sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv \in \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}}),$$

and hence

$$U_1\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1)Qv \in \mathcal{A},$$

where \mathcal{A} represents the affine space $\{w = u - \sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv : \forall u \in \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}})\}$.

For given $\mathbf{A}_k, k \geq 2$, if $\sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv = 0$, we have $\mathcal{A} = \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}}) = \text{span}(V_1) \neq \text{span}(U_1)$, and thus $\text{span}(U_1) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

If $\sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv \neq 0$, then \mathcal{A} is a shifted r_1 dimensional space. If the shift direction is in the subspace, i.e., $\sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv \in \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}})$, then $\mathcal{A} = \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}})$, and hence $\text{span}(U_1) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$. If the shift direction is not in the subspace, i.e., $\sum_{k=2}^d \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_k)Q_kv \notin \ker(P_{V_{1\perp}})$, then $\forall u$ with small enough $\|u\|$, we have $u \notin \mathcal{A}$. Thus, $\text{span}(U_1) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

By above discuss, we always have $\text{span}(U_1) \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Hence by the condition in the theorem, we have $\mathbb{P}(U_1\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1)Qv \in \mathcal{A} | \mathbf{A}_k, k \geq 2) = 0$, which concludes that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \times_{k=1}^d P_{V_{k\perp}} = 0\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{P}(U_1\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_1)Qv \in \mathcal{A} | \mathbf{A}_k, k \geq 2)\right) = 0.$$

Thus, by Theorem 8, if the covariance tensor Σ of \mathbf{Y} satisfies $\Sigma \times_{k=1}^d V_{k\perp} = 0$, then there exists $\{\mathbf{B}_i\}$ such that $\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{B}_i \times_i P_{V_{k\perp}}$, and hence, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \times_{k=1}^d P_{V_{k\perp}} = 0) = 1$. Thus, $\Sigma \times_{k=1}^d V_{k\perp} \neq 0$. ■

H.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = 0$. Notice

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbf{X}_i \times_{k=1}^d U_{k\perp}^\top \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{k=1}^d U_{k\perp}^\top \right) \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left(P_{U_{k\perp}} \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right)^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} \right) \\
&= \text{tr} \left(P_{U_{k\perp}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right)^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} \right) \\
&= \text{tr} \left(P_{U_{k\perp}} \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} \lambda_i e_i e_i^\top \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} \lambda_i \text{tr}(P_{U_{k\perp}} e_i e_i^\top) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} \lambda_i e_i^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} e_i \geq \sum_{i > r_k} \lambda_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where e_i is the eigenvector of $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{h \neq k} U_{h\perp}^\top \right)^\top$ and λ_i is the corresponding eigenvalue satisfying $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1} \geq 0$. The last inequality is due to the fact that $0 \leq e_i^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} e_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p_k} e_i^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} e_i = \text{tr}(P_{U_{k\perp}} \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} e_i e_i^\top) = \text{tr}(P_{U_{k\perp}}) = p_k - r_k$. The equality holds when $P_{U_{k\perp}} e_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, r_k$, i.e. the minimizer should be U_k such that $\text{span}(U_k) = \text{span}(\text{Eigen}_{r_k}(\frac{1}{n} \sum (X_i^\top P_{U_{k\perp}} X_i)))$. \blacksquare

H.4 Proof of Theorem 11

Let's first introduce notations of set \mathcal{A} of conditions on $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}$, \mathbf{Z}_i and set \mathcal{C} of condition on initialization.

Notation 2. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
T_h &= \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k \times \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} : \|W\| = 1, \text{tr}(W) = 0, W = W^\top, \text{rank}(W) \leq 2^{d-1} \prod_{k \neq h} r_k \right\}, \\
L_h &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,h}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,h})^\top \right), \\
M_{1,h} &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \sup_{E \in T_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,h}) E \mathcal{M}_h \left(\sum_{k \neq h} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{2,h} &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \max_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \\ k_1, k_2 \neq h; k_1 \neq k_2}} \sup_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_1} \times_{k_1} U_{k_1}) E \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_2} \times_{k_2} U_{k_2})^\top \right\| \\
M_{3,h} &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \sup_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_h \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\|, \\
M_{4,h} &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \sup_{E \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right\|, \\
\Delta_h &= L_h - (d-1)(M_{1,h} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,h} + M_{3,h} + M_{4,h}), \\
\xi_h &= (d-1)(2 + 2d^2 + M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + 3M_{3,1} + 3M_{4,1}), \\
\Gamma_h &= \Delta_h - \varepsilon_0 \xi_h, \\
\kappa_h &= \frac{2}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,h} \times_h U_h)^\top \right\| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq h} (p_k - r_k) I \right\|, \\
\mathcal{A}_1 &= \{\Delta_h > 0; h = 1, \dots, d\}, \\
\mathcal{A}_2 &= \left\{ \frac{4\kappa_h}{L_h - \varepsilon_0 \xi_h - 3\kappa_h} \leq \frac{\Gamma_h}{L_h} \varepsilon_0; h = 1, \dots, d \right\}, \\
\mathcal{A}_3 &= \left\{ \max_{i,k} \|\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{i,k})\| \leq \sqrt{\prod_{t \neq h} p_t} \right\}, \\
\mathcal{A} &= \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \mathcal{A}_3
\end{aligned}$$

Notation 3. Denote

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\Gamma_h > 0; h = 1, \dots, d\}.$$

The strategy of this proof is to first establish a deterministic upper bound for estimation error given that $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}$, \mathbf{Z}_i are nonrandom satisfying conditions $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ (in Section H.4.1), and then prove these conditions hold with high probability (in Section H.4.2).

H.4.1 Deterministic Bound

We first introduce the following technical lemma that will be used in this section:

Lemma 15. Let A_i, B_i be matrices with the same dimension, $\|A_i\|, \|B_i\| \leq 1$, and $\|A_i - B_i\| \leq \varepsilon$.

Then

$$\left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^d A_i - \bigotimes_{i=1}^d B_i \right\| \leq d\varepsilon$$

Proof. Notice the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^k A_i \bigotimes_{i=k+1}^d B_i - \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i \bigotimes_{i=k}^d B_i \right\| &= \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i \otimes (A_k - B_k) \bigotimes_{i=k+1}^d B_i \right\| \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \|A_i\| \|A_k - B_k\| \prod_{i=k+1}^d \|B_i\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^d A_i - \bigotimes_{i=1}^d B_i \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^k A_i \bigotimes_{i=k+1}^d B_i - \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i \bigotimes_{i=k}^d B_i \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^k A_i \bigotimes_{i=k+1}^d B_i - \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i \bigotimes_{i=k}^d B_i \right\| \leq d\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

■

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_i &= \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k = \mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{Z}_i, \\ H_k &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{j \neq k} p_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{S}_i \times_{j \neq k} (U_{j\perp})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{S}_i \times_{j \neq k} (U_{j\perp})^\top \right)^\top, \\ \widehat{H}_k^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{n \prod_{j \neq k} p_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{j \neq k} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_k \left(\mathbf{X}_i \times_{j \neq k} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 16. In the context of Corollary 2, let $\widehat{X} = \widehat{H}_1^{(t+1)} - \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} \frac{p_k - r_k}{p_k} \sigma^2 \right) I$, $X = H_1$, and denote

$$\varepsilon_t = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U_k, \widehat{U}_k^{(t)})\|, k = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \alpha = \lambda_{r_1}(P_{U_1} \widehat{X} P_{U_1}), \beta = \|P_{U_{1\perp}} \widehat{X} P_{U_{1\perp}}\|, z_{21} = \|P_{U_1} Z P_{U_{1\perp}}\|.$$

When $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i$ are nonrandom satisfying condition $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$,

we have:

$$\alpha \geq L_1 - \varepsilon_t(d-1)(d^2 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) - \kappa_1,$$

$$\alpha \leq L_1 + \varepsilon_t(d-1)(d^2 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1,$$

$$\beta \leq \varepsilon_t(d-1)(d^2 + 1 + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1,$$

$$z_{21} \leq \varepsilon_t(d-1)(M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + \varepsilon_t + M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1.$$

where $M_{i,1}, \kappa_1, L_1$ are defined in Notation 1.

Proof. Firstly notice, by Lemma 15, we have

$$\left\| \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \right\| \leq 1. \quad (35)$$

Also, $\text{rank}(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}) = \text{rank}(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} (P_{U_{j\perp}} - P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}})) = \text{rank}(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} (P_{U_j} - P_{\widehat{U}_j^{(t)}})) \leq 2^{d-1} \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k$ Hence, by Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned} & n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \alpha \\ &= n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \lambda_{r_1} \left(U_1^\top \widehat{H}_1^{(t+1)} U_1 - \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} \frac{p_k - r_k}{p_k} \sigma^2 \cdot U_1^\top I U_1 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(21)}{\leq} \lambda_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\| \\ &\quad + 2 \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 - n \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I U_1 \right\| \\ &= \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \right)^\top \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
\leq & \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right) \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right\| \\
& + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
= & \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right\| \\
& + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
& \leq n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (L_1 + \varepsilon_t(d-1)((d-1)^2 + 2(d-1) + 1 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1) \\
& = n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (L_1 + \varepsilon_t(d-1)(d^2 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by (35) and $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$. On the other hand, we can similarly derive a lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
& n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \alpha \\
& \stackrel{(21)}{\geq} \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top \right) \\
& - 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\| \\
& - \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\| \\
& - 2 \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{Z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left\| U_1^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_1 - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I U_1 \right\| \\
& \geq \sigma_{r_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right) \\
& - (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1})^\top \right\| \\
& - 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& - (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& - 2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \\
& - 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& - \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
& - (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
& \geq n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (L_1 - \varepsilon_t(d-1)(d^2 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) - \kappa_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can give an upper bound of β :

$$\begin{aligned}
& n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \beta \\
& = n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \left\| U_{1\perp}^\top \widehat{H}_1^{(t+1)} U_{1\perp} - \prod_{k \neq 1} \frac{p_k - r_k}{p_k} \sigma^2 \cdot I \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| U_{1\perp}^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_{1\perp} \right\| \\
& + 2 \left\| U_{1\perp}^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_{1\perp} \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\| U_{1\perp}^\top \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} \left(\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)} \right)^\top \right)^\top U_{1\perp} - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
& \leq (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
& \leq n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (\varepsilon_t (d-1) ((d-1)^2 + 2d + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1) \\
& = n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (\varepsilon_t (d-1) (d^2 + 1 + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1)
\end{aligned}$$

To upper bound z_{21} , firstly notice

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k \left(\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k \right) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k \left(\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k \right) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right)^\top \right\| \\
& \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k \neq 1} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k \left(\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k \right) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k \left(\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k \right) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right)^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \neq 1 \\ k_1 \neq k_2}} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_1} \times_{k_1} U_{k_1} \times_{j \neq 1} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_2} \times_{k_2} U_{k_2} \times_{j \neq 1} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right)^\top \right\| \\
& = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k \neq 1} \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{A}_{i,k}) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \leq k-1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \otimes (U_k^\top \widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)})^2 \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \geq k+1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \right) \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{A}_{i,k})^\top \right\| \\
& + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \neq 1 \\ k_1 \neq k_2}} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_1} \times_{k_1} U_{k_1} \times_{j \neq 1} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i,k_2} \times_{k_2} U_{k_2} \times_{j \neq 1} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right)^\top \right\| \\
& \leq \sum_{k \neq 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{A}_{i,k}) \left(\left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \leq k-1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \otimes (U_k^\top \widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)})^2 \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \geq k+1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \right) \mathcal{M}_1 (\mathbf{A}_{i,k})^\top \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \neq 1 \\ k_1 \neq k_2}} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k_1} \times_{k_1} U_{k_1}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k_2} \times_{k_2} U_{k_2})^\top \right\|.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} & n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k z_{21} = n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \left\| P_{U_{1\perp}} \widehat{H}_1^{(t+1)} P_{U_1} \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{A}_{i, 1} \times_1 U_1 \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k (\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} \mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k (\widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)\top} U_k) \times_{j \neq 1, k} \widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)\top} \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n P_{U_{1\perp}} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k U_k) \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right) \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{z}_i \times_{j \neq 1} (\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)})^\top \right)^\top \right\| \\ & \leq (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, 1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \varepsilon_t^2 \sum_{k \neq 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k}) \frac{\left(\left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \leq k-1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \otimes (U_k^\top \widehat{U}_{k\perp}^{(t)})^2 \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1, j \geq k+1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}} \right) \right)}{\varepsilon_t^2} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k})^\top \right\| \\ & + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2 \neq 1 \\ k_1 \neq k_2}} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k_1} \times_{k_1} U_{k_1}) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, k_2} \times_{k_2} U_{k_2})^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i, 1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \\ & + 2(d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j\perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i, k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\ & + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{z}_i)^\top - n\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (d-1)\varepsilon_t \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} - \bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{\widehat{U}_{j \perp}^{(t)}}}{(d-1)\varepsilon_t} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right\| \\
& \leq n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k (\varepsilon_t (d-1)(M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + \varepsilon_t + M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) + \kappa_1).
\end{aligned}$$

■

We are ready to prove the following:

Theorem 12. *In Algorithm 2, let $\mathbf{X}_i = \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k + \mathbf{Z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times \dots \times p_d}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote the estimation error $\varepsilon_t = \max \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U_k, \widehat{U}_k^{(t)})\|, k = 1, \dots, n \right\}$. When $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i$ are non-random satisfying condition $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, there is a constant $\chi = \max_h \frac{L_h - \Gamma_h}{L_h} < 1$, which does not depend on t , such that for $t = 0, 1, \dots, m$,*

$$\varepsilon_{t+1} \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0,$$

where

$$K_1 = \max_h \frac{4\kappa_h}{L_h - \xi_h - 3\kappa_h}.$$

Consequently,

$$\varepsilon_t \leq \chi^t \varepsilon_0 + K_2,$$

where $K_2 = K_1 \frac{1 - \chi^t}{1 - \chi}$.

Proof. We will prove this by induction. Assume the statement holds for $m < t$. Consider $m = t$, where we are calculating $\widehat{U}_h^{(t+1)}$ for $h = 1$.

By Corollary 2:

$$\|\sin \Theta(U_1, \widehat{U}_1^{(t+1)})\| \leq \frac{z_{21}}{\alpha - \beta - z_{21}}.$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1 &= L_1 - \varepsilon_t (d-1)(d^2 + 2M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}), \\
\beta_1 &= \varepsilon_t (d-1)(d^2 + 1 + M_{4,1}), \\
z_1 &= \varepsilon_t (d-1)(M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + \varepsilon_t + M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 16,

$$\frac{z_{21}}{\alpha - \beta - z_{21}} \leq \frac{z_1 + \kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1}$$

$$= \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} + \frac{\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1}. \quad (36)$$

To bound the first term on right-hand side of (36), notice that the function $f(y) = (x - y)/x$ is monotone decreasing for $y < x$ with any given x and that by $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \frac{z_1}{\varepsilon_t} &= L_1 - (d-1)(M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + M_{3,1} + M_{4,1}) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon_t(d-1)(2 + 2d^2 + M_{1,1} + (d-1)^2 M_{2,1} + 3M_{3,1} + 3M_{4,1}) \\ &\geq \Gamma_1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\frac{z_1/\varepsilon_t}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \Gamma_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1}. \quad (37)$$

Further notice that the function $g(x) = (x - y)/x$ is monotone increasing on $x > y$ for fixed y and $\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 \leq L_1$. So,

$$\frac{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - \Gamma_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{L_1 - \Gamma_1}{L_1}. \quad (38)$$

Thus, combining (37) and (38), we have

$$\frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \leq \frac{L_1 - \Gamma_1}{L_1} \varepsilon_t. \quad (39)$$

To bound the remaining two terms of (36), by (25) and $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\frac{\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} \leq \frac{4\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1},$$

and

$$\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 \geq L_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1,$$

which yield

$$\frac{\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} + \frac{z_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1} \frac{3\kappa_1}{\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - z_1 - 3\kappa_1} \leq \frac{4\kappa_1}{L_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1 - 3\kappa_1}. \quad (40)$$

Combining (36), (25) and (40), we finally have

$$\|\sin \Theta(U_1, \widehat{U}_1^{(t+1)})\| \leq \frac{z_1}{\alpha - \beta - z_1} \leq \frac{L_1 - \Gamma_1}{L_1} \varepsilon_t + \frac{4\kappa_1}{L_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1 - 3\kappa_1} \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1.$$

By $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$, we further have

$$\frac{L_1 - \Gamma_1}{L_1} \varepsilon_t + \frac{4\kappa_1}{L_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1 - 3\kappa_1} \leq \frac{L_1 - \Gamma_1}{L_1} \varepsilon_0 + \frac{\Gamma_1}{L_1} \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0.$$

Thus, we have proved

$$\|\sin \Theta(U_1, \widehat{U}_1^{(t+1)})\| \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Similarly, we can prove $\|\sin \Theta(U_h, \widehat{U}_h^{(t+1)})\| \leq \chi \varepsilon_t + K_1 \leq \varepsilon_0$ for other h . So the statement holds by induction. \blacksquare

H.4.2 Statistical Bound

In this section, we are going to argue that when $\mathbf{A}_{i,k}$ and \mathbf{Z}_i are random tensors satisfying Assumption 3 and 4 and with proper initialization, the probability of $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 \cap \mathcal{B}$ is high and the estimation error converges to 0 in probability.

Recall Assumption 3:

Assumption 3. Assume in decomposition (13), \mathbf{A}_k 's are independent and there is a constant μ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mu \leq \frac{\max_k \|\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_k)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}} \right\} \leq \nu, \quad \text{for some small } \nu < 1.$$

Denote λ as

$$\lambda = \min_h \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_h) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_h)^\top \right) \right).$$

We have $\frac{\mu^2}{\lambda} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

We additionally assume $\mu = 1$ and $\nu = 0$ for now, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_3) = 1$. The following lemma bounds the sub-Gaussian norm of $\|Z_i\|$. Denote the variance and fourth moment of each entry of Z as σ^2 and ζ^4 .

Let's first bound the term L in Notation 2 by the well-known Matrix Chernoff inequality (Lemma 4). In our setting, since $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{1,h}) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq h} P_{U_{j\perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_{1,h})^\top \right)$, apply this on L_h :

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_h \leq (1 - \delta)\lambda\} \leq r_h \cdot \left[\frac{e^{-\delta}}{(1 - \delta)^{1-\delta}} \right]^{n\lambda}.$$

Taking $\delta = 1/2$, since $e^{-0.5}/0.5^{0.5} \leq 0.86$, we have

Corollary 10.

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_h \leq \lambda/2\} \leq r_h \cdot \exp\{\log(0.86)n\lambda\}.$$

To bound the terms M in Notation 2, we are going to use the strategy called ‘union bound’.

To that end, let’s first estimate the covering number. Recall

$$T_1 = \left\{ W \in \mathbb{R}^{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k \times \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} : \|W\| = 1, \text{tr}(W) = 0, W = W^\top, \text{rank}(W) \leq \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right\}.$$

By Lemma 10, we have

Corollary 11. *There exists subset \bar{T}_1 of T_1 such that for some absolute constant C_0 ,*

$$|\bar{T}_1| \leq \exp(2^{d-1} \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \log(C_0/\varepsilon)),$$

$$M_{1,1} \leq \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \sup_{E \in \bar{T}_1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| + \varepsilon,$$

and similar bounds hold for other $M_{i,1}$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$ in Notation 1.

Then, we use the Bernstein bound (Lemma 11) and union bound (Corollary 11), which yield the following corollaries for different M in Notation 2.

Corollary 12. *For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^2 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k),$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(c_2) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{1,1} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top$, then $\|Z_i\| \leq (d-1)$ and hence $\exp((\log 2)\|Z_i\|/(d-1)) \leq 2$. Also, $\|Z_i Z_i^\top\| = \|Z_i^\top Z_i\| \leq (d-1)^2$. So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)$, $\sigma_Z = (d-1)$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = (d-1)/\log 2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability

more than $1 - e^{-C \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1}) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k \neq 1} (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\ & \leq C_2 \max \left\{ (d-1) \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, (d-1) \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by union bound from Corollary 11, it yields that with probability more than

$$1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon)) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)},$$

we have

$$M_{1,1} \leq C_2 \max \left\{ (d-1) \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, (d-1) \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^2 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C_4) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{1,1} \leq C_5 \lambda. \quad \blacksquare$$

We can similarly prove the following:

Corollary 13. *For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right)^2 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k),$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(c_2) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{2,1} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

And we also have:

Corollary 14. For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if

$$n \geq c_3 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(c_2) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{3,1} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top$, then $\|Z_i\| \leq (d-1) \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}$ and

$$\sqrt{\log 2} \cdot \left\| \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq \left\| \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_2}.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log 2} \|Z_i\|}{u(d-1)} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log 2} \|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{u \sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right) \leq 2$. Also, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} Z_i Z_i^\top \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \middle| \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right) \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \text{tr} \left(E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) E \right) I \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \left\| \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \right\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq d^2 \sigma^2 \\ &\leq C_6^2 d^2 u^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathbb{E} Z_i^\top Z_i \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \middle| \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right) \right) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) E^2 \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \left\| \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right) \right\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{d^2 p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \sigma^2 \\
&\leq C_6^2 \frac{d^2 p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 du\theta$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = C_6 ud\theta/\sqrt{\log 2}$, where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$. It yields that, there exists constant C_2 such that, with probability more than $1 - e^{-C \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\mathbf{A}_{i,k} \times_k U_k) \right)^\top \right\| \\
&\leq C_2 \max \left\{ du\theta \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, du\theta \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$. Then by union bound from Corollary 11, it yields that with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon)) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$.

$$M_{3,1} \leq C_2 \max \left\{ du\theta \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, du\theta \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C_4) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{3,1} \leq C_5 \lambda.$$

■

Corollary 15. For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if

$$n \geq c_3 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda} \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{4,1} \leq c_1 \lambda.$$

Proof. Let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top$, then $\|Z_i\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|^2}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}$ and hence $\mathbb{E} \exp(\|Z_i\|/u^2) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp\left(\frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|^2}{u^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}\right) \leq 2$. Also, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} Z_i Z_i^\top \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right\| \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 12}}{\leq} \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \zeta^4 \text{tr}(E^2) \\ &\leq \zeta^4 \|E\|^2 \\ &\leq \zeta^4 \\ &\leq C_6^2 u^4. \end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 u^2$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = 2C_6 u^2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-C \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) E \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right\| \\ &\leq C_2 \max \left\{ u^2 \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, u^2 \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by union bound from Corollary 11, it yields that with probability more than

$$1 - e^{-(C - \log(C_0/\varepsilon)) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)},$$

we have

$$M_{4,1} \leq C_2 \max \left\{ u^2 \sqrt{\frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n}}, u^2 \frac{(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k)(p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}{n} \right\} + \varepsilon.$$

So for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 , let ε be a constant multiplier of λ and hence, if

$$n \geq C_3 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-(C_4) \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, we have

$$M_{4,1} \leq C_5 \lambda.$$

■

Corollary 16. *For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \leq c_1 \lambda^3.$$

Proof. Let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top$, then $\|Z_i\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}$ and

$$\sqrt{\log 2} \cdot \left\| \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq \left\| \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right\|_{\psi_2}.$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|Z_i\| \sqrt{\log 2}}{u} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\| \sqrt{\log 2}}{u \sqrt{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}} \right) \leq 2$. Also, there exists an absolute constant $C_6 > 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} Z_i Z_i^\top \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \middle| \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right) \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \text{tr} \left(\left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \right) I \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 \|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)\|^2 \right) \leq \sigma^2 \leq C_6^2 u^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathbb{E} \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{Z}_i \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right)^\top \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \middle| \mathbf{A}_{i,k} \right) \right) \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right)^2 \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sigma^2 p_1 \|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)\|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \sigma^2 \\
&\leq C_6^2 \frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} u^2.
\end{aligned}$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C \log p_1$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 \theta u$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = C_6 \theta u / \sqrt{\log 2}$, where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$. It yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-C \log p_1}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \\
&\leq C_2 \max \left\{ u \theta \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, u \theta \frac{\log p_1}{n} \right\}, \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p_1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}}, 1 \right\}$. So, for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 if

$$n \geq C_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-C_4 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{A}_{i,1} \times_1 U_1)^\top \right\| \leq C_5 \lambda^3.$$

■

Corollary 17. *For given d , c_1 and c_2 , there exists constant c_3 such that if*

$$n \geq c_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \leq c_1 \lambda^3.$$

Proof. Let $Z_i = \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \left(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right)$, then $\|Z_i\| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|^2}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}, \sigma^2 r \right\}$, where $r = \frac{\prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k)}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}$.

Hence, $\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{\|Z_i\|}{\tau} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)\|^2}{\tau \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k}, \frac{\sigma^2 r}{\tau} \right\} \right) \leq 2$, where $\tau = \max \left\{ u^2, \frac{\sigma^2 r}{\log 2} \right\} \leq u^2 / \log 2$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} Z_i Z_i^\top \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left(\mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{2\sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k)}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \left(\mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top \right) + \frac{\sigma^4 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k)^2}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} I \\ & \stackrel{\text{Lemma 12}}{\preceq} \frac{\zeta^4}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \text{tr} \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}}^2 \right) I - \frac{2\sigma^4 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k)}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} \text{tr} \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) I + \frac{\sigma^4 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k)^2}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k^2} I \\ & \preceq \frac{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k - r_k}{\prod_{k \neq 1} p_k} \zeta^4 I. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for some absolute constant $C_6 > 1$,

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} Z_i Z_i^\top \right\| \leq \zeta^4 \leq C_6^2 u^4.$$

So in Lemma 11, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, constant C and $E \in T_1$, let $t = C \log p_1$, $\sigma_Z = C_6 u^2$, $\alpha = 1$ and $U_Z^{(\alpha)} = C_6 u^2 / \log 2$, which yields that there exists constant C_2 such that with probability more than $1 - e^{-C \log p_1}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \\ & \leq C_2 \max \left\{ u^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, u^2 \frac{\log p_1}{n} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

So, for given d and constants C_4 and C_5 if

$$n \geq C_3 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3} \right\}$$

for some large enough C_3 , then with probability more than $1 - e^{-C_4 \log p_1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n \prod_{k \neq h} p_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i) \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq 1} P_{U_{j \perp}} \right) \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbf{Z}_i)^\top - n \sigma^2 \prod_{k \neq 1} (p_k - r_k) I \right\| \leq C_5 \lambda^3.$$

■

Corollaries 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 imply that with proper choice of c_1 , we have

$$\Delta_1 \geq L_1 - C_d(M_{1,h} + M_{2,h} + M_{3,h} + M_{4,h}) \gtrsim \lambda,$$

and

$$\xi_1 \leq C'_d + C_d(M_{1,h} + M_{2,h} + M_{3,h} + M_{4,h}) \lesssim 1$$

with high probability, where C_d and C'_d are constants only related to d . If d is fixed and we set ε_0 as a small constant multiplier of λ , we have

$$\Gamma_1 = \Delta_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1 \gtrsim \lambda.$$

So, if further pick $\kappa_1 \lesssim \lambda^3 \leq \lambda$ small enough, by Corollaries 16 and 17, we have

$$\frac{4\kappa_1}{L_1 - \varepsilon_0 \xi_1 - 3\kappa_1} \lesssim \lambda^2 \lesssim \frac{\Gamma_1 \varepsilon_0}{L_1}$$

with high probability. Additionally, we can bound the error K_2 in Theorem 12 by (41) and (42).

The argument above can be summarized as the following lemma.

Lemma 17. *Given tensor order $d \geq 2$, constants $c_2 > 0$ and assuming Assumption 1, 2 hold with $\mu = 1$ in Assumption 1, then there exist constants $c_1, c_4, c_5 < 1, c_6$ (does not depend on any variable appeared in the following equations) such that if $\varepsilon_0 \leq c_4 \lambda$,*

$$n \geq c_1 \log p_1 \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\lambda^6}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda^3}, \frac{\theta u^2}{\lambda^6}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda^3} \right\},$$

and

$$n \geq c_1 \left(\prod_{k \neq 1} r_k \right) (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^4}{\lambda^2}, \frac{u^2}{\lambda}, \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\lambda^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\lambda} \right\},$$

where $\theta = \max \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{p_h}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}; h = 1, \dots, d \right\}$, then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_2 \prod_{k \neq 1} r_k (p_1 + \prod_{k \neq 1} p_k)}$, $\{\mathbf{A}_{i,k}, \mathbf{Z}_i; i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$. Additionally, in Theorem 12, we have $\chi \leq c_5$ and

$$K_2 \leq c_6 \lambda \max \left\{ u \theta \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, u \theta \frac{\log p_1}{n}, u^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_1}{n}}, u^2 \frac{\log p_1}{n} \right\}.$$

Now let's consider general μ . We can let $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{X}_i/\mu(\{\mathbf{X}_i\})$ and then $\mu(\{\mathbf{Y}_i\}) = 1$ and $\lambda(\{\mathbf{Y}_i\}) = \lambda(\{\mathbf{X}_i\})/\mu(\{\mathbf{X}_i\})^2 \geq 1/C$, where $\mu(\{\mathbf{X}_i\})$ refers the μ of \mathbf{X}_i in Assumption 1, $\mu(\{\mathbf{Y}_i\})$ refers the μ of \mathbf{Y}_i and $\lambda(\{\mathbf{Y}_i\})$ are defined similarly. Then we can apply the above lemma and Theorem 12 to \mathbf{Y}_i . So finally for general ν , by taking out the probability of $\mu \leq \frac{\max_k \|\mathcal{M}_h(\mathbf{A}_k)\|}{\sqrt{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}$ we get:

Theorem 11. *Given constant $c_1 > 0$, tensors $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}$ satisfying decomposition (13) and Assumption 3 and 4 with order $d \geq 2$, then when applying Algorithm 3, there exists constant $c_2, c_3, c_4 < 1, c_5$ (does not depend on any variable appeared in the following equations) such that if $\varepsilon_0 \leq c_3$ and n satisfies the following for all h :*

$$n \geq c_2 r_{-h} (p_h + p_{-h}) \max \left\{ \frac{u^4}{\mu^4}, \frac{\theta^2 u^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\theta u}{\mu}, 1 \right\},$$

then with probability more than $1 - e^{-c_1 r_{-h} (p_h + p_{-h})} - \nu$, the estimation error $\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U_k, \hat{U}_k^{(t)})\| \right\}$ in Algorithm 3 converges linearly with $\chi \leq c_4$:

$$\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U_k, \hat{U}_k^{(t)})\| \right\} - \text{Error} \leq \chi \left(\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \left\{ \|\sin \Theta(U_k, \hat{U}_k^{(t-1)})\| \right\} - \text{Error} \right),$$

and the final error is bounded by

$$\text{Error} \leq c_5 \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{\max}}{n}} \max \left\{ \theta \frac{u}{\mu}, \frac{u^2}{\mu^2} \right\},$$

where $r_{-h} = \prod_{k \neq h} r_k$, $p_{-h} = \prod_{k \neq h} p_k$, $\theta = \max \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{p_h}{\prod_{k \neq h} p_k}}; h = 1, \dots, d \right\}$, $m = \arg \max \{r_{-k} (p_k + p_{-k})\}$ and $p_{\max} = \max_k \{p_k\}$.