

CONSISTENCY OF MATRIX DECOMPOSITION FACTOR ANALYSIS

BY YOSHIKAZU TERADA^{1,2,a},

¹Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University, terada.yoshikazu.es@osaka-u.ac.jp

²Center for Advanced Integrated Intelligence Research, RIKEN

For factor analysis, many estimators, starting with the maximum likelihood estimator, have been developed, and the statistical properties of most estimators have been well explored. In the early 2000s, a new estimator based on matrix factorization, called Matrix Decomposition Factor Analysis (MDFA), was developed. Although the estimator is obtained by minimizing the principal component analysis-like loss function, this estimator empirically behaves like other consistent estimators of factor analysis, not principal component analysis. Since the MDFA estimator cannot be formulated as a classical M-estimator, the statistical properties of the MDFA estimator have yet to be discussed. To explain this unexpected behavior theoretically, we establish the consistency of the MDFA estimator for factor analysis. That is, we show that the MDFA estimator converges to the same limit as other consistent estimators of factor analysis.

1. Introduction. Exploratory factor analysis, often referred to as factor analysis, is an important technique of multivariate analysis (Anderson, 2003). Factor analysis explores the underlying structure of a set of variables and is applied in various fields. In factor analysis, we consider the following model for a p -dimensional observation x :

$$(1) \quad x = \mu + \Lambda f + \epsilon,$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a mean vector, m is the number of factors ($m < p$), $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ is a factor loading matrix, f be a m -dimensional centered random vector with the identity covariance, ϵ be a p -dimensional uncorrelated centered random vector, which is independent from f , with diagonal covariance matrix $\text{Var}(\epsilon) = \Psi^2 = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$. Each component of f and ϵ are called the common and unique factors, respectively. While the common factors refer to latent variables that influence observed variables, explaining the correlations between them, the unique factors represent all unique sources of variance in each observed variable independent of common factors. For example, each unique factor includes a measurement error in each observed variable.

For a constant $c_\Lambda > 0$, let $\Theta_\Lambda := \{\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m} \mid |\lambda_{jk}| \leq c_\Lambda \ (j = 1, \dots, p; k = 1, \dots, m)\}$ be the parameter space for the factor loading matrix Λ . For positive constants $c_L, c_U > 0$, let $\Theta_\Psi := \{\text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p) \mid c_L \leq \sigma_j \leq c_U \ (j = 1, \dots, p)\}$ be the parameter space for Ψ . Let $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (m+p)}$, and write $\Theta_\Phi = \{\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi] \mid \Lambda \in \Theta_\Lambda \text{ and } \Psi \in \Theta_\Psi\}$. For the factor model (1) with $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi]$, the covariance matrix of x is represented as $\Phi\Phi^T = \Lambda\Lambda^T + \Psi^2$.

We assume that the factor model (1) is true with a certain unknown parameter $\Phi_* = [\Lambda_*, \Psi_*] \in \Theta_\Phi$. Let $\Sigma_* = \Phi_*\Phi_*^T = \Lambda_*\Lambda_*^T + \Psi_*^2$ denote the true covariance matrix. Let $(x_1, f_1, \epsilon_1), \dots, (x_n, f_n, \epsilon_n)$ be i.i.d. copies of (x, f, ϵ) , where $(f_1, \epsilon_1), \dots, (f_n, \epsilon_n)$ are not observable in practice. Throughout the paper, it is assumed that $n > m + p$. In factor analysis, we consider the estimation of (Λ_*, Ψ_*) from the observations $X_n := (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T$. Here, we note that the factor model (1) has an indeterminacy. For example, for any $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix R , a rotated loading matrix Λ_*R can also be a true loading matrix. Thus, let $\Theta_\Phi^* = \{\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi \mid \Sigma_* = \Phi\Phi^T\}$ be the set of all possible true parameters.

Keywords and phrases: Factor analysis, matrix factorization.

There are several estimation approaches for parameter $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi]$, e.g., the maximum likelihood estimation, the least-squares estimation, the generalized least-squares estimation (Jöreskog and Goldberger, 1972), the minimum rank factor analysis (ten Berge and Kiers, 1991), and the non-iterative estimation (Ihara and Kano, 1986; Kano, 1990). The theoretical properties of these estimation approaches are well-studied (e.g., Anderson and Rubin, 1956; Browne, 1974; Kano, 1983; Shapiro, 1984; Kano, 1986; Anderson and Amemiya, 1988; Kano, 1991; Shapiro and ten Berge, 2002).

One might think that the maximum likelihood estimator is the best choice from the viewpoint of efficiency. However, it is known that the maximum likelihood estimator is sensitive to the model error on (1) although it is robust to the distributional assumption. For more details, see MacCallum and Tucker (1991), Briggs and MacCallum (2003) and MacCallum, Browne and Cai (2007). Thus, other estimators could be better choices than the maximum likelihood estimator in practice. In fact, some researchers recommend the use of the ordinary least squares estimator in exploratory factor analysis.

In the early 2000s, a new estimator based on matrix factorization was developed for factor analysis (Söcan, 2003; de Leeuw, 2004). According to Adachi and Trendafilov (2018), this method was originally developed by Professor Henk A. L. Kiers at the University of Groningen and first appeared in Söcan's dissertation (Söcan, 2003). Here, this method is referred to as matrix decomposition factor analysis (MDFA for short). MDFA does not provide improper solutions; thus, it is computationally more stable than the maximum likelihood estimator. From the aspect of computational statistics, matrix decomposition factor analysis has been well-studied, and several extensions were developed (see, e.g., Unkel and Trendafilov, 2010; Trendafilov and Unkel, 2011; Trendafilov, Unkel and Krzanowski, 2013; Stegeman, 2016; Adachi, 2022). As an important extension of MDFA for high-dimensional data, we can consider the sparse estimation of MDFA with the ℓ_0 -constraint $\|\Lambda\|_0 \leq K$. Although the sparse estimation with the ℓ_0 -constraint has no bias, unlike other sparse regularizations, the optimization with the ℓ_0 -constraint is generally hard. Thus, there is no sparse version of classical factor analysis with the ℓ_0 -constraint. However, fortunately, the MDFA with the ℓ_0 -constraint $\|\Lambda\|_0 \leq K$ can be easily developed as described in Section 2.

In the matrix decomposition factor analysis, the estimator is obtained by minimizing the following principal component analysis-like loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\mu, \Lambda, \Psi, F, E) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - (\mu + \Lambda f_i + \Psi e_i)\|^2,$$

where $e_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{ip})^T$, $E = (e_1, \dots, e_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, and $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. As described in Section 2, we put some constraints on the common factor matrix F and the normalized unique factor matrix E . Here, we note that the loss function of principal component analysis (PCA) can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{PCA}}(\mu, \Lambda, F) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - (\mu + \Lambda f_i)\|^2$$

with the same constraints on F . The equivalence between this formulation and other standard formulations of PCA can be found in Adachi (2016).

Although the loss function of matrix decomposition factor analysis is very similar to that of principal component analysis, this estimator empirically behaves like other consistent estimators of factor analysis, not principal component analysis. In fact, Stegeman (2016) and Adachi and Trendafilov (2018) empirically show that the matrix decomposition factor analysis provides very similar results with the classical consistent estimators, such as the maximum likelihood estimator. For high-dimensional data, it is well known that principal component

analysis and factor analysis are approximately the same (e.g., [Bentler and Kano \(1990\)](#) and Section 2.1 of [Fan, Liao and Mincheva \(2013\)](#)). Thus, we can expect this behavior of the estimator based on matrix decomposition factor analysis in high-dimensional cases. On the other hand, even in low-dimensional cases, matrix decomposition factor analysis yields results close to other consistent estimators for factor analysis.

In this paper, to explain this unexpected behavior theoretically, we establish the consistency of matrix decomposition factor analysis. That is, we show that as the sample size n goes to infinity, the estimator of matrix decomposition factor analysis converges to the true parameter $\Phi_* \in \Theta_\Phi^*$ like other consistent estimators in factor analysis. Unlike classical factor analysis, in the matrix decomposition factor analysis, common factors F and normalized unique factors E are also considered parameters and are estimated simultaneously with $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi]$. Thus, the number of parameters linearly depends on the sample size n , and we cannot directly apply the standard asymptotic theory of the classical M-estimator to analyze the theoretical properties of matrix decomposition factor analysis. We first reveal the population-level loss function of matrix decomposition factor analysis and its fundamental properties. Then, we will show the consistency of matrix decomposition factor analysis. All proofs can be found in the Appendix.

Throughout the paper, let us denote by $\lambda_j(A)$ the j th largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix A . Let $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ be the operator and the Frobenius norms for a matrix, respectively. Let I_p denote the identity matrix of size p , and let $O_{p \times q}$ denote the $p \times q$ matrix of zeros. The p -dimensional vectors of ones will be denoted by $\mathbf{1}_p$, and the vectors of zeros will be denoted by $\mathbf{0}_p$. For matrix A , let A^+ denote the Moore-Penrose inverse of A . We will denote by $\mathcal{O}(p \times q)$ the set of all $p \times q$ column-orthogonal matrices and will denote by $\mathcal{O}(p)$ the set of all $p \times p$ orthogonal matrices.

2. Matrix decomposition factor analysis (MDFA). We will briefly describe the matrix decomposition factor analysis (MDFA) proposed by [Söcan \(2003\)](#) and [de Leeuw \(2004\)](#) independently. Without loss of generality, the data matrix X_n is centered by the sample mean, and we ignore the estimation of the mean vector μ . For simplicity of notation, we use the same symbol X_n for the centered data matrix. Write $F_n = (f_1, \dots, f_n)^T$ and $\mathcal{E}_n = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^T$. The factor model (1) can be written in the matrix form as follows:

$$X_n = F_n \Lambda^T + \mathcal{E}_n.$$

From this representation, we can naturally consider the following matrix factorization problem:

$$X_n \approx F \Lambda^T + E \Psi,$$

where $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are constrained by

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{n} F^T F = I_m, \quad \frac{1}{n} E^T E = I_p, \quad \text{and} \quad F^T E = O_{m \times p}.$$

In the constraint (2), the first two conditions are empirical counterparts of the assumptions $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbf{0}_m$ and $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon] = \mathbf{0}_p$. Moreover, the other conditions correspond to the covariance constraints for f and ϵ . This matrix factorization approach is called the matrix decomposition factor analysis (MDFA). Here, we note that the factor $1/n$ can be replaced by the factor $1/(n-1)$ in the constraint (2). This modification is essential in practice, as described later.

Let $\Theta_Z := \{Z = [F, E] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (m+p)} \mid Z \text{ satisfies the constraint (2)}\}$. In the matrix decomposition factor analysis, the estimator $(\widehat{\Lambda}_n, \widehat{\Psi}_n, \widehat{F}_n, \widehat{E}_n)$ is obtained by minimizing the following loss function over $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi] \in \Theta_\Phi$ and $Z = [F, E] \in \Theta_Z$:

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z) = \frac{1}{n} \|X_n - Z\Phi^T\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|X_n - (F\Lambda^T + E\Psi)\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - (\Lambda f_i + \Psi e_i)\|^2.$$

Here, we recall that the principal component analysis can be formulated as the minimization problem of the following loss function with constraints $1_n^T F = 0_m^T$ and $F^T F/n = I_m$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \|X_n - F\Lambda^T\|_F^2.$$

When we impose the constraint that $\Lambda^T \Lambda$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are arranged in decreasing order to identify the parameter Λ uniquely, the principal component estimator can be represented as

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{\text{PCA}} = L_m \Delta_m / \sqrt{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{F}_{\text{PCA}} = \sqrt{n} K_m,$$

where Δ_m is a diagonal matrix with the first m singular values of X_n , and $K_m \in \mathcal{O}(n \times m)$ and $L_m \in \mathcal{O}(p \times m)$ are the matrices of first m left singular vectors and right singular vectors of X_n , respectively.

[Adachi and Trendafilov \(2018\)](#) shows several essential properties of matrix decomposition factor analysis. Here, we will introduce some of these properties. The loss function \mathcal{L}_n can be written as follows:

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z) = \frac{1}{n} \|X_n\|_F^2 + \|\Phi\|_F^2 - \frac{2}{n} \text{tr}\{(X_n \Phi)^T Z\}$$

$$(5) \quad = \frac{1}{n} \|X_n - Z Z^T X_n / n\|_F^2 + \|X_n^T Z / n - \Phi\|_F^2.$$

Now, we consider the minimization of the loss function \mathcal{L}_n . Let $\widehat{K}(\Phi) \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T$ be the singular value decomposition of $X^T \Phi / \sqrt{n}$, where $\widehat{\Delta}(\Phi)$ be the diagonal matrix with the singular values, and $\widehat{K}(\Phi) \in \mathcal{O}(n \times p)$ and $\widehat{L}(\Phi) \in \mathcal{O}((m+p) \times p)$ are the matrix of the left singular vectors and the matrix of the right singular vectors, respectively. Let $\widehat{S}_n = X_n^T X_n / n$ be the sample covariance matrix, and then the spectral decomposition of $\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi$ can be written as

$$\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi = (X^T \Phi / \sqrt{n})^T (X^T \Phi / \sqrt{n}) = \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi)^2 \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T.$$

From (4), it follows that, for given Φ , the following $\widehat{Z}(\Phi)$ attains the minimum of $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z)$:

$$(6) \quad \widehat{Z}(\Phi) = \sqrt{n} \widehat{K}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T + \sqrt{n} \widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi) \widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi)^T,$$

where $\widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi) \in \mathcal{O}(n \times m)$ and $\widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi) \in \mathcal{O}((m+p) \times m)$ are column-orthonormal matrices such that

$$\widehat{K}(\Phi)^T \widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi) = \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi) = O_{p \times m}.$$

Here, we note that $\widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi)$ and $\widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi)$ are not uniquely determined.

For given $Z = [F, E] \in \Theta_Z$, the minimization of \mathcal{L}_n with Φ is easy. From (5), we conclude that, for given $Z \in \Theta_Z$, the optimal $\widehat{\Phi}(Z)$ is given by

$$(7) \quad \widehat{\Phi}(Z) = [\widehat{\Lambda}(Z), \widehat{\Psi}(Z)] = [X_n^T F / n, \text{diag}(X_n^T E / n)],$$

where $\text{diag}(X_n^T E / n)$ is the diagonal matrix with diagonal elements of $X_n^T E / n$. That is, $\widehat{\Lambda}(Z) = X_n^T F / n$ and $\widehat{\Psi}(Z) = \text{diag}(X_n^T E / n)$. Therefore, the minimization problem for \mathcal{L}_n can be solved by the simple alternating minimization algorithm. An algorithm of matrix decomposition factor analysis is summarized as follows:

Step 1. Initialize $t = 0$ and $\Phi_{(0)} = [\Lambda_{(0)}, \Psi_{(0)}] \in \Theta_\Phi$.

Step 2. Update $t = t + 1$. By the singular value decomposition of $X_n^T \Phi_{(t-1)} / \sqrt{n}$, update the parameter Z as follows:

$$\widehat{Z}_{(t)} = \left[\widehat{F}_{(t)}, \widehat{E}_{(t)} \right] = \sqrt{n} \widehat{K}(\Phi_{(t-1)}) \widehat{L}(\Phi_{(t-1)})^T + \sqrt{n} \widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi_{(t-1)}) \widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi_{(t-1)})^T.$$

Step 3. Update the parameter Φ as follows:

$$\widehat{\Phi}_{(t)} = \left[\widehat{\Lambda}_{(t)}, \widehat{\Psi}_{(t)} \right] = \left[X_n^T \widehat{F}_{(t)} / n, \text{diag}(X_n^T \widehat{E}_{(t)} / n) \right].$$

Step 4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 until convergence.

Due to the simplicity of the loss function, we can consider the sparse estimation of MDFA with the ℓ_0 -constraint $\|\Lambda\|_0 \leq K$. In Step 3, we keep the top K largest elements in terms of absolute value and set other elements as zero, and then this sparse MDFA can be done. This method is called cardinality-constrained MDFA (CC-MDFA), and see [Adachi \(2016\)](#) for more details.

3. Consistency of Matrix decomposition factor analysis.

3.1. *Main idea.* First, we will describe the main idea to prove the consistency of the matrix decomposition factor analysis. For estimating both Ψ and Z , the original data matrix X_n is necessary. However, when only the estimator for Ψ is needed (and the estimator of Z is unnecessary), [Adachi \(2012\)](#) shows that the above algorithm can be performed using only the sample covariance matrix \widehat{S}_n . For more details of this algorithm, see [Adachi and Trendafilov \(2018\)](#). This fact indicates the possibility that the loss function \mathcal{L}_n concentrated on Ψ can be rewritten using the sample covariance matrix \widehat{S}_n instead of the data matrix X_n . The following lemma shows that the concentrated loss function $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) := \min_{Z \in \Theta_Z} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z)$ has the explicit form with the sample covariance matrix. Considering Z as the nuisance parameter, this loss $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi)$ is related to the concentrating-out approach ([Newey, 1994](#)).

LEMMA 3.1. *For any $\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) &:= \min_{Z \in \Theta_Z} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z) \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \widehat{S}_n \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \right] + \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ \left(\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi \right)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{A}(\Phi) = \Phi \Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi (\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi)^+ = \Phi \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+$.

In [Adachi \(2012\)](#) and [Adachi and Trendafilov \(2018\)](#), they only focus on the minimization algorithm and the descriptive properties of the minimizers. Thus, the above representation of the concentrated loss is not obtained in the existing papers, although their descriptive properties are essential to derive this representation.

REMARK. When we replace the factor $1/n$ by the factor $1/(n-1)$ in the loss function (3) and the constraint (2), the sample covariance matrix \widehat{S}_n is changed by the unbiased covariance matrix $\widehat{U}_n := X^T X / (n-1)$ in the explicit form of $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi)$. This modification has no impact on the theoretical properties of MDFA, but it improves the finite-sample performance.

3.2. *Population-level loss function and its properties.* For given $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p+m)}$, the spectral decomposition of $\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+p) \times (m+p)}$ is denoted by

$$\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi = L(\Phi) \Delta(\Phi)^2 L(\Phi)^T,$$

where $\Delta(\Phi)^2$ is the diagonal matrix with ordered positive eigenvalues, and $L(\Phi) \in \mathcal{O}((m+p) \times (m+p))$ is the matrix of eigenvectors. From Lemma 3.1, we can naturally consider the following population-level loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \text{tr} [\{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \Sigma_* \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}] + \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2,$$

where $A(\Phi) = \Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi) (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^+ \Phi^+ = \Phi L(\Phi) L(\Phi)^T \Phi^+$.

Since the loss $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ has a complex form, this form does not immediately tell us whether this loss $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ is reasonable for factor analysis. The following proposition shows that the loss function $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ is appropriate for factor analysis. That is, the population-level matrix decomposition factor analysis is identifiable up to the indeterminacy of the factor model.

PROPOSITION 3.2 (Identifiability of the population-level MDFA). *For any $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi] \in \Theta_\Phi$, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

$$(i) \Sigma_* = \Phi \Phi^T = \Lambda \Lambda^T + \Psi^2, \text{ and } (ii) \mathcal{L}(\Phi) = 0.$$

Interestingly, as shown in the proof, only the second term of the loss \mathcal{L} is essential for this identifiability. Thus, the second term of the empirical loss \mathcal{L}_n could be the appropriate loss function for factor analysis, but the optimization step will be more complicated.

Since $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi)$ is not represented as the empirical mean over samples, $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ has a complex form. Thus, even the continuity of the loss \mathcal{L} is non-trivial, unlike the classical theory of the M-estimator. The following proposition ensures the continuity of the population-level loss $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$. This continuity can be directly obtained from the continuity of $A(\Phi)$ (see Lemma A.4 in the appendix), the continuity of the square root (Chen and Huan, 1997; Wihler, 2009), and the continuity of the generalized inverse (Stewart, 1969).

PROPOSITION 3.3 (Continuity of the population-level loss). *The population-level loss \mathcal{L} is continuous on Θ_B .*

On the space of all positive definite matrices, the differentiability of the square root function can be obtained. For example, see Del Moral and Niclas (2018). However, we can only ensure the 1/2-Hölder continuity of the square root function for non-negative matrices (Chen and Huan, 1997; Wihler, 2009). Thus, it seems that the differentiability of the loss \mathcal{L} cannot be obtained.

3.3. *Consistency.* Now, we will describe the consistency of the matrix decomposition factor analysis. The main difficulty is to prove the uniform law of large numbers for the empirical loss \mathcal{L}_n . The following proposition ensures the uniform strong law of large numbers.

PROPOSITION 3.4 (Uniform law of large numbers). *For any $\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi$,*

$$|\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi)| \leq \text{Const.} \times \left(p \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_F^{1/2} \vee p^4 \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_F \right),$$

where $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$, and *Const.* is a global constant depending only on c_L , c_Λ , and c_U . Therefore, the following uniform strong law of large numbers holds:

$$(8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{B \in \Theta_B} |\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi)| = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By the above uniform law of large numbers for \mathcal{L}_n and the continuity of the population-level loss \mathcal{L} , we can obtain the strong consistency of matrix decomposition factor analysis.

THEOREM 3.5 (Consistency of MDFA). *Assume the observation $X_n = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T$ is an i.i.d. sample from the factor model (1). Let $\widehat{\Phi}_n = [\widehat{\Lambda}_n, \widehat{\Psi}_n]$ be the estimator of the matrix decomposition factor analysis for $\Phi = [\Lambda, \Psi]$. That is, $\widehat{\Phi}_n \in \arg \min_{\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi)$. Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\Phi}_n) = 0 \text{ a.s.}, \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\Phi_* \in \Theta_\Phi} \|\widehat{\Phi}_n - \Phi_*\|_F = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

From this theorem, the MDFA estimator converges to the true parameter, similar to other consistent estimators in factor analysis; thus, the MDFA estimator is appropriate for factor analysis. We can theoretically explain why matrix decomposition factor analysis yields results similar to those of other consistent estimators for factor analysis. Under Anderson and Rubin’s sufficient condition, a stronger consistency result can be achieved when combined with Theorem 1 of [Kano \(1983\)](#). Moreover, even if the factor model (1) is incorrect, the MDFA estimator maintains consistency as a minimum contrast estimator. This means that the MDFA estimator converges to a solution that minimizes the population-level loss \mathcal{L} .

4. Numerical experiments. We will demonstrate that the MDFA estimator performs well through the numerical experiments. Throughout the experiments, the MDFA estimator with the factor $1/(n - 1)$ is employed (see Remark in Section 3.1). We compare the MDFA estimator with the existing estimators which are implemented in the R package `psych` ([Rev-elle, 2024](#)), specifically, the maximum likelihood estimator (fa: MLE), the ordinary least-squares estimator (fa: OLS), the generalized least-squares estimator (fa: GLS), and the minimum rank estimator (fa: MRFA). In addition to these estimators, we also consider the maximum likelihood estimator by the expectation-maximization algorithm (EM: MLE) and the generalized least-squares estimator by using numerical derivatives (BFGS: GLS) since the maximum likelihood estimator and the generalized least-squares estimator of `psych` are sometimes unstable. We note that the maximum likelihood estimator by the expectation-maximization algorithm never gives improper solutions ([Adachi, 2013](#)). Moreover, the principal component estimator (PCA) is also considered, although it is not consistent.

We consider the following four settings:

- **Setting 1:** Set the number of variables $p = 20$ and the number of factors $m = 5$. The true loading matrix Λ_* has the perfect simple structure. That is, each row of the loading matrix has at most one non-zero element, and each column has four non-zero elements. Non-zero elements of loadings were independently drawn from uniform distributions on the interval $[0.90, 0.95]$ for Factor 1, on $[0.85, 0.90]$ for Factor 2, $[0.80, 0.85]$ for Factor 3, $[0.45, 0.50]$ for Factor 4, and $[0.40, 0.45]$ for Factor 5. Thus, the fourth and fifth factors are weak. For each variable, the unique variance was set to one minus the common variance. That is, the true covariance is given by

$$\Sigma_* = \Lambda_* \Lambda_*^T + \Psi_*^2, \quad \Psi_*^2 = I_p - \text{diag}(\Lambda_* \Lambda_*^T).$$

All p -dimensional observations are independently generated from the centered multivariate normal distribution with the true covariance Σ_* .

- **Setting 2:** Set $p = 20$ and $m = 5$. The generating process of the true loading matrix is the same in Setting 1. In this setting, we consider the following approximate factor model:

$$\Sigma_* = \Lambda_* \Lambda_*^T + \Psi_*^2 + WW^T,$$




Fig 1: Convergence behavior of all estimators in Setting 1 for larger sample sizes.

where W is a $p \times 150$ -minor factor loading matrix, and WW^T represents the model error term. Minor factor loadings in W were generated using the well-known procedure of [Tucker, Koopman and Linn \(1969\)](#).

This procedure has two parameters: the proportion π of unique variance due to model error and the parameter ε introduced by [Tucker, Koopman and Linn \(1969\)](#). Here, we use the setting of [Briggs and MacCallum \(2003\)](#) for generating W . The proportion of unique variance was set to $\pi = 0.2$. The parameter ε controls the size of the factor loadings in successive minor factors, and we set ε to 0.1. The unique variances were set such that the diagonal elements of Σ_* equal 1.0. In this experiment, we use the function `simFA` in the R package `fungible` ([Waller, 2024](#)) for generating W .

- **Setting 3:** Set $p = 50$ and $m = 5$, with each factor loading having ten non-zero elements. All other aspects are identical to Setting 1.
- **Setting 4:** Set $p = 50$ and $m = 5$, with each factor loading having ten non-zero elements. All other aspects are identical to Setting 2.

In each setting, ten different sample sizes $n = 100, 200, \dots, 1000$ are considered, and 100 replications were generated at each sample size. To demonstrate the consistency of the MDFA estimator more clearly, we also consider larger sample sizes $n = 1000, 2000, \dots, 10000$ for Setting 1. To evaluate the estimation accuracy, we employ the following squared errors:

$$SE_{\Lambda}(\hat{\Lambda}_n) := \min_{P: P^T P = I_m} \|\hat{\Lambda}_n P - \Lambda_*\|_F^2, \quad \text{and} \quad SE(\hat{\Lambda}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n^2) := SE_{\Lambda}(\hat{\Lambda}_n) + \|\hat{\Psi}_n^2 - \Psi_*^2\|_F^2,$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_n$ and $\hat{\Psi}_n^2$ are estimators for $\hat{\Lambda}_n$ and Ψ_*^2 , respectively. For Settings 2 and 4, the true unique variance Ψ_*^2 is replaced by $I_p - \text{diag}(\Lambda_* \Lambda_*^T)$ when we evaluate the estimation accuracy $SE(\hat{\Lambda}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n^2)$ for unique variance. For the principal component estimator, we only evaluate the squared error $SE_{\Lambda}(\hat{\Lambda}_n)$ for factor loadings. All reported results are the average of 100 replications.

Figure 1 shows the convergence behavior of all estimators in Setting 1 with larger sample sizes. We can see that the MDFA estimator converges to the true parameter as the other consistent estimators. Since the principal component estimator is inconsistent in the finite-dimensional settings, it converges to a different solution. Although the generalized least-squares estimator using the numerical derivatives performs well, the generalized least-squares estimator by `psych` does not work. This difference is related to the choice of optimization methods.

Figure 2 is the result of all settings with sizes $n = 100, \dots, 1000$. In Settings 2 and 4, the maximum likelihood estimator fails to recover the weak factor loadings (Factors 4 and 5), although it performs well in the settings without model error. In contrast, the minimum rank estimator works well with model error included but yields slightly poorer results than other consistent estimators in settings without model error. Due to the complexity of the optimization in the minimum rank factor analysis, its computational cost is higher than that of other methods. Unexpectedly, the generalized least-squares estimators are unstable. In higher dimensional settings, the generalized least-squares estimator by `psych` performs well, although it behaves irregularly in the lower dimensional settings. The ordinary least-squares estimator provides better performance in all settings, as shown in [MacCallum and Tucker \(1991\)](#), [Briggs and MacCallum \(2003\)](#), and [MacCallum, Browne and Cai \(2007\)](#). Remarkably, the MDFA estimator also consistently performs well in all settings, comparable to the ordinary least-squares estimator.

5. Conclusion. In this paper, we established the statistical properties of matrix decomposition factor analysis (MDFA) for the first time. Although the loss function of matrix decomposition factor analysis is very similar to that of principal component analysis, we proved that the MDFA estimator is consistent as factor analysis, not principal component analysis. The standard asymptotic theory of the classical M-estimators cannot be applied; instead, matrix perturbation theory, including the Davis-Kahan theorem, plays a key role in the proofs. Numerical experiments showed that the MDFA estimator stably performs well in various settings. Therefore, the MDFA estimator can be a good choice for factor analysis.

In the words of [Shapiro \(1984\)](#), “consistency is the minimal statistical attribute which one would expect from a well-behaved estimator.” Thus, further investigation into the theoretical properties for statistical inference of factor analysis is necessary. Due to the $1/2$ -Hölder continuity of the square root function for non-negative matrices ([Chen and Huan, 1997](#); [Wihler, 2009](#)), it seems challenging to obtain the asymptotic normality of the MDFA estimator. As an important future work, we will consider the asymptotic distribution of the MDFA estimator.

Moreover, as described in Section 2, we can easily obtain the sparse MDFA estimator with the ℓ_0 -constraint. We will also study the asymptotic properties of the sparse MDFA estimator in the high-dimensional setting.

APPENDIX: PROOFS

Proof of Lemma 3.1.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1. From the equation (16) in [Adachi and Trendafilov \(2018\)](#), we have

$$\frac{1}{n} X_n^T \widehat{Z}(\Phi) = (\Phi^T)^+ \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T = (\Phi^T)^+ (\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi)^{1/2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \widehat{Z}(\Phi) \widehat{Z}(\Phi)^T X_n \\ &= \left\{ X_n \Phi \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi)^{-1} \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T + \sqrt{n} \widehat{K}_\perp(\Phi) \widehat{L}_\perp(\Phi)^T \right\} \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+ \\ &= X_n \Phi \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+. \end{aligned}$$

the first term of (5) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{n} \|X_n - \widehat{Z}(\Phi) \widehat{Z}(\Phi)^T X_n/n\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|X_n \{I_p - \Phi \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+\|_F^2.$$

Let $\widehat{A}(\Phi) = \Phi \widehat{L}(\Phi) \widehat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+$, and then

$$\frac{1}{n} \|X_n - \widehat{Z}(\Phi) \widehat{Z}(\Phi)^T X_n / n\|_F^2 = \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \widehat{S}_n \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \right].$$

Therefore, we can drop the parameter Z from the objective function $\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) &= \min_Z \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi, Z) \\ &= \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \widehat{S}_n \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \right] + \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ \left(\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi \right)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.2.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2. Let us first show that the condition (i) implies the condition (ii). Suppose the condition (i) $\Sigma_* = \Phi \Phi^T$. We have

$$(\Phi^T \Phi)^2 = \Phi^T \Phi \Phi^T \Phi = \Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi = L(\Phi) \Delta(\Phi)^2 L(\Phi)^T \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^T \Phi = L(\Phi) \Delta(\Phi) L(\Phi)^T.$$

Let $\Phi = UDV^T$ denote the singular value decomposition of Φ , where $U \in \mathcal{O}(p)$, $V \in \mathcal{O}((p+m) \times p)$, and D is the p -dimensional diagonal matrix with the ordered singular values. Then, by $\Phi^T \Phi = VD^2V^T$, we have $V = L(\Phi)$ and $D^2 = \Delta(\Phi)$. For simplicity of notation, we write $L := L(\Phi)$ and $\Delta := \Delta(\Phi)$. Using these notations, we have $\Phi = U\Delta^{1/2}L^T$ and $\Phi\Phi^T = U\Delta U^T$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(\Phi) &= \Phi LL^T \Phi^+ = U\Delta^{1/2}L^T LL^T \Phi^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \\ &= U\Delta^{1/2}L^T L\Delta^{1/2}U^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} = U\Delta U^T U\Delta^{-1}U^T = I_p \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the loss function $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ can be minimized at Φ with $\Sigma_* = \Phi\Phi^T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\Phi) &= \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \Sigma_* \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \right] + \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ \left(\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi \right)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2 \\ &= 0 + \left\| (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi\Phi^T \Phi - \Phi \right\|_F^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, assuming the condition (ii), we will prove the condition (i). The parameter Φ with $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = 0$ should satisfy the following condition:

$$(9) \quad (\Phi^T)^+ (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} = \Phi.$$

Since the Moore-Penrose inverse of Φ is represented as $\Phi^+ = \Phi^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}$, the condition (9) can be rewritten as

$$\Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} = \Phi\Phi^T \Phi \Leftrightarrow UDV^T L\Delta L^T = UD^2U^TUDV^T \Leftrightarrow V^T L\Delta L^T = D^2V^T.$$

Thus, the condition (9) implies $V^T L\Delta L^T V = D^2$.

Moreover, using the above equality, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} = \Phi &\rightarrow (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi = \Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_* \Phi = \Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} \rightarrow \Sigma_* = \Phi (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} \Phi^+ \\ &\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_* = UD \{V^T L\Delta L^T V\} D^{-1} U^T \\ &\Leftrightarrow \Sigma_* = UD^2 U^T = \Phi\Phi^T. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we note that the condition (9) is essential for the identifiability. This indicates that the second term of the loss \mathcal{L} can be appropriate for factor analysis. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.4. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi) &= \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \widehat{S}_n \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \Sigma_* \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \right] \\ &\quad + \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ \left(\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi \right)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2 - \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ \left(\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi \right)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

First, we consider the bound for the first term. The first term can be decomposed into two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \widehat{S}_n \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \Sigma_* \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \right] \\ &= \underbrace{\text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \left(\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_* \right) \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \right]}_{=:(\text{I})} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\text{tr} \left[\Sigma_* \left(\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \right) \right]}_{=:(\text{II})}. \end{aligned}$$

The term (I) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{I})| &= \text{tr} \left[\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T \left(\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_* \right) \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \right] \\ &= \left| \text{vec}(I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi))^T \left\{ I_p \otimes \left(\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_* \right) \right\} \text{vec}(I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)) \right| \\ &\leq \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2 \|I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\|_F^2 \leq \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2 \{p + \|\widehat{A}(\Phi)\|_F\}^2 \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2}}{c_L} \right)^2 p^2 \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we consider the term (II). Since $|\text{tr}(AB)| \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_F$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\text{II})| &= \left| \text{tr} \left[\Sigma_* \left(\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \right) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \|\Sigma_*\|_F \left\| \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of notation, we write \widehat{A} and A instead of $\widehat{A}(\Phi)$ and $A(\Phi)$, respectively. A simple computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \\ &= I_p - \widehat{A}^T - \widehat{A} + \widehat{A} \widehat{A}^T - (I_p - A^T - A + A A^T) \\ &= (A - \widehat{A})^T + (A - \widehat{A}) + \widehat{A}(\widehat{A} - A)^T + (\widehat{A} - A)A^T. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{II}) &\leq \|\Sigma_*\|_F \left\| \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\} \{I_p - \widehat{A}(\Phi)\}^T - \{I_p - A(\Phi)\} \{I_p - A(\Phi)\}^T \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left(2 + \|\widehat{A}\|_F + \|A\|_F \right) \|\Sigma_*\|_F \|\widehat{A} - A\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1, $\|\Sigma_*\|_F = \|\Phi_*\Phi_*^T\|_F \leq \|\Phi_*\|_F^2 \leq p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)$. Moreover, from Lemma A.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A} - A\|_F &\leq \|\Phi\|_F \|\Phi^+\|_F \|\widehat{L}(\Phi)\widehat{L}(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T\|_F \\ &\leq p \left(\frac{c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2}{c_L^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{2\sqrt{2}p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)}{c_L^4} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2 \\ &= p^2 \left(\frac{8(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)^3}{c_L^{10}} \right)^{1/2} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(II)} &\leq p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2) \times 2 \left\{ 1 + p \left(\frac{c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2}{c_L^2} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \times p^2 \left\{ \frac{8(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)^3}{c_L^{10}} \right\}^{1/2} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2 \\ &\leq \text{Const.} \times p^4 \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where *Const.* represents a global constant depending only on c_L , c_Λ , and c_U .

Next, we consider the second term. We have

$$\|\Phi^T(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}\Phi\|_F^2 = \text{tr}\{\Phi^T(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}\Phi\} = \text{tr}\{\Phi\Phi^T(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}\} = p.$$

By Lemma A.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ (\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2 - \left\| (\Phi^T)^+ (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} - \Phi \right\|_F^2 \right| \\ &= \left| \text{tr} \left\{ (\Phi\Phi^+)^T (\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*) \Phi\Phi^+ \right\} \right| \\ &\quad + 2 \left| \text{tr} \left\{ \left((\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} - (\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi)^{1/2} \right) \Phi^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \text{tr} (\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*) \right| + 2 \left\| (\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)^{1/2} - (\Phi^T \widehat{S}_n \Phi)^{1/2} \right\|_F \|\Phi^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi\|_F \\ &\leq \left| \text{tr} (\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*) \right| + 2\sqrt{p} \left\| \Phi^T (\Sigma_* - \widehat{S}_n) \Phi \right\|_F^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left| \text{tr} (\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*) \right| + 2\sqrt{p} \|\Phi\|_F \|\Sigma_* - \widehat{S}_n\|_F^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left| \text{tr} (\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*) \right| + 2p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)^{1/2} \|\Sigma_* - \widehat{S}_n\|_F^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the strong law of large numbers, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_F = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of the main theorem.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5. Proposition 3.4 implies the first claim immediately:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\Phi}_n) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi_*) &\leq \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\Phi}_n) - \mathcal{L}_n(\widehat{\Phi}_n) + \mathcal{L}_n(\widehat{\Phi}_n) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi_*) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\Phi}_n) - \mathcal{L}_n(\widehat{\Phi}_n) + \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi_*) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi_*) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi} |\mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) - \mathcal{L}(\Phi)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will show the second claim. Let $d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) = \min_{\Phi_* \in \Theta_\Phi^*} \|\Phi - \Phi_*\|_F$. The continuity of \mathcal{L} implies

$$(10) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0; \quad \inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}(\Phi) > 0.$$

By Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) \geq \inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}(\Phi) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the event satisfying (8). For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, the inequality (10) and the first claim lead to

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) \geq \inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}(\Phi) > \mathcal{L}(\Phi^*) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_n(\hat{\Phi}_n),$$

and thus there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$

$$\inf_{d(\Phi, \Theta_\Phi^*) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{L}_n(\Phi) > \mathcal{L}_n(\hat{\Phi}_n).$$

This implies $d(\hat{\Phi}_n, \Theta_\Phi^*) \leq \epsilon$, and the proof is complete. \square

Some auxiliary lemmas. Here, we describe some auxiliary results.

LEMMA A.1 (Some basic properties). *For any $\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi$, the following properties hold:*

$$(a) \ c_L^2 \leq \lambda_j(\Phi\Phi^T) \ (j = 1, \dots, p), \quad (b) \ \|\Phi\|_F^2 = \|\Lambda\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \sigma_j^2 \leq p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2),$$

$$(c) \ \|\Phi^+\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\lambda_j(\Phi\Phi^T)} \leq \frac{p}{c_L^2}, \quad (d) \ \lambda_p(\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi) = \|\Sigma_*^{1/2} \Phi\|_2^2 \geq c_L^4, \text{ and}$$

$$(e) \ \|\hat{A}(\Phi)\|_F \leq \|\Phi\|_F \|\hat{L}(\Phi) \hat{L}(\Phi)^T\|_2 \|\Phi^+\|_F \leq p \frac{\sqrt{c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2}}{c_L}.$$

PROOF. (a) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$x^T(\Phi\Phi^T)x = x^T \Lambda \Lambda^T x + x^T \Psi^2 x \geq x^T \Psi^2 x = \sum_{j=1}^p \sigma_j^2 x_j^2 \geq c_L^2 \|x\|_2^2.$$

(b) By the definition of Φ , $\|\Phi\|_F^2 = \|\Lambda\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \sigma_j^2 \leq p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)$.

(c) By $\Phi^+ = \Phi^T(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}$, we have

$$\|\Phi^+\|_F^2 = \text{tr}\{(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1} \Phi\Phi^T (\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}\} = \text{tr}\{(\Phi\Phi^T)^{-1}\} = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\lambda_j(\Phi\Phi^T)} \leq \frac{p}{c_L^2}.$$

(d) For $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m+p}$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $\Phi x \neq 0$, we have

$$\|\Sigma_*^{1/2} \Phi x\| = \left\| \Sigma_*^{1/2} \frac{\Phi x}{\|\Phi x\|} \right\| \|\Phi x\| \geq \inf_{\|y\|=1} \left\| \Sigma_*^{1/2} y \right\| \inf_{\|x\|=1, \Phi x \neq 0} \|\Phi x\| \geq c_L^2 > 0.$$

Thus, we obtain $\lambda_p(\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi) = \|\Sigma_*^{1/2} \Phi\|_2^2 \geq c_L^4$.

(e) By the basic property of the Frobenius norm,

$$\|\hat{A}(\Phi)\|_F = \|\Phi \hat{L}(\Phi) \hat{L}(\Phi)^T \Phi^+\|_F \leq \|\Phi\|_F \|\hat{L}(\Phi) \hat{L}(\Phi)^T\|_2 \|\Phi^+\|_F \leq p \frac{\sqrt{c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2}}{c_L}.$$

\square

LEMMA A.2. For any $\Phi \in \Theta_\Phi$,

$$\|\widehat{L}(\Phi)\widehat{L}(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T\|_F \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)}{c_L^4} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2.$$

PROOF. Applying the variant of the Davis-Kahan theorem (Theorem 2 in [Yu, Wang and Samworth \(2015\)](#) with $r = 1$ and $s = p$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sin \Theta(\widehat{L}, L)\|_F &\leq \frac{2\|\Phi^T(\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*)\Phi\|_F}{\min(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1, \lambda_p - \lambda_{p+1})} = \frac{2\|\Phi^T(\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*)\Phi\|_F}{\lambda_p} \\ &\leq \frac{2p(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)}{c_L^4} \|\widehat{S}_n - \Sigma_*\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where λ_j is the the j th largest eigenvalue of $\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi$, and $\lambda_0 = \infty$. Here, we note that

$$\|\sin \Theta(\widehat{L}, L)\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{L}(\Phi)\widehat{L}(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T\|_F^2,$$

which establishes the formula. \square

It is known that the square root of a non-negative definite matrix is the Hölder continuous as a matrix function ([Chen and Huan, 1997](#); [Wihler, 2009](#)). The following result is the special case of Theorem 1 in [Wihler \(2009\)](#).

LEMMA A.3 (Hölder continuity of the square root). For any symmetric non-negative definite matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$\|A^{1/2} - B^{1/2}\|_F \leq \|A - B\|_F^{1/2}.$$

PROOF. See the proof of Theorem 1 in [Wihler \(2009\)](#). \square

LEMMA A.4 (Continuity of the matrix function $A(\Phi)$). The matrix function $A(\Phi)$ is continuous on Θ_Φ .

PROOF. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &A(\Phi) - A(\Phi + E) \\ &= \Phi^T L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T \Phi - (\Phi + E)^T L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T (\Phi + E) \\ &= \Phi^T \{L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T\} \Phi - E^T L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T E \\ &\quad - \Phi^T L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T E - E^T L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T \Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T\|_F^2 = p$ for any $B \in \Theta_B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(\Phi) - A(\Phi + E)\|_F &\leq \|\Phi\|_F^2 \|L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T\|_F \\ &\quad + \sqrt{p}\|E\|_F^2 + 2\sqrt{p}\|\Phi\|_F \|E\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $(\Phi + E)^T \Sigma_* (\Phi + E) = L(\Phi + E)\Delta(\Phi + E)^2 L(\Phi + E)^T$. Since

$$\|(\Phi + E)^T \Sigma_* (\Phi + E) - \Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi\|_F = \|\Phi^T \Sigma_* E + E^T \Sigma_* \Phi\|_F \leq 2\|\Sigma_*\|_F \|\Phi\|_F \|E\|_F,$$

the variant of the Davis-Kahan theorem (Theorem 2 in Yu, Wang and Samworth (2015) with $r = 1$ and $s = p$) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L(\Phi)L(\Phi)^T - L(\Phi + E)L(\Phi + E)^T\|_F = \sqrt{2}\|\sin \Theta(L(\Phi), L(\Phi + E))\|_F \\ & \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\|(\Phi + E)^T \Sigma_*(\Phi + E) - \Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi\|_F}{\lambda_p(\Phi^T \Sigma_* \Phi)} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2p^3(c_\Lambda^2 + c_U^2)^3}\|E\|_F}{c_L^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\|E\|_F \rightarrow 0$, the difference $\|A(\Phi) - A(\Phi + E)\|_F$ goes to zero. \square

Funding. The author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant (JP20K19756, JP20H00601, and JP23H03355) and iGCORE Open Collaborative Research.

REFERENCES

- ADACHI, K. (2012). Some contributions to data-fitting factor analysis with empirical comparisons to covariance-fitting factor analysis. *Journal of the Japanese Society of Computational Statistics* **25** 25–38.
- ADACHI, K. (2013). Factor analysis with EM algorithm never gives improper solutions when sample covariance and initial parameter matrices are proper. *Psychometrika* **78** 380–394.
- ADACHI, K. (2016). *Matrix-based introduction to multivariate data analysis*. Springer.
- ADACHI, K. (2022). Factor Analysis Procedures Revisited from the Comprehensive Model with Unique Factors Decomposed into Specific Factors and Errors. *Psychometrika* **87** 967–991.
- ADACHI, K. and TRENDAFILOV, N. T. (2018). Some mathematical properties of the matrix decomposition solution in factor analysis. *Psychometrika* **83** 407–424.
- ANDERSON, T. W. (2003). *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- ANDERSON, T. W. and AMEMIYA, Y. (1988). The asymptotic normal distribution of estimators in factor analysis under general conditions. *The Annals of Statistics* **16** 759–771.
- ANDERSON, T. and RUBIN, H. (1956). Statistical Inference in Factor Analysis. In *Proceedings of the Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability* 111. University of California Press.
- BENTLER, P. M. and KANO, Y. (1990). On the equivalence of factors and components. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* **25** 67–74.
- BRIGGS, N. E. and MACCALLUM, R. C. (2003). Recovery of weak common factors by maximum likelihood and ordinary least squares estimation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* **38** 25–56.
- BROWNE, M. W. (1974). Generalized least squares estimators in the analysis of covariance structures. *South African Statistical Journal* **8** 1–24.
- CHEN, Z. and HUAN, Z. (1997). On the Continuity of the m th Root of a Continuous Nonnegative Definite Matrix-valued Function. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **209** 60–66.
- DE LEEUW, J. (2004). Least squares optimal scaling of partially observed linear systems. In *Recent developments on structural equation models: Theory and applications* 121–134. Springer.
- FAN, J., LIAO, Y. and MINCHEVA, M. (2013). Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **75** 603–680.
- IHARA, M. and KANO, Y. (1986). A new estimator of the uniqueness in factor analysis. *Psychometrika* **51** 563–566.
- JÖRESKOG, K. G. and GOLDBERGER, A. S. (1972). Factor analysis by generalized least squares. *Psychometrika* **37** 243–260.
- KANO, Y. (1983). Consistency of estimators in factor analysis. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society* **13** 137–144.
- KANO, Y. (1986). Conditions on consistency of estimators in covariance structure model. *Journal of the Japan Statistical Society* **16** 75–80.
- KANO, Y. (1990). Noniterative estimation and the choice of the number of factors in exploratory factor analysis. *Psychometrika* **55** 277–291.
- KANO, Y. (1991). The asymptotic distribution of a noniterative estimator in exploratory factor analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* **19** 272–282.
- MACCALLUM, R. C., BROWNE, M. W. and CAI, L. (2007). Factor analysis models as approximations. In *Factor analysis at 100: Historical developments and future directions* (R. Cudeck and R. C. MacCallum, eds.) 153–175. Routledge.

- MACCALLUM, R. C. and TUCKER, L. R. (1991). Representing sources of error in the common-factor model: Implications for theory and practice. *Psychological Bulletin* **109** 502–511.
- DEL MORAL, P. and NICLAS, A. (2018). A Taylor expansion of the square root matrix function. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **465** 259–266.
- NEWBY, W. K. (1994). The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica* **62** 1349–1382.
- REVELLE, W. (2024). psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois R package version 2.4.6.
- SHAPIRO, A. (1984). A note on the consistency of estimators in the analysis of moment structures. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* **37** 84–88.
- SHAPIRO, A. and TEN BERGE, J. M. (2002). Statistical inference of minimum rank factor analysis. *Psychometrika* **67** 79–94.
- STEGEMAN, A. (2016). A new method for simultaneous estimation of the factor model parameters, factor scores, and unique parts. *Computational statistics & data analysis* **99** 189–203.
- STEWART, G. W. (1969). On the continuity of the generalized inverse. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **17** 33–45.
- SÖCAN, G. (2003). The incremental value of minimum rank factor analysis., PhD dissertation, University of Groningen.
- TEN BERGE, J. M. and KIERS, H. A. (1991). A numerical approach to the approximate and the exact minimum rank of a covariance matrix. *Psychometrika* **56** 309–315.
- TRENDAFILOV, N. T. and UNKEL, S. (2011). Exploratory factor analysis of data matrices with more variables than observations. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **20** 874–891.
- TRENDAFILOV, N. T., UNKEL, S. and KRZANOWSKI, W. (2013). Exploratory factor and principal component analyses: some new aspects. *Statistics and Computing* **23** 209–220.
- TUCKER, L. R., KOOPMAN, R. F. and LINN, R. L. (1969). Evaluation of factor analytic research procedures by means of simulated correlation matrices. *Psychometrika* **34** 421–459.
- UNKEL, S. and TRENDAFILOV, N. T. (2010). Simultaneous parameter estimation in exploratory factor analysis: An expository review. *International Statistical Review* **78** 363–382.
- WALLER, N. G. (2024). fungible: Psychometric Functions from the Waller Lab University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota R package 2.4.4.
- WIHLER, T. P. (2009). On the Hölder Continuity of Matrix Functions for Normal Matrices. *Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics* **10**.
- YU, Y., WANG, T. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2015). A useful variant of the Davis–Kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika* **102** 315–323.




Fig 2: The averages of squared errors of 100 replications for all settings.