

Meta-Learning with Generalized Ridge Regression: High-dimensional Asymptotics, Optimality and Hyper-covariance Estimation

Yanhao Jin¹, Krishnakumar Balasubramanian¹, and Debashis Paul^{1,2}

¹Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis.

²Applied Statistics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata.

¹{yahjin, kbala, depaul}@ucdavis.edu

Abstract

Meta-learning involves training models on a variety of *training tasks* in a way that enables them to generalize well on new, unseen *test tasks*. In this work, we consider meta-learning within the framework of high-dimensional multivariate random-effects linear models and study generalized ridge-regression based predictions. The statistical intuition of using generalized ridge regression in this setting is that the covariance structure of the random regression coefficients could be leveraged to make better predictions on new tasks. Accordingly, we first characterize the precise asymptotic behavior of the predictive risk for a new *test task* when the data dimension grows proportionally to the number of samples per task. We next show that this predictive risk is optimal when the weight matrix in generalized ridge regression is chosen to be the inverse of the covariance matrix of random coefficients. Finally, we propose and analyze an estimator of the inverse covariance matrix of random regression coefficients based on data from the *training tasks*. As opposed to intractable MLE-type estimators, the proposed estimators could be computed efficiently as they could be obtained by solving (global) geodesically-convex optimization problems. Our analysis and methodology use tools from random matrix theory and Riemannian optimization. Simulation results demonstrate the improved generalization performance of the proposed method on new unseen *test tasks* within the considered framework.

1 Introduction

Classical statistical machine learning involves models that are trained on a specific task using a given dataset, and their predictive performance is evaluated on the same task. In contrast, meta-learning (Baxter, 2000) aims to learn models that generalize well in new, unseen but related tasks. This is facilitated by training a model on a distribution over tasks so that it can efficiently adapt to new tasks with limited data. In this sense, meta-learning can be viewed as a form of higher-level learning that leverages knowledge gained from multiple *training tasks* to improve performance on new *test task*. In this paper, we analyze meta-learning under a natural multivariate random effects model to model the relationship between different tasks. When dealing with multiple tasks in meta-learning, each task can be considered a random effect. The random effects model may then help in modeling the variability between tasks, allowing development of efficient meta-learning algorithms that leverage this shared information across task to obtain better performance on new tasks.

Specifically, we consider the *training tasks* from the following linear model,

$$y^{(\ell)} = X^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)}, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \dots, L,$$

where $X^{(\ell)}$ is the $n_\ell \times p$ data matrix and $y^{(\ell)}$ is n_ℓ -dimensional vector, and n_ℓ represents the number of observations in each task. The rows denoted by $x_j^{(\ell)}$ are random samples with covariance matrix Σ and they are independent across j . Besides, the noise $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$ corresponding to each task is a random vector which has mean zero and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 I_{n_\ell}$. In order to encode task similarity, we consider a multivariate random-effects model where it is assumed that the true coefficients $\bar{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{\beta}^{(L)}$ are sampled from a common distribution with $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\beta}^{(j)}] = 0$ and $\text{Var}(\bar{\beta}^{(j)}) = p^{-1}\Omega$. The assumption that the regression coefficients are centered is made mostly for convenience. If they are uncentered (but share a common hyper-expectation), it is possible to learn the common hyper-expectation relatively easily based on techniques introduced later in later Section 3. The parameter Ω is the *hyper-covariance matrix* encoding the similarity among the different tasks. Note in particular that we do not make any parametric assumptions on the task distribution, as is commonly made in the literature on random effects model. A similar model was considered by Balasubramanian et al. (2013) in the context of multi-task learning. In contrast to that work, here we consider the meta-learning problem where the objective is to do well on unseen tasks. Specifically, given a new *test task*, with index $L + 1$, and n_{L+1} observations from model, $y^{(L+1)} = X^{(L+1)}\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} + \varepsilon^{(L+1)}$, where the rows $x_j^{(L+1)}$ of data matrix $X^{(L+1)}$ is random sample with covariance $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ and independent across j , and $\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)}$ is a sample from a distribution with the same shared hyper-covariance matrix Ω as that of the training tasks, our goal is do well in terms of predictive performance on this new *test task*.

To accomplish this goal, we consider prediction using generalized ridge regression estimators (Strawderman, 1978; Casella, 1980) of the form

$$\beta_\lambda^{(\ell)}(A) = (X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + n_\ell \lambda A^{-1})^{-1} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)}, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \dots, L + 1, \quad (1)$$

where A is a given positive definite matrix. Note that the above estimator is the solution of the regularized regression problem

$$\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(\ell)} = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_\ell} \|y^{(\ell)} - X^{(\ell)}\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \beta^{(\ell)\top} A^{-1} \beta^{(\ell)} \right\}.$$

In particular, when $A = \Omega$, the true common hyper-covariance matrix of the regression coefficients, we denote the corresponding distinguished estimator as the oracle estimator given by

$$\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(\ell)} := \beta_\lambda^{(\ell)}(\Omega), \quad (2)$$

However, in practice, the hyper-covariance matrix Ω is unknown. One natural idea is to estimate Ω by $\hat{\Omega}$ based on previous tasks. Then the true coefficient in ℓ -th task could be estimated by

$$\hat{\beta}_\lambda^{(\ell)} := \beta_\lambda^{(\ell)}(\hat{\Omega}). \quad (3)$$

Under the stated model, we study the generalization performance of the above generalized ridge regression based predictors on a new task.

The statistical intuition of using generalized ridge regression under the meta-learning framework is that the hyper-covariance structure of the random regression coefficients could be leveraged to make better predictions on new tasks. To elaborate, under the meta-learning framework, we can construct an estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ of the shared hyperparameter Ω from the L *training tasks*, which in turn could be used in the form of the estimator in (1) in the context of prediction in the *test task* $L + 1$. If the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is accurate in some appropriate sense, then this procedure should help in obtaining predictive accuracy in the new task $\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)}$. We provide a rigorous justification to

the above intuition in this work. We do so by analyzing the prediction performance of the above approach on the new $(L+1)$ -th *test task*. For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the predictive risk using $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(A)$ is defined by

$$R_\lambda(A | X^{(L+1)}) := \mathbb{E} \left[(x_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)\top} \beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(A) - y_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)})^2 | X^{(L+1)} \right],$$

and in particular, the predictive risk using oracle ridge estimator $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\Omega)$ is defined as

$$R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) := \mathbb{E} \left[(x_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)\top} \beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\Omega) - y_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)})^2 | X^{(L+1)} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $(x_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)}, y_{\text{new}}^{(L+1)})$ is an independent test example from the same distribution as the training data. Here, $R_\lambda(A | X^{(L+1)})$ could be treated as a function of positive definite matrix A . In Section 2.2, we derive the high-dimensional limit of predictive risk, $R_\lambda(A | X^{(L+1)})$, when $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1} \in (1, \infty)$ using tools from random matrix theory; see Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4. In Section 2.3, we also briefly discuss the consequence for out-of-distribution prediction risk, i.e., when the test task distribution is different from the training tasks' distribution. In Section 2.4, we then show using tools from Riemannian analysis that the function $R_\lambda(A | X^{(L+1)})$ on the space of positive definite matrix is minimized when $A = \Omega$, under mild regularity conditions (see Theorem 2.5). These two results provide a strong justification of the proposed approach for meta-learning under the assumed random effects framework.

Motivated by this, we next consider the problem of hyper-covariance estimation, i.e., estimating Ω from the *training tasks*. Traditionally, in the random effects model literature, maximum likelihood based approaches are considered under parametric distributional assumptions on the task and noise distributions. However, such approaches lead to non-convex optimization problems which are computationally harder to solve efficiently. In contrast, we extend the approach initiated in Balasubramanian et al. (2013) and propose a novel method-of-moments based approach for estimating the hyper-covariance matrix. Our estimators are constructed as solutions to geodesically convex optimization problems which can be efficiently solved using Riemannian optimization techniques.

In Section 3.1, we prove consistency and rates of convergence results of the proposed estimators under sub-Gaussian assumptions on the random coefficient $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ and noise $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$, as the number of training tasks L grows. In particular, we show consistency as $n_\ell, L, p \rightarrow \infty$ under appropriate scaling, as long as there is a non-vanishing fraction of the tasks for which $p/n_\ell \leq 1 - \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. This shows the benefit of meta-learning, i.e., as long as there is a small fraction of the tasks with adequate data, it is possible to estimate the hyper-parameter Ω consistently. The associated scaling however requires that $p^2/L \rightarrow 0$ which is not practical when p is very large. To overcome this limitation, it is necessary to enforce further structural assumptions on the hyper-covariance Ω . In Section 3.2, we assume that the true hyper-covariance Ω satisfies certain sparsity conditions (indexed by a sparsity parameter s) and study L_1 regularized approaches for estimation. We prove consistency and rates of convergence of the resulting estimators under improved scalings on s, p and L under various assumptions; see Table 1 for a full overview of the developed results.

1.1 Related Work

Our work lies at the intersection of random effects models, multitask and meta-learning. Traditional approaches for estimation in random effects model include (restricted) maximum likelihood to estimate variance components in the linear mixed models literature (e.g. Thompson Jr (1962), Corbeil and Searle (1976) and Harville (1977)). However, these methods are mainly studied in low-dimensional settings. High-dimensional analysis of a similar multivariate random effects model

was considered by Sun et al. (2021) and Huang et al. (2022). However, the question of precise asymptotics and optimality are not studied in these works. Our work is mainly motivated by the work by Balasubramanian et al. (2013), where a similar random effects model was analyzed in the context of multi-task learning, mainly from a methodological perspective.

Subspace-based meta-learning, where the multiple tasks share a common set of low-dimensional features, was used and analyzed in the works by Tripuraneni et al. (2021); Du et al. (2021) and Duan and Wang (2023). A mixed linear regression models for meta-learning, where the prior over the tasks corresponds to a discrete distribution, was analyzed by Kong et al. (2020). General statistical learning theory results for multi-task and meta-learning are examined by many authors. While it is not possible to cover the extensive literature on this topic, here, we list a few recent representative works by Argyriou et al. (2008); Lounici et al. (2009); Maurer et al. (2016); Amit and Meir (2018); Finn et al. (2019); Khodak et al. (2019); Lucas et al. (2021); Farid and Majumdar (2021); Chen et al. (2021); Chen and Chen (2022) and Li and Oymak (2023). The above works are mainly focused on non-asymptotic *bounds* and do not consider the question of optimality and deriving precise asymptotics, which is the main focus of our work.

Our methodology is based on generalized ridge regression. The methodological idea behind the formulation (1), in the context of single-task ridge regression, was studied by Strawderman (1978), Casella (1980) and Maruyama and Strawderman (2005) under the setting of $n \gg p$. High-dimensional asymptotics of ridge regression (i.e., (1) with $A = I$) in the single-task setting has been studied extensively in the last decade. El Karoui (2013) studied the asymptotic behavior of ridge estimators under the scenario $\Sigma = \Omega = I_p$ when p/n tends to a finite non-zero limit. Dicker (2016) studied asymptotic minimax problems for estimating a regression parameter over growing dimension p such that $p/n \rightarrow \rho$ when the sample x_i are i.i.d. Gaussian random vector. However, these results only focus on the estimation error. The behavior of prediction error of single-task ridge regression has been studied, for example, in Hsu et al. (2012), Dobriban and Wager (2018), Wu and Xu (2020) and Richards et al. (2021). In particular, Hsu et al. (2012) studied finite-sample concentration inequalities on the out-of-sample prediction error of random-design ridge regression. Dobriban and Wager (2018) later provided an explicit formula of prediction error when $\Omega = I_p$ under high-dimensional asymptotics $p, n \rightarrow \infty$ and $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$. This result has been extended by Richards et al. (2021), and Wu and Xu (2020). Richards et al. (2021) studied the asymptotic behavior of prediction error when Ω could be expressed by some source function of Σ . Wu and Xu (2020) extended previous works on the asymptotic behavior of prediction error of generalized ridge regression when arbitrary weight matrix is used in ridge estimator $\hat{\beta}$. Explicit formula of limiting risk is provided in Wu and Xu (2020) under several different choices of weight matrix, and an expression of optimal regularization parameter λ based on the limiting prediction error is also provided. None of the above works focuses on the meta-learning setup that we focus on, and more importantly, none of the above works focuses on estimating the shared hyper-covariance matrix.

Finally, as mentioned above, we use tools from Random matrix theory (RMT) and Riemannian geometry/optimization for our methodology and analysis. RMT has been widely used for high-dimensional analysis of statistical problems. We refer to Yao et al. (2015) and Couillet and Liao (2022) for the fundamental of RMT and high-dimensional statistics. For our analysis, we specifically use the work by Ledoit and P ech e (2011). We also refer to the books by Tu (2011) and Boumal (2023) for an overview of Riemannian manifolds and optimization over Riemannian manifolds respectively.

1.2 Notation

Here, we list several commonly used notations in the rest of the paper.

- The parameter λ refers to the ridge regularization parameter in (1), and $\tilde{\lambda}$ to be regularized parameter in other proposed methods.
- For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|v\|_k$ denotes the L_k norm of the vector.
- For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, denote $\lambda_i(A)$ to be the i -th eigenvalues, $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ to be the smallest and largest eigenvalue of matrix A respectively. Furthermore, $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|$ denotes the Frobenius and operator norms respectively.
- For any matrix $M = [m_{ij}]$, we write $M^+ = \text{diag}(M)$ for a diagonal matrix with the same diagonal as M , and $M^- = M - M^+$.
- We also write $|\cdot|_1$ for the l_1 norm of a vector or a (vectorized) matrix, i.e., for a matrix $|M|_1 = \sum_{i,j} |m_{ij}|$.
- For a random variable Z we denote $\|Z\|_{\psi_1}$ and $\|Z\|_{\psi_2}$ to be the ψ_1 and ψ_2 norm whose precise definition is given in (31).
- For a sequence of random variable X_n and X , $X_n \xrightarrow{p} X$, $X_n \Rightarrow X$ and $X_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} X$ denotes convergence in probability, convergence in distribution and almost sure convergence respectively.
- We say a random variable $X_n = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ means that $\sup_n \mathbb{P}(|X_n| > K) \rightarrow 0$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$. And $X_n = \mathcal{O}_p(b_n)$ means that $X_n/b_n = \mathcal{O}_p(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- \mathbb{S}_p^+ and \mathbb{S}_p denotes the space of $p \times p$ positive definite matrices and symmetric matrices respectively.
- The sample covariance matrix for ℓ -th task is denoted by $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}$.
- $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ denotes the risk function of our generalized ridge regression using oracle estimators $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\Omega)$ and $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ to be the true risk using $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Omega})$ for any estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ in the new task. Besides, we denote $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ to be the limiting risk for generalized ridge regression investigated in Section 2.2.
- Throughout the paper, we use C to represent some absolute constant which does not depend on important problem parameters, like the dimension p , sample size n_ℓ and number of tasks L . Here, C may change from instance to instance.

2 Characterizing the predictive performance on a new task

2.1 Assumptions

We start by introducing the assumptions we require for our analysis.

Assumption 2.1.1 (Data generation). For the ℓ^{th} task (for $\ell = 1, \dots, L, L+1$), the data matrix $X^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell \times p}$ is generated as

$$X^{(\ell)} = Z^{(\ell)} \Sigma^{(\ell)1/2},$$

for an $n_\ell \times p$ matrix $Z^{(\ell)}$ with i.i.d. entries satisfying $\mathbb{E}[Z_{ij}^{(\ell)}] = 0$, $\text{Var}[Z_{ij}^{(\ell)}] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[(Z_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2] \leq c_m^{(\ell)}$ for any p . $\Sigma^{(\ell)}$ is a deterministic $p \times p$ positive definite covariance matrix such that $\|\Sigma^{(\ell)}\| \leq \bar{c}^{(\ell)}$ for any p . Furthermore, there are constants c_m and \bar{c}_{op} such that $\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} c_m^{(\ell)} = c_m < \infty$ and $\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{c}^{(\ell)} = \bar{c}_{\text{op}} < \infty$.

The above conditions on the data matrix corresponding to the individual tasks are rather mild, and are made frequently in the literature on random matrix theory based analysis of statistical models (Dobriban and Wager, 2018). We emphasize in particular that the covariance matrices of the data across the task are allowed to change arbitrarily, allowing for a flexible statistical modeling. The bounded 12th moment condition is a technical condition which could be further relaxed using more sophisticated random matrix theory tools. However, we do not pursue such an extension in this work. On a more technical note, the condition $\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\| \leq \bar{c}^{(\ell)}$ ensures the existence of the limits for terms (I) and (II) appearing in Theorem 2.1 that follows. It also allows us to express these limits in terms of derivatives of the limit of term (III). Moreover, in the proof of the theorem presented in Section 3, explicit expressions of the quantities dependent on the constants $\bar{c}^{(\ell)}$ are not stated, as we mainly focus on their asymptotic orders as $p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 2.1.2 (Random regression coefficients). The true coefficients $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ for the training tasks are i.i.d. random vectors from a common distribution with mean $\mathbb{E}\bar{\beta} = 0$ and hyper-covariance $\mathbb{E}\bar{\beta}\bar{\beta}^\top = \frac{1}{p}\Omega$.

The above assumption models the task similarity by positing that the tasks share a common distribution parametrized by the hyper-covariance matrix $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Such a learning setup is called a multivariate random effects model in classical statistics (Jiang and Nguyen, 2007), and forms a special case of the meta-learning setup (Baxter, 2000). Compared to classical random effects models, we emphasize here that we do not make any parametric assumption on the task distribution. In the context of estimating the hyper-covariance matrix, we later enforce additional sub-Gaussian type conditions on the task distribution to obtain high-probability error bounds.

Assumption 2.1.3 (High dimensional asymptotics). The predictor dimension p and the number of samples in each task n_ℓ satisfy the following condition:

$$\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, \dots, L, L+1,$$

as p and n_ℓ go to infinity. Besides, the limiting ratios satisfy $\gamma_\ell \in (1, \infty)$, for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$.

The above assumption characterizes the high-dimensional setup that we are interested in. When $\gamma_\ell \in (0, 1]$, i.e., the proportional but low-dimensional setting, there is a rich literature on understanding covariance matrix estimation (see, for example, Paul (2007); Tao and Vu (2012); Pillai and Yin (2014)) which could also be leveraged in the context of ridge regression analysis. Furthermore, we emphasize that the above condition will be relaxed in a delicate manner in the context of estimating the hyper-covariance matrix in the later sections. In particular, we require that $\gamma_\ell \in (0, 1)$ for a proportion of the *training tasks* to ensure consistency in estimating the hyper-covariance matrix.

Before we proceed further, we require the following additional definitions.

Definition 2.1 (Empirical and limiting spectral distribution (ESD)). For any symmetric matrix A , the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) function of A is the empirical distribution of its eigenvalues:

$$F_A(x) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{1}(\lambda_i(A) \leq x).$$

Given a sequence of matrices $A_p \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, with corresponding empirical spectral distributions F_{A_p} , if $\{F_{A_p}\}$ converges weakly (as p tends to infinity), either almost surely or in probability, to some probability distribution, then the latter distribution is called the Limiting Spectral Distribution (LSD) of the sequence $\{A_p\}$.

Now, consider a *test task* $(L + 1)$ with coefficient drawn from *any* zero-mean distribution with the same hyper-covariance matrix Ω as the training tasks. Note in particular that the testing task distribution is fully characterized by the covariance matrix for the linear models we consider. Under this setting, the marginal distribution of $y^{(L+1)} \mid X^{(L+1)}$ will be a centered distribution whose (scaled) variance given by

$$\frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \text{Var}(y^{(L+1)} \mid X^{(L+1)}) = \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} X^{(L+1)} \Omega X^{(L+1)\top} + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I.$$

The term $X^{(L+1)} \Omega X^{(L+1)\top} / n_{L+1}$ plays an important role in our analysis. The expectation of this matrix, and those of its spectral moments, depend on $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}} \Omega \Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$ where $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$ is a positive semidefinite square root of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$. The predictive risk for the $(L + 1)$ -th task, depends on the spectrum of the matrix $X^{(L+1)} \Omega X^{(L+1)\top} / n_{L+1}$. Hence, the asymptotic behavior of predictive risk depends on the limiting spectral distribution of $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}} \Omega \Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$, or equivalently, the LSD of

$$\Lambda^{(L+1)} := \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5)$$

In order to precisely characterize the asymptotic behavior of predictive risk, we also make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1.4 (Spectral structure). There is a limiting spectral distribution $H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}$ such that as n_{L+1} and p goes to infinity, the empirical spectral distribution of $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$ converges in distribution to the limiting spectral distribution $F_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}} \Rightarrow H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}$, and the support of $H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}$ is contained in a compact interval bounded away from 0 and ∞ .

If $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ and Ω share the same eigenvectors, i.e. they commute, then Assumption 2.1.4 could be guaranteed if the empirical spectral distribution of two individual matrices converge in distribution to their limiting spectral distribution and the support of limiting spectral distribution is contained in a compact interval bounded away from 0 and ∞ . Assumption 2.1.4 is more general and allows for matrices $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ and Ω that do not necessarily commute. Below, we explicitly provide a numerical example to illustrate Assumption 2.1.4, which will also be used in our numerical experiments.

Example 2.1. Consider the following choice of the matrices Ω and $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$,

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ b & a & b & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b & a & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & b & a & b \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & b & a \end{bmatrix} \quad \Sigma^{(L+1)} = \begin{bmatrix} c & & & & \\ & d & & & \\ & & d & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & d \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where $a, b, c, d > 0$ and $a > b$. Then

$$\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}} \Omega \Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{bmatrix} ac & b\sqrt{cd} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ b\sqrt{cd} & ad & bd & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & bd & ad & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & bd & ad & bd \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & bd & ad \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of Ω are given by $\lambda_i = a + b \cos \frac{k\pi}{p+1}$. The ESD of Ω converges to the distribution of the random variable $a + b \cos U$ for $U \sim \text{Uniform}(-\pi, \pi]$. The ESD of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ converges to the distribution of the degenerate probability distribution with probability 1 at d . We now characterize the limiting spectral distribution of $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that

$$\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} ad & bd & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ bd & ad & bd & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & bd & ad & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & bd & ad & bd \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & bd & ad \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{N}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} a(c-d) & b\sqrt{d}(\sqrt{c}-\sqrt{d}) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ b\sqrt{d}(\sqrt{c}-\sqrt{d}) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{R}}.$$

Denote $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_p$ to be ordered eigenvalues of $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$, $\nu_1 \geq \dots \geq \nu_p$ to be ordered eigenvalues of \mathbf{N} and $\rho_1 \geq \dots \geq \rho_p$ to be ordered eigenvalues of \mathbf{R} . Then, one can calculate $\nu_k = ad + bd \cos \frac{k\pi}{p+1}$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \frac{a(c-d) + (\sqrt{c}-\sqrt{d})\sqrt{(\sqrt{c}+\sqrt{d})^2a^2 + 4b^2d}}{2} > 0, \\ \rho_2 &= \dots = \rho_{p-1} = 0, \\ \rho_p &= \frac{a(c-d) - (\sqrt{c}-\sqrt{d})\sqrt{(\sqrt{c}+\sqrt{d})^2a^2 + 4b^2d}}{2} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Weyl's inequality, one has $\nu_{k+1} = \nu_{k+1} + \rho_{p-1} \leq \mu_k \leq \nu_{k-1} + \rho_2 = \nu_{k-1}$ for $k = 2, \dots, p-1$. Now, for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then one has

$$\left| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^1 1\{\mu_i \leq x\} - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p 1\{\nu_i \leq x\} \right| \leq \frac{2}{p} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{when } p \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, the ESD of $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$ and ESD of \mathbf{N} will have the same limiting probability distribution. Since the support of limiting distribution of \mathbf{N} is defined on the compact interval $[ad - bd, ad + bd]$, the limiting distribution of $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$ will be the same. Finally, since $\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Sigma^{(L+1)\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$ share the same eigenvalues, the limiting distribution of $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$ will also be the same. By a simple computation, the form of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ could be generalized to $\text{diag}\{c, \dots, c, d, \dots, d\}$ where the proportion of c goes to zero as dimension $p \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, in this example, $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ could also be allowed to be a block-diagonal matrix with less variability within each block. In this case too, a similar calculation holds, albeit being more tedious to carryout.

2.2 Precise high-dimensional asymptotics of the predictive risk

We now investigate the predictive performance of the generalized ridge regression estimator on a new task in the high-dimensional setting when $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$. Our result about the predictive risk of generalized ridge regression is stated in terms of the expected predictive risk on a new task $L+1$; denoted as $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$. We first characterize the asymptotic behavior of predictive risk $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ using oracle estimator $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\Omega)$ when n_{L+1} and p goes to

infinity. The quantity $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ is the benchmark that we can compare with and is the optimal risk that we can achieve under mild assumptions; see Section 2.4. When using an arbitrary estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ of Ω , the corresponding predictive risk is denoted as $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$. Assuming the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is consistent in appropriate sense, we then show that the asymptotic behavior of $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ is the same as the asymptotic risk using true Ω .

We begin with the following result that provides explicit expressions for the predictive risk of generalized ridge regression on the new task using the oracle estimator (2) and estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(L+1)}$ from (3). Before we present our results, we also introduce *sample versions* of $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$ defined in (5):

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} &:= \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \check{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} &:= \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} &:= \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Recall that $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$ is composed to both the data covariance (Σ) and the hyper-covariance (Ω). The above matrices are essentially the sample version of $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$ when Ω is known but $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ is estimated, $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ is known and Ω is estimated, and both $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ and Ω are estimated, respectively.

Theorem 2.1. *The predictive risk of generalized ridge regression on the new task indexed by $L + 1$, using oracle estimator $\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}$ and using estimator $\hat{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}$ from (3), are given by*

$$\begin{aligned}R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) &= \sigma^2 + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr}(\Lambda^{(L+1)}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-2})}_{\text{(I)}} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}(\Lambda^{(L+1)}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-2})}_{\text{(II)}} + \underbrace{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}(\Lambda^{(L+1)}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-1})}_{\text{(III)}},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) &= \sigma^2 + \underbrace{\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr}((\hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \check{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-2})}_{\text{(I)'}} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}(\check{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-2})}_{\text{(II)'}} + \underbrace{\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}(\check{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-1})}_{\text{(III)'}}\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

respectively.

From the expression above, we see that term (I') consist the bias part which is independent of the noise level σ^2 . And terms (II'), (III') consist of the variance part involving σ^2 but do not depend on the true Ω . As the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ only depends on the observation and responses from first L , we have $\hat{\Omega}$ is independent to $X^{(L+1)}$.

Remark 2.1. The oracle risk $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ is still a random quantity because it depends on the samples. This predictive predictive risk using oracle estimator depends on the spectrum of $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If we assume some stabilizing behavior of the spectrum that can be stated in terms of the limiting spectral distribution of this matrix, this random quantity $R_\lambda(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ converges a.s. to some deterministic function of $\lambda, \gamma_{L+1}, \sigma^2$ and the LSD of $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Based on the explicit expressions obtained above, we now examine the asymptotic behavior of predictive risk function in (8), as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$. We introduce a few basic random matrix theory tools that are required to present our subsequent results.

Definition 2.2 (Stieltjes transform). For a real probability measure μ with support $\text{supp}(\mu)$, the Stieltjes transform $s(z)$ is defined, for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$, as

$$s(z) \equiv \int \frac{1}{t-z} \mu(dt).$$

Theorem 2.2 (Marčenko and Pastur (1967)). *Let*

$$s_{p,L+1}(z) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\lambda_i(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}) - z)^{-1} = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} - zI)^{-1})$$

be the Stieltjes transform of the matrix $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$. Under Assumptions 2.1.1 to 2.1.4, one has that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} s_{p,L+1}(z) = s_{L+1}(z)$ a.s. where

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{C}^+, \quad s_{L+1}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \{\tau [1 - \gamma_{L+1} - \gamma_{L+1} z s_{L+1}(z)] - z\}^{-1} dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(\tau).$$

Furthermore, the E.S.D. of the matrix $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$ given by $F_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(t) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p 1(\lambda_i(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}) \leq t)$ converges a.s. to a limiting distribution supported on $[0, \infty)$.

We also define the companion Stieltjes transform $v_{L+1}(z)$, which is the Stieltjes transform of the limiting spectral distribution of the matrix $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} = n_{L+1}^{-1} X^{(L+1)} \Omega X^{(L+1)\top}$. This is related to $s_{L+1}(z)$ by the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{L+1}(s_{L+1}(z) + z^{-1}) &= v_{L+1}(z) + z^{-1}, \\ \gamma_{L+1}(s'_{L+1}(z) - z^{-2}) &= v'_{L+1}(z) - z^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Ledoit and Péché (2011) proved that the following quantity that appears in the risk of ridge regression will converge almost surely to $\kappa(\lambda)$, a function of Stieltjes transform $v(z)$ under suitable moment condition as $n_{(L+1)}, p \rightarrow \infty$ and $\frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\Lambda^{(L+1)}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I_{p \times p})^{-1}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{\gamma_{L+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v(-\lambda)} - 1 \right) \triangleq \kappa(\lambda).$$

Besides, Dobriban and Wager (2018) proved that if we further assume that the operator norm of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ is bounded by some absolute constant C for any p , the other quantities appearing in the predictive risk in ridge regression will converge almost surely to the negative derivative of $\kappa(\lambda)$, i.e.,

$$p^{-1} \text{tr}(\Lambda^{(L+1)}(\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I_{p \times p})^{-2}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} -\kappa'(\lambda).$$

Theorem 2.3. *For any $\lambda > 0$, the oracle predictive risk $R_{\lambda}^{OR}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ converges almost surely to the limiting predictive risk $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} &r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda \gamma_{L+1} s_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \left[\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_{L+1}} - \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\lambda^2 \gamma_{L+1} s'_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})}{\gamma_{L+1} \lambda s_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where s_{L+1} is the Stieltjes transform of limiting spectral distribution of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$. In particular, the choice $\lambda^* = \gamma_{L+1} \sigma^2$ minimizes the limiting risk.




Figure 1: Plot of limiting risk in (10). Here, $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \varrho\Omega^{-1}$ (for various choices of a), $\sigma^2 = 1.5$ and γ_{L+1} takes values in the set $\{1.5, 2, 3, 5, 10\}$.

Remark 2.2. Analytically computing the limiting risk and obtaining a more tangible expression is still a non-trivial task. In certain special cases, it is possible to obtain more interpretable expressions. When $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \varrho\Omega^{-1}$, for some $\varrho > 0$, we can have a closed form expression, given by

$$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1}) = \sigma^2 + \gamma_{L+1}\sigma^2 m_{\varrho I}(-\lambda; \gamma_{L+1}) + \lambda(\lambda - \gamma_{L+1}\sigma^2) m'_{\varrho I}(-\lambda; \gamma_{L+1}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$m_{\varrho I}(-\lambda; \gamma_{L+1}) = \frac{-(\varrho - \varrho\gamma_{L+1} + \lambda) + \sqrt{(\varrho - \varrho\gamma_{L+1} + \lambda)^2 + 4\varrho\gamma_{L+1}\lambda}}{2\varrho\gamma_{L+1}\lambda}.$$

A plot of the above limiting risk is provided in Figure 1 when Ω , as in (6) with $a = 16$ and $b = 5$. In general, when γ_{L+1} and ϱ are fixed, the risk function decreases rapidly before hitting $\lambda = \lambda^* = \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}$. After attain the minimum risk at λ^* , the risk function increases slowly as λ increases. Larger value of a means larger eigenvalues for Λ , which will leads to larger risk due to (10) when $\gamma_{L+1} > 1$ and λ, γ_{L+1} are fixed. Besides, the values of a does not affect the value of λ^* which could also be seen from (10). Also, as γ_{L+1} increases, the minimum of the risk function λ^* increases, as long as ϱ is kept fixed. This agrees with the conventional wisdom that one should emphasize the effect of regularizer more when the dimension p is much larger comparing to number of samples n_{L+1} . Furthermore, in this case, the optimal limiting risk can also be calculated when $\lambda = \gamma_{L+1}\sigma^2$ and $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \varrho\Omega^{-1}$, and it is is given by

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\varrho}\right)\sigma^2 + \frac{\gamma_{L+1} - 1}{2\gamma_{L+1}} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\varrho} - \frac{\gamma_{L+1} - 1}{\gamma_{L+1}}\right)^2 + \frac{4\sigma^2}{\varrho}}.$$

Another example generalizing the above setting is provided in Section C for illustration.

Remark 2.3. Focusing on the single-task setting, and with general weight matrix, Wu and Xu (2020) studied the precise high-dimensional asymptotics of generalized ridge regression estimator in (1). Their focus is on explaining the double descent phenomenon, which depends on the alignment between the data covariance matrix and the weight matrix in Wu and Xu (2020). Compared their work, our proof is more elementary and is directly suited for the meta-learning setup we consider in this work. A more elaborate comparison between their proof technique and ours is provided in Section D.

Note that the predictive risk of the generalized ridge regression estimator is derived in terms of a generic estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ of the true Ω . Hence, we need to analyze the difference between the oracle risk

$R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ and actual predictive risk. In particular, $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ is naturally determined by how good an estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is. Therefore, conditions (as stated in Assumption 2.2.1 below) are made in terms of consistency of the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ that guarantee the consistency of $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega$.

Assumption 2.2.1. We make the following conditions on $\hat{\Omega}$ and Ω :

- (i) The estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is consistent, i.e. $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $L, n_\ell, p \rightarrow \infty$ (the specific rate depends on the choice of $\hat{\Omega}$);
- (ii) $\|\Omega\|$ is bounded away from 0 and infinity by some absolute constant for any p ;
- (iii) The condition number $\varsigma(\Omega) = \|\Omega^{-1}\|\|\Omega\|$ is bounded by universal constant c_Ω for any p .

The next result shows that under the above conditions, we have consistency of $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega$.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose the conditions in Assumption 2.2.1 hold. Then it holds that:

$$\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}\| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega - I\| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

In particular, the consistency of $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega$ is used to control term (I') in (8) and the consistency of $\hat{\Omega}^{-1}$ is used to control terms (II') and (III') in (8), in terms of closeness to their respective oracle versions. Our next result characterizes the asymptotic behavior of the $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ and $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ as p, n_{L+1} goes to infinity.

Assumption 2.2.2. The distribution $H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}$ in Assumption 2.1.4 converges in distribution to the limiting distribution H_Λ as L goes to infinity, and the support of H_Λ is contained in a compact interval bounded uniformly (over L) away from 0 and ∞ .

Theorem 2.4. For any fixed p, L and n_ℓ , the difference between term (III) and (III') is given by

$$\frac{-\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}) \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} + \lambda I)^{-1} \right).$$

Furthermore, under Assumptions 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, as $L, n_{L+1}, p \rightarrow \infty$ such that for each fixed L , $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$, while $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{L+1} = \gamma_* \in (1, \infty)$, we have

$$R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{\lambda\gamma_*s(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)} \left[\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_*} - \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\lambda^2\gamma_*s'(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)}{\gamma_*\lambda s(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)} \right],$$

where $s(z)$ is the solution to the following equation

$$s(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \{\tau [1 - \gamma_* - \gamma_*zs(z)] - z\}^{-1} dH_\Lambda(\tau).$$

2.3 Out-of-distribution Prediction Risk

In this section, we briefly discuss the consequence of our results for the case when the new *testing* task $\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)}$ covariance matrix is different from that of the training tasks. Such a setting is called as out-of-distribution prediction in the literature; in particular note that for linear models the task distribution (which is assumed to have zero mean) is completely characterized by the covariance matrix. Specifically, we assume that $\text{Var}(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)}) = \frac{1}{p}\Upsilon$ for the $(L+1)$ -th task. In order to model the relationship between the training and the test task covariance, we assume that

$$\|\Upsilon - \Omega\| = \vartheta, \tag{11}$$

for any p . The corresponding distinguished oracle estimator (in comparison to (2)) becomes

$$\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(\ell)} := \beta_\lambda^{(\ell)}(\Upsilon), \quad (12)$$

However, in reality we are still making our predictions for the test task based on the estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(L+1)} = \beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Omega})$. Hence, in our next result, we compare the risk of this estimator with that of the oracle estimator in (12).

Proposition 2.1. *Under Assumption 2.2.1 and suppose that the condition number of Υ is bounded by some universal constant c_Υ for any p and let (11) hold. When the coefficient in the new task is from some distribution with covariance $\frac{1}{p}\Upsilon$, as $L, n_{L+1}, p \rightarrow \infty$ such that for each fixed L , $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$, while $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{L+1} = \gamma_* \in (1, \infty)$, it holds that*

$$|\mathbb{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbb{R}}_\lambda^{OR}(\Upsilon | X^{(L+1)})| \rightarrow M(\vartheta, \lambda),$$

where, in particular, we have

$$|M(\vartheta, \lambda)| \leq \frac{\gamma_* \sigma^2}{\lambda} \bar{c}_{op} c_\Omega c_\Upsilon \vartheta (2 + c_\Omega + c_\Upsilon) + \bar{c}_{op} (1 + c_\Omega + c_\Upsilon) c_\Omega c_\Upsilon \vartheta. \quad (13)$$

Note that the first term in (13) could be controlled by both ϑ and λ . However, the second term is purely controllable by ϑ demonstrating the unavoidable error incurred due to the train-test model mismatch.

2.4 Statistical Optimality of Using Ω^{-1} as the Weight Matrix

We now demonstrate the statistical advantage of using Ω^{-1} as generalized ridge regression comparing to using identity matrix in Dobriban and Wager (2018), using Riemannian optimization and analysis. Recall that our benchmark is the oracle risk $\mathbb{R}_\lambda^{OR}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ computed based on $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(\Omega)$.

We first introduce some basics of Riemannian geometric analysis that allow us to characterize the minimizer of functions defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} . In this work, the domain of these functions will be the space of positive definite symmetric matrices, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{S}_p^+ = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : Q = Q^\top; v^\top Q v > 0, \forall v \in \mathbb{R}^p\}.$$

For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$, the tangent space \mathcal{T}_A could be identified with the space of symmetric matrices $\mathbb{S}_p = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : Q = Q^\top\}$ since the tangent space $T_a V$ to a vector space V (in this case $V = \mathbb{S}_p$) can be identified with the vector space itself (via the isomorphism which takes an element $v \in V$ to the directional derivative $D_v|_a$). Moreover, the tangent space to an open subset of a manifold is isomorphic to the tangent space of the manifold itself. Hence,

$$\mathcal{T}_A \mathbb{S}_p^+ \cong \mathcal{T}_A \mathbb{S}_p \cong \mathbb{S}_p = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : Q = Q^\top\}.$$

A differentiable manifold \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold if it is equipped with an inner product (called Riemannian metric) on the tangent space, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x : \mathcal{T}_x \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, that varies smoothly on \mathcal{M} . The norm of a tangent vector is defined as $\|\xi\|_x := \sqrt{\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_x}$. We drop the subscript x and simply write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (and $\|\xi\|$) if \mathcal{M} is an embedded submanifold with Euclidean metric. Here we use the notion of the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_x \mathcal{M}$ of a differentiable manifold \mathcal{M} , whose precise definition can be found in Tu (2011, Chapter 8). We now introduce the concept of a Riemannian gradient.

Definition 2.3 (Riemannian Gradient). Suppose f is a smooth function on Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} . The Riemannian gradient $\text{grad } f(x)$ is a vector in $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\left. \frac{d(f(\gamma(t)))}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \langle v, \text{grad } f(x) \rangle_x$ for any $v \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$, where $\gamma(t)$ is a curve satisfying $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$.

The Riemannian gradient on Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} could be conveniently computed using the retraction on the \mathcal{M} defined formally below.

Definition 2.4 (Retraction). A retraction on a manifold \mathcal{M} is a smooth map

$$P : \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M} : (x, v) \mapsto P_x(v),$$

such that each curve $c(t) = R_x(tv)$ satisfies $c(0) = x$ and $c'(0) = v$.

Now let $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} equipped with a retraction R . According to Boumal (2023, Proposition 3.59), the Riemannian gradient $\text{grad } f(x)$ could be computed as,

$$\text{grad } f(x) = \text{grad } (f \circ R_x)(0), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (14)$$

where $f \circ R_x : \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined on the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ equipped with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_x$. $\mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ equipped with inner product is just a Euclidean space, hence the right hand side of (14) is a ‘‘classical’’ gradient.

In general, checking whether a point x on \mathcal{M} is a local minimizer for $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not easy. However, we can identify the necessary conditions for a point x to be a local minimizer. Following proposition in Boumal (2023) shows that critical points of a function defined on the manifold \mathcal{M} are exactly those points where the Riemannian gradient vanishes.

Proposition 2.2 (Boumal (2023)). *Let $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be smooth on a Riemannian manifold \mathcal{M} . Then, x is a critical point of f if and only if $\text{grad } f(x) = 0$.*

Now, suppose that Q is any symmetric positive definite matrix, then the predictive risk of the generalized ridge estimator $\beta_\lambda^{(L+1)}(Q)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)}) &= \sigma^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr} \left(\Omega Q^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q^{-1})^{-1} Q^{-1} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left((\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q^{-1})^{-1} Q^{-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q^{-1})^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Given the predictive risk in this form, we show that under some restriction on λ , the predictive risk $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ is minimized at $Q = \Omega$, the true covariance matrix, for any finite p, n_{L+1} .

To do so, we derive the Riemannian Gradient and check the optimality condition of predictive risk on \mathbb{S}_p^+ , i.e. the manifold of $p \times p$ symmetric positive definite matrices. \mathbb{S}_p^+ becomes a Riemannian manifold when it is equipped with the affine-invariant metric $g_Q(A_Q, B_Q)$ given by

$$g_Q(A_Q, B_Q) = \text{tr} (A_Q Q^{-1} B_Q Q^{-1}).$$

See, for example, Pennec et al. (2006), Sra and Hosseini (2015) for additional details. In order to optimize the predictive risk, or check the optimality condition, one needs to find a proper retraction

on \mathbb{S}_p^+ . Following notation from Boumal (2023), possible choices of proper retraction on \mathbb{S}_p^+ are given by

$$P_Q(A_Q) = Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(Q^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_Q Q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) Q^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

or

$$P_Q(A_Q) = Q + A_Q + \frac{1}{2} A_Q Q^{-1} A_Q.$$

The latter one is preferred since it is more computationally cheap. This is indeed a proper retraction since for any $Q \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$, $A_Q \in \text{TS}_p^+$ and any vector $0 \neq v \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top P_Q(A_Q) v &= \frac{1}{2} v^\top (Q + 2A_Q + A_Q Q^{-1} A_Q) v + \frac{1}{2} v^\top Q v \\ &= \frac{1}{2} v^\top (Q^{\frac{1}{2}} + A_Q Q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) (Q^{\frac{1}{2}} + A_Q Q^{-\frac{1}{2}})^\top v + \frac{1}{2} v^\top Q v > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $P_Q(A) = Q + A_Q + \frac{1}{2} A_Q Q^{-1} A_Q$ remains symmetric positive definite for all $Q \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$ and $A_Q \in \text{TS}_p^+$. The Riemannian gradient of the predictive risk $R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)})$ w.r.t. $Q^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$ is then given by

$$\text{grad } R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)}) = \text{grad} (R_\lambda \circ P_{Q^{-1}})(0) = \text{grad } R_\lambda(P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) | X^{(L+1)}) \Big|_{\Xi=0}.$$

Note that $\text{grad} (R_\lambda \circ P_{Q^{-1}})$ is defined on a Euclidean space (linear space $\text{T}_{Q^{-1}} \mathbb{S}_p^+$ with inner product $g_{Q^{-1}}(A_{Q^{-1}}, B_{Q^{-1}}) = A_{Q^{-1}} Q B_{Q^{-1}} Q$). Hence, $\text{grad} (R_\lambda \circ P_{Q^{-1}})$ is the classical gradient. We now have the following result showing that as the tuning parameter λ is appropriately chosen, the predictive risk is minimized at $Q = \Omega$.

Theorem 2.5. *If $\lambda = c \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}$ for any $c > 0$, then $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ is minimized at $Q^* = c\Omega$. The optimal risk is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} R_\lambda(Q^* = c\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) &= \sigma^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\ &= R_\lambda^{OR}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) \Big|_{\lambda = \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $c = 1$, then $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ is minimized at $Q^ = \Omega$. Furthermore, the risk R_λ at Ω is exactly the same as the oracle risk when $\lambda = \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}$.*

Remark 2.4. Wu and Xu (2020) also studied the question of the optimal weight matrix in generalized ridge regression. However, their work required a stringent assumption that the matrices Ω and $\Sigma^{(L)}$ commute, which makes the proof straightforward. Our result above is more generally applicable without the aforementioned restriction, which is enabled by our proof technique based on Riemannian optimization and analysis.

3 Estimation of the hyper-covariance matrix Ω

The main message from the previous section is that the optimal matrix A to consider in the generalized ridge regression estimator (1) is the *unknown* hyper-covariance matrix Ω . In this

Method	Unregularized (16)	L_1 regularized estimator (19)	L_1 regularized estimator (22)	L_1 regularized estimator (20)
Assumption on Ω	$C_0 < \lambda_{\min}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega) < C_1$	$C_0 < \lambda_{\min}(\Omega) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega) < C_1$ $S = \{(i, j) : \Omega_{ij} \neq 0, i \neq j\}, \text{card}(S) \leq s$		
Assumption on γ_ℓ	$\exists L_0$ s.t. $L_0/L \rightarrow c > 0$ $\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_0} \gamma_\ell \leq 1 - \delta,$ $\forall \ell, 0 < \underline{c} \leq \gamma_\ell \leq \bar{c} < \infty$	$\forall \ell, 0 < \underline{c} \leq \gamma_\ell \leq \bar{c} < \infty$		
Assumption on $\Sigma^{(\ell)}$	$\underline{c}^{(\ell)} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \leq \bar{c}^{(\ell)}, \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{c}^{(\ell)} \leq \bar{c}_{\text{op}}, \inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \underline{c}^{(\ell)} > \underline{c}_{\text{op}}$			
Assumption on $X^{(\ell)}$	$\{x_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n_\ell}$ are i.i.d.	$\{x_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n_\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{subG}(\tau_x)$ for all ℓ	$\{x_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n_\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{subG}(\tau_x)$ $\text{rank}(X^{(\ell)}) = p$ for all ℓ	$\exists L_0$ such that $L_0/L \rightarrow c > 0$ and $\text{rank}(X^{(\ell)}) = p$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq L_0$. $\{x_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n_\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{subG}(\tau_x)$
Assumption on $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$	$\sigma^2 > 0$ (noisy setting)		$\sigma^2 = 0$ (noiseless setting)	
Rate for L and L_0	$\sqrt{\frac{p^2}{L}}$ (Theorem 3.1)	$\sqrt{\frac{(p+s) \log p}{L}}$ (Theorem 3.2)	$\sqrt{\frac{(s+1) \log p}{L}}$ (Theorem 3.3)	$\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}}$ (Theorem 3.4)

Table 1: Summary of estimation methods for Ω : In all approach, sub-Gaussian assumption is proposed on $\sqrt{p}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ and $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$. L_0 is the number of special tasks that have special properties on $X^{(\ell)}$ or γ_ℓ .

section, we propose a number of approaches to estimate the hyper-covariance matrix from the training tasks. A natural approach is to perform maximum likelihood estimation of Ω . However, as we discuss next, such an approach suffers from the following drawbacks: (i) it requires explicit parametric assumption on the task distribution; (ii) it is computationally intensive as it requires inversion of large matrices. Furthermore, as we show next, the negative log-likelihood function is not necessarily globally geodesically convex. To overcome these issues, we propose a *method-of-moments* based estimation procedure that involves minimizing a globally geodesically convex objective function. Hence, the proposed method can be implemented efficiently using off-the-shelf Riemannian optimization techniques. An overview of the proposed estimators and their rates of consistency is provided in Table 1.

Non-convexity of MLE. Following classical works in the literature on random effects models, suppose that $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, \frac{1}{p}\Omega)$ and $\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2 I)$. Then, the log-likelihood function is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& l(\Omega, \sigma^2) \\
& = c - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log \det \left(\sigma^2 I + \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L y^{(\ell)\top} \left(\sigma^2 I + \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} \right)^{-1} y^{(\ell)}, \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant c . Maximizing this log-likelihood yields the MLE for $\hat{\Omega}$. However, the negative log-likelihood function is not necessarily globally (geodesically) convex, according to the Definition 3.1 below.

Definition 3.1. A function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on a Riemannian manifold is said to be geodesically convex if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$, a geodesic γ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$, and $t \in [0, 1]$, it holds that

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)f(x) + tf(y).$$

To see that the negative log-likelihood in (15) is not globally geodesically convex, we first note that, equipped with the natural Riemannian metric over space of positive definite matrices, the geodesic path (Lim, 2013) between any $A, B \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$ becomes $\gamma_{A,B}(t) = A^{\frac{1}{2}}(A^{-\frac{1}{2}}BA^{-\frac{1}{2}})^t A^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By Definition 3.1, the function $l(\Omega)$ is geodesically convex if and only if the composition $l(\gamma_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2}(t)) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex in usual sense for any $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$. In this case,

$$\gamma_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2}(t) := \Omega_1^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Omega_2\Omega_1^{-\frac{1}{2}})^t \Omega_1^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Fix $\Omega_1 \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$ and $\Omega_2 = k\Omega_1$ where $k > 0$, and denote $X^{(\ell)}\Omega_1X^{(\ell)\top} = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(\ell)} e_i^{(\ell)} e_i^{(\ell)\top}$ to be the eigenvalue decomposition of $X^{(\ell)}\Omega_1X^{(\ell)\top}$. Then,

$$l(\gamma(t)) = c - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^p \log \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right)^{-1} \left(e_i^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right)^2.$$

The first and second derivatives with respect to t are respectively given by

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right)^{-1} \frac{\lambda_i^{(\ell)}}{p} k^t \ln k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right)^{-2} \frac{\lambda_i^{(\ell)}}{p} k^t \ln k,$$

and

$$-\sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{(\ln k)^2 \lambda_i^{(\ell)} k^t}{2p} \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right)^{-2} \underbrace{\left[\sigma^2 + (e_i^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)})^2 \left(\sigma^2 + \frac{k^t}{p} \lambda_i^{(\ell)} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_i^{(\ell)}}{p} k^t - \sigma^2 \right) \right]}_{\text{Ind}}.$$

The presence of the term Ind , makes the second derivative to be indefinite, depending on the sample configurations $X^{(\ell)}$ and $y^{(\ell)}$. Thus the negative log-likelihood function might not be globally geodesically convex.

To sum up, MLE has many limitations: (i) it relies on distributional assumption on $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ and $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$, (ii) evaluating the objective function in (15) requires inverting large matrices which can be computationally expensive when p is large, and (iii) the negative log-likelihood function is not geodesically convex. Numerical approach to calculate MLE, such as Newton-Raphson method, might be sensitive to initial values and can be inefficient when the dimension of the solution is relatively high.

3.1 Estimation without sparsity assumptions

Given the limitation listed above for MLE, a new approach to estimating Ω is proposed below, motivated by the procedure indicated by Balasubramanian et al. (2013). Note that as $\mathbb{E}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} = \frac{1}{p}\Omega$ and $y^{(\ell)} = X^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}, \varepsilon^{(\ell)}} y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} = \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} + \sigma^2 I_{n^{(\ell)} \times n^{(\ell)}}.$$

This suggests the following estimator of Ω :

$$\hat{\Omega} := \arg \min_{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathbb{S}_p^+} \left[f(\tilde{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 \right]. \quad (16)$$

Problem (16) is an optimization problem on the manifold of positive definite matrices. By definition of Frobenius norm, the objective function, denoted as $f(\tilde{\Omega})$, could be equivalently written as

$$f(\tilde{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} \left[\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right)^\top \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \right]. \quad (17)$$

The minimizer of $f(\tilde{\Omega})$ could be characterized by setting the Riemannian gradient (see Definition 2.3) to zero. Using the retraction

$$P_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\Xi) = \tilde{\Omega} + \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \Xi \tilde{\Omega}^{-1} \Xi, \quad \text{for } \tilde{\Omega} \in \mathbb{S}_p^+, \Xi \in \text{TS}_p^+,$$

and the reformulation in (17), it is easy to see that the Riemannian gradient of $f(\tilde{\Omega})$ is given by

$$\text{grad } f(\tilde{\Omega}) = -\frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)}, \quad (18)$$

and $\hat{\Omega}$ is characterized by $\text{grad } f(\tilde{\Omega}) = 0$. Our next result shows that the problem (16) is (globally) geodesically convex.

Proposition 3.1. *The objective function (16), when conditioned on all the random quantities involved and treated as a deterministic function, is (globally) geodesically convex.*

Our framework based on (16) is hence free of stringent distributional assumptions for random coefficient and noise. Also, it does not rely on computing the inverse of large matrix. And finally, since this problem is geodesically convex, numerical approaches such as Riemannian gradient descent will efficiently converge to the global minimum.

Remark 3.1. In practice, one should also estimate the parameter σ^2 . [Dicker \(2014\)](#) proposed a good approach to estimate σ^2 ; see also [Hu and Li \(2022\)](#). Within our meta-learning framework, one could estimate σ^2 using their approach:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(\hat{\Sigma}) = \frac{p + n_\ell + 1}{n_\ell(n_\ell + 1)} \|y^{(\ell)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n_\ell(n_\ell + 1)} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{-1/2} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)}\|^2,$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}$ is a norm-consistent estimator for Σ as $p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell$. In general, we could use one of the tasks to estimate σ^2 and remaining tasks to estimate Ω . Having different noise variance is a more challenging problem, and is left as future work.

3.1.1 Consistency and rates when p and L go to infinity

In this section, we show that the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ given by (16) is consistent as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$ under sub-Gaussian assumptions on $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ and $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$.

Definition 3.2 ([\(Vershynin, 2010\)](#)). A random vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is sub-gaussian $x \in SG_p(\tau)$ with parameter τ if for all $v \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda v^\top (x - \mu))] \leq \exp(\lambda^2 \tau^2 / 2)$.

Our main result below establishes the consistency of $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) under some assumptions on $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}$ and γ_ℓ . The main idea of proving consistency of $\hat{\Omega}$ is to provide an upper bound on $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F$ in terms of $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$, and to show that $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \xrightarrow{p, L} 0$ as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, the first assumption in Theorem 3.1 is mainly used to find a lower bound on $\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle$ in terms of $\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2$ so that one can upper bound $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F$ in terms of $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$ by using the inequality

$$|\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle| = |\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle| \leq \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F.$$

For this purpose, we slightly modify Assumption 2.1.3 such that there is a significant proportion of tasks whose limiting dimension-to-sample-size ratio γ_ℓ is strictly less than 1.

Assumption 3.1.1. We have that:

- (a) For any L , there exists L_0 such that $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_0}{L} = c > 0$ and $\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_0} \gamma_\ell \leq 1 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$
- (b) For any ℓ , $0 < \underline{c} \leq \gamma_\ell \leq \bar{c} < \infty$ and for any dimension p , $0 < \underline{c}^{(\ell)} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \leq \bar{c}^{(\ell)} < \infty$, $\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{c}^{(\ell)} \leq \bar{c}_{\text{op}}$, $\inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \underline{c}^{(\ell)} > \underline{c}_{\text{op}}$
- (c) $\sqrt{p}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_β ; $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_ε .

Theorem 3.1. Under assumption 3.1.1, for the estimator (16), we have

$$\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| = \mathcal{O}_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{p^2}{L}}\right).$$

Hence, $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ when $L, p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p^2}{L} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell$. In addition,

(i) If $L_0/L \rightarrow 0$, the condition $\frac{p^2}{L} \rightarrow 0$ needs to be replaced by $\frac{L}{L_0} \frac{p^2}{L} \rightarrow 0$ to guarantee $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$.

(ii) If all $\gamma_\ell = \gamma$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, then $\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\| = \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{(1+\sqrt{\gamma})^2 \gamma^2}{(1-\sqrt{\gamma})^2} \sqrt{\frac{p^2}{L}}\right)$.

Remark 3.2. Condition (a) above shows the benefit of structure-sharing between the training tasks in terms of estimating the common hyper-covariance matrix. In particular, as long as there is a non-trivial number L_0 of tasks for which there are more observations than the dimensions, it suffices to have consistency in hyper-covariance estimation under otherwise high-dimensional setting.

3.2 Estimation under sparsity assumptions

In Theorem 3.1, we show that $\hat{\Omega}$ is consistent when $p, n_\ell, L \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p^2/L \rightarrow 0$. This means if we want to estimate Ω well by (16), it requires L to be order of p^2 . The result in Theorem 3.1 has the drawback that the aforementioned scaling of the dimension with respect to the number of training tasks is not favourable. In this section, we show that this scaling could be further improved under an additional structural assumptions on Ω , namely sparsity. We then propose a L_1 regularized version of (16) for estimating Ω as follows:

$$\hat{\Omega} = \arg \min_{\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathbb{S}_p^+} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Omega}_{ij}| \right] \quad (19)$$

The outline of the rest of this section is that we first prove the consistency of $\hat{\Omega}$ as $p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ under fixed design of $X^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ in section 3.2.1. Next, in section 3.2.2, we discuss some potential improvement on the convergence rate under the noiseless setting $y^{(\ell)} = X^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$. This approach is motivated the work of Rothman et al. (2008). The main idea of estimating Ω is that we first estimate the diagonal part of Ω using some of tasks whose data matrix $X^{(\ell)}$ has full column rank. Next, the remaining tasks are used to estimate the correlation matrix. Specifically, if the data matrix $X^{(\ell)}$ of L_0 tasks has full column rank, define the left inverse of $X^{(\ell)}$ to be $(X^{(\ell)})_{\text{left}}^{-1} = (X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)})^{-1} X^{(\ell)\top}$ and also $z^{(\ell)} = (X^{(\ell)})_{\text{left}}^{-1} y^{(\ell)}$. One can first get an estimator \hat{W} of the diagonal entries of Ω based on

$$\hat{W}_{ii} = \left[\frac{p}{L_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_0} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right]_{ii} = \left[\frac{p}{L_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_0} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} \right]_{ii}.$$

Then one could estimate Ω based on some modified correlation-based estimator

$$\hat{\Omega}_w = \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Theta}_\lambda \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\Theta}_\lambda$ is an estimator of the correlation matrix $\Theta = W^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Omega W^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ by solving problem

$$\hat{\Theta}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \Gamma_+^p} \left[\frac{1}{L - L_0} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\Theta} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}| \right],$$

where Γ_+^p is a sub-manifold defined to be $\Gamma_+^p = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : A \in \mathbb{S}_p^+, \text{diag } A = I_p\}$.

3.2.1 Fixed design case

In this section, we prove that the estimator given by (19) under fixed design matrix $X^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ is consistent when p, n_ℓ, L goes to infinity under some specific rate of L in term of p . Similar to the assumptions proposed in Theorem 3.1, following assumption are imposed in this section.

Assumption 3.2.1. Suppose that conditions (b) and (c) in Assumption 3.1.1 hold and in addition,

(d) Let the set $S = \{(i, j) : \Omega_{ij} \neq 0, i \neq j\}$. Then $\text{card}(S) \leq s$.

(e) There exists some absolute constant κ_0 such that matrix $X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}$ satisfies the property

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}) \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 \geq \kappa_0^2 \|\Delta\|_F^2 \quad (21)$$

for any symmetric matrix $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\kappa_0^{(\ell)}$ is uniformly bounded below for all ℓ .

Condition (e) above is an analog of Condition (a) listed in Theorem 3.1 motivated by our structural sparsity assumption. We now provide our consistency result.

Theorem 3.2. Let $\hat{\Omega}$ be the minimizer defined by (19), under Assumption 3.2.1, if we set $\tilde{\lambda} \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}$, then we have that

$$\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{(p+s) \log p}{L}} \right).$$

Theorem 3.2 indicates that under fixed design case, the estimator based on (19) is consistent as $p, n_\ell, L \rightarrow \infty$ such that $(p+s) \log p / L \rightarrow 0$. The factor $\sqrt{p \log p / L}$ in particular comes from having to estimate the diagonal entries of the Ω . Hence, in sparse case, one could get an consistent estimator using $L-1$ regularized approach that requires L to be less order of p comparing to order of p^2 in Theorem 3.1.

3.2.2 Improved rates in the noiseless setting

In this section, we further try to improve the rates by estimating the correlation matrix instead of estimating the covariance matrix directly, as discussed previously. To show the improvement, we start with the simplest case when all $X^{(\ell)}$'s are full column rank and show the convergence rate is given by $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{(s+1)\log p/L})$. Suppose that $X^{(\ell)}$ in all tasks are full rank, then one can estimate Ω in following ways

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Theta}_\lambda &= \arg \min_{\Theta \in \Gamma_+^p} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \tilde{\Theta} \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}| \right], \\ \hat{W}_{ii} &= \left[\frac{p}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right]_{ii} = \left[\frac{p}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} \right]_{ii}, \\ \hat{\Omega}_w &= \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Theta}_\lambda \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

Theorem 3.3. *For ℓ -th task, suppose we observe $y^{(\ell)}$ and $X^{(\ell)}$ under noiseless setting, let $\hat{\Omega}_w$ be the minimizer defined by (22). Under Assumption 3.2.1, if the data matrices of all these L tasks have full column rank structure and $\tilde{\lambda} \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}$,*

$$\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{(s+1)\log p}{L}}\right).$$

Then we relax this stringent assumption into the case when only a proportion of $X^{(\ell)}$'s are of full column rank. In this case, we show that the convergence rate in operator norm is given by $\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\| \leq \mathcal{O}_P(\sqrt{s \log p/(L-L_0)} + \sqrt{s \log p/L_0} + \sqrt{s(\log p)^2/L_0(L-L_0)})$. Following theorem shows that with appropriate choice of $\tilde{\lambda}$ the convergence rate of $\hat{\Omega}_w$ could be improved compared to that of $\hat{\Omega}$ given by (19)

Theorem 3.4. *Under Assumptions 3.2.1, let $\hat{\Omega}_w$ be the estimator based on (20) in the noiseless setting. With $\tilde{\lambda} = 2C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right)$, it holds that*

$$\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\| \leq \mathcal{O}_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}}\right)$$

Therefore, Theorem 3.4 states that $\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $p, L, L_0, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ as long as $s \log p/L \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{L_0}{L} \rightarrow c > 0$ under noiseless setting. Therefore, with appropriate choice of $\tilde{\lambda}$, the convergence rate could be improved based on (20) comparing to (19).

To extend previous results to random design case, we need to prove the condition (e) in Assumption 3.2.1 holds with high probability. Theorem 3.5 shows that when rows of $X^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell \times p}$ are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian random vector, the condition (e) in Assumption 3.2.1 holds with high probability.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that the rows of $X^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\ell \times p}$ are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian random vector with parameter $\tau_x^{(\ell)}$ and for all ℓ $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \geq \underline{c}^{(\ell)}$ for some absolute constant $\underline{c}^{(\ell)} > 0$, then for any $q \geq 2$ with probability at least $1 - C_q p^{-\frac{q}{4}}$, (21) holds for any symmetric matrix Δ . The constant C_q does not depends on p and n_ℓ .*

With the above result in hand, the results in Theorem 3.4 extend to random design case with sub-Gaussian assumption on the samples $x^{(\ell)}$ by applying $\Delta = W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Besides, same quantity

Algorithm 1 Simulation for Meta-learning

for each run from 1 to 50 **do**

Generate data matrix $Z^{(\ell)}$ for l -th task ($l = 1, \dots, L$) whose entries are i.i.d. sampled from Gaussian $N(0, 1)$.

Compute $X^{(\ell)} = Z^{(\ell)}\Sigma^{(\ell)\frac{1}{2}}$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$

Generate the coefficient $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ from $N(0, \frac{1}{p}\Omega)$ and $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$ from $N(0, \sigma^2 I)$ with $\sigma^2 = 1$.

Generate $y^{(\ell)}$ based on $y^{(\ell)} = X^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)}$ for $l = 1, \dots, L$

To compute the matrix $\hat{\Omega}$ by running RGD Algorithm 2 depending on:

If unregularized estimator is used, **then** $f(x)$ is given by (16).

If $L-1$ regularized estimator is used, **then** the $f(x)$ is given by (19)

For the new task $L + 1$, generate the training data $X^{(L+1)}, y^{(L+1)}$ in the same way as previous tasks.

Compute the estimator of $\bar{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}$ by (3) and the predictive risk on the test data from new task.

end for

$\text{tr}(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta)$ also appears in the proof of Theorem 3.2, in which we need to find a lower bound on this quantity. Hence, the convergence results in Theorem 3.2 could also be extended into random design case under sub-Gaussian assumption.

Remark 3.3. For the approaches in Section 3.2, when all $\gamma_\ell = \gamma$, the order in Theorem 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}_P\left(\zeta(\gamma)\sqrt{\frac{(p+s)\log p}{L}}\right), \mathcal{O}_P(\zeta(\gamma)\sqrt{(s+1)\log p/L}), \quad \text{and} \\ & \mathcal{O}_P\left(\zeta(\gamma)\left[\sqrt{\frac{s\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

respectively, where $\zeta(\gamma) = \mathcal{O}\left((1+\sqrt{\gamma})^2((1+\gamma)^2+\gamma^2(1+\sqrt{\gamma})^2)\right)$. See Remark B.1 for a justification.

4 Numerical Experiments

We now provide numerical simulation illustrating the proposed approach. The codes for all experiments could be found at

<https://github.com/yanhaojin/Generalized-Ridge-Regression-for-Meta-Learning>.

For the simulation in this section, Algorithm 1 is performed for every choice of dimension p , number of samples n_ℓ in each task, number of samples in the new task, total number of tasks L .

For our initial experiments, the hyper-covariance matrix of the coefficients, Ω , as in (6) with $a = 16$ and $b = 5$, and $\Sigma^{(\ell)} = I$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L, L + 1$. According to Elliott (1953), the eigenvalues of this $p \times p$ matrix is given by $\lambda_k = 16 + 10 \cos \frac{k\pi}{p+1} \in [6, 26]$. Notably, the conditions in Assumption 2.2.1 are verified for this setting. In our experimental setup, problems (16) or (19) demands numerical methods. To tackle (16), we implement Riemannian gradient descent utilizing the Pymanopt package by Townsend et al. (2016), as detailed in Algorithm 2. For (19), we adopt a Riemannian proximal gradient method. To do so, note that (19) has the structure $h(\tilde{\Omega}) = f(\tilde{\Omega}) + \psi(\tilde{\Omega})$ where $f(\tilde{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|y^{(\ell)}y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p}X^{(\ell)}\tilde{\Omega}X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|_F^2$ is differentiable part

Algorithm 2 (Proximal) Riemannian Gradient Descent

Given the retraction $P_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\Xi)$, the Riemannian gradient descent (RGD) iterates

Input: $\Omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$

for For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, **do**

If simple Riemannian gradient descent is used, **then** pick a step-size $\alpha > 0$, and update:

$$\Omega_{k+1} = P_{\Omega_k}(-\alpha \text{grad } f(\Omega_k))$$

If proximal Riemannian gradient descent is used, **then** $\Omega_{k+1} = P_{\Omega_k}(\eta_{\Omega_k}^*)$ where $\eta_{\Omega_k}^*$ is a stationary point of $L_{\Omega_k}(\eta)$ on $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_k} \mathbb{S}_p^+$ and $L_{\Omega_k}(0) \geq L_{\Omega_k}(\eta_{\Omega_k}^*)$, where the function L is as in (23).

end for

where $\text{grad } f(x)$ is the Riemannian gradient defined in (18).

and $\psi(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Omega}_{ij}|$ is non-smooth part. Hence, Riemannian proximal methods are immediately applicable (Huang and Wei, 2022). Let

$$L_{\Omega_k}(\eta) = \langle \text{grad } f(\Omega_k), \eta \rangle_{\Omega_k} + \frac{\tilde{L}}{2} \|\eta\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_k}^2 + \psi(P_{\Omega_k}(\eta)), \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{L} > L$ serves as a constant larger than the smooth parameter L of $f(\tilde{\Omega})$. This allows us to employ proximal Riemannian gradient descent, which is employed in Algorithm 2.

All results reported in our experiments are averaged over 50 random runs. In each experiment, the predictive risk using identity matrix $R_\lambda(I | X^{(L+1)})$, the predictive risk $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ using $\hat{\Omega}$ and the limiting risk $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ are reported. In addition, the $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F$ is reported for the experiment in section 4.1.1. In each random run, the predictive risk is approximated by averaging the squared l_2 norm of predicted and true value of y over 200 independent new samples in new task. Besides, the limiting risk $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ is approximated in following way: For each choice of p and n_{L+1} , we choose a surrogate version of p and n_{L+1} , denoted by \tilde{p} and \tilde{n}_{L+1} , such that $\frac{\tilde{p}}{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} = \frac{p}{n_{L+1}}$. Then the surrogate covariance matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}^{(L+1)}, \tilde{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p} \times \tilde{p}}$ is generated and the surrogate data $\tilde{X}^{(L+1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}_{L+1} \times \tilde{p}}, \tilde{y}^{(L+1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}_{L+1}}$ is generated based on $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$. In (9), the limiting risk $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ mainly depends on the Stieltjes transform s and its derivative s' . $s(-\lambda)$ and $s'(-\lambda)$ could be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}(-\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \tilde{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)\top} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)} \tilde{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I_{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \right)^{-1} \right) \\ \hat{s}'(-\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \tilde{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)\top} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)} \tilde{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I_{\tilde{n}_{L+1}} \right)^{-2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$ could be approximated by

$$\frac{1}{\lambda \gamma_{L+1} \hat{s}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \left[\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_{L+1}} - \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\lambda^2 \gamma_{L+1} \hat{s}'(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})}{\gamma_{L+1} \lambda \hat{s}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \right].$$

Finally, the difference percentage of the risk is computed by

$$\frac{R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) - r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})}{r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})} \times 100\%.$$

L	$\ \hat{\Omega} - \Omega\ _F$	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
100	366.53	9.93	16.93	5.85	189.22%
500	184.19	9.8045	13.24	5.85	126.21%
1000	136.59	9.71	9.01	5.85	53.93%
5000	63.05	9.80	6.23	5.85	6.52%
10000	42.04	9.87	5.93	5.85	1.45%

Table 2: Frobenius norm of $\hat{\Omega} - \Omega$ and prediction risk on new task, with $p = 128$, $n_\ell = 100$, (for $\ell = 1, \dots, L, L + 1$), for $L = 100, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000$.

4.1 Unregularized Setting

4.1.1 Estimation of Ω changing the number of tasks L

In the first part of simulation, we investigate how the error of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ changes as the number of tasks L increases, when the number of samples n_ℓ for first L tasks are less than dimension p . In this part, we fix dimension $p = 128$, the number of samples in previous L tasks $n_\ell = 100$. The total number of tasks L varies from $L = 100, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000$. The results are given in Table 2. In scenarios where the number of tasks is limited, the estimator exhibits a substantial error $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F$ in terms of the Frobenius norm. Additionally, the predictive risk incurred by the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ turns to be inferior to that using the identity matrix, which totally ignores estimating the hyper-covariance matrix modeling the task similarity. However, as the number of tasks L increases, the error between $\hat{\Omega}$ and Ω diminishes, leading to a significant reduction in *difference percentage* showing the benefit of incorporating estimating the hyper-covariance matrix explicitly for prediction.

4.1.2 Behavior of predictive risk based on (16) when changing n_{L+1}

In the second part of the experiment, we fixed the number of task $L = 10000$ to guarantee a good approximation for Ω and we consider the high dimensional case. In this case, the dimension p fixed to be 128, the number of previous tasks $L = 10000$ and set all $n_\ell = 50$ ($\ell = 1, \dots, L$) to be same and vary n_{L+1} from 25, 50, 75, 100, 125, 150. In this part, the initialization of optimization process (16) is given by five different matrices (identity matrix and four different randomly generated positive definite matrices). These results are given in Table 3. Given an adequate number of training tasks, the predictive risk associated with the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ demonstrates superior performance under various choices of n_{L+1} compared to the risk incurred using the identity matrix. Furthermore, the predictive risk using $\hat{\Omega}$ consistently approaches the limiting risk with relatively small *difference percentage*. Notably, the results exhibit similarity across different initializations of the optimization problem (16), affirming benefit of geodesic convexity of (16) and its insensitivity to initialization.

4.1.3 Behavior of predictive risk based on MLE when changing n_{L+1}

In the third part of the experiment in this section, we consider the estimator of the covariance matrix $\hat{\Omega}$ given by MLE approach. The initialization of the optimization is given by identity matrix, four different randomly generated positive definite matrices same as previous case, and the estimator given by (16) with identity as initialization. These results given in Table 4. The predictive risk results obtained using the Maximum Likelihood estimator (MLE) exhibits significant variability based on different choices of initializations. Specifically, the performance of the predictive risk using the MLE is notably poor, characterized by a large *difference percentage*, when employing four randomly generated symmetric positive definite matrices as initialization. This undesirable

behavior arises due to the lack of global geodesic convexity in the optimization problem aimed at minimizing the negative log-likelihood function. Diverse initialization choices may lead the solution to converge to local minima during Riemannian gradient descent. In contrast, performing MLE with an initialization given by the identity matrix, or the output obtained from (16), yields favorable results. This is attributed to the initialization’s proximity to the global minimum of the negative log-likelihood function, resulting in good predictive performance with minimal *difference percentage*.

4.2 L_1 Regularized Setting

In our next set of experiments, we estimate Ω by L_1 regularization using (19). Algorithm 1 is performed based on Riemannian optimization for problem (19). In this experiment, settings for dimension p , choice of Ω and $\Sigma^{(\ell)}$ and n_{L+1} are the same as the general setting at the beginning of Section 4. The main difference in the experimental settings compared to the previous case lies in the number of samples within the tasks and the total number of tasks. In this experiment, we have reduced the number of tasks L to 1000, a significantly smaller quantity than in the prior scenario. Regarding the number of samples for the tasks, we considered two cases:

- Equal Sample Size: all tasks ($\ell = 1, \dots, L$) have an identical sample size, specifically set to $n_\ell = 50$.
- Variable Sample Sizes: we adopted a varied approach. For tasks $\ell = 1, \dots, 200$, we set the sample size to $n_\ell = 150$, whereas for tasks $\ell = 201, \dots, 1000$, the sample size was $n_\ell = 50$.

The results for these two cases are given in Table 5a and 5b. The results indicate that we could achieve comparative results on the predictive risk using much less number of tasks based on (19) than that based on (16). Besides, if we have sufficient number of samples in a proportion of tasks, the behavior of predictive risk $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ is slightly better than that when all tasks have same number of samples $n_\ell = 50$.

We conclude this section by highlighting that in Section E, we provide additional experiments specifically for the cases when the assumptions required for the theoretical results are violated. Specifically, we consider the case when the covariance matrices have eigenvalues that decay to zero as the dimension goes to infinity. We note from our results that the proposed approach performs well even in such cases.

Acknowledgement

YJ and KB were partially supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant DMS-2053918. DP was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1915894.

References

- R. Adamczak and P. Wolff. Concentration inequalities for non-lipschitz functions with bounded derivatives of higher order. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 162:531–586, 2015.
- R. Amit and R. Meir. Meta-learning by adjusting priors based on extended PAC-Bayes theory. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 205–214. PMLR, 2018.
- A. Argyriou, T. Evgeniou, and M. Pontil. Convex multi-task feature learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 73(3):243–272, 2008.

- Z. Bai and J. W. Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, volume 20. Springer, 2010.
- K. Balasubramanian, K. Yu, and T. Zhang. High-dimensional joint sparsity random effects model for multi-task learning. In *Proceedings of the 29th Conference Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, 2013.
- J. Baxter. A model of inductive bias learning. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 12:149–198, 2000.
- N. Boumal. *An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. doi: 10.1017/9781009166164. URL <https://www.nicolasboumal.net/book>.
- V. V. Buldygin and I. V. Kozachenko. *Metric characterization of random variables and random processes*, volume 188. American Mathematical Soc., 2000.
- G. Casella. Minimax ridge regression estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, pages 1036–1056, 1980.
- L. Chen and T. Chen. Is bayesian model-agnostic meta learning better than model-agnostic meta learning, provably? In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1733–1774. PMLR, 2022.
- Q. Chen, C. Shui, and M. Marchand. Generalization bounds for meta-learning: An information-theoretic analysis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25878–25890, 2021.
- R. R. Corbeil and S. R. Searle. Restricted maximum likelihood (reml) estimation of variance components in the mixed model. *Technometrics*, 18(1):31–38, 1976.
- R. Couillet and Z. Liao. *Random Matrix Methods for Machine Learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- L. H. Dicker. Variance estimation in high-dimensional linear models. *Biometrika*, 101(2):269–284, 2014.
- L. H. Dicker. Ridge regression and asymptotic minimax estimation over spheres of growing dimension. *Bernoulli*, 22(1):1–37, 2016.
- E. Dobriban and S. Wager. High-dimensional asymptotics of prediction: Ridge regression and classification. *Ann. Statist.*, 46(1):247–279, 2018.
- S. S. Du, W. Hu, S. M. Kakade, J. D. Lee, and Q. Lei. Few-shot learning via learning the representation, provably. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Y. Duan and K. Wang. Adaptive and robust multi-task learning. *Ann. Statist.*, 51(5):2015–2039, 2023.
- N. El Karoui. Asymptotic behavior of unregularized and ridge-regularized high-dimensional robust regression estimators: Rigorous results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2445*, 2013.
- J. F. Elliott. *The characteristic roots of certain real symmetric matrices*. Masters thesis, University of Tennessee - Knoxville, 1953. Available at https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3834&context=utk_gradthes.
- A. Farid and A. Majumdar. Generalization bounds for meta-learning via PAC-Bayes and uniform stability. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:2173–2186, 2021.

- C. Finn, A. Rajeswaran, S. Kakade, and S. Levine. Online meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1920–1930. PMLR, 2019.
- D. A. Harville. Maximum likelihood approaches to variance component estimation and to related problems. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 72(358):320–338, 1977.
- D. Hsu, S. M. Kakade, and T. Zhang. Random design analysis of ridge regression. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 9–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012.
- X. Hu and X. Li. Misspecification analysis of high-dimensional random effects models for estimation of signal-to-noise ratios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06400*, 2022.
- W. Huang and K. Wei. Riemannian proximal gradient methods. *Math. Program.*, 194(1-2):371–413, 2022.
- Y. Huang, Y. Liang, and L. Huang. Provable generalization of overparameterized meta-learning trained with SGD. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16563–16576, 2022.
- J. Jiang and T. Nguyen. *Linear and generalized linear mixed models and their applications*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- M. Khodak, M.-F. F. Balcan, and A. S. Talwalkar. Adaptive gradient-based meta-learning methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- V. Koltchinskii. *Oracle inequalities in empirical risk minimization and sparse recovery problems: École D’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVIII-2008*, volume 2033. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- W. Kong, R. Somani, Z. Song, S. Kakade, and S. Oh. Meta-learning for mixed linear regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5394–5404. PMLR, 2020.
- O. Ledoit and S. Péché. Eigenvectors of some large sample covariance matrix ensembles. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 151(1):233–264, 2011.
- H. Li, A. Aue, D. Paul, J. Peng, and P. Wang. An adaptable generalization of Hotelling’s t^2 in high dimension. *Ann. Statist.*, 48:1815–1847, 2020.
- Y. Li and S. Oymak. Provable pathways: Learning multiple tasks over multiple paths. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04338*, 2023.
- Y. Lim. Convex geometric means. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 404(1):115–128, 2013.
- K. Lounici, M. Pontil, A. Tsybakov, and S. Van De Geer. Taking advantage of sparsity in multi-task learning. In *COLT 2009-The 22nd Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- J. Lucas, M. Ren, I. Kamení, T. Pitassi, and R. Zemel. Theoretical bounds on estimation error for meta-learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- V. A. Marčenko and L. A. Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457, 1967.
- Y. Maruyama and W. E. Strawderman. A new class of generalized bayes minimax ridge regression estimators. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(4):1753–1770, 2005.

- A. Maurer and M. Pontil. Concentration inequalities under sub-gaussian and sub-exponential conditions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:7588–7597, 2021.
- A. Maurer, M. Pontil, and B. Romera-Paredes. The benefit of multitask representation learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 17(81):1–32, 2016.
- D. Paul. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statist. Sinica*, pages 1617–1642, 2007.
- X. Pennec, P. Fillard, and N. Ayache. A riemannian framework for tensor computing. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 66(1):41–66, 2006.
- N. S. Pillai and J. Yin. Universality of covariance matrices. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(3):935, 2014.
- D. Richards, J. Mourtada, and L. Rosasco. Asymptotics of ridge (less) regression under general source condition. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3889–3897. PMLR, 2021.
- A. J. Rothman, P. J. Bickel, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. Sparse permutation invariant covariance estimation. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 2:494–515, 2008.
- F. Rubio and X. Mestre. Spectral convergence for a general class of random matrices. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 81(5):592–602, 2011.
- Q.-M. Shao and W.-X. Zhou. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the asymptotic distributions of coherence of ultra-high dimensional random matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(2):623–648, 2014.
- J. W. Silverstein. Strong convergence of the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 55(2):331–339, 1995.
- S. Sra and R. Hosseini. Conic geometric optimization on the manifold of positive definite matrices. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(1):713–739, 2015.
- W. E. Strawderman. Minimax adaptive generalized ridge regression estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 73(363):623–627, 1978.
- Y. Sun, A. Narang, I. Gulluk, S. Oymak, and M. Fazel. Towards sample-efficient overparameterized meta-learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28156–28168, 2021.
- T. Tao and V. H. Vu. Random covariance matrices: Universality of local statistics of eigenvalues. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(3):1285–1315, 2012.
- W. Thompson Jr. The problem of negative estimates of variance components. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, pages 273–289, 1962.
- J. Townsend, N. Koep, and S. Weichwald. Pymanopt: A Python toolbox for optimization on manifolds using automatic differentiation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 17(137):1–5, 2016.
- N. Tripuraneni, C. Jin, and M. Jordan. Provable meta-learning of linear representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10434–10443. PMLR, 2021.
- L. W. Tu. *An Introduction to Manifolds*. Springer, 2011.
- R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.

- M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- K. Wang. Some compact notations for concentration inequalities and user-friendly results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.13463*, 2019.
- D. Wu and J. Xu. On the optimal weighted l_2 regularization in overparameterized linear regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:10112–10123, 2020.
- J. Yao, S. Zheng, and Z. Bai. Sample covariance matrices and high-dimensional data analysis. *Cambridge UP, New York*, 2015.

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.89	13.58	2.25%
50	12.34	11.24	10.58	6.22%
75	11.60	8.41	7.94	5.91%
100	9.76	6.53	5.85	11.71%
125	8.12	4.80	4.32	11.13%
150	7.25	3.57	3.34	7.02%

(a) Initialization: Identity matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.91	13.58	2.42%
50	12.34	11.40	10.58	7.73%
75	11.60	8.62	7.94	8.56%
100	9.76	6.77	5.85	15.67%
125	8.12	4.91	4.32	13.72%
150	7.25	3.71	3.34	10.99%

(b) Initialization: First randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	14.00	13.58	3.07%
50	12.34	11.89	10.58	12.37%
75	11.60	9.10	7.94	14.51%
100	9.76	7.01	5.85	19.83%
125	8.12	5.11	4.32	18.25%
150	7.25	3.92	3.34	17.25%

(c) Initialization: Second randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.90	13.58	2.33%
50	12.34	11.36	10.58	7.40%
75	11.60	8.53	7.94	7.45%
100	9.76	6.69	5.85	14.42%
125	8.12	4.86	4.32	12.47%
150	7.25	3.64	3.34	8.95%

(d) Initialization: Third randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.97	13.58	2.89%
50	12.34	11.56	10.58	9.26%
75	11.60	8.91	7.94	12.16%
100	9.76	6.81	5.85	16.37%
125	8.12	5.01	4.32	16.09%
150	7.25	3.87	3.34	15.80%

(e) Initialization: Fourth randomly generated SPD matrix

Table 3: Prediction risk when $\hat{\Omega}$ is estimated based on (16), with 5 different initialization. The max running time for optimizing (16) is 360 minutes.

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.84	13.58	1.91%
50	12.34	11.14	10.58	5.33%
75	11.60	8.26	7.94	4.02%
100	9.76	6.21	5.85	6.14%
125	8.12	4.52	4.32	4.62%
150	7.25	3.49	3.34	4.41%

(a) Initialization: identity matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	18.25	13.58	34.36%
50	12.34	15.91	10.58	50.35%
75	11.60	14.08	7.94	77.22%
100	9.76	10.65	5.85	82.07%
125	8.12	6.93	4.32	60.30%
150	7.25	6.64	3.34	98.57%

(b) Initialization: First randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	19.59	13.58	44.27%
50	12.34	17.03	10.58	61.00%
75	11.60	15.84	7.94	99.40%
100	9.76	11.19	5.85	91.26%
125	8.12	7.32	4.32	69.30%
150	7.25	6.81	3.34	103.65%

(c) Initialization: Second randomly generated SPD matrix

Table 4: Prediction risk when $\hat{\Omega}$ is the MLE in (15), with 5 different initializations. The max running time for MLE iteration is 120 minutes and the max running time for optimizing (16) is 360 minutes. (continued in next page)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	16.59	13.58	22.19%
50	12.34	15.07	10.58	42.43%
75	11.60	12.89	7.94	62.24%
100	9.76	9.92	5.85	69.54%
125	8.12	7.03	4.32	62.66%
150	7.25	6.08	3.34	81.92%

(d) Initialization: Third randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	18.29	13.58	34.68%
50	12.34	16.37	10.58	54.69%
75	11.60	15.07	7.94	89.69%
100	9.76	10.96	5.85	87.23%
125	8.12	7.45	4.32	72.34%
150	7.25	6.71	3.34	100.83%

(e) Initialization: Fourth randomly generated SPD matrix

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.11	13.75	13.58	1.22%
50	12.34	11.01	10.58	4.08%
75	11.60	8.16	7.94	2.79%
100	9.76	6.12	5.85	4.70%
125	8.12	4.50	4.32	4.1910%
150	7.25	3.36	3.34	0.69%

(f) Initialization: Output given by problem (16)

Table 4: (Continuation from previous page) Prediction risk when $\hat{\Omega}$ is the MLE in (15), with 5 different initializations. The max running time for MLE iteration is 120 minutes and the max running time for optimizing (16) is 360 minutes.

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.95	14.03	13.58	3.70%
50	12.57	10.74	10.58	3.92%
75	10.99	8.51	7.94	7.32%
100	9.70	6.65	5.85	14.37%
125	8.63	5.04	4.32	17.23%
150	7.26	3.65	3.34	9.27%

(a) $n_\ell = 50$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.95	13.87	13.58	2.15%
50	12.57	10.52	10.58	-0.58%
75	10.99	8.43	7.94	6.17%
100	9.70	6.63	5.85	13.26%
125	8.63	5.01	4.32	16.09%
150	7.26	3.65	3.34	9.20%

(b) $n_\ell = 150$ for $\ell \leq 200$ and $n_\ell = 50$ for $\ell > 200$.

Table 5: Prediction risk when $\hat{\Omega}$ is estimated based on (19), with $p = 128$, $L = 1000$. The regularization parameter is set as $\lambda = 0.0004$ (The initial point is I).

A Proofs for Section 2.2

In order to make the manipulations more easily readable, in our proofs we will explicitly write $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$, $\hat{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$, $\check{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$ from (5) and (7).

A.1 Derivation of Predictive Risk

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We first calculate the predictive risk using oracle estimator $\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}$ in (2). Let (x, y) be the new test sample whose distribution is the same as training data in $(L+1)$ -th task. Note that, we then have

$$y - \tilde{y} = x^\top \bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} + \varepsilon^{(L+1)} - x^\top \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)} = x^\top (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) + \varepsilon^{(L+1)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[(x^\top (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) + \varepsilon^{(L+1)})^2 \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(\varepsilon^{(L+1)})^2 \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[(x^\top (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}))^2 \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)})^\top x x^\top (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)})^\top \Sigma (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) \mid X^{(L+1)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By plugging in the expression of $\tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}$, it then holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)} &= \lambda (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Omega^{-1} \bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} X^{(L+1)\top} \varepsilon^{(L+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The oracle risk is hence given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)}) &= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)})^\top \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)\top} \Omega^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Omega^{-1} \bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n_{L+1}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon^{(L+1)\top} X^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} X^{(L+1)\top} \varepsilon^{(L+1)} \mid X^{(L+1)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Omega^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and the trace trick, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)}) \\
&= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}^{(L+1)})^\top \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \tilde{\beta}^{(L+1)}) \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\
&= \sigma^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Omega^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \Omega^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&= \sigma^2 + \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)},
\end{aligned}$$

where these three terms could also be expressed as below

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(I)} &= \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-2} \right) \\
\text{(II)} &= -\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-2} \right) \\
\text{(III)} &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (24), it holds that

$$\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \hat{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)} = \lambda (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} X^{(L+1)\top} \varepsilon^{(L+1)}.$$

Therefore, again using the trace trick, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega}^{(L+1)} \mid X^{(L+1)}) \\
&= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \hat{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)})^\top \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\bar{\beta}^{(L+1)} - \hat{\beta}_\lambda^{(L+1)}) \mid X^{(L+1)} \right] \\
&= \sigma^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr} \left(\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}^2} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} X^{(L+1)\top} X^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the third term could be further decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda}{n_{L+1}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the risk $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)})$ could be simplified to

$$R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sigma^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left((\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&= \sigma^2 + (\text{I}') + (\text{II}') + (\text{III}'),
\end{aligned}$$

where these three terms could also be expressed as below

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{I}') &= \frac{\lambda^2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right), \\
(\text{II}') &= -\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-2} \right), \\
(\text{III}') &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Asymptotic Behavior of Predictive Risk

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We first consider the asymptotic behavior of oracle risk $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)})$ as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$. The terms (I) and (II) could be combined together, and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{I}) + (\text{II}) &= \left(\lambda^2 - \lambda \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \right) \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-2} \right) \\
(\text{III}) &= \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1} p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Define $\tilde{X}^{(L+1)} = X^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let v_{L+1} be the Stieltjes transform of limiting spectral distribution of $\tilde{\Lambda}_*^{(L+1)} = \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)\top}$ and s_{L+1} is the Stieltjes transform of limiting spectral distribution of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$. According to [Ledoit and Péché \(2011\)](#),

$$(\text{III}) = \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1} p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \right) \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1} \sigma^2 \Theta^{(1)}(-\lambda),$$

where

$$\Theta^{(1)}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{t}{t(1 - \gamma_{L+1} - \gamma_{L+1} z s_{L+1}(z)) - z} dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t),$$

and $H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t)$ is the limiting spectral distribution of $\Lambda^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)} = \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)\top} \tilde{X}^{(L+1)}$ and $s_{L+1}(z)$ is related to $v_{L+1}(z)$ by following Silverstein equation

$$\gamma_{L+1} \left(s_{L+1}(z) + \frac{1}{z} \right) = v_{L+1}(z) + \frac{1}{z}.$$

According to [Ledoit and Péché \(2011, Lemma 2\)](#), we have that

$$\Theta^{(1)}(z) = \frac{\gamma_{L+1}^{-2}}{\gamma_{L+1}^{-1} - 1 - z s_{L+1}(z)} - \gamma_{L+1}^{-1}.$$

Plugging in the Silverstein equation yields

$$\Theta^{(1)}(z) = \gamma_{L+1}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{-zv_{L+1}(z)} - 1 \right),$$

and

$$(III) \rightarrow \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v_{L+1}(-\lambda)} - 1 \right). \quad (25)$$

Taking derivatives w.r.t. z on both hand side of Silverstein equation gives

$$v'_{L+1}(z) = \gamma_{L+1}(s'_{L+1}(z) - z^{-2}) + z^{-2}.$$

Now, following the the steps by [Dobriban and Wager \(2018, Proof of Theorem 2.1\)](#), we have that

$$(I) + (II) \rightarrow (\lambda^2 - \lambda\gamma_{L+1}\sigma^2) \frac{v_{L+1}(-\lambda) - \lambda v'_{L+1}(-\lambda)}{\gamma_{L+1}(\lambda v_{L+1}(-\lambda))^2}. \quad (26)$$

Combining (26) and (25) together and replacing v in terms of s , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \\ & \frac{1}{\lambda\gamma_{L+1}s_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \left[\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_{L+1}} - \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\lambda^2\gamma_{L+1}s'_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})}{\gamma_{L+1}\lambda s_{L+1}(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_{L+1})} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Since the condition number of Ω is upper bounded and naturally bounded below by 1, under (ii), one has that $\|\Omega^{-1}\|$ is upper bounded. Besides, by triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega + \Omega\| \geq \|\Omega\| - \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|.$$

Since $\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\| \rightarrow 0$ in probability when $p, L \rightarrow \infty$ and $\|\Omega\|$ is bounded away from 0 for any p , $\|\hat{\Omega}\|$ is also bounded away from 0 for sufficient large p and L with high probability. Therefore, $\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\|$ is bounded for sufficient large p and L with high probability.

Note that as $\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1} = \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\Omega^{-1}$, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}\| \leq \|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\| \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\| \|\Omega^{-1}\|,$$

and

$$\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega - I\| = \|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}(\Omega - \hat{\Omega})\| \leq \|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\| \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|.$$

Hence, as long as $\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\| \rightarrow 0$ in probability when $p, L \rightarrow \infty$, and $\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\|$ and $\|\Omega^{-1}\|$ is bounded for sufficiently large p and L , it holds that $\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1}\Omega - I\| \rightarrow 0$ in probability as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4. To analyze the asymptotic behavior of (I'), (II') and (III'), we first investigate the behavior of (III') or equivalently the term $\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{(L+1)}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1})$. Applying resolvent identity $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}$ with

$$A = (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1}), \quad B = (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1}),$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
& \quad + z \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} (\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now using the fact that for $p \times p$ matrices C, D , $|\operatorname{tr} CD| \leq (\operatorname{tr} CC^\top \operatorname{tr} DD^\top)^{1/2} \leq p \|C\| \|D\|$, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\Re z < 0$, the second term could be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{z}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} (\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \right| \\
& \leq |z| \|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\| \|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1}\| \|\Omega^{-1} - \hat{\Omega}^{-1}\| \|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1}\| \\
& \leq |z| \|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\| \|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1}\| \\
& \quad \|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\Omega^{-1} - \hat{\Omega}^{-1}\| \|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1}\| \|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\
& \leq \|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\| \|\Omega^{-1} - \hat{\Omega}^{-1}\| \|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \frac{1}{|z|},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} &= \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1} &= \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

and third inequality follows from the fact that for any Hermitian matrix A , the operator norm of its resolvent could be bounded by $\|(A - zI)^{-1}\| \leq 1/\operatorname{dist}(z, \operatorname{supp}(F^A))$ and if $z \in \mathbb{R}^-$ and A has all non-negative eigenvalues, it could be further bounded by $1/|z|$.

By Assumption 2.2.1 and Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\|\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

and $\|\Sigma\|$, $\|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ and $\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ is bounded as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{z}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} (\hat{\Omega}^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} - z\Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, for any fixed L and for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $s_{L+1}(z)$ is the solution of following fixed point problem,

$$s_{L+1}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \{\tau [1 - \gamma_{L+1} - \gamma_{L+1} z s_{L+1}(z)] - z\}^{-1} dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(\tau).$$

For every fixed $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}})$, the function $|s_{L+1}(z)| \leq \frac{1}{\operatorname{Im} z}$. As $L \rightarrow \infty$, $H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}} \Rightarrow H_{\Lambda}$ whose support is contained in a compact interval. Also, as $\gamma_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma^*$, by Arzela–Ascoli Theorem, for every subsequence $\{s_{L_k+1}\}$, there exists a sub-subsequence $\{s_{L_{k_i}+1}\}$ such that the limit of the subsequence exists and is uniform. By dominated convergence theorem, for each convergent subsequence of $\{s_{L+1}\}$, the limit must be the solution to the following fixed point problem

$$s(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \{\tau [1 - \gamma_* - \gamma_* z s(z)] - z\}^{-1} dH_{\Lambda}(\tau). \quad (27)$$

And (27) has unique solution by a similar argument as that in (Silverstein, 1995, Chapter 6). So under Assumption 2.2.2, $s_{L+1}(z)$ converges pointwisely to $s(z)$ which is uniquely defined by (27).

Therefore, according to Ledoit and P ech e (2011, Lemma 2), for any fixed L one has

$$\sigma^2 \frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1}) \rightarrow \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v_{L+1}(-\lambda)} - 1 \right)$$

as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$. Now, when $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $\gamma_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_*$, we have that

$$\sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v_{L+1}(-\lambda)} - 1 \right) \rightarrow \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v(-\lambda)} - 1 \right),$$

where $v(z)$ is related to $s(z)$ by following equation for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}^+$:

$$\gamma_* \left(s(z) + \frac{1}{z} \right) = v(z) + \frac{1}{z}.$$

Also, as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$ and $L \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_*$, $|(III) - (III')| \xrightarrow{p} 0$. Therefore, as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$ and $L \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_*$,

$$(III') \xrightarrow{p} \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda v(-\lambda)} - 1 \right).$$

Now for the second term (II'), it holds that

$$(II') = -\frac{\lambda p \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-2}).$$

Consider the quantity $\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-2})$. Note that as the eigenvalue of $(\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1}$ is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{\lambda}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1}) \right| &\leq \frac{\|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|}{\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\| \|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\|$ is upper bounded for any p and L , and $\|\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|$ is upper bounded for sufficiently large p and L . Therefore, $\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1})$ is a bounded sequence. By Lemma F.1, it holds that

$$(II') \rightarrow -\lambda \gamma_* \sigma^2 \frac{v(-\lambda) - \lambda v'(-\lambda)}{\gamma_* (\lambda v(-\lambda))^2},$$

as $p, n_{L+1} \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$ and $L \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\gamma_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_*$.

Finally, for the term (I'), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} (\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} ((\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} ((\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The second term $\frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \left((\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \right)$ could be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \left((\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \hat{\Omega}^{-1})^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \left((\Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I) \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&\leq \| \Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I \| \| \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|^3 \| \Sigma^{(L+1)} \| \| (\hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \|^2 \| \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \| \Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I \| \| \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|^3 \| \Sigma^{(L+1)} \| \| \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|,
\end{aligned}$$

which will converge to zero in probability as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$ since $\| \Omega \hat{\Omega}^{-1} - I \|$ converges to zero in probability and $\| \hat{\Omega}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|^3$, $\| \Sigma^{(L+1)} \|$ and $\| \hat{\Omega}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|$ are bounded. Hence, under conditions mentioned above we have that

$$\mathbf{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)}) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{\lambda \gamma_* s(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)} \left[\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma_*} - \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\lambda^2 \gamma_* s'(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)}{\gamma_* \lambda s(-\lambda) + (1 - \gamma_*)} \right],$$

where $s(z)$ is the solution to the following equation

$$s(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \{ \tau [1 - \gamma_* - \gamma_* z s(z)] - z \}^{-1} dH_\Lambda(\tau).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We start by bounding the term $|\mathbf{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon \mid X^{(L+1)})|$ by triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbf{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon \mid X^{(L+1)})| \\
&\leq |\mathbf{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \mathbf{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)})| + |\mathbf{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon \mid X^{(L+1)})|
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand side above is already analyzed in Theorem 2.4, and the second term $|\mathbf{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon \mid X^{(L+1)})|$ mainly depends on $\| \Upsilon^{-1} - \Omega^{-1} \|$ and is bounded next. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbf{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega \mid X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon \mid X^{(L+1)})| \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} (\Upsilon^{-1} - \Omega^{-1}) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{p} - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \right) \text{tr} \left[\Sigma^{(L+1)} \left((\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} - (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Upsilon^{-1})^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \quad \quad \left. \Omega^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right] \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{p} - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \right) \text{tr} \left[\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Upsilon^{-1})^{-1} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \quad \left. (\Omega^{-1} - \Upsilon^{-1}) (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} \right] \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{p} - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \right) \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Upsilon^{-1})^{-1} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \quad \left. \Upsilon^{-1} \left((\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Omega^{-1})^{-1} - (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda \Upsilon^{-1})^{-1} \right) \right). \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

By resolvent identity, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Omega^{-1} - \Upsilon^{-1}\| &= \|\Omega^{-1}(\Upsilon - \Omega)\Upsilon^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|\Omega^{-1}\|\|\Upsilon - \Omega\|\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|\end{aligned}$$

Under our assumptions, $\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|$ is bounded by some universal constant C_Υ , then $\|\Omega^{-1} - \Upsilon^{-1}\| \leq C'\vartheta$. Besides, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Omega^{-1})^{-1}\| &\leq \|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ \|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Upsilon^{-1})^{-1}\| &\leq \|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|(\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)}\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\end{aligned}$$

Again, by resolvent identity, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Omega^{-1})^{-1} - (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Upsilon^{-1})^{-1}\| \\ &= \lambda\|(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Omega^{-1})^{-1}(\Upsilon^{-1} - \Omega^{-1})(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda\Upsilon^{-1})^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Omega^{-1} - \Upsilon^{-1}\|\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

Combining (28) to (29) together, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathbb{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbb{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon | X^{(L+1)})| \\ &\leq \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\|\|\Omega^{-1}\|\vartheta\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\right)\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\|\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^4\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Omega^{-1}\|^2\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|\vartheta \\ &\quad + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\right)\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\|\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Omega^{-1}\|\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|\vartheta \\ &\quad + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\right)\|\Sigma^{(L+1)}\|\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2\|\Upsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^4\|\Upsilon^{-1}\|^2\|\Omega^{-1}\|\vartheta,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbb{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon | X^{(L+1)})| &\leq |\mathbb{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) - \mathbb{R}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})| \\ &\quad + \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\frac{\bar{c}^{(L+1)}}{\lambda^2}\varsigma(\Omega)\varsigma(\Upsilon)\vartheta \\ &\quad + \left(\lambda^2 - \frac{p\lambda\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}\right)\frac{\bar{c}^{(L+1)}}{\lambda^2}\varsigma(\Omega)\varsigma(\Upsilon)(1 + \varsigma(\Omega) + \varsigma(\Upsilon))\vartheta.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $L, n_{L+1}, p \rightarrow \infty$ such that for each fixed L , $p/n_{L+1} \rightarrow \gamma_{L+1}$, while $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{L+1} = \gamma_* \in (1, \infty)$,

$$|\mathbb{R}_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)}) - \tilde{\mathbb{R}}_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Upsilon | X^{(L+1)})| \rightarrow M(\vartheta, \lambda),$$

where the limit $M(\vartheta, \lambda)$ satisfies

$$|M(\vartheta, \lambda)| \leq \frac{\gamma_*\sigma^2}{\lambda}\bar{c}_{\text{op}}c_\Omega c_\Upsilon\vartheta + \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_*\sigma^2}{\lambda}\right)\bar{c}_{\text{op}}(1 + c_\Omega + c_\Upsilon)c_\Omega c_\Upsilon\vartheta.$$

□

A.3 Statistical Advantage of Using Ω

Lemma A.1. For any $p \times p$ positive definite matrix $A \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$, it holds that

$$\text{tr} \left[\left(\exp(tA) - I \right) \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tA) \right] \geq 0.$$

Proof. Note that for any $t > 0$ and $A = \mathbb{S}_p^+$ with eigenvalue decomposition $A = UDU^\top$ and eigenvalues $\lambda_{11}, \dots, \lambda_{pp}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tA) &= U \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tD) U^\top \\ &= U \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} \exp(t\lambda_{11}) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \exp(t\lambda_{pp}) \end{bmatrix} U^\top \\ &= UD \exp(tD) U^\top \\ \text{tr} \left[\left(\exp(tA) - I \right) \frac{d}{dt} \exp(tA) \right] &= \text{tr} \left[U \left(\exp(tD) - I \right) D \exp(tD) U^\top \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\left(\exp(tD) - I \right) D \exp(tD) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\exp(t\lambda_{ii}) - 1 \right) \lambda_{ii} \exp(t\lambda_{ii}) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \geq 0$ since $(\exp(t\lambda_{ii}) - 1)\lambda_{ii} \geq 0$ for any $t \geq 0$. \square

Lemma A.2. By treating $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ as a function of Q^{-1} , the Riemannian gradient of $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ w.r.t. Q^{-1} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad } R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)}) &= \text{grad } R_\lambda(P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) | X^{(L+1)}) \Big|_{\Xi=0} \\ &= 2\lambda \left[B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right)^\top \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \text{diag} \left\{ B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let ξ_{ij} be the (i, j) -th entry of symmetric matrices Ξ . By chain rule, it holds that

$$\frac{\partial R_\lambda(P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \xi_{ij}} = \sum_{u,v} \frac{\partial R_\lambda(P | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial P_{uv}} \frac{\partial P_{uv}}{\partial \xi_{ij}} = \text{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P} \right)^\top \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right],$$

where we slightly abuse the notation P to be the $P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi)$. Note that with

$$P = P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) = Q^{-1} + \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \Xi Q \Xi,$$

it holds that for any $i < j$,

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} = e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \Xi}{\partial \xi_{ij}} Q \Xi + \Xi Q \frac{\partial \Xi}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2}(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top)(Q\Xi + I) + \frac{1}{2}(I + \Xi Q)(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top) \\
\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ii}} &= e_i e_i^\top + \frac{1}{2}e_i e_i^\top Q\Xi + \frac{1}{2}\Xi Q e_i e_i^\top \\
&= \frac{1}{2}e_i e_i^\top (I + Q\Xi) + \frac{1}{2}(\Xi Q + I)e_i e_i^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $B_P := (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda P)^{-1}$, then it holds that $\frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} = -\lambda B_P e_u e_v^\top B_P$. In order to calculate the Riemannian gradient, we first calculate $\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P}$:

$$\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P_{uv}} = \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial P_{uv}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} \frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} \right). \quad (30)$$

We calculate two terms in (30) now. The trace in second term is calculated as

$$\operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} \frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} \right) = \operatorname{tr} \left(-\lambda \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P e_u e_v^\top B_P \right) = -\lambda e_v^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P e_u,$$

and the second term could be calculated in a similar way

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial P_{uv}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \right) \\
&= \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega \frac{\partial P}{\partial P_{uv}} B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} \frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} P \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \frac{\partial P}{\partial P_{uv}} \right) \\
&= e_v^\top \left[\frac{\lambda}{p} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \Omega + \Omega P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \right] e_u \\
&\quad - e_v^\top \left[\frac{\lambda^2}{p} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \Omega P B_P + B_P P \Omega P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P B_P + B_P P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) \right] e_u.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining two terms $\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} \frac{\partial B_P}{\partial P_{uv}} \right)$ and $\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial P_{uv}} \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \right)$ together yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\partial R}{\partial P} \right)^\top &= \lambda \left[\frac{\lambda}{p} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \Omega + \Omega P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) - \frac{2\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda^2}{p} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P \Omega P B_P + B_P P \Omega P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} (B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P P B_P + B_P P B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}}$ is symmetric, plugging $\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P}$ in $\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P} \right)^\top \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right) \right]$ yields

$$\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P} \right)^\top \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lambda \operatorname{tr} \left[(I - \lambda B_P P) \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega P - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right] \\
&\quad + \lambda \operatorname{tr} \left[B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) (I - \lambda P B_P) \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right] \\
&= 2\lambda \operatorname{tr} \left[B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) (I - \lambda P B_P) \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right] \\
&= \lambda e_j^\top (Q \Xi + I) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_i \\
&\quad + \lambda e_i^\top (Q \Xi + I) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_j \\
&\quad + \lambda e_j^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P (I + \Xi Q) e_i \\
&\quad + \lambda e_i^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P (I + \Xi Q) e_j,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the identity $I - \lambda P B_P = (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda P - \lambda P)(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda P)^{-1} = \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P$ for $B_P = (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda P)^{-1}$. Therefore, by taking $\Xi = 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P} \right)^\top \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ij}} \right) \right] \Big|_{\Xi=0} &= 2\lambda e_j^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_i \\
&\quad + 2\lambda e_i^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since $\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ii}} = \frac{1}{2} e_i e_i^\top (I + Q \Xi) + \frac{1}{2} (\Xi \hat{\Omega} + I) e_i e_i^\top$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_\lambda}{\partial P} \right)^\top \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_{ii}} \right) \right] &= \lambda e_i^\top (I + Q \Xi) B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_i \\
&\quad + \lambda e_i^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} P \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P (\Xi Q + I) e_i,
\end{aligned}$$

when $\Xi = 0$, this becomes $2\lambda e_i^\top B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P e_i$. Therefore, the Riemannian gradient is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{grad} R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)}) &= \operatorname{grad} R_\lambda(P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) | X^{(L+1)}) \Big|_{\Xi=0} \\
&= 2\lambda \left[B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right)^\top \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \operatorname{diag} \left\{ B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.5. We treat the risk function $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ as a function of Q^{-1} . By Lemma A.2 calculate Riemannian gradient of $R_\lambda(Q | X^{(L+1)})$ w.r.t. Q^{-1} is given by

$$\operatorname{grad} R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)}) = \operatorname{grad} R_\lambda(P_{Q^{-1}}(\Xi) | X^{(L+1)}) \Big|_{\Xi=0}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2\lambda \left[B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right)^\top \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{diag} \left\{ B_P \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_P \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} Q^{-1} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_P \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to [Boumal \(2023, Proposition 4.6\)](#), $Q^{-1} \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$ is a critical point if and only if $\text{grad } R_\lambda(Q^{-1} | X^{(L+1)}) = 0$. By setting the Riemannian gradient to zero, it is easy to see that $Q^{-1} = \frac{p\sigma^2}{\lambda n_{L+1}} \Omega^{-1}$ is the critical point.

Now we prove that $Q^* = \frac{\lambda n_{L+1}}{p\sigma^2} \Omega$ is actually the global minimizer of the predictive risk. We pick any $Q_0 \in \text{T}_{Q^*} \mathbb{S}_p^+$ and $Q_0 \neq Q^*$. Consider the line segment between Q^* and Q_0 , i.e. $\alpha Q^* + (1-\alpha)Q_0 \in \text{T}_{Q^*} \mathbb{S}_p^+$. We project this line segment to $Q_\alpha \in \text{T}_{Q^*} \mathbb{S}_p^+$ such that when $\alpha = 1$, $Q_\alpha = Q^*$. Note that $\alpha Q^* + (1-\alpha)Q_0 = Q^* + (1-\alpha)Q_0 - (1-\alpha)Q^* = Q^* + (1-\alpha)(Q_0 - Q^*)$, one can define

$$Q_\alpha := Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ (1-\alpha) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} (Q_0 - Q^*) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} \right\} Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}, \quad B_\alpha := (\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \lambda Q_\alpha^{-1})^{-1},$$

and the predictive risk is given by

$$R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)}) = \sigma^2 + \lambda \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha).$$

We show that with $Q^* = \frac{\lambda n_{L+1}}{p\sigma^2} \Omega$, the predictive risk is the global minimizer along every geodesical line ending at Q^* , i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)}) \leq 0$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)}) = 0$ at $\alpha = 1$ under arbitrary choice of $Q_0 \neq Q^*$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial Q_\alpha^{-1}}{\partial \alpha} &= -Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \\
\frac{\partial B_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} &= \lambda B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking derivative w.r.t. α yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)}) \\
&= \lambda \left[-\text{tr} \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \lambda \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \lambda \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \right) \\
&= (i) + (ii),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first term could be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) &= \left[-\operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{p} B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} Q_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad \left. - \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \right] \\
&= \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha \left(\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I - \frac{\lambda^2}{p} Q_\alpha^{-1} \Omega \right) Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha \left(\frac{\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I - \frac{\lambda^2}{p} Q_\alpha^{-1} \Omega \right) Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&= 2\lambda \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q_\alpha - \frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega \right) Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(ii) &= \lambda^2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&\quad + \lambda^2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega Q_\alpha^{-1} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} I \right) B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&= 2\lambda^2 \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \left(\frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega - \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q_\alpha \right) Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the two terms together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \operatorname{R}_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \alpha} \\
&= 2\lambda \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q_\alpha - \frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega \right) \left(I - \lambda Q_\alpha^{-1} B_\alpha \right) Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right) \\
&= 2\lambda \operatorname{tr} \left(B_\alpha \Sigma^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q_\alpha - \frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_\alpha}{\partial \alpha} Q_\alpha^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We now show that $\frac{\partial \operatorname{R}_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \alpha} \leq 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_\alpha &= Q^{*\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ (1-\alpha) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} (Q_0 - Q^*) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} \right\} Q^{*\frac{1}{2}} \\
\frac{dQ_\alpha}{d\alpha} &= -Q^{*\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial (1-\alpha)} \exp \left\{ (1-\alpha) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} (Q_0 - Q^*) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} \right\} Q^{*\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q_\alpha - \frac{\lambda}{p} \Omega &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} (Q_\alpha - Q^*) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} Q^{*\frac{1}{2}} \left(\exp \left\{ (1-\alpha) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} (Q_0 - Q^*) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} \right\} - I \right) Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging these expressions in the derivative, we get

$$\frac{\partial \operatorname{R}_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{2\lambda \sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \operatorname{tr} \left(A_1 \left(\exp \left\{ (1-\alpha) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} (Q_0 - Q^*) Q^{*-\frac{1}{2}} \right\} - I \right) \right)$$

$$\cdot A_2 \frac{\partial \exp\{(1-\alpha)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}(Q_0 - Q^*)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}\}}{\partial(1-\alpha)},$$

where $A_1 := Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}Q_\alpha^{-1}B_\alpha\Sigma^{(L+1)}B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1}Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}$ and $A_2 := Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)}B_\alpha Q_\alpha^{-1}Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}$. Since A_1 and A_2 are two positive definite matrices. By Lemma A.1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left(\left(\exp\{(1-\alpha)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}(Q_0 - Q^*)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}\} - I \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial(1-\alpha)} \exp\{(1-\alpha)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}(Q_0 - Q^*)Q^{*\frac{1}{2}}\} \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\frac{\partial R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \alpha} \leq 0$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Besides, for any $Q_0 \in \mathbb{S}_p^+$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial R_\lambda(Q_\alpha | X^{(L+1)})}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=1} = 0.$$

Therefore, $Q^* = \frac{n_{L+1}\lambda}{p\sigma^2}\Omega$ is the global minimizer of the predictive risk. Besides, the risk in this case is given by

$$R_\lambda(Q^* | X^{(L+1)}) = \sigma^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma^{(L+1)} \left(\hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} + \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}} \Omega^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right).$$

□

B Proofs for Section 3

Proof of Proposition 3.1. One needs to prove

$$g(\Omega) = \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2$$

is geodesically convex. Define

$$g_1(\Omega) = \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} + \sigma^2 I - y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} \quad g_2(\Omega) = \|\Omega\|_F^2$$

Then $g(\Omega) = g_2 \circ g_1(\Omega)$. We note that g_2 are convex in usual sense. And if $\Omega_1 \geq \Omega_2$ in Löwner order, then

$$g_1(\Omega_1) - g_1(\Omega_2) = \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega_1 - \Omega_2) X^{(\ell)\top} \geq 0$$

i.e. g_1 is monotone. Besides, g_2 monotone on the set of positive definite matrices \mathbb{S}_p^+ , then by Lim (2013, Proposition 3.5, Property (8)), we have that $g = g_2 \circ g_1$ is geodesically convex. □

B.1 Technical Lemmas

We start with a few preliminary results required to prove Theorem 3.1.

Lemma B.1. Suppose that $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_β ; $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_ε , then

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|^k \leq 1 + 4k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta p} \right)^k \Gamma(k),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^k &\leq n_\ell^k + 4k\left(\frac{2}{C_\tau}\right)^k \Gamma(k), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k &\leq 1 + k\left(\frac{4\tau_\beta^2}{p}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k &\leq n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + k(4\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2).\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p}\Omega\right\|^2 &\leq 1 + \frac{32}{C_\beta^2 p^2} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^2 &\leq n_\ell^2 + \frac{32}{C_\varepsilon^2} = \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^2), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 &\leq 1 + 8\tau_\beta^2 p^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 &\leq n_\ell + 8\tau_\varepsilon^2 = \mathcal{O}(n_\ell).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma B.1. Suppose that $\sqrt{p}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_β , we bound the $\mathbb{E}\left\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p}\Omega\right\|^k$ using concentration results on $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p}\Omega\right\|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{p^k} \mathbb{E}\|p\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \Omega\|^k = \frac{1}{p^k} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|p\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \Omega\|^k \geq u) du \\ &= \frac{1}{p^k} \int_0^{p^k} \mathbb{P}(\|p\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \Omega\| \geq u^{\frac{1}{k}}) du + \frac{1}{p^k} \int_{p^k}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|p\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \Omega\| \geq u^{\frac{1}{k}}) du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p^k} \left(p^k + \int_{p^k}^{+\infty} 2 \cdot 9^p \exp\{-C_\beta u^{\frac{1}{k}}/2\} du \right) \quad C_\beta = \min\left\{\frac{1}{(32\tau_\beta^2)^2}, \frac{1}{32\tau_\beta^2}\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{p^k} \left(p^k + 2 \cdot 9^p \int_{\frac{C_\beta}{2} p}^{+\infty} k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta}\right)^k v^{k-1} e^{-v} dv \right) \quad v = \frac{1}{2} C_\beta u^{\frac{1}{k}}, du = k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta}\right)^k v^{k-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p^k} \left(p^k + 2k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta}\right)^k \int_{\frac{C_\beta}{2} p}^{+\infty} 9^p v^{k-1} e^{-v} dv \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p^k} \left(p^k + 4k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta}\right)^k \int_{\frac{C_\beta}{2} p}^{+\infty} v^{k-1} e^{-\frac{v}{2}} dv \right) \\ &\leq 1 + 4k \left(\frac{4}{C_\beta p}\right)^k \Gamma(k).\end{aligned}$$

Now we bound the term $\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^k$ in the same way

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^k \\ &= \int_0^{n_\ell^k} \mathbb{P}(\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\| \geq u^{\frac{1}{k}}) du + \int_{n_\ell^k}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\| \geq u^{\frac{1}{k}}) du \\ &\leq n_\ell^k + \int_{n_\ell^k}^{+\infty} 2 \cdot 9^{n_\ell} \exp\{-C_\varepsilon u^{\frac{1}{k}}/2\} du \quad C_\varepsilon = \min\left\{\frac{1}{(32\tau_\varepsilon^2)^2}, \frac{1}{32\tau_\varepsilon^2}\right\} \\ &= n_\ell^k + 2 \cdot 9^{n_\ell} \int_{\frac{C_\varepsilon}{2} n_\ell}^{+\infty} k \left(\frac{2}{C_\varepsilon}\right)^k v^{k-1} e^{-v} dv \quad v = \frac{1}{2} C_\varepsilon u^{\frac{1}{k}}, du = k \left(\frac{2}{C_\varepsilon}\right)^k v^{k-1}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= n_\ell^k + 2k \left(\frac{2}{C_\varepsilon} \right)^k \int_{\frac{C_\varepsilon}{2} n_\ell}^{+\infty} 9^{n_\ell} v^{k-1} e^{-v} dv \\
&\leq n_\ell^k + 4k \left(\frac{2}{C_\varepsilon} \right)^k \int_{\frac{C_\varepsilon}{2} n_\ell}^{+\infty} v^{k-1} e^{-\frac{v}{2}} dv \\
&\leq n_\ell^k + 4k \left(\frac{4}{C_\varepsilon} \right)^k \Gamma(k).
\end{aligned}$$

Now in particular, if $k = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|^2 &\leq 1 + \frac{32}{p^2 C_\beta^2}, \\
\mathbb{E} \left\| \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|^2 &\leq n_\ell^2 + \frac{32}{C_\varepsilon^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \\
&= \int_0^{n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}}} \mathbb{P}(\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \geq u) du + \int_{n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}}}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \geq u) du \\
&\leq n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + \int_{n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}}}^{+\infty} 5^{n_\ell} \exp\left\{-\frac{u^{\frac{2}{k}}}{2\tau_\varepsilon^2}\right\} du \\
&= n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + \int_{\frac{n_\ell}{2\tau_\varepsilon^2}}^{+\infty} 5^{n_\ell} \exp\{-v\} (2\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \quad v = \frac{1}{2\tau_\varepsilon^2} u^{\frac{2}{k}}; du = (2\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \\
&= n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + (2\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} \int_{\frac{n_\ell}{2\tau_\varepsilon^2}}^{+\infty} 5^{n_\ell} \exp\{-v\} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \\
&\leq n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + k(4\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k &= \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \mathbb{E} \|\sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k = \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \geq u) du \\
&= \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int_0^{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \mathbb{P}(\|\sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \geq u) du + \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int_{p^{\frac{k}{2}}}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \geq u) du \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int_{p^{\frac{k}{2}}}^{+\infty} 5^p \exp\left\{-\frac{u^{\frac{2}{k}}}{2\tau_\beta^2}\right\} du \\
&= 1 + \frac{1}{p^{\frac{k}{2}}} \int_{\frac{p}{2\tau_\beta^2}}^{+\infty} 5^p \exp\{-v\} (2\tau_\beta^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \quad v = \frac{1}{2\tau_\beta^2} u^{\frac{2}{k}}; du = (2\tau_\beta^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \\
&= 1 + \left(\frac{2\tau_\beta^2}{p}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k}{2} \int_{\frac{p}{2\tau_\beta^2}}^{+\infty} 5^p \exp\{-v\} v^{\frac{k}{2}-1} dv \\
&\leq 1 + k \left(\frac{4\tau_\beta^2}{p}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 &\leq 1 + 8\tau_\beta^2 p^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 &\leq n_\ell + 8\tau_\varepsilon^2 = \mathcal{O}(n_\ell).\end{aligned}$$

□

In the next lemma, we bound the ψ_1 norm of related quantities appears in Riemannian gradient $\text{grad} f(\Omega)$. According to [Maurer and Pontil \(2021, Equation \(1\)\)](#), we can define the usual sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential norms $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_1}$ for any real random variable Z as

$$\|Z\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\|Z\|_k}{\sqrt{k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|Z\|_{\psi_1} = \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\|Z\|_k}{k} \quad (31)$$

where the L_k -norms are defined as $\|Z\|_k = (\mathbb{E}[|Z|^k])^{1/k}$.

Lemma B.2. Suppose that $\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_β ; $\varepsilon^{(\ell)}$'s are independent zero mean and sub-Gaussian with parameter τ_ε , then

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} &\leq 8n_\ell^2 (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sqrt{p}, \\ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} &\leq 4 \frac{n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}),\end{aligned}$$

almost surely.

Proof of Lemma B.2. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ &\leq \frac{4n_\ell^2}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ &\leq \frac{4n_\ell^2}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega\|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to bound this ψ_1 norm, it suffices to bound $\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega\|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega\|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k} &\leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k} \left(p^k + 4k \left(\frac{2}{C_\beta} \right)^k \Gamma(k) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \\ &= 1 + \frac{8}{C_\beta p} \leq 2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it holds that for p sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} &\leq \frac{4n_\ell^2}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) 2 \\ &= 8n_\ell^2 (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) / \sqrt{p}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \left\| \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_{\psi_1} \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E} \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k} \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{\left(n_\ell^k + 4k \left(\frac{2}{C_\tau} \right)^k \Gamma(k) \right)^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k} \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) (n_\ell + 8/C_\varepsilon) \\
& \leq 4 n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) / \sqrt{p}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Another tool we use to prove Theorem 3.1 is the concentration inequality stated in Theorem F.1.

B.2 Consistency of $\hat{\Omega}$ as L, n_ℓ, p go to infinity

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Define the target function, by the definition of Frobenius norm, to be

$$f(\tilde{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} \left[\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right)^\top \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \right].$$

The minimizer of $f(\tilde{\Omega})$ could be characterized by setting the Riemannian gradient to be zero. Using retraction $P_{\tilde{\Omega}}(\Xi) = \tilde{\Omega} + \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \Xi \tilde{\Omega}^{-1} \Xi$, the Riemannian gradient is given by

$$\text{grad } f(\tilde{\Omega}) = -\frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)}.$$

Note that $y^{(\ell)} = X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)}$, hence, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \\
& = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \right) \left(X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \right)^\top X^{(\ell)} \\
& = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad } f(\Omega) &= -\frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} - \frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

The main idea to prove $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F \xrightarrow{p} 0$ is trying to bound the $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F$ by $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$. We first prove that under Assumption 3.1.1, it holds that for sufficiently large p, n_ℓ and L ,

$$2cd^2 \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F \leq \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F. \quad (32)$$

where c is the limit of L_0/L as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and $d = \inf_{\ell \leq L_0} \frac{1}{2} (1 - \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$. To prove (32), note that for the minimizer $\hat{\Omega}$ of (16), $\text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}) = 0$ so it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle| &= |\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}) &= -\frac{4}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \\ &= \frac{4}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \frac{1}{n_\ell^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the inner product $\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle$ is given by

$$\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle = \frac{4}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} \left(\frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \frac{1}{n_\ell^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) \right).$$

Now we seek to lower bound for this inner product in terms of $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F^2$ for any finite L . Define $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle \\ &= \frac{4}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{n_\ell^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) \right) \\ &\geq 4 \min_{\ell=1, \dots, L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega}) \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} (\Omega - \hat{\Omega})) \\ &\geq \frac{4}{L} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_0} \lambda_{\min}^2(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \frac{4L_0}{L} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_0} \lambda_{\min}^2(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2.$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})$ is the minimum eigenvalue of $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}$. Now note that for $\ell = 1, \dots, L_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &= \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n_\ell} \Sigma^{(\ell)\frac{1}{2}} Z^{(\ell)\top} Z^{(\ell)} \Sigma^{(\ell)\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)\frac{1}{2}})^2 \lambda_{\min}(Z^{(\ell)\top} Z^{(\ell)}/n_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

According to [Bai and Silverstein \(2010, Theorem 5.11\)](#), with probability 1,

$$\lambda_{\min}(Z^{(\ell)\top} Z^{(\ell)}/n_\ell) \rightarrow (1 - \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2.$$

Thus, with probability 1, for p and n_ℓ being sufficiently large,

$$\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \geq d > 0 \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L_0,$$

where $d = \inf_{\ell \leq L_0} \frac{1}{2} (1 - \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$. This implies $\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_0} \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \geq d > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle &\geq \frac{4L_0}{L} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L_0} \lambda_{\min}^2(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \frac{4L_0}{L} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} d^2 \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4L_0}{L} \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} d^2 \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F^2 &\leq \langle \text{grad } f(\Omega) - \text{grad } f(\hat{\Omega}), \Omega - \hat{\Omega} \rangle \\ &\leq \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Hence, for sufficiently large p, n_ℓ and L , (32) holds. Now, if $\frac{L_0}{L} \rightarrow c > 0$, it suffices to control $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$. We prove $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \xrightarrow{p} 0$ by deriving the explicit concentration inequality in terms of p, L, n_ℓ . In order to guarantee $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $p, L, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, we only need to control following three terms

$$\frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \tag{34}$$

$$\frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \tag{35}$$

$$\frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}. \tag{36}$$

We want to guarantee that the Frobenius norm of these three terms converge in probability to 0 as $p, L, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Here, we use the result by [Koltchinskii \(2011, Theorem 2.7\)](#), recalled in [Theorem F.1](#).

Concentration inequality for the term (34) in the gradient.

In order to prove the Frobenius norm of term (34) converges to zero in probability as p, n_ℓ and L go to infinity, we use the fact that for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $\|A\|_F \leq \sqrt{p}\|A\|$. Hence, we only need to utilize Theorem F.1 to guarantee

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

To apply Theorem F.1, it suffices to bound all the required constants in the result and specifying $U^{(1)}$ in the Theorem. By Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|^2 &\leq 1 + \frac{32}{C_\beta^2 p^2} = \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1} &\leq 8n_\ell^2 (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) / \sqrt{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Bai and Silverstein (2010, Theorem 5.11), with probability 1, it holds that $\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \rightarrow (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$. Then for sufficiently large p and n_ℓ , $\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}\| \leq 2(1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$ with probability 1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{4n_\ell^2}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4n_\ell^2}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally we bound the term $\|\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}]^2\|$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{L} \left\| \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]^2 \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \left[X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]^2 \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left\| X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \|X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}\|^4 \left\| (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{16}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell^4 \lambda_{\max}^4(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^8 \mathbb{E} \left\| \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{16}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell^4 \lambda_{\max}^4(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^8 \mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}(p^3). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in Theorem F.1, one can set

$$U^{(1)} = \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1}, \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we are ready to derive the concentration inequality using Theorem F.1. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\ & \leq 2p \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{K} \frac{L^2 t^2}{L \mathcal{O}(p^3) + Lt \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\ & = 2p \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}(p^3/L) + t \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}} \log(p^{\frac{3}{2}}/L))} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Using Wang (2019, Fact 1), the Frobenius norm of (34) is $\mathcal{O}_P(p^{\frac{3}{2}})$. Hence, as long as $\frac{p^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L} = o(1)$, the Frobenius norm of (34) will converge to zero in probability as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$.

Concentration inequality for the term (35) in the gradient. We follow a similar approach to derive the concentration inequality. Note that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|_F \leq \sqrt{p} \left\| \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|_F \\ & = \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} \text{tr} (X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)})} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \lambda_{\max}(X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top}) \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|_F \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} \lambda_{\max}(X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top}) \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\| \\ & \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now we want to use Theorem F.1 to derive the concentration inequality for

$$\left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|.$$

Again, by Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.2, it holds that

$$\left\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\| \right\|_{\psi_1} \leq 4 \frac{n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) = \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}/\sqrt{p})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^2).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{n_\ell}{p}} n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) [\mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}/\sqrt{p}) = \mathcal{O}(p^2). \end{aligned}$$

To apply Theorem F.1, we could set the required quantity $U^{(1)}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(1)} &= \max \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(p^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we bound the other quantity required in the Theorem F.1 as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{L} \left\| \mathbb{E} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right]^2 \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{p} [X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)}]^2 \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left\| X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L 4 \frac{n_\ell^3}{p} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^4 \lambda_{\max}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I\|^2 \\ & \leq \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^5/p) = \mathcal{O}(p^4). \end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem F.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\ & \leq 2p \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{K} \frac{L^2 t^2}{L \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^5/p) + L t \mathcal{O}(n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}/\sqrt{p}) \log(\mathcal{O}(n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}}/\sqrt{p}))} \right\} \\ & = 2p \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}(p^4/L) + t \mathcal{O}(p^2 \log(p^2)/L)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Again, according to in Wang (2019, Fact 1), the Frobenius norm of (35) is $\mathcal{O}_P(p^2/L)$. As long as $\mathcal{O}(p^2/L) = o(1)$, the Frobenius norm of (35) will converge to zero in probability as $p, L, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Concentration inequality for the term (36) in the gradient. Finally, we deal with the cross term (36): Note that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_F \leq \left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|.$$

Hence, it suffices to show that $\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|$ converges to 0 in probability using Theorem F.1. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_F \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left[\text{tr}(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 2n_\ell (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^2 \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \left[\text{tr}(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\| \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} \|_F \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2 \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2 \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)\top}\|_2 \|\psi_1 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E} \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k & \leq 1 + k(4\tau_\beta^2/p)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2), \\ \mathbb{E} \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k & \leq n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + k(4\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the ψ_1 norm could be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \right\|_{\psi_1} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{[\mathbb{E} \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^k \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^k]^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 4n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{(1 + k(4\tau_\beta^2/p)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2))^{\frac{1}{k}} (n_\ell^{\frac{k}{2}} + k(4\tau_\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{k}{2}} \Gamma(k/2))^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} 8n_\ell^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 \lambda_{\max}^{\frac{3}{2}}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Besides,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(n_\ell).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq 8 \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 (n_\ell \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}))^{\frac{3}{2}} (\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq 64 \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^3 (n_\ell \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}))^{\frac{3}{2}} \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one could set the quantity $U^{(1)}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(1)} &= \max_{\ell} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\psi_1}, \left(\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Besides, notice that for n_ℓ, p sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} \|X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}\|^2 \|X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top}\| \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top}\| \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top}\| \\ & \leq \frac{8}{p} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^6 n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \frac{8}{p} (1 + \sqrt{c})^6 n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{O}(p) = \mathcal{O}(p^3), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left\| X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_{\max}(X^{(\ell)} X^{(\ell)\top}) \lambda_{\max}^2(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}) \|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top}\|_F \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} 8 n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^6 \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \mathbb{E}\|\varepsilon^{(\ell)}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \frac{8}{p} (1 + \sqrt{\gamma_\ell})^6 n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{O}(p) \leq \frac{8}{p} (1 + \sqrt{c})^6 p^3 \lambda_{\max}^3(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \mathcal{O}(p) \\ & = \mathcal{O}(p^3). \end{aligned}$$

Now applying Theorem F.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2 L^2}{L\mathcal{O}(p^3) + tL\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\
&= 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}(p^3/L) + t\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}} \log(p^{\frac{3}{2}}/L))} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Once again, according to Wang (2019, Fact 1), Frobenius norm of (36) is $\mathcal{O}_P(p^{\frac{3}{2}}/L)$. As long as $p^{\frac{3}{2}}/L = o(1)$, i.e. $p^{\frac{3}{2}}/L \rightarrow 0$, the Frobenius norm of the cross term (36) will converge to zero in probability as $p, n_\ell, L \rightarrow \infty$.

We now prove the claims in part (i) and part(ii).

Proof of Part (i). By inequality (33), it holds that

$$\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} d^2 \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F \leq \frac{L}{4L_0} \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$$

If $\frac{L_0}{L} \rightarrow c = 0$, then we need to control $\frac{L}{L_0} \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F$. We want $\frac{L}{L_0} \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $p, n_\ell, L, L_0 \rightarrow \infty$. In order to guarantee this, we only need to bound the operator norm of following terms

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \frac{L}{L_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \tag{40}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \frac{L}{L_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \tag{41}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \frac{L}{L_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \tag{42}$$

By a similar calculation as above, the respective concentration inequalities for terms (40), (41) and (42) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{L}{L_0} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
&\leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{L_0^2 t^2}{L\mathcal{O}(p^3) + L_0 t \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\
&= 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((\frac{L}{L_0})^2 \frac{p^3}{L}) + t \mathcal{O}(\frac{L}{L_0} \frac{p^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L} \log(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
&\leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{L_0^2 t^2}{L\mathcal{O}(p^4) + L_0 t \mathcal{O}(p^2) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^2))} \right\} \\
&= 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((\frac{L}{L_0})^2 \frac{p^4}{L}) + t \mathcal{O}((\frac{L}{L_0}) \frac{p^2}{L} \log(p^2))} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \frac{L}{L_0} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
& \leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2 L_0^2}{L \mathcal{O}(p^3) + t L_0 \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\
& = 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((\frac{L}{L_0})^2 \frac{p^3}{L}) + t \mathcal{O}((\frac{L}{L_0}) \frac{p^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L} \log(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as $\frac{L}{L_0} \frac{p^2}{L} = o(1)$, $\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F \xrightarrow{p} 0$. Now if $\frac{L}{L_0} \rightarrow 0$, then L needs to be higher order in previous case.

Proof of Part (ii). When all $\gamma_\ell = \gamma$, we can track γ in our theoretical results. The inequality (37) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
& \leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{L^2 t^2}{L \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^8 p^3) + Lt \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^4 p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\
& = 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^8 p^3 / L) + t \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^4 p^{\frac{3}{2}} \log(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) / L)} \right\}. \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

So term (34) is $\mathcal{O}_P((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^4 \frac{p^{3/2}}{L})$. The second inequality (38) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} (\varepsilon^{(\ell)} \varepsilon^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I) X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
& \leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{L^2 t^2}{L \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^4 n_\ell^5 / p) + Lt \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}} / \sqrt{p}) \log(\mathcal{O}(n_\ell^{\frac{5}{2}} / \sqrt{p}))} \right\} \\
& = 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^4 p^4 / L) + t \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 p^2 \log(p^2) / L)} \right\}. \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the term (35) is $\mathcal{O}_P((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 \frac{p^2}{L})$. Finally, the inequality (39) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| \geq t \right) \\
& \leq 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2 L^2}{L \mathcal{O}(p^3) + t L \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}) \log(\mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}}))} \right\} \\
& = 2p \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{\mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^6 p^3 / L) + t \mathcal{O}(p^{\frac{3}{2}} \log((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^3 p^{\frac{3}{2}} / L))} \right\}. \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the cross term (36) is $\mathcal{O}_P((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^3 \frac{p^{\frac{3}{2}}}{L})$. Therefore, $\|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 \frac{p^2}{L})$. On the other hand, the quantity γ also appears in the inequality (33). If we track γ explicitly,

inequality (33) becomes

$$\frac{4L_0}{L} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^2}(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})^2\right) \|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F \leq \|\text{grad } f(\Omega)\|_F \quad (46)$$

Finally, (46), (43), (44) and (45) imply $\|\Omega - \hat{\Omega}\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P\left(\frac{(1+\sqrt{\gamma})^2\gamma^2 p^2}{(1-\sqrt{\gamma})^2 L}\right)$. \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Define functions $f(\tilde{\Omega})$ and $Q(\tilde{\Omega})$ to be

$$f(\tilde{\Omega}) := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Omega}_{ij}|,$$

and $Q(\tilde{\Omega}) := f(\tilde{\Omega}) - f(\Omega)$. With immediate calculation, $Q(\tilde{\Omega})$ could be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\tilde{\Omega}) &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left(\left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \tilde{\Omega} X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \tilde{\lambda} (|\tilde{\Omega}^-|_1 - |\Omega^-|_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ minimize $f(\tilde{\Omega})$, then it holds that $\hat{\Omega}$ minimizes $Q(\tilde{\Omega})$, or equivalently $\hat{\Delta} = \hat{\Omega} - \Omega$ minimizes $G(\Delta) \equiv Q(\Omega + \Delta)$. Consider the set

$$\Theta_p(M) = \{\Delta : \Delta = \Delta^T, \|\Delta\|_F = Mr(p, L)\},$$

where

- M is some absolute constant that does not depends on L, p and n_ℓ 's,
- $r(p, L) = \sqrt{\frac{(p+s)\log p}{L}}$ and goes to zero as p, L and n_ℓ go to infinity such that $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell$.

Since $f(\tilde{\Omega})$ is geodesically convex, it follows that $G(\Delta)$ is also geodesically convex. Also, it holds that $G(\hat{\Delta}) \leq 0$. If we could show that $\inf\{G(\Delta) : \Delta \in \Theta_p(M)\} > 0$, the minimizer $\hat{\Delta}$ must be inside the sphere defined by $\Theta_n(M)$, and hence

$$\|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F = \|\hat{\Delta}\|_F \leq Mr(p, L).$$

We now do a Taylor expansion of

$$\begin{aligned} f_\ell(t) &= \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega + t\Delta) X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega + t\Delta) X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega + t\Delta) X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{df_\ell(t)}{dt} = 2 \text{tr} \left[\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega + t\Delta) X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \left(-\frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \right],$$

$$\frac{d^2 f_\ell(t)}{dt^2} = 2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) = \frac{2}{p^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta \right).$$

Therefore, using second order Taylor theorem, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} (\Omega + \Delta) X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 - \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right\|_F^2 \\ &= 2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) \left(-\frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{2}{p^2} \int_0^1 (1-v) \operatorname{tr} \left(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta \right) dv \\ &= -\frac{2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{p^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\Delta = \tilde{\Omega} - \Omega$, by taking the average on ℓ over 1 to L , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\Delta) = Q(\Omega + \Delta) &= -\frac{2}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{p^2 L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta \right) \\ & \quad + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Omega^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Omega^-|_1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $S = \{(i, j) : \Omega_{ij} \neq 0, i \neq j\}$, it holds that $|\Omega_0^- + \Delta^-|_1 = |\Omega_S^- + \Delta_S^-|_1 + |\Delta_{S^c}^-|_1$ and $|\Omega^-|_1 = |\Omega_S^-|_1$. Therefore, by triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\tilde{\lambda} (|\Omega^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Omega^-|_1) \geq \tilde{\lambda} (|\Delta_{S^c}^-|_1 - |\Delta_S^-|_1).$$

We first bound the term

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)} \Delta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Define the matrix

$$A = \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)}.$$

Then,

$$|\operatorname{tr}(A\Delta)| \leq \left| \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} \Delta_{ij} \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii} \Delta_{ii} \right| = (i) + (ii).$$

For term (i), it holds that

$$(i) \leq \max_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}| \sum_{i \neq j} |\Delta_{ij}| = \left(\max_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}| \right) |\Delta^-|_1.$$

For term (ii), it holds that

$$(ii) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}^2} \|\Delta^+\|_F \leq \sqrt{p} \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, p} |A_{ii}| \right) \|\Delta^+\|_F.$$

We now bound $\max_{i=1, \dots, p} |A_{ii}|$ and $\max_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}|$ with probability tending to 1 as $p, L \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that

$$A = \frac{1}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} - \sigma^2 I \right) X^{(\ell)}.$$

Denote

$$X^{(\ell)} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^{(\ell)\top} \\ \vdots \\ x_{n_\ell}^{(\ell)\top} \end{bmatrix},$$

and the (i, j) -th entry of A by A_{ij} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & LA_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} - \frac{1}{p^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} - \frac{1}{p} \sigma^2 X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \left(\frac{1}{p^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{p} \sigma^2 X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right)_{ij} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \xi_{ij} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $[X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)}]_i$ is the i -th entry of the vector $X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and

$$\xi_{ij} = \left(\frac{1}{p^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{p} \sigma^2 X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right)_{ij}$$

is the (i, j) -th entry of matrix $\frac{1}{p^2} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{p} \sigma^2 X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)} \\ &= \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} \varepsilon^{(\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the i -th entry of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)}$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter at most

$$\left\| \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\tau_\beta} + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\tau_\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Finally, define the event

$$A_{ij}(t) = \{|A_{ij}| > t\} = \left\{ \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \xi_{ij} \right| > Lt \right\}.$$

To derive the high probability bound for $A_{ij}(t)$, we proceed this first by decoupling the product

$$\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j.$$

Define the random variables

$$\begin{aligned} U_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i + \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j, \\ V_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i - \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j, \end{aligned}$$

whose the second moments are given by $\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2] = u_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbb{E}[(V_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2] = v_{ij}^{(\ell)}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)\top} y^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \xi_{ij}, \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^L [U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}] - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^L [V_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - v_{ij}^{(\ell)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij}(t)) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L [U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq \frac{4Lt}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L [V_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - v_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq \frac{4Lt}{2}\right).$$

Now, random variables $U_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $V_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ are sub-Gaussian with parameter σ_U and σ_V at most

$$\tilde{\sigma} = 2\left(\left\| \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\tau_\beta} + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\tau_\varepsilon}\right) = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Next we show that $U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $V_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - v_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ are sub-exponential. To prove this, according to [Wainwright \(2019, Theorem 2.2\)](#) and [\(Buldygin and Kozachenko, 2000, Theorem 3.2\)](#), if find a B such that

$$\sup_{m \geq 2} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{m!} \right] \leq B,$$

then $U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ is sub-exponential with parameter $2B$ in the interval $(-\frac{1}{2B}, +\frac{1}{2B})$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{m!} &\leq \left[\frac{2^m (\mathbb{E}(U_{ij}^{(\ell)2m}) + (u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m)}{m!} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &\leq \left[2^{2m+1} \sigma_U^{2m} + \frac{(2u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m}{m!} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2^{\frac{1}{m}} \left[(2^{2m+1} \sigma_U^2)^{\frac{1}{m}} + \frac{2u_{ij}^{(\ell)}}{(m!)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right] \\
&= 2^{\frac{1}{m}} \left(2^{\frac{1}{m}} 4\sigma_U^2 + \frac{2u_{ij}^{(\ell)}}{(m!)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

- the first inequality follows from the inequality $(a + b)^m \leq 2^m(a^m + b^m)$,
- the second inequality follows from the moment bound of sub-Gaussian random variable (e.g. Lemma 1.4 from [Buldygin and Kozachenko \(2000\)](#)) $\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)})^{2m}] \leq 2\left(\frac{2m}{e}\right)^m (\sigma_U^2)^m$ and inequality $m! \geq (m/e)^m$,
- the third inequality follows from the inequality $(x + y)^{1/m} \leq 2^{1/m}(x^{1/m} + y^{1/m})$, valid for any integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive x, y .

Therefore, at this point we bound $\frac{\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{m!}$ by a decreasing function of m . It holds that

$$\sup_{m \geq 2} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[(U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^m]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{m!} \right] \leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(2^{\frac{1}{2}} 4\sigma_U^2 + \frac{u_{ij}^{(\ell)}}{2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) = 8\sigma_U^2 + u_{ij}^{(\ell)} := B$$

Therefore, $U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $V_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - v_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ are sub-exponential with parameter at most $(16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2u_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2u_{ij}^{(\ell)})$ and $(16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2v_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2v_{ij}^{(\ell)})$

Now we are ready to derive the bound for $\mathbb{P}(A_{ij}(t))$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(A_{ij}(t)) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L [U_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - u_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq 2Lt \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L [V_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - v_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq 2Lt \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp\left\{ -\frac{4L^2 t^2}{2 \sum_{\ell=1}^L (16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2u_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2} \right\} \\
&\quad + 2 \exp\left\{ -\frac{4L^2 t^2}{2 \sum_{\ell=1}^L (16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2v_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_{ij}^{(\ell)} \leq \frac{4}{p} \|\mathbb{E}[y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top}]\| \|X^{(\ell)}\|^2 = 4 \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \left\| \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} + \sigma^2 I \right\| = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Similarly, $v_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This implies

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij}(t)) \leq 4 \exp\{-\mathcal{O}(Lt^2)\}, \quad \text{for } Lt \leq \delta.$$

Therefore, by taking $t = C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}$ with sufficient large absolute constant C_1 ,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}| \leq C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}},$$

with probability tending to 1. Similarly,

$$(ii) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}^2} \|\Delta^+\|_F \leq \sqrt{p} \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, p} |A_{ii}| \right) \|\Delta^+\|_F \leq C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}} \|\Delta^+\|_F.$$

Therefore, with probability tending to 1, it holds that

$$(i) + (ii) \leq C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} |\Delta^-|_1 + C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}} \|\Delta^+\|_F.$$

Now, for the term $\frac{1}{p^2 L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} (X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta)$, by condition (e) in Assumption 3.2.1 it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p^2 L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{tr} (X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta) &= \frac{1}{p^2 L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \|X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)} \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining everything together, with choice of $\tilde{\lambda} = 2C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}$, we have with probability tending to 1,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\Delta) &\geq \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta\|_F^2 - C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} |\Delta_{\bar{S}}^-|_1 - C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} |\Delta_{\bar{S}^c}^-|_1 \\ &\quad - C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}} \|\Delta^+\|_F + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Delta_{\bar{S}^c}^-|_1 - |\Delta_{\bar{S}}^-|_1) \\ &\geq \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta\|_F^2 - \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} - \tilde{\lambda} \right) |\Delta_{\bar{S}^c}^-|_1 \\ &\quad - \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} + \tilde{\lambda} \right) |\Delta_{\bar{S}}^-|_1 - C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}} \|\Delta^+\|_F \\ &\geq \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left(\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} - \frac{\left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} + \tilde{\lambda} \right) \sqrt{s}}{Mr(p, L)} \right) \\ &\quad + \|\Delta^+\|_F^2 \left(\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} - \frac{C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}}}{Mr(p, L)} \right) \\ &= \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left(\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} - \frac{3C_1 \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L}}}{Mr(p, L)} \right) + \|\Delta^+\|_F^2 \left(\min_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} - \frac{C_2 \sqrt{\frac{p \log p}{L}}}{Mr(p, L)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now if $r(p, L) = \sqrt{\frac{(p+s) \log p}{L}}$ and $r(p, L) \rightarrow 0$, it holds that $\inf \{G(\Delta) : \Delta \in \Theta_p(M)\} > 0$ for sufficiently large M . \square

B.4 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Following the idea in the proof of Theorem 3.2, define

$$G(\Delta) := \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \tilde{\Theta} \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}| \right]$$

$$- \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \left\| \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\Theta_{ij}| \right].$$

By a Taylor expansion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} (\Theta + \Delta) \right\|_F^2 - \left\| \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right\|_F^2 \\ &= 2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \left(-\frac{1}{p} \Delta \right) \right) + \frac{2}{p^2} \int_0^1 (1-v) \operatorname{tr}(\Delta^2) dv \\ &= -\frac{2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \Delta \right] + \frac{1}{p^2} \operatorname{tr}(\Delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\Delta = \tilde{\Theta} - \Theta$, by taking the average on ℓ over 1 to L , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\Delta) &= Q(\Theta + \Delta) = -\frac{2}{pL} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \Delta \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p^2} \operatorname{tr}(\Delta^2) + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Theta^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Theta^-|_1) \\ &= -\frac{2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right) \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \Delta \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p^2} \operatorname{tr}(\Delta^2) + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Theta^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Theta^-|_1). \end{aligned}$$

We first bound the linear term

$$\frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right) \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \Delta \right].$$

Denote $A = \frac{1}{p} \left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right) \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right)$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(\hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L z^{(\ell)} z^{(\ell)\top} \right) \hat{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \Theta \right) \Delta \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^p A_{ij} \Delta_{ij} \right| \leq \left| \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} \Delta_{ij} \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii} \Delta_{ii} \right| = (i) + (ii). \end{aligned}$$

For term (ii), the (i, i) -th entry of A is exactly 0. For term (i), since $z^{(\ell)} = (X^{(\ell)})_{\text{left}}^{-1} y^{(\ell)} = \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ is sub-Gaussian, according to [Shao and Zhou \(2014, Theorem 2.1\)](#), we have that

$$\max_{i \neq j} |A_{ij}| \leq \frac{C_1}{p^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}.$$

Hence, it holds that $(i) \leq \frac{C_1}{p^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}} |\Delta^-|_1$. Finally, with probability tending to 1, with the choice of $\tilde{\lambda} = \frac{2C_1}{p^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}$, we obtain that

$$G(\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{p^2} \|\Delta\|_F^2 - C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{p^4 L}} |\Delta_S^-|_1 - C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{p^4 L}} |\Delta_{S^c}^-|_1 + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Delta_{S^c}^-|_1 - |\Delta_S^-|_1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{1}{p^2} \|\Delta\|_F^2 - \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{p^4 L}} - \tilde{\lambda}\right) |\Delta_{S^c}|_1 - \left(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{p^4 L}} + \tilde{\lambda}\right) |\Delta_S|_1 \\
&\geq \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left(\frac{1}{p^2} - \frac{(C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{p^4 L}} + \tilde{\lambda}) \sqrt{s}}{Mr(p, L)}\right) + \frac{1}{p^2} \|\Delta^+\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left(\frac{1}{p^2} - \frac{3C_1 \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{p^4 L}}}{Mr(p, L)}\right) + \frac{1}{p^2} \|\Delta^+\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now if $r(p, L) = \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L}}$ and $r(p, L) \rightarrow 0$, it holds that $\inf\{G(\Delta) : \Delta \in \Theta_p(M)\} > 0$ for sufficiently large M . Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega &= \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Theta} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}})(\hat{\Theta} - \Theta)(\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}})\hat{\Theta}W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\Theta(\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) + W^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\Theta} - \Theta)\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Lipschitz property of square root function when x is bounded away from zero, it holds that $\|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq \mathcal{O}_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L}}\right)$. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\| &\leq \|\hat{\Theta} - \Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| (\|\hat{\Theta}\| \|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + \|\Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|) \\
&\quad + \|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\hat{\Theta} - \Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{(s+1) \log p}{L}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.5 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof of Theorem 3.4. To analyze the property of $\hat{\Theta}_\lambda$, we first consider the oracle estimator

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\Theta}_\lambda^{\text{OR}} \\
&= \arg \min_{\Theta \in \Gamma_+^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{L - L_0} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\Theta_{ij}| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Following similar steps as in Rothman et al. (2008), we consider the Taylor expansion of

$$f_\ell(t) = \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Theta + t\Delta) W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2.$$

The first and second order derivatives of $f_\ell(t)$ w.r.t. t are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{df_\ell(t)}{dt} &= 2 \operatorname{tr} \left[\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Theta + t\Delta) W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \left(-\frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \right], \\
\frac{d^2 f_\ell(t)}{dt^2} &= 2 \operatorname{tr} \left[\frac{1}{p^2} (X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top}) (X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top}) \right] \\
&= \frac{2}{p^2} \operatorname{tr} (W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using second order Taylor theorem, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Theta + \Delta) W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2 - \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= 2 \operatorname{tr} \left(\left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \left(-\frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{p^2} \int_0^1 (1-v) \operatorname{tr} \left(W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right) dv \\
&= -\frac{2}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left[W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By summing over ℓ from $L_0 + 1$ to L , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\Delta) &= -\frac{2}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left[W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{p^2(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \operatorname{tr} \left(W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Theta^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Theta^-|_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we first consider the linear term

$$-\frac{2}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-L_0} \operatorname{tr} \left[W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right].$$

Here, the matrix Δ is the difference between some feasible matrix in Γ_p^+ and true correlation matrix. Note that in Γ_p^+ , the diagonal elements are all equal to 1. Hence, the diagonal elements of Δ are all zero. Now, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A} &= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We first derive a high probability bound for (i, j) -th entry of \tilde{A} . Specifically, we show that there exists an absolute constant $C_1 > 0$ such that with probability tending to 1,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |\tilde{A}_{ij}| \leq C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}}. \quad (47)$$

To see that, note that by definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
(L-L_0) \tilde{A}_{ij} &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \Omega \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \tilde{\xi}_{ij} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{ij} = \left(\frac{1}{p^2} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)_{ij}$ is the (i, j) -th entry of matrix

$$\frac{1}{p^2} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Omega X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Define the event

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_{ij}(t) &:= \{|\tilde{A}_{ij}| > t\} \\ &= \left\{ \left| \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \tilde{\xi}_{ij} \right| > (L - L_0)t \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the previous proof, to derive the high probability bound for $\tilde{A}_{ij}(t)$, we proceed this first by decoupling the product

$$\left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j.$$

Define the random variables

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i + \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j \\ \tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i - \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j, \end{aligned}$$

whose second moments are given by $\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2] = \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)})^2] = \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_i \left[\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \sqrt{p} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \right]_j - \tilde{\xi}_{ij} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right] - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{A}_{ij}(t)) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right] \geq 2(L - L_0)t \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left[\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right] \geq 2(L - L_0)t \right). \end{aligned}$$

The random variables $\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ and $\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ are sub-Gaussian with parameter at most

$$\tilde{\sigma} = 2 \left(\left\| \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|_{\tau_\beta} + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_{\tau_\varepsilon} \right) = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Next, with similar arguments as in the previous proof, $\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ is sub-exponential with parameter $(16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2\tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2\tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)})$. Similarly, random variable $\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ is sub-exponential with parameter $(16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2\tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 16\tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2\tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)})$.

Now we are ready to derive the bound for $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{A}_{ij}(t))$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tilde{A}_{ij}(t)) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L [\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq 2(L-L_0)t\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L [\tilde{V}_{ij}^{(\ell)2} - \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)}] \geq 2(L-L_0)t\right) \\ &\leq 4 \exp\{-\mathcal{O}((L-L_0)t^2)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by taking $t = C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}}$ with sufficient large absolute constant C_1 , we obtain (47) holds with probability tending to 1.

Now we want to find a lower bound for the quadratic term. In particular, under Assumption 3.2.1, the quadratic term can be lower bounded in terms of $\|\Delta^-\|_F^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{tr}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}\right) \\ &= \text{vec}^\top\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}\otimes X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}\right)\text{vec}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \text{vec}^\top\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(X^{(\ell)}\otimes X^{(\ell)}\right)^\top\left(X^{(\ell)}\otimes X^{(\ell)}\right)\text{vec}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \left\|\left(X^{(\ell)}\otimes X^{(\ell)}\right)\text{vec}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Taking average over $\ell = L_0 + 1, \dots, L$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{p^2(L-L_0)}\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \text{tr}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}X^{(\ell)\top}X^{(\ell)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2(L-L_0)}\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left\|\left(X^{(\ell)}\otimes X^{(\ell)}\right)\text{vec}\left(W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(L-L_0)}\sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \kappa_0^{(\ell)}\left\|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)}\left\|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_F^2.\end{aligned}$$

With a same computation as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, it holds that

$$\left\|\tilde{\Theta}_\lambda - \Theta\right\|_F = \mathcal{O}_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}}\right).$$

On the other hand

$$\left\|\hat{W} - W\right\| = \mathcal{O}_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}}\right).$$

In the next step, we analyze what happens if we replace W by \hat{W} , where our estimator is given by

$$\hat{\Theta}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \Gamma_+^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{L-L_0} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \left\| y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\Theta} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right\|_F^2 + \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i \neq j} |\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}| \right\}.$$

In this case, the linear term would be

$$-\frac{2}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \text{tr} \left[\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right]$$

$$= -2 \operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}\Delta),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A} &= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{L-L_0} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to upper bound $\operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}\Delta)$, we want to estimate the difference between \tilde{A}_{ij} and \hat{A}_{ij} . We have that,

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{tr}(\hat{A}\Delta)| &= |\operatorname{tr}(\tilde{A}\Delta) + \operatorname{tr}((\hat{A} - \tilde{A})\Delta)| \\ &\leq |\operatorname{tr}(\tilde{A}\Delta)| + |\operatorname{tr}((\hat{A} - \tilde{A})\Delta)| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{i \neq j} \tilde{A}_{ij} \Delta_{ij} \right| + \left| \sum_{i \neq j} (\hat{A}_{ij} - \tilde{A}_{ij}) \Delta_{ij} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, with probability tending to 1, $\max_{i \neq j} |\tilde{A}_{ij}| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{A} - \tilde{A} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{p} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L W^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= (i) + (ii) + (iii).
\end{aligned}$$

For the term (ii), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} + W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} + W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(ii) &= \frac{1}{p^2(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p^2(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta (\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the (i, j) -th entry of a matrix is upper bounded by its operator norm, we could bound these terms by following procedure

$$\begin{aligned}
[(i)]_{ij} &\leq \|(i)\| \leq \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \left[\frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]_{ij} \\
[(ii)]_{ij} &\leq \|(ii)\| \leq \frac{1}{p^2(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \|X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)}\|^2 \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \\
&\quad \|\Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| (\|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|) \\
&= \frac{n_\ell^2}{p^2} \max_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \left\| \frac{1}{n_\ell} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \|\Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| (\|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|), \\
[(iii)]_{ij} &\leq \|(iii)\| \leq \|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \left[\frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]_{ij}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the square root function \sqrt{x} is Lipschitz when x is bounded away from zero, then it holds that

$$\|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq C \|\hat{W} - W\| = \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right).$$

Besides, $\left\| \frac{1}{n_\ell} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Also, by Assumption on Ω , $\|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\|\Theta\| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Therefore, as $n_\ell, p \rightarrow \infty$

$$[(ii)]_{ij} \leq \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right).$$

Similar to previous case, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{1}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \left(\bar{\beta}^{(\ell)} \bar{\beta}^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} W^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta W^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \right]_{ij} \\ &= \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$[(i)]_{ij} + [(iii)]_{ij} = \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right).$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$|\hat{A}_{ij} - \tilde{A}_{ij}| = \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr}(\hat{A}\Delta)| &\leq |\text{tr}(\tilde{A}\Delta)| + |\text{tr}((\hat{A} - \tilde{A})\Delta)| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{i \neq j} \tilde{A}_{ij} \Delta_{ij} \right| + \left| \sum_{i \neq j} (\hat{A}_{ij} - \tilde{A}_{ij}) \Delta_{ij} \right| \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) |\Delta^-|_1, \end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constant C_1 .

Now by Assumption 3.2.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\Delta) &= -\frac{2}{p(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \text{tr} \left[\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \left(y^{(\ell)} y^{(\ell)\top} - \frac{1}{p} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Theta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} \right) X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{p^2(L-L_0)} \sum_{\ell=L_0+1}^L \text{tr} \left(\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta \right) \\ &\quad + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Theta^- + \Delta^-|_1 - |\Theta^-|_1) \\ &\geq C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta\|_F^2 \\ &\quad - C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) |\Delta^-|_1 + \tilde{\lambda} (|\Delta_{S^c}^-|_1 - |\Delta_S^-|_1) \\ &\geq C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left[C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) - \tilde{\lambda} \right] |\Delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \\
& - \left[C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) + \tilde{\lambda} \right] |\Delta_{\bar{S}}|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $\tilde{\lambda} = 2C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right)$. Then, by inequality

$$|\Delta_{\bar{S}}|_1 \leq \sqrt{s} \|\Delta_{\bar{S}}\|_F \leq \sqrt{s} \|\Delta^-\|_F,$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\Delta) & \geq C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 + C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta^+\|_F^2 \\
& - 3C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) |\Delta_{\bar{S}}|_1 \\
& \geq \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left[C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 3C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \right) \|\Delta^-\|_F^{-1} \right] \\
& + C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} \|\Delta^+\|_F^2 \\
& \geq \|\Delta^-\|_F^2 \left[C \min_{\ell=L_0+1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} - \frac{3C_1}{Mr(p, L)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now as long as $\left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}} \right) \rightarrow 0$, it holds that

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_\lambda - \Theta\|_F = \mathcal{O}_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}} \right).$$

Furthermore, as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\| & \leq \|\hat{\Theta} - \Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 + \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} - W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| (\|\hat{\Theta}\| \|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + \|\Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|) \\
& \quad + \|W^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \|\hat{\Theta} - \Theta\| \|\hat{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

the stochastic order of $\|\hat{\Omega}_w - \Omega\|$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}} \right) \frac{\log p}{L_0} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{L_0}} \\
& + \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L-L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{L_0}} + \sqrt{\frac{s(\log p)^2}{L_0(L-L_0)}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

B.6 Proof of Theorem 3.5

The main tool to prove Theorem 3.5 is the concentration inequality stated in Theorem F.2. Below, we start with some preliminary results.

Lemma B.3. Suppose that $\{x_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^{n_\ell}$ are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian random vectors with parameter τ_x and define $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} x_i^{(\ell)} x_i^{(\ell)\top}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\lambda_{\max}^{3q}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &\leq 3q2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q}, \\ \|\lambda_{\max}^3(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q} &\leq \left[3q2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}, \\ \|\lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} &\leq \left[4q2^{4q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{4q}}{4q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3} \right)^{4q} \Gamma(4q) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + b_2^{4q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_2^{4q} \right]^{\frac{1}{2q}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &:= c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}), \\ b_2 &:= c_1 (\sqrt{p} + p) \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first bound the quantity $\mathbb{E}\lambda_{\max}^{3q}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})$. With

$$b_1 := c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}),$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\lambda_{\max}^{3q}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &= \int_0^{+\infty} 3qt^{3q-1} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \geq t) dt \\ &= \left(\int_0^{b_1} + \int_{b_1}^{+\infty} \right) 3qt^{3q-1} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \geq t) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{b_1} 3qt^{3q-1} dt + \int_{b_1}^{+\infty} 3qt^{3q-1} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta(t), \delta^2(t)\}\} dt \\ &= \left(c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \right)^{3q} \\ &\quad + \int_0^{+\infty} 3q \left\{ \left[c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) + \delta \right] \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \right\}^{3q-1} \\ &\quad \cdot c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\} \tau_x^2 d\delta \\ &\leq 3q \int_0^{+\infty} \left[\left(\tau_x^2 \delta \right)^{3q-1} + \left(\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) + \tau_x^2 c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) \right)^{3q-1} \right] 2^{3q-2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\} \tau_x^2 d\delta \\
& = 3q \cdot 2^{3q-2} \left[\mathcal{I}_1 + \left(\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) + \tau_x^2 c_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right) \right)^{3q-1} \mathcal{I}_2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1 &= \int_0^{+\infty} (\tau_x^2 \delta)^{3q-1} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\} \tau_x^2 d\delta \\
\mathcal{I}_2 &= \int_0^{+\infty} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\} \tau_x^2 d\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

The term \mathcal{I}_2 could be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_2 &= \int_0^1 c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta^2\} \tau_x^2 d\delta + \int_1^{+\infty} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta\} \delta^2 d\delta \\
&\leq c_2 \tau_x^2 + \frac{c_2 \tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \int_0^{+\infty} \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta\} d c_3 n_\ell \delta \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we deal with term \mathcal{I}_1 . This term could be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1 &= \int_0^{+\infty} (\tau_x^2 \delta)^{3q-1} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\} \tau_x^2 d\delta \\
&= \int_0^1 (\tau_x^2 \delta)^{3q-1} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta^2\} \tau_x^2 d\delta + \int_1^{+\infty} (\tau_x^2 \delta)^{3q-1} c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta\} \tau_x^2 d\delta \\
&\leq c_2 \int_0^1 (\tau_x^2 \delta)^{3q-1} \tau_x^2 d\delta + c_2 (\tau_x^2)^{3q} \int_1^{+\infty} \delta^{3q-1} \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta\} d\delta \\
&= c_2 \frac{1}{3q} (\tau_x^2)^{3q} + c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{(c_3 n_\ell)^{3q}} \int_1^{+\infty} (c_3 n_\ell \delta)^{3q-1} \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \delta\} d c_3 n_\ell \delta \\
&\leq c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above calculations together, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \lambda_{\max}^{3q}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &\leq 3q 2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q}, \\
\|\lambda_{\max}^3(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q} &\leq \left[3q 2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem F.3 with $n_\ell = 1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} &\leq \left[4q 2^{4q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{4q}}{4q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3} \right)^{4q} \Gamma(4q) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + b_2^{4q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_2^{4q} \right]^{\frac{1}{2q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $b_2 = c_1(\sqrt{p} + p)\tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.5.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Consider $f(X^{(\ell)}) = \frac{1}{p^2} \|X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)} v\|_2^2$ for $v = \text{vec}(\Delta)$.

We first show that the expectation of $f(X^{(\ell)})$ is lower bounded. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}) \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 &= \text{tr}(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})^2 + \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \end{aligned}$$

For the first part, each term $(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})$ in the square is sub-exponential with

$$\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1} \leq \|\Delta\|_F \|x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_2}^2.$$

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})^2 \\ &= \int_0^\infty 2\mathbb{P}(|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}| \geq t) t dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty 2\mathbb{P}\left(\exp\left\{\frac{|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}|}{\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}}\right\} \geq \exp\left\{\frac{t}{\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}}\right\}\right) t dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{t}{\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}}\right\} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\frac{|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}|}{\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}}\right\} t dt \\ &\leq 4 \int_0^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{t}{\|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}}\right\} t dt \\ &\leq 2 \|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}^2 \Gamma(3) \\ &= 4 \|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}^2 \leq 4 \|\Delta\|_F^2 \|x_i^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_2}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have similar results for the cross term $(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \leq 4 \|x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)}\|_{\psi_1}^2.$$

On the other hand, for the second part, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 &= \mathbb{E}[x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)}] = \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})] \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbb{E} x_i^{(\ell)} x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta \mathbb{E} x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} \Delta) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{(\ell)} \Delta \Sigma^{(\ell)} \Delta) \\ &\geq \lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Also there are n_ℓ terms in the first part and $n_\ell(n_\ell - 1)$ terms in the second part. The order of expectation of each term from the first part is not larger than that from the second part. Therefore, in order to find a lower bound for the expectation, the second part is the dominant term. There exists a absolute constant C such that

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}) \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 \geq C \frac{n_\ell(n_\ell - 1)}{p^2} \lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^2.$$

Next, we use concentration inequalities to assert that for each fixed $r > 0$, the random variable $f(X)$ is sharply concentrated around its expectation with high probability. For $v = \text{vec}(\Delta)$, consider

$$\frac{1}{p^2} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)})v\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{p^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})^2 + \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right).$$

In order to use Theorem F.2, we define

$$f(X^{(\ell)}) = \frac{1}{p^2} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)})v\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{p^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})^2 + \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right).$$

The gradient of $f(X^{(\ell)})$ w.r.t. $x_k^{(\ell)}$ is given below

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_k f(X^{(\ell)}) &= \frac{1}{p^2} \nabla_{x_k^{(\ell)}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_i^{(\ell)})^2 + \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_\ell} (x_i^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2} \nabla_{x_k^{(\ell)}} \left[(x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)})^2 + \sum_{j \neq k}^{n_\ell} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{4}{p^2} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} + \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{j \neq k}^{n_\ell} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} \\ &= \frac{2}{p^2} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} + \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n_\ell} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_j^{(\ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $c_{kj} = (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})$. Consider eigenvalue decomposition $\Delta = \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l v_l v_l^\top$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) v_l = \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right) v_l, \\ \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} \right\|_2^2 &= \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right)^2, \\ \left\| (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} \right\|_2^2 &= \left\| c_{kk} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)}) v_l \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 (c_{kk} (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)}))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \left[\left\| \frac{2}{p^2} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \frac{2}{p^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{n_\ell} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)}) \Delta x_j^{(\ell)} \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 c_{kk}^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2 + \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we control the L_q norm of two parts separately and then using the Holder's inequality to control the L_q norm of $|\nabla f(X)|_2$. First, we upper bound the second part as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (x_k^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (v_j^\top x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} \text{tr} (\Delta x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top}) \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left[n_\ell \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 n_\ell^2 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \right) \\
&= n_\ell^2 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)})^2 \\
&= n_\ell^2 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \sum_{l=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} \lambda_l^2 \text{tr} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} v_l) \\
&= n_\ell^2 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \text{tr} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} x_j^{(\ell)} x_j^{(\ell)\top} v_l v_l^\top \right) \\
&= n_\ell^3 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \text{tr} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} v_l v_l^\top) \\
&= n_\ell^3 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \text{tr} \left[\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 v_l v_l^\top \right) \right] \\
&= n_\ell^3 \text{tr} (\Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta \hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \text{tr} (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} \Delta^2) \leq n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3 (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the main part in $|\nabla f(X)|_2^2$ could be bounded by

$$\frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right)^2 \leq \frac{8}{p^4} n_\ell^3 \lambda_{\max}^3 (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^4.$$

To calculate the L_q norm of $\lambda_{\max}^3 (\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})$, we need tail behavior of largest eigenvalue of the sub-Gaussian sample covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} x_i^{(\ell)} x_i^{(\ell)\top}$. By Theorem F.3, for $\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{n_\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} x_i^{(\ell)} x_i^{(\ell)\top}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\|\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} - \Sigma^{(\ell)}\|_2}{\tau_x^2} \geq c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right\} + \delta \right) \leq c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\}.$$

This means with probability at least $1 - c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\tau_x^2} \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} - \Sigma^{(\ell)}\|_2 \leq c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right\} + \delta.$$

Then by triangle inequality, with probability at least $1 - c_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}\}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &= \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)} - \Sigma^{(\ell)}\|_2 + \|\Sigma^{(\ell)}\|_2 \\
&\leq \left[c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right\} + \delta \right] \tau_x^2 + \|\Sigma^{(\ell)}\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we set

$$t = \left[c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right\} + \delta \right] \tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})$$

or equivalently,

$$\delta(t) := \frac{t - \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)})}{\tau_x^2} - c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_\ell}} + \frac{p}{n_\ell} \right\}.$$

Theorem F.3 indicates that

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) \geq t) \leq C_2 \exp\{-c_3 n_\ell \min\{\delta(t), \delta^2(t)\}\}$$

Also by Lemma B.3, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \lambda_{\max}^{3q}(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)}) &\leq 3q 2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1), \\ \|\lambda_{\max}^3(\hat{\Sigma}^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q} &\leq \left[3q 2^{3q-2} \left[c_2 \frac{(\tau_x^2)^{3q}}{3q} + c_2 \left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3 n_\ell} \right)^{3q} \Gamma(3q) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + b_1^{3q-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3 n_\ell} \right) c_2 \tau_x^2 \right] + b_1^{3q} \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(1), \end{aligned}$$

as p and n_ℓ goes to infinity such that $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell$. The L_q norm of second part could be bounded by

$$\frac{8}{p^4} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)}) \right)^2 \right\|_{L_q} \leq \mathcal{O}(p^{-1}) \|\Delta\|_F^4.$$

Next, we bound the L_q norm of first part of gradient.

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 c_{kk}^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2 \right\|_{L_q} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \left\| c_{kk}^2 \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2 \right\|_{L_q} \quad (\text{triangle inequality}) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \|c_{kk}^2\|_{L_{2q}} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2 \right\|_{L_{2q}} \quad (\text{Holder's inequality}) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \|c_{kk}^2\|_{L_{2q}} \left[\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \|(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\|_{L_{2q}} \right] \quad (\text{triangle inequality}). \end{aligned}$$

We first bound the L_{2q} norm of c_{kk}^2 by following upper bound on the quantity c_{kk}^2 :

$$\begin{aligned} c_{kk}^2 &= \left[\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l (x_k^{(\ell)\top} v_l)^2 \right]^2 \leq \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (x_k^{(\ell)\top} v_l)^4 \right) \\ &= \|\Delta\|_F^2 \sum_{l=1}^p \text{tr} (x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top} v_l v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top} v_l v_l^\top) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|\Delta\|_F^2 \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_{\max}(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top}) \operatorname{tr}(v_l v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top} v_l v_l^\top) \\
&\leq \|\Delta\|_F^2 \lambda_{\max}(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top}) \operatorname{tr}\left(\sum_{l=1}^p v_l v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top}\right) \\
&\leq \|\Delta\|_F^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for the first part in the gradient, by Lemma B.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\right\|_{L_{2q}} &\leq \left[4q2^{4q-2}\left[c_2\frac{(\tau_x^2)^{4q}}{4q} + c_2\left(\frac{\tau_x^2}{c_3}\right)^{4q}\Gamma(4q)\right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left.+ b_2^{4q-1}\left(1 + \frac{1}{c_3}\right)c_2\tau_x^2\right] + b_2^{4q}\right]^{\frac{1}{2q}} \\
b_2 &= c_1(\sqrt{p} + p)\tau_x^2 + \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) = \mathcal{O}(p).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} = \mathcal{O}(p^2)$. Next, for the L_{2q} norm of $(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2$. Note that $x_k^{(\ell)}$ is sub-Gaussian random vector with parameter τ_x and v_l is a unit vector. Therefore, $v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)}$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter τ_x . Therefore, for $k = 1, \dots, n_\ell$,

$$\|(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\|_{L_{2q}} = (\mathbb{E}[(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^{4q}])^{\frac{1}{2q}} \leq (c_4^{4q} \sqrt{4q}^{4q})^{\frac{1}{2q}} = c_4^2 4q.$$

Finally, note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 c_{kk}^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\right\|_{L_q} \\
&\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \|c_{kk}^2\|_{L_{2q}} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \|(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\|_{L_{2q}} \\
&\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \left[\|\Delta\|_F^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \|(v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\|_{L_{2q}}\right)\right] \\
&\leq \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \left[\|\Delta\|_F^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} c_4^2 4q \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \left[\|\Delta\|_F^2 \lambda_{\max}^2(x_k^{(\ell)} x_k^{(\ell)\top})\|_{L_{2q}} c_4^2 4q \|\Delta\|_F^2\right] \\
&= \mathcal{O}(p^{-1}) \|\Delta\|_F^4,
\end{aligned}$$

as $p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell$.

Combine the two parts together, the L_q norm of $|\nabla f(X)|_2^2$ could be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^2\|_{L_{2q}} &\leq \left\|\frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 c_{kk}^2 (v_l^\top x_k^{(\ell)})^2\right\|_{L_q} \\
&\quad + \left\|\frac{8}{p^4} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \sum_{l=1}^p \lambda_l^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_\ell} c_{kj} (v_l^\top x_j^{(\ell)})\right)^2\right\|_{L_q} \\
&\leq \mathcal{O}(p^{-1}) \|\Delta\|_F^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we are able to control the L_q norm of $|\nabla f(X)|_2$ by applying Holder's inequality ($1 < r < s < \infty$)

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y|^r] \leq (\mathbb{E}[|Y|^s])^{\frac{r}{s}}$$

with $r = \frac{q}{2}$, $s = q$ and random variable $Y = |\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^2$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^q] &\leq (\mathbb{E}|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^{2q})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2\|_{L_q} &= \mathbb{E}[|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^q] \leq [(\mathbb{E}|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^{2q})^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &= [(\mathbb{E}|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2^{2q})^{\frac{1}{q}}]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2\|_{L_q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the L_q norm of $|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2$ could be bounded as

$$\|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2\|_{L_q} \leq \sqrt{\|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2\|_{L_q}} = \mathcal{O}(p^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|\Delta\|_F^2.$$

By Theorem F.2, we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f(X^{(\ell)}) - \mathbb{E}f(X^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q} \\ &\leq C_\beta D_{LS_\beta}^{1/2} q^{1/2} \|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_2\|_{L_q} + D_{LS_\beta}^{1/\beta} q^{1/\alpha} \|\nabla f(X^{(\ell)})|_\beta\|_{L_q} \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(p^{-\frac{1}{2}})\|\Delta\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(|f(X^{(\ell)}) - \mathbb{E}f(X^{(\ell)})| > t) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|f(X^{(\ell)}) - \mathbb{E}f(X^{(\ell)})|^q]}{t^q} = \frac{\|f(X^{(\ell)}) - \mathbb{E}f(X^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q}^q}{t^q} \\ &= \left(\frac{\|f(X^{(\ell)}) - \mathbb{E}f(X^{(\ell)})\|_{L_q}}{t} \right)^q \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(t^{-q} p^{-\frac{q}{2}} \|\Delta\|_F^{2q}). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $t = p^{-\frac{1}{4}}\|\Delta\|_F^2$, it holds that with probability at least $1 - C_q p^{-\frac{q}{4}}$ tending to 1 as $p, n_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\frac{p}{n_\ell} \rightarrow \gamma_\ell < \infty$, that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p^2} \|X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)} \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{p^2} \|X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)} \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 \right] \right| \leq p^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|\Delta\|_F^2,$$

where C_q is some absolute constant only depends on the choice of q .

Furthermore, the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{p^2} \|X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}\|_2^2]$ is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}) \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 &\geq C \frac{n_\ell(n_\ell - 1)}{p^2} \lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^2 \\ &\geq C \lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - C_q p^{-\frac{q}{4}}$ for any $q \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p^2} \mathbb{E} \|(X^{(\ell)} \otimes X^{(\ell)}) \text{vec}(\Delta)\|_2^2 &= \text{tr}(X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta X^{(\ell)\top} X^{(\ell)} \Delta) \\ &\geq C \lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma^{(\ell)}) \|\Delta\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark B.1. For the approaches in Section 3.2, when all $\gamma_\ell = \gamma$ under random design, following constants in the proofs of Theorem 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 depend on γ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\sigma}^2 &\leq \mathcal{O}((1 + \gamma^{-1})^2(1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2), \\ u_{ij}^{(\ell)}, v_{ij}^{(\ell)}, \tilde{u}_{ij}^{(\ell)}, \tilde{v}_{ij}^{(\ell)} &\leq \mathcal{O}((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2(1 + (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2)), \\ C_1, C_2 &= \mathcal{O}\left((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2((1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 + (1 + \gamma^{-1})^2)\right), \\ \min_{\ell=1, \dots, L} \kappa_0^{(\ell)} &\geq \mathcal{O}(\gamma^{-2}).\end{aligned}$$

under random design case.

C Additional example for visualization of limiting risk

Here, we provide another example for explicitly computing and visualizing the limiting risk. Suppose that $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{-\kappa}$, where Ω is as in (6) with $a = 16$ and $b = 5$, so that the eigenvalues of Ω are of the form $\lambda_k = 16 + 10 \cos \frac{k\pi}{p+1} \in [6, 26]$ according to Elliott (1953). Under this model for $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$, the eigensubspaces for Ω coincide with those of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$, so that the matrices commute, even though eigenvalues of Ω are smooth transforms of the eigenvalues the latter. In effect this model modifies the weights associated with eigensubspaces flexibly, through a single power index κ . A similar model has been considered in the context of two sample regularized tests in Li et al. (2020).

When $\kappa = 0$, i.e. $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = I_p$ and $\Lambda^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} = \Omega$. For any fixed p , solving $16 + 10 \cos \frac{k\pi}{p+1} \leq x$ gives $k \geq \left\lceil \frac{p+1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \frac{x-16}{10} \right\rceil$. The empirical spectral distribution is given by

$$F_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(x) = 1 - \left\lceil \frac{p+1}{p\pi} \cos^{-1} \frac{x-16}{10} \right\rceil.$$

Hence, the limiting spectral distribution of $\Lambda^{(L+1)}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(x) &= 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \frac{x-16}{10} \\ dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(x) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{100 - (x-16)^2}}.\end{aligned}$$

In general, if $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{-\kappa}$, then $\Lambda^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{1-\kappa}$, and

$$dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(x) = -\frac{1-\kappa}{\pi x^\kappa} \frac{1}{\sqrt{100 - (x^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa}} - 16)^2}}.$$

Let v be the Stieltjes transform of limiting spectral distribution of $\frac{1}{n_{L+1}} X^{(L+1)} \Omega X^{(L+1)\top}$ and s is the Stieltjes transform of limiting spectral distribution of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(L+1)}$

$$\begin{aligned}v(z) &= \left(-z + c \int \frac{t dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t)}{1 + v(z)t} \right)^{-1}, \\ v'(z) &= \left(\frac{1}{v(z)^2} - \gamma_{L+1} \int \frac{t^2 dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t)}{(1 + tv(z))^2} \right)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Plot of limiting risk when $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = \Omega^{-\kappa}$.

and $s(z)$ is related to $v(z)$ by following equation

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{L+1}(s(z) + z^{-1}) &= v(z) + z^{-1}, \\ \gamma_{L+1}(s'(z) - z^{-2}) &= v'(z) - z^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Standard fixed point algorithm converges could be used to determining $s(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{v}^{(0)}(z) &= 0 \\ \tilde{v}^{(t+1)}(z) &= \left(-z + c \int \frac{tdH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t)}{1 + \tilde{v}^{(t)}(z)t} \right)^{-1} \\ v'^{(t+1)}(z) &= \left(\frac{1}{(\tilde{v}^{(t)}(z))^2} - \gamma_{L+1} \int \frac{t^2 dH_{\Lambda^{(L+1)}}(t)}{(1 + t\tilde{v}^{(t)}(z))^2} \right)^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

After T iterations

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{s}^{(T)}(z) &= \gamma_{L+1}^{-1}(\tilde{v}^{(T)}(z) + z^{-1}) - z^{-1} \\ \tilde{s}'^{(T)}(z) &= \gamma_{L+1}^{-1}(\tilde{v}'^{(T)}(z) - z^{-2}) + z^{-2}\end{aligned}$$

Then one could estimate the limiting risk at point $z = -\lambda$ by replacing quantities $s(-\lambda)$ and $s'(-\lambda)$ by $\tilde{s}^{(T)}(-\lambda)$ and $\tilde{s}'^{(T)}(-\lambda)$ in (9). One can generate the plots of limiting risk w.r.t. λ by tabulating the limiting risk (9) on a dense grid of λ .

D Comparison between Theorem 2.3 and Wu and Xu (2020)

The limiting behavior of oracle risk $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ could be derived from the approach by Wu and Xu (2020, Theorem 1) with $\Sigma_{\omega\beta} = \Omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Omega\Omega^{-\frac{1}{2}} = I_p$ (in the notation of their paper). However, this approach is relatively complicated as we illustrate next.

The bias part contained in oracle risk $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ is given by

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I \right)^{-2} \right).$$

Let $s(z)$ be the Stieltjes transform of $\frac{1}{n_{L+1}} X^{(L+1)\top} X^{(L+1)}$ and $m(z)$ be the Stieltjes transform of $\frac{1}{n_{L+1}} X^{(L+1)} X^{(L+1)\top}$. In Assumption 1 from Wu and Xu (2020), the random variable g is degenerated to be a constant 1. Define $S = \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I$. Following analysis in proof of Theorem

1 in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#), this bias part is just $\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr}(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{-2})$. By analyzing the quantity $\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(S^{-2} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and similar to (A.3) in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#), it holds that

$$\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(S^{-2} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-1} - \lambda(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-2}).$$

Also, (A.5) in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#) for analyzing $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$ becomes

$$\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(S^{-2} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}) \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\frac{\lambda^2}{p} \text{tr}(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{-2})}{\left(\frac{1}{m(-\lambda)}\right)^2}.$$

Then the bias part will converge in probability to

$$\frac{1}{m^2(-\lambda)} \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-1} - \lambda(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-2}). \quad (48)$$

Hence, to analyze the limiting behavior of $R_\lambda^{\text{OR}}(\Omega | X^{(L+1)})$, we only need to analyze the limit of $\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-1})$ and $\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - \lambda I)^{-2})$, while in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#), one needs to analyze $\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{w\beta}^\top (\mathbf{X}_{/w}^\top \mathbf{X}_{/w} + \lambda I)^{-1})$ where $\Sigma_{w\beta} = \Sigma_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_\beta \Sigma_w^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for arbitrary Σ_w .

Our approach differs from that in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#) at this point, as results in [Ledoit and Péché \(2011\)](#) can not be applied at this point following their approach. Indeed, it relies on the underlying condition that $\Sigma_{w\beta}$ and $\Sigma_{x/w} = \Sigma_w^{-1/2} \Sigma_x \Sigma_w^{-1/2}$ shares the same eigenvectors. Only in this case, it is possible to write $\Sigma_{w\beta}$ as a continuous function of $\Sigma_{x/w}$. However, when $\Sigma_w = \Omega^{-1}$ and $\Sigma_{w\beta} = I$, analyzing the limit of bias part does not require the assumption 1 in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#).

Now we show that the limit $\frac{m'(-\lambda)}{m^2(-\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \frac{h}{(hm(-\lambda)+1)^2}$ presented in [Wu and Xu \(2020\)](#) for bias part is essentially the same as $\frac{m(-\lambda) - \lambda m'(-\lambda)}{\gamma_{L+1} m^2(-\lambda)}$ presented in [Theorem 2.3](#). To do so, it is required to use [Theorem 1](#) in [Rubio and Mestre \(2011\)](#) with $A = 0$, $T = I$ and $R = \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1}) - \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}((c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1}) \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

where

$$c_{n_{L+1}}(z) = \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr}((I_{n_{L+1}} + \frac{p}{n_{L+1}} e_p(z) I)^{-1}), \quad (49)$$

$$e_p(z) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI_p)^{-1}). \quad (50)$$

By proof of [Theorem 1](#) in [Rubio and Mestre \(2011\)](#), we have that $c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \rightarrow -zm(z)$. Combining (49) and (50) together, $c_{n_{L+1}}(z)$ should satisfy following equation

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n_{L+1}}(z) &= 1 - \frac{1}{n_{L+1}} \text{tr} \left(c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} (c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{p}{n_{L+1}} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \lambda_i (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}})}{c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \lambda_i (\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}) - z}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_i(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}})$ is i -th eigenvalue of $\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma^{(L+1)}\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Taking $n_{L+1}, p \rightarrow \infty$, then it holds that

$$-zm(z) = 1 - \gamma \mathbb{E} \frac{-zm(z)h}{-zm(z)h - z}.$$

Plugging in $z = -\lambda$, we see that

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{m(-\lambda)} - \gamma \mathbb{E} \frac{h}{hm(z) + 1}.$$

Besides, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left((c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1} \right) &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{c_{n_{L+1}}(z) \lambda_i(\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}) - z} \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{-z} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{hm(z) + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $z = -\lambda$, it holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \right) - \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{hm(-\lambda) + 1} \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Also, it holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} - zI)^{-1} \right) - s(z) \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad s(z) = \gamma_{L+1}^{-1} m(z) + \gamma_{L+1}^{-1} z^{-1}.$$

Hence, by uniqueness of limit,

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{1}{hm(-\lambda) + 1} = \lambda(\gamma_{L+1}^{-1} m(-\lambda) - \gamma_{L+1}^{-1} \lambda^{-1}).$$

Now, by taking derivative w.r.t. z and taking $z = -\lambda$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I)^{-2} \right) - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{hm(-\lambda) + 1} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{E} \frac{m'(-\lambda)}{(hm(-\lambda) + 1)^2} \right| &\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \\ \left| \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{tr} \left((\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\Sigma}^{(L+1)} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} + \lambda I_p)^{-2} \right) - (\gamma_{L+1}^{-1} (m'(-\lambda) - \frac{1 - \gamma_{L+1}}{\lambda^2})) \right| &\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \end{aligned}$$

and again,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{hm(-\lambda) + 1} - \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{E} \frac{m'(-\lambda)}{(hm(-\lambda) + 1)^2} = (\gamma_{L+1}^{-1} (m'(-\lambda) - \frac{1 - \gamma_{L+1}}{\lambda^2})).$$

Now by (48), the bias part will converge to

$$\frac{m'(-\lambda)}{m^2(-\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \frac{h}{(hm(-\lambda) + 1)^2},$$

and this is equal to

$$\frac{m(-\lambda) - \lambda m'(-\lambda)}{\gamma_{L+1} m^2(-\lambda)},$$

which coincides with our results presented in Theorem 2.3.

To summarize, our proof of Theorem 2.3 is much simpler and specifically suited to the meta-learning problem that we focus on in this work.

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.39	1.40	1.22	14.48%
50	1.38	1.39	1.21	14.46%
75	1.33	1.31	1.20	8.51%
100	1.30	1.29	1.20	8.05%
125	1.26	1.26	1.19	5.73%
150	1.25	1.24	1.18	5.14%

(a) Results for (16) (Initialization: Random generated)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.39	1.40	1.22	14.66%
50	1.38	1.39	1.21	14.60%
75	1.33	1.31	1.20	8.89%
100	1.30	1.29	1.20	7.65%
125	1.26	1.27	1.19	6.35%
150	1.25	1.20	1.18	1.36%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Output of (16))

Table 6: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) and MLE for the case $\lambda_j(\Omega) = \frac{1}{j^4}$

E Additional experiments

E.1 Diminishing eigenvalue case on Ω

Instead of utilizing Ω as in (6), we adopt an alternative approach where the eigenvalues of Ω decrease following a power-law decay, given by $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-a}$ for some $a > 0$, while keeping the matrices $\Sigma^{(\ell)}$ as identity matrices. Note in particular that this violates our assumption. The generation process for Ω is as follows:

- We randomly generate an orthogonal matrix P .
- Let $D(\Omega)$ be a diagonal matrix with its j -th diagonal entry defined as $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-a}$.
- Set $\Omega = PD(\Omega)P^\top$.

In this experiment, we set $p = 128$, $n_\ell = 50$ for all the tasks and n_{L+1} varying from 25, 50, 75, 100, 125, 150. Then the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is calculated based on (16) and MLE. We set a to be $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{10}$ and $\frac{1}{100}$ respectively. For $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-1/4}$, this means the eigenvalue of Ω decays fast and it violates the assumption 2.2.1 most severely. On the contrary, for $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-1/100}$, this means the eigenvalue of Ω decays very slowly and this is almost same to identity matrix. The results for $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-1/4}$, $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-1/10}$ and $\lambda_j(\Omega) = j^{-1/100}$ are given in Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8 respectively. The results indicate that the behavior of predictive risk $R_\lambda(\hat{\Omega} | X^{(L+1)})$ is not very closed to the corresponding limiting risk $r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$. The Difference Percentage is larger for the case when eigenvalue of Ω decays faster.

E.2 Diminishing eigenvalue case on $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$

Instead of using identity matrix for $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$, we now let the eigenvalue of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ is decreasing as $\lambda_j = j^{-a}$ for some $a > 0$. For this section, the choice of Ω is still given by (6) with $a = 16$ and

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.60	1.61	1.45	11.18%
50	1.58	1.59	1.42	11.98%
75	1.56	1.57	1.41	11.56%
100	1.52	1.51	1.37	10.19%
125	1.47	1.46	1.35	8.13%
150	1.45	1.44	1.33	8.05%

(a) Results for (16) (Initialization: Random generated)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.60	1.61	1.45	11.20%
50	1.58	1.58	1.42	11.03%
75	1.56	1.56	1.41	10.67%
100	1.52	1.51	1.37	10.07%
125	1.47	1.45	1.35	7.48%
150	1.45	1.44	1.33	7.74%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Output of (16))

Table 7: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) and MLE for the case $\lambda_j(\Omega) = \frac{1}{j^{10}}$

$b = 5$. Suppose that the eigenvalue decomposition of Ω is given by $\Omega = UD(\Omega)U^\top$. Then we set $\Sigma^{(L+1)} = UD(\Sigma^{(L+1)})U^\top$ where the eigenvalue of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ is given by

$$\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = j^{-a}$$

Therefore, the eigenvectors of $\Sigma^{(L+1)}$ are the same as the eigenvectors of Ω .

In this experiment, we set $p = 128$, $n_\ell = 50$ for all the tasks and n_{L+1} varying from 25, 50, 75, 100, 125, 150. Then the estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is calculated based on (16) and MLE. We set a to be $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{10}$ and $\frac{1}{100}$ respectively. The results for $\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = j^{-1/4}$, $\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = j^{-1/10}$ and $\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = j^{-1/100}$ are given in Table 9, Table 10 and 11 respectively. The performance of predictive risk is still good in these three cases.

E.3 Influence of choosing different λ in Sparse case

Finally, we study the influence of the choice of different λ in ridge regression. In this experiment, the number of task $L = 1000$, the dimension $p = 128$, the number of samples in each task $n_\ell = 50$ ($\ell = 1, \dots, L$) and the number of samples in the new task n_{L+1} varies as 25, 50, 75, 100, 125, 150. The estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ is calculated based on (19) and in the new task the coefficient $\hat{\beta}^{(L+1)}$ is estimated by (3) with the choice of λ given by $\lambda = c \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}$, where $c = 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95, 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$. In particular, when $c = 1$ and $\lambda = \frac{p\sigma^2}{n_{L+1}}$ is the theoretically optimal value for ridge regression that minimizes the predictive risk.

The results of this simulation is given in Figure 3, where the x-axis is the choice of coefficient c in front of the theoretical optimal λ in ridge regression and y-axis is the predictive risk using different choice of c in the λ . Figure 3 indicate that the predictive risk is minimized near the theoretically optimal λ .

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.85	1.86	1.84	1.24%
50	1.81	1.83	1.77	3.44%
75	1.74	1.72	1.71	0.60%
100	1.65	1.66	1.65	0.75%
125	1.60	1.61	1.59	0.73%
150	1.55	1.57	1.55	1.38%

(a) Results for (16) (Initialization: Random generated)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	1.85	1.86	1.84	1.14%
50	1.81	1.82	1.77	3.07%
75	1.74	1.71	1.71	-0.13%
100	1.65	1.65	1.65	0.35%
125	1.60	1.60	1.59	0.45%
150	1.55	1.56	1.55	0.81%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Output of (16))

Table 8: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) and MLE for the case $\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = \frac{1}{j^{100}}$

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	7.12	6.40	4.25	50.68%
50	6.48	5.18	3.58	44.83%
75	5.92	4.85	3.05	59.00%
100	5.50	3.65	2.66	37.22%
125	5.07	3.08	2.36	30.24%
150	4.72	2.52	2.14	18.08%

(a) Results for (16) (Initialization: Random generated Initialization)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	7.12	6.34	4.25	49.29%
50	6.48	5.20	3.58	45.41%
75	5.92	4.86	3.05	59.29%
100	5.50	3.58	2.66	34.60%
125	5.07	3.01	2.36	27.56%
150	4.72	2.54	2.14	18.92%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Output of (16))

Table 9: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) and MLE for the case $\lambda_j(\Sigma^{(L+1)}) = \frac{1}{j^4}$

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	10.84	9.62	8.22	17.04%
50	9.65	8.35	6.59	26.54%
75	8.69	6.84	5.18	31.98%
100	7.72	5.65	4.11	37.41%
125	6.90	4.69	3.33	40.61%
150	6.18	3.95	2.79	41.70%

(a) Results for (16) (Initialization: Random generated)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	10.84	9.38	8.22	14.13%
50	9.65	8.16	6.59	23.67%
75	8.69	6.74	5.18	29.89%
100	7.72	5.45	4.11	32.51%
125	6.90	4.59	3.33	37.48%
150	6.18	3.85	2.79	38.09%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Output of (16))

Table 10: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based for (16) and MLE on the case $[\Lambda_{\Sigma(L+1)}]_{jj} = \frac{1}{j^{10}}$

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.37	13.33	12.94	3.01%
50	12.57	11.01	10.06	9.41%
75	10.90	8.56	7.63	12.25%
100	9.42	6.09	5.6368	8.0808%
125	8.32	4.47	4.12	8.56%
150	7.34	3.50	3.28	6.75%

(a) Results for estimator based on problem (16) (Random generated Initialization)

n_{L+1}	$R(I X)$	$R(\hat{\Omega} X)$	$r(\lambda, \gamma_{L+1})$	Difference Percentage
25	14.37	13.31	12.94	2.88%
50	12.57	10.72	10.06	6.51%
75	10.90	8.38	7.63	9.83%
100	9.42	6.04	5.63	7.24%
125	8.32	4.43	4.12	7.63%
150	7.33	3.41	3.28	3.99%

(b) Results for MLE (Initialization: Result given by problem (16))

Table 11: Comparison of estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ based on (16) and MLE for the case $[\Lambda_{\Sigma(L+1)}]_{jj} = \frac{1}{j^{100}}$




Figure 3: Risk $R_{c\lambda^*}(\hat{\Omega})$ with different c

F Auxiliary Results

Lemma F.1 (Lemma 2.14 from [Bai and Silverstein \(2010\)](#)). Let f_1, f_2, \dots be analytic on the domain D , satisfying $|f_n(z)| \leq M$ for every n and z in D . Suppose that there is an analytic function f on D such that $f_n(z) \rightarrow f(z)$ for all $z \in D$. Then it also holds that $f'_n(z) \rightarrow f'(z)$ for all $z \in D$.

The following standard concentration result is easy to obtain.

Lemma F.2. Let $X \in SG_p(\sigma)$, $\|X\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p X_i^2}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X\|_2 \geq t) \leq 5^p \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{8\sigma^2}\right\}.$$

Theorem F.1 ([Koltchinskii \(2011\)](#)). Given independent random $m_1 \times m_2$ matrices X_1, \dots, X_n with $\mathbb{E}X_j = 0$, denote

$$\sigma^2 := n^{-1} \max\left\{\left\|\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top\right\|, \left\|\mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\top X_i\right\|\right\}.$$

Let $\alpha \geq 1$ and suppose that, for some $U^{(\alpha)} > 0$ and for all $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have that $\|X_j\|_{op} \leq \psi_\alpha \vee 2\mathbb{E}^{1/2}\|X_j\|_{op}^2 \leq U^{(\alpha)}$, a.s.. Then, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\|X_1 + \dots + X_n\| \geq t\} \leq (m_1 + m_2) \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{K} \frac{t^2}{n\sigma^2 + tU^{(\alpha)} \log^{1/\alpha}(U^{(\alpha)}/\sigma)}\right\}.$$

Theorem F.2 (Theorem 3.4 from [Adamczak and Wolff \(2015\)](#)). Let $\beta \in [2, \infty)$ and Y be a random vector in \mathbb{R}^k , satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}f^2(Y) &= \mathbb{E}f^2(Y) \log f^2(Y) - \mathbb{E}f^2(Y) \log \mathbb{E}f^2(Y) \\ &\leq D_{LS_\beta} \left(\mathbb{E}|\nabla f(Y)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \frac{|\nabla f(Y)|^\beta}{f(Y)^{\beta-2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consider a random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ in \mathbb{R}^{mp} , where X_1, \dots, X_m are independent copies of Y . Then for any locally Lipschitz $f : \mathbb{R}^{mp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(X)$ is integrable, and $q \geq 2$,

$$\|f(X) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_{L_q} \leq C_\beta D_{LS_\beta}^{1/2} q^{1/2} \|\nabla f(X)\|_2 \|L_q + D_{LS_\beta}^{1/\beta} q^{1/\alpha} \|\nabla f(X)\|_\beta \|L_q, \quad (51)$$

where $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}$ is the Hölder conjugate of β .

Remark F.1. In particular, the second term $D_{LS_\beta}^{1/\beta} q^{1/\alpha} \|\nabla f(X)\|_\beta \|L_q$ in (51) is upper bounded by first term. Hence, it suffices to bound the first term to prove concentration results needed in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Theorem F.3 (Theorem 6.5 from [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)). *There are universal constants $\{c_j\}_{j=0}^3$ such that, for any row-wise σ -sub-Gaussian random matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, the sample covariance $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^T$ satisfies the bounds*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_2}] \leq e^{c_0 \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^4}{n} + 4d} \quad \text{for all } |\lambda| < \frac{n}{64e^2 \sigma^2},$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_2}{\sigma^2} \geq c_1 \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{d}{n} \right\} + \delta\right) \leq c_2 e^{-c_3 n \min\{\delta, \delta^2\}}, \quad \text{for all } \delta \geq 0.$$