

Inference in Randomized Least Squares and PCA via Normality of Quadratic Forms

Leda Wang, Zhixiang Zhang, and Edgar Dobriban*

April 2, 2024

Abstract

Randomized algorithms can be used to speed up the analysis of large datasets. In this paper, we develop a unified methodology for statistical inference via randomized sketching or projections in two of the most fundamental problems in multivariate statistical analysis: least squares and PCA. The methodology applies to fixed datasets—i.e., is data-conditional—and the only randomness is due to the randomized algorithm. We propose statistical inference methods for a broad range of sketching distributions, such as the subsampled randomized Hadamard transform (SRHT), Sparse Sign Embeddings (SSE) and CountSketch, sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries, and uniform subsampling. To our knowledge, no comparable methods are available for SSE and for SRHT in PCA. Our novel theoretical approach rests on showing the asymptotic normality of certain quadratic forms. As a contribution of broader interest, we show central limit theorems for quadratic forms of the SRHT, relying on a novel proof via a dyadic expansion that leverages the recursive structure of the Hadamard transform. Numerical experiments using both synthetic and empirical datasets support the efficacy of our methods, and in particular suggest that sketching methods can have better computation-estimation tradeoffs than recently proposed optimal subsampling methods.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Contributions	4
1.2	Related Work	5
1.3	A Concrete Result	5
1.4	Notation and Definitions	6
2	Unifying Approach via Normality of Quadratic Forms	7
2.1	Unifying Conditions	7
2.2	Asymptotic Distributions under Unifying Conditions	9
2.2.1	Sketched Least Squares	9
2.2.2	Sketched PCA	10
3	Inference for Specific Sketching Distributions	12
3.1	Subsampled Randomized Hadamard Transform	12
3.2	Sparse Sign Embeddings and CountSketch	14
3.3	Uniform Random Sampling	15
3.4	Sketching Matrices with i.i.d. Entries	16
3.5	Uniform Orthogonal Sketching	18
4	Computational Considerations	19

*Author information: LW: School of Mathematics, Univ. of Science and Technology of China, wangleda@mail.ustc.edu.cn. ZZ: Department of Mathematics, University of Macau, zhixz@wharton.upenn.edu. ED: Department of Statistics and Data Science, University of Pennsylvania, dobriban@wharton.upenn.edu.

5	Numerical Experiments	20
5.1	Inference from Sketch-and-Solve Estimators	21
5.1.1	Simulated Data	21
5.1.2	Empirical Data Example	21
5.1.3	Running Time	22
5.2	Comparison of Various Forms of Sketching	23
5.2.1	Comparison with Optimal Subsampling	24
6	Summary	24
7	Appendix	25
7.1	Technical Reminders	25
7.2	Proof of Theorem 2.3	26
7.3	Proof of Corollary 2.4	29
7.4	Proof of Theorem 2.5	29
7.5	Proof of Corollary 2.6	32
7.6	Proof of Theorem 3.1	32
7.7	Proof of Theorem 3.2	32
7.8	Proof of Lemma 3.3	32
7.9	Proof of Lemma 3.4	33
7.10	Proof of Lemma 3.5	36
7.11	Proof of Theorem 3.6	36
7.12	Proof of Theorem 3.7	36
7.13	Proof of Lemma 3.8	37
7.14	Proof of Lemma 3.9	41
7.15	Proof of Theorem 3.10	42
7.16	Proof of Theorem 3.11	43
7.17	Proof of Lemma 3.12	44
7.18	Proof of Lemma 3.13	44
7.19	Proof of Theorem 3.14	44
7.20	Proof of Theorem 3.15	45
7.21	Proof of Lemma 3.16	47
7.22	Proof of Lemma 3.17	47
7.23	Proof of Theorem 3.18	48
7.24	Proof of Theorem 3.19	48
7.25	Proof of Lemma 3.20	49
7.26	Proof of Lemma 3.21	50
7.27	PCA after Sketching with i.i.d. Gaussian Matrices	51
7.28	Additional Experimental Results	51

1 Introduction

Randomized algorithms, including Monte Carlo methods, stochastic optimization, as well as randomized sketching and random projections, can be used to speed up the analysis of large datasets, and have a broad range of applications (Spall, 2005; Owen, 2019; Vempala, 2005; Halko et al., 2011a; Mahoney, 2011; Woodruff, 2014; Lee and Ng, 2020; Cannings, 2021). At the same time, randomization leads to additional variability, which must be controlled. By viewing the numerical quantity of interest as an unknown parameter, recent works have developed methods for statistical inference based on randomized sketching algorithms in both least squares regression, see e.g., Lopes et al. (2018, 2019b, 2020); Wang et al. (2018a); Wang and Ma (2021); Yu et al. (2022); Ahfock et al. (2021); Bartan and Pilanci (2023); Lee and Ng (2022); Zhang et al. (2023); Ma et al. (2022), etc, and in principal component analysis (PCA), see e.g., Lopes et al. (2020); as discussed more in Section 1.2.

At the moment, developing methods for statistical inference via randomized sketching algorithms requires a case-by-case analysis for each specific problem and sketching distribution. In particular, the above works

study two of the possibly most fundamental problems in multivariate statistics—linear regression and PCA—separately and with different methods. Moreover, various works study different specific distributions of the sketching or projection matrices, such as Gaussian sketching (e.g., Lopes et al., 2020; Ahfock et al., 2021; Bartan and Pilanci, 2023, etc), projections with i.i.d. entries (e.g., Lopes et al., 2018, etc), subsampling (e.g., Wang et al., 2018a; Wang and Ma, 2021; Yu et al., 2022; Lopes et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2022, etc), CountSketch (e.g., Ahfock et al., 2021, etc), and Hadamard sketching (e.g., Lopes et al., 2019a; Ahfock et al., 2021, etc). It is unclear whether each problem requires a completely different approach and methods, or a unifying approach exists.

In this work, we develop a unifying approach for statistical inference for randomized sketching methods in those two fundamental multivariate statistical problems, least squares and PCA. Our key insight is that both problems can be reduced to proving the asymptotic normality of certain quadratic forms of the sketching matrices. We develop a theoretical framework (see Figure 1 for an illustration) that makes only a few assumptions on the data, and develops methods for statistical inference in randomized least-squares and PCA if appropriate quadratic forms are normal. Then we apply our general theory to develop methods for a broad set of sketching distributions (matrices with i.i.d. entries, subsampled randomized Hadamard transforms, sparse sign embeddings and CountSketch, uniform orthogonal sketching and uniform subsampling). We also study the computational cost of our methods in detail, and show empirically that our sketching methods have a favorable speed-accuracy tradeoff compared to optimal subsampling methods.

In more detail, we consider a sequence of deterministic datasets $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, following the framework of Zhang et al. (2023). We are interested in a parameter $\theta_n = \theta_n(\mathcal{D}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for some fixed positive integer d , which is a deterministic function of the data. We consider the setting where the data is so large that we cannot access it directly to perform least squares or PCA computations. We instead observe the output $\mathcal{A}_m(\mathcal{D}_n, S_{m,n})$ of a known *randomized algorithm* \mathcal{A}_m , based on an auxiliary source of randomness $S_{m,n}$ whose distribution $Q_{m,n}$ is chosen by the user. However, the random variable $S_{m,n}$ may have a large size and is not assumed to be observed. Having observed $Z_{m,n}$, we are interested in statistical inference for θ_n .




Figure 1: An illustration of the geometry of the sketched least squares estimator, highlighting our inferential objective.

In the *least squares problem*—see Figure 1 for an illustration—the unobserved dataset is a deterministic $n \times p$ matrix X_n —where often n is the sample size and p is the number of features—and a deterministic $n \times 1$ vector y_n . We are interested in the deterministic least squares parameter $\beta_n = (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} X_n^\top y_n$. For an $m \times n$ random sketching matrix $S_{m,n}$, the sketched data is $(\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n}) = (S_{m,n} X_n, S_{m,n} y_n)$. We consider two possible estimators of β_n , the *sketch-and-solve* (or, complete sketching) least squares and *partial sketching* estimators (e.g., Sarlos, 2006; Drineas et al., 2006, etc), defined, respectively as:

$$\hat{\beta}_{m,n} = \left(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} \right)^{-1} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{y}_{m,n} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} = \left(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} \right)^{-1} X_n^\top y_n. \quad (1)$$

The observed data for sketch-and-solve regression is $(\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n}) = (S_{m,n} X_n, S_{m,n} y_n)$, and for partial sketching, it is $S_{m,n} X_n$ and $X_n^\top y_n$. In some cases, $X_n^\top y_n$ can be computed relatively efficiently, and using it may improve accuracy.

In the *principal component analysis problem*, the unobserved dataset is the $n \times p$ matrix X_n , while the observed dataset is $\tilde{X}_{m,n} = S_{m,n} X_n$. Our targets of inference are the singular values of X_n —or equivalently




Figure 2: A flowchart illustrating our theoretical framework. This graph shows the connections between the various conditions and results to develop methods for statistical inference in least squares (LS, also referred to as ordinary least squares or OLS) and PCA using SRHT (Subsampled Randomized Hadamard Transform) sketching. In particular, note that all components of Condition 2.1 are used directly in our key general inference results.

the eigenvalues of $X_n^\top X_n$ —and the right singular vectors of X_n . We consider the corresponding singular values and vectors of $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ as estimators.

1.1 Contributions

- 1. Unifying approach to statistical inference in randomized least squares (LS) and PCA.** We propose a unifying approach for statistical inference in randomized least squares and PCA (Section 2). Our approach reduces this to showing the asymptotic normality of certain sequences of quadratic forms. See Figure 2 for the logical flow of ideas and the connections between the various results in our framework. The methodology applies to fixed datasets—i.e., is data-conditional—under mild conditions such as a bounded condition number. In particular, we do not impose any statistical model (such as i.i.d.-ness or a linear model) on the data.

Specifically, we propose methods for inference in sketched least squares (Theorem 2.3), under the asymptotic normality of quadratic forms from Condition 2.1. We also develop methods for inference in sketched PCA (Theorem 2.5), when certain matrix-valued quadratic forms converge to a multivariate Gaussian distribution. See Table 2 for a summary. For completeness, we also show how our results can be used for inference for population parameters when given an i.i.d. sample from a population.
- 2. Inference methods for a broad range of sketching distributions.** We then propose statistical inference methods for a broad range of sketching distributions, such as the subsampled randomized Hadamard transform (SRHT, Section 3.1), Sparse Sign Embeddings (SSE) and CountSketch (Section 3.2), sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries (Section 3.4), uniform partial orthogonal or Haar sketches (Section 3.5), and uniform subsampling (Section 3.3). For several of these, either no comparable methods have been available before (e.g., for SSE, and for SRHT in PCA), or our results allow for broader conditions on the data (e.g., for i.i.d. sketches, and for SRHT in LS).
- 3. Technical contributions: CLTs for quadratic forms.** As a technical contribution of broader interest, we show novel central limit theorems for quadratic forms of sketching matrices. This includes the SRHT (Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5), which relies on a novel proof via a dyadic expansion, leveraging the Hadamard transform. It also includes SSE and CountSketch (Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9), which relies on the analysis of a weighted degenerate U-statistic of order two via delicate moment calculations. CLTs for random quadratic forms are an important tool in random matrix theory, see e.g. (Bai and Yao, 2008); and thus we think our results are of broader interest.

4. **Computational analysis and empirical experiments.** We analyze and compare the computational cost of various sketching methods (Section 4). Additionally, we conduct numerical experiments using both synthetic and empirical data (Section 5), which support the efficacy of our methods. A comparison of our methods with certain optimal subsampling approaches (Section 5.2) supports that sketching methods achieve a better empirical time-accuracy tradeoff. Our experiments are reproducible with code provided at github.com/Futwangalrda/normality-QF-sketching-apps.

1.2 Related Work

Sketching and random projection methods have been studied extensively in multiple domains (Vempala, 2005; Li et al., 2006; Halko et al., 2011b; Mahoney, 2011; Woodruff, 2014; Drineas and Mahoney, 2016; Martinsson and Tropp, 2020; Cannings, 2021, etc). They have been applied to various problems, including PCA and SVD (e.g., Frieze et al., 2004; Halko et al., 2011b; Yang et al., 2021; Zhang and Tang, 2022, etc), linear and ridge regression (Lu et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2018b; Dobriban and Liu, 2019; Liu and Dobriban, 2019; Lacotte et al., 2020; Derezhinski et al., 2021), two sample testing (Lopes et al., 2011; Srivastava et al., 2016), testing point null hypotheses in non-parametric regression (Liu et al., 2019), testing in single-index models (Liu et al., 2022), nonparametric testing (Liu et al., 2019), and convex optimization (Pilanci and Wainwright, 2015, 2016, 2017), etc.

Works such as Lopes et al. (2018); Ahfock et al. (2021); Lee and Ng (2022); Bartan and Pilanci (2023) have developed methods for statistical inference in least squares regression. Ahfock et al. (2021) study the statistical properties of complete, partial, and certain one-step corrected sketching estimators in least squares. They develop methods for finite-sample exact inference for Gaussian sketching. For Hadamard sketching and the CountSketch, they show the asymptotic normality of the sketched estimators, using a technical approach that is different from ours. Compared to Ahfock et al. (2021), we develop a unifying framework that includes both PCA and least squares, study the setting where the sketch dimension diverges, and consider a broader range of sketching distributions.

Bootstrap methods for inference using sketching have been studied separately for least squares (Lopes et al., 2018) and PCA (Lopes et al., 2020), while we develop a unified approach. Moreover, they require certain convergence conditions for the unobserved data, while we only need some regularity conditions (such as a bounded condition number), by using subsequence arguments. Lopes et al. (2020) considers Gaussian sketching methods and subsampling in PCA, again under certain convergence conditions.

Zhang et al. (2023) propose a framework for statistical inference via randomized algorithms. They consider arbitrary algorithms, only assuming that their output has a limiting error distribution around the true quantity/parameter of interest, without knowing what the distribution is. They develop a range of methods for statistical inference in this context, including sub-randomization—generalizing subsampling (Politis et al., 1999)—multi-run plug-in and multi-run aggregation. When the limiting distribution belongs to a known parametric family with unknown parameters, they consider inference based on estimating those parameters. Our setting belongs to this latter case, and our main contribution is to show how to derive the limiting distributions in a unifying way in sketching for linear regression and PCA.

Wang et al. (2018a); Wang and Ma (2021); Yu et al. (2022) investigate optimal subsampling for logistic regression, quantile regression models as well as for more general maximum quasi-likelihood estimators. They establish consistency and asymptotic normality of weighted subsampling estimators, and derive optimal subsampling probabilities that minimize the asymptotic mean squared error, as well as methods to estimate these probabilities. These approaches impose a regression model on the data, while we consider the data as fixed. Ma et al. (2022) study weighted sampling estimators in a fixed-data setting, where the sample size is fixed. In contrast, we consider a growing sample size.

1.3 A Concrete Result

To give the reader a concrete example of the type of results that we can obtain, we state here a method for inference in PCA using the Subsampled Randomized Hadamard Transform (SRHT) (Ailon and Chazelle, 2006), see Section 3.1. In Theorem 3.1, we consider an $m \times n$, $m \leq n$, SRHT sketching matrix $S_{m,n}$, data matrices $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying an eigengap condition, with vanishing leverage scores (i.e., row norms of their left singular matrices). We show that for any $i \in [p]$, as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ with p

fixed, we have for the unobserved data eigenvalues $\Lambda_{n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ and the observed sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$ that with $\gamma_n = m/n$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{3(1-\gamma_n)}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (2)$$

Letting $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ be the normal $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, this result can be used to form confidence intervals $[\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}(1 - z_{1-\alpha/2}\sqrt{3(1-\gamma_n)/m}), \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}(1 + z_{1-\alpha/2}\sqrt{3(1-\gamma_n)/m})]$ with $1 - \alpha$ asymptotic coverage for the data eigenvalues $\Lambda_{n,i}$ based on the sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}$.

1.4 Notation and Definitions

We present a self-contained summary of notations needed in our work. The reader may skip to Section 2 and refer back to this section as needed.

Basics. For a positive integer $p \geq 1$, we let $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$. For a vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $\|a\|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^q)^{1/q}$ for its ℓ_q norm, where $1 \leq q < \infty$. For $q = \infty$, we denote $\|a\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i|$. For any $n \geq 1$, we define \mathbb{S}^{n-1} to be the unit sphere in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n . For any real numbers x and y , we define $\lceil x \rceil$ as the smallest integer greater than or equal to x , and $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$. We use the symbol “d” to denote the differential of a function. For an event A , $I\{A\}$ denotes its indicator function, which equals to unity if A happens and to zero otherwise.

Convergence. For two positive sequences $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, we write $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists a positive constant C such that $a_n/b_n \leq C$ and we write $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, $O_P(\cdot)$ and $o_P(\cdot)$ have similar meanings to $O(\cdot)$ and $o(\cdot)$ respectively, but hold asymptotically with probability tending to one. For two positive sequences $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, we write $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ if $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $b_n = O(a_n)$. We also denote weak convergence of a sequence of probability measures $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ to a probability measure Q by $Q_n \Rightarrow Q$.

Matrices. Let $\mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ be the set of $p \times p$ positive definite matrices. For a vector $(v_1, \dots, v_n)^\top$, we define $\text{diag}(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ as the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries v_i for $i \in [n]$. For positive integers m, n , and for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we denote the operator norm of A as $\|A\|$. If further $m \leq n$, the Stiefel manifold $W_{m,n}$ is the set of ordered orthonormal m -tuples of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . Recall that for square matrices A, B , $A \preceq B$ denotes that $B - A$ is positive semi-definite. For two matrices A, B of the same size $k \times l$, $A \odot B$ is Hadamard product where $(A \odot B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$ for all $(i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$. For two matrices A, B , $A \otimes B$ denotes the tensor product. For a sequence of matrices $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with fixed dimensions, we write $A_n = O(1)$ if $\|A_n\| = O(1)$.

For $i \in [p]$, we let E_{ii} be a $p \times p$ matrix with the (i, i) -th entry equal to unity, and other entries equal to zero. For positive integers k, l , we often denote the columns of a $k \times l$ matrix A by $(a_j)_{j \in [l]}$. To study limiting distributions of matrices, it will be convenient to work with their vectorizations:

Definition 1.1 (Vectorization). *We define $\text{vec}: \mathbb{R}^{k \times l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{kl}$ as the vectorization operator listing the columns of a matrix placing the leftmost one on top, i.e., for a $k \times l$ matrix A , $\text{vec}(A) = (a_1^\top, \dots, a_p^\top)^\top$.*

Vectorization provides an identification of $[kl]$ and $[k] \times [l]$ —whose elements we denote by either (i, j) , (ij) , or ij —so that $\text{vec}(A)_{(i,j)} = A_{ij}$. Given indices $(i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$ of a matrix, we refer to the corresponding indices in the vectorization of the matrix as follows:

Definition 1.2 (Vectorized Indexing of a Matrix). *For $(i, j) \in [k] \times [l]$, $\sigma_{k,l}(i, j) \in [kl]$ is defined as the index of A_{ij} in the vectorization $\text{vec}(A)$, so that $\text{vec}(A)_{\sigma_{k,l}(i,j)} = \text{vec}(A)_{(i,j)} = A_{ij}$.*

Similarly, we can represent the indices in $[p(p+1)/2]$ as $\{(11), (12), \dots, (1p), (22), \dots, (2p), \dots, (pp)\}$, which are the indices in the upper triangular part of a $p \times p$ matrix. When dealing with matrices that have one or both dimensions of size kl or $p(p+1)/2$, we may use the above forms of indexing for those dimensions.

When working with symmetric matrices, we will often need to extract their diagonals and above-diagonal components. To apply this operation to a vectorized $p \times p$ matrix, we define the following upper triangulation operator. Recall that for $i, j \in \mathbb{R}$, δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta which equals unity if $i = j$ and zero otherwise.

Definition 1.3 (Upper Triangulation Operator). *For every $p \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, we consider the upper triangulation operator $D_p: \mathbb{R}^{p^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p(p+1)/2}$, which in a matrix form takes values $(D_p)_{(ij),(kl)} = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$, $i, j, k, l \in [p]$, and $k \leq l$.*

We will require the following definition to describe covariance matrices of vectorized $p \times p$ matrices.

Definition 1.4 (Absolutely Symmetric Matrix). *For a positive integer p , we say that a $p^2 \times p^2$ positive semi-definite matrix G is absolutely symmetric if $G_{(ij),(kl)} = G_{(ij),(lk)} = G_{(ji),(kl)} = G_{(ji),(lk)}$ for all $i, j, k, l \in [p]$, and with the upper triangulation operator D_p from Definition 1.3, $D_p^\top G D_p$ is positive definite.*

For an absolutely symmetric matrix G , there is a one-to-one correspondence between $D_p^\top G D_p$ and G . Indeed, although $D_p^\top G D_p$ is a principal submatrix of G , it contains all distinct elements of G .

We will also need the following two special matrices.

Definition 1.5 (Special Matrices Q_p and P_p). *For a positive integer p , we denote $Q_p = \text{vec}(I_p)\text{vec}(I_p)^\top$. Moreover, we denote the $p^2 \times p^2$ matrix representing matrix transposition in the vectorized matrix space by P_p , such that $(P_p)_{ij,kl} = \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}$ for all $i, j, k, l \in [p]$.*

2 Unifying Approach via Normality of Quadratic Forms

In this section, we present the core results of our unifying approach for inference in randomized PCA and LS via normality of quadratic forms.

2.1 Unifying Conditions

Notice that the sketch-and-solve least squares solution from (1) can be written as

$$\hat{\beta}_{m,n} = (X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)^{-1} X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} y_n.$$

Therefore, we expect that *quadratic forms* $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} b_n$ for appropriate vectors a_n, b_n play a crucial role in determining the distribution of this estimator. Similar observations can be made about the partial sketching estimator as well as about the singular values and vectors of the sketched data. Our analysis confirms this intuition.

In addition, if we let the SVD¹ of X_n be $X_n = U_n L_n V_n^\top$, then

$$\hat{\beta}_{m,n} = V_n L_n^{-1} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} y_n. \quad (3)$$

Hence, due to the form of $U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} y_n$, U_n is expected to play a special role. We introduce an $n \times (n-p)$ orthogonal complement $U_{n,\perp}$ of U_n , so that the matrix $[U_n, U_{n,\perp}]$ forms an $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix. We let $\varepsilon_n = y_n - X_n \beta_n$ be the true residuals. We also let $\bar{\varepsilon}_n = \varepsilon_n / \|\varepsilon_n\|$ be the normalized residuals, and $\bar{X}_n \beta_n = X_n \beta_n / \|X_n \beta_n\|$, be the normalized fitted values. It will be assumed that $\varepsilon_n \neq 0$ and $\bar{X}_n \beta_n \neq 0$, respectively, whenever these are used. We also let $\Lambda_n = L_n^2$.

The normality conditions of quadratic forms are required to hold only for sequences of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all n and $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy certain conditions—such as certain forms of delocalization, as seen informally in Table 1—that depend on the sketching matrix $S_{m,n}$. Typically, the more “randomness” $S_{m,n}$ has, the weaker these conditions. For instance, Gaussian sketches require weak conditions (but are computationally impractical), while uniform subsampling requires stronger conditions. To handle this in a general way, we introduce abstract conditions called Condition \mathfrak{p} , \mathfrak{P} , and \mathfrak{P}' . These will depend on the specific distributions of sketching matrices used, and will be specified in each case in Section 3. Since we are aiming to develop a theory with near-optimal yet unified conditions, our next condition lists several types of properties that we may require of quadratic forms. While this condition may seem complicated, each component is used crucially in our framework; see Figure 2 for an illustration.

Condition 2.1 (Asymptotic Normality of Quadratic Forms). *Consider the asymptotic regime where $n \rightarrow \infty$, $m = m_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $m < n$, while p is fixed. Let $(S_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of $m \times n$ sketching matrices, and U_n be the $n \times p$ left singular matrix of X_n . Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_n = \varepsilon_n / \|\varepsilon_n\|$, $\bar{X}_n \beta_n = X_n \beta_n / \|X_n \beta_n\|$, assuming they*

¹Here, U_n denotes a $n \times p$ partial orthogonal matrix satisfying $U_n^\top U_n = I_p$, $L_n = \text{diag}(\ell_{n,1}, \dots, \ell_{n,p})$, where $\ell_{n,1} \geq \dots \geq \ell_{n,p} > 0$ are the singular values of X_n in non-decreasing order, and V_n is a $p \times p$ orthogonal matrix containing the right singular vectors of X_n .

are well-defined when used. We consider a sequence of positive scalars $(\tau_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$, such that $\tau_{m,n}/m \rightarrow 0$. Consider Conditions \mathfrak{p} , \mathfrak{B} , which refer to sequences of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all n and $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, and Condition \mathfrak{B}' for the sequence of matrices $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Consider the following boundedness condition:

- **Bounded: Bounded Quadratic Form Under Condition \mathfrak{p} .** For any sequence $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of vector-pairs such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all n and $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{p} , we have

$$\sqrt{m}\tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) = O_P(1).$$

Moreover, consider the following asymptotic normality conditions for quadratic forms:

- **1-dim: One-dimensional Quadratic Form Under Condition \mathfrak{B} .** For any sequences of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all n , and $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{B} , there exists a sequence $(\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n))_{n \geq 1}$ uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity, such that

$$\sqrt{m}\tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \sigma_n^{-1} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Moreover, for all $n \geq 1$, there is $M_n = M_n(\bar{\varepsilon}_n)$ and $M_n^{(p)} = M_n^{(p)}(\overline{X_n \beta_n}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, also possibly depending on U_n , such that for any $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ with $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, $(U_n b_n, \overline{X_n \beta_n})_{n \geq 1}$, satisfying Condition \mathfrak{B} , σ_n^2 has the form

$$\sigma_n^2(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n) = b_n^\top M_n(\bar{\varepsilon}_n) b_n; \quad \sigma_n^2(U_n b_n, \overline{X_n \beta_n}) = b_n^\top M_n^{(p)}(\overline{X_n \beta_n}) b_n. \quad (4)$$

As a special case, for $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, consider Condition **1-dim'** — the special case of Condition **1-dim** — where $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n) = 1 + (\alpha + 1)(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying Condition \mathfrak{B} .

- **Sym: Symmetric Matrix Quadratic Form Under Condition \mathfrak{B}' .** For $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying Condition \mathfrak{B}' , there exists a sequence of $p^2 \times p^2$ absolutely symmetric matrices $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ as per Definition 1.4, such that there is $0 < c < C < \infty$ for which the upper triangulation operator D_p from Definition 1.3 satisfies $cI_{p(p+1)/2} \preceq D_p^\top G_n D_p \preceq CI_{p(p+1)/2}$, and vectorizing as per Definition 1.1,

$$\sqrt{m}(\tau_{m,n} D_p^\top G_n D_p)^{-1/2} D_p^\top \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_{p(p+1)/2}). \quad (5)$$

As a special case, consider Condition **Sym-1**, under which there exists a $p^2 \times p^2$ absolutely symmetric matrix G as per Definition 1.4, such that

$$\sqrt{m}\tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, G). \quad (6)$$

As an even more special case, we consider Condition **Sym-1'** for $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, such that for P_p and Q_p from Definition 1.5, $G = I_{p^2} + P_p + \alpha Q_p$.

It is not hard to see that under Condition 2.1 **1-dim'**, we can take $M_n = I_p$. Moreover, in most cases — but not always — we take $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{B}$ and use the results in Condition 2.1 **1-dim** to derive Condition 2.1 **Bounded**. However, Condition 2.1 **Bounded** is more general than Condition 2.1 **1-dim**.

Moreover, we will work under some mild conditions on the singular values of the data matrix. In particular, our theory and methods do not require that the sequence of data matrices converge in any way.

Condition 2.2 (Condition Number and Eigengap). For a sequence $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of $n \times p$ data matrices, where $\ell_{n,1} \geq \dots \geq \ell_{n,p} > 0$ are the singular values of X_n , consider the following conditions:

- **A: Bounded Condition Number.** We have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_{n,1}/\ell_{n,p} < \infty$.
- **B: Global Relative Eigengap.** Condition 2.2 A holds, and further

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{i \in [p-1]} \frac{\ell_{n,i}}{\ell_{n,i+1}} > 1.$$

Condition 2.2 A ensures that the condition number of the data matrix is bounded, which is required to use tightness arguments in the proofs. Conditions B ensures that the eigengaps are sufficiently large, and in particular that the singular values are distinct, which is helpful for performing inference on the individual eigenvalues². In our work, we will impose either one of A or B, as specified below.

²One could relax this assumption and aim to conduct inference for singular values associated with arbitrary singular spaces; we leave this to future work.

2.2 Asymptotic Distributions under Unifying Conditions

2.2.1 Sketched Least Squares

Recall that we are interested in the deterministic least squares parameter $\beta_n = (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} X_n^\top y_n$. Under Conditions 2.1 and 2.2, we can derive the asymptotic distributions of the sketched LS solutions, as well as methods for statistical inference. See Section 7.2 for the proof of this result.

Theorem 2.3 (Limiting Distribution and Inference for Sketched LS Estimators). *Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of data matrices satisfying Condition 2.2 A, and $(S_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of sketching matrices. Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_n = \varepsilon_n / \|\varepsilon_n\|$, $\overline{X_n \beta_n} = X_n \beta_n / \|X_n \beta_n\|$, assuming they are well-defined when used. Suppose that for any $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ for all n , $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P} . Then under Conditions 2.1 Bounded and 1-dim, the sketch-and-solve LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ from (1) has the limiting distribution*

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (V_n L_n^{-1} M_n (\bar{\varepsilon}_n) L_n^{-1} V_n^\top)^{-1/2} \|\varepsilon_n\|^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p), \quad (7)$$

with M_n from (4). Moreover, under Condition 2.1 Bounded and 1-dim with $M_n^{(p)}$ from (4), the partial sketching LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ from (1) has the limiting distribution

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (V_n L_n^{-1} M_n^{(p)} (\overline{X_n \beta_n}) L_n^{-1} V_n^\top)^{-1/2} \|X_n \beta_n\|^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (8)$$

In the special case that Condition 2.1 1-dim' holds for $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, we further have the following inferential results for the unobserved least squares parameter β_n based on the observed $\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n}$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} = \tilde{y}_{m,n} - \tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}$:

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^{-1} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p) \quad (9)$$

and

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(\|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|^2 \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} + (\alpha + 1) \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} \right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (10)$$

The results (9) and (10) can be used in the standard way to form confidence regions for the unknown least squares parameter β_n based on the observed $\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n}$. To form some intuition for (7), if Condition 1-dim' holds, then we can take $M_n = I_p$, and so (7) reduces to

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1/2} \|y_n - X_n \beta_n\|^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p), \quad (11)$$

showing that the effective covariance matrix is a multiple of $(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}$. This form is familiar from classical multivariate statistics based on i.i.d. data, and shows that our results can be viewed as a generalization. However, our theorem applies to arbitrary fixed data X_n, y_n , and imposes no distributional assumptions such as i.i.d.-ness.

In the above result, statistical inference requires a stronger condition (Condition 2.1 1-dim') than the existence of the asymptotic distribution. It turns out that guarantees for statistical inference more generally can be better handled case-by-case for various sketching distributions. In the remainder of the paper, we will use this result to derive limiting distributions and inferential methods for various distributions of sketching matrices. Table 1 summarizes some of these results.

While our results are data-conditional and do not assume that the data was generated by a statistical model, they can also be used for inference on population regression parameters when the data follows a population linear regression model. The following corollary illustrates this. See Section 7.3 for the proof.

Corollary 2.4 (Inference for regression parameters in a linear model). *Assume the data follows a standard linear model with true parameter β^* , that is, $y_n = X_n \beta^* + \varepsilon_n$, where the error vector ε_n has i.i.d. components with mean zero and variance σ_ε^2 , and X_n can be either random or deterministic. Under the conditions of Theorem 2.3, let Condition 2.1 1-dim' and the Lindeberg-Feller condition as stated in Example 2.28 of Van der Vaart (1998) hold. If in addition $m/(n\tau_{m,n}) \rightarrow 0$, we have*

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^{-1} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (12)$$

If instead $m/(\tau_{m,n}\|X_n\beta^*\|^2) \rightarrow_P 0$, then

$$m^{1/2}\tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(\|\tilde{X}_{m,n}\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|^2 \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} + (\alpha + 1)\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} \right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (13)$$

For various types of sketching methods discussed in this paper, $m/(n\tau_{m,n}) \rightarrow 0$ reduces to $m/n \rightarrow 0$. Further, $m/(\tau_{m,n}\|X_n\beta^*\|^2) \rightarrow_P 0$ has a similar interpretation if $\|X_n\beta^*\|^2 = \Theta(n)$, which is a genericity condition that holds if e.g., the matrix X_n has i.i.d. entries with zero mean and unit variance, and if $\|\beta^*\|^2 = \Theta(1)$. Therefore, given data sampled i.i.d. from a population, if the sketched sample size grows slower than the original sample size, we can directly use the sketched solution for inference about the population regression coefficient. However, we emphasize that our general theory is data-conditional and is thus stronger and more broadly applicable, as it does not assume any specific statistical model generating the data.

Table 1: Summary of some of our results for sketching in LS. For various distributions of sketching matrices, we summarize the choices of $\tau_{m,n}$, $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)$, G_n , and Condition \mathfrak{P} used in Condition 2.1 for which we show Theorem 2.3. Here $\gamma_n = m/n$, and as defined in Definition 1.5, $Q_p = \text{vec}(I_p)\text{vec}(I_p)^\top$, while P_p is the $p^2 \times p^2$ matrix representing matrix transposition in the vectorized matrix space. Also, $u_{n,i}$, $i \in [n]$ are the rows of the $n \times p$ left singular matrix U_n of X_n . See Section 3 for the details.

Sketching Distribution	$\tau_{m,n}$	$\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)$	G_n	Condition \mathfrak{P}
Hadamard	$1 - \gamma_n$	$1 + 2(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2$	$I_{p^2} + P_p + Q_p$	ℓ_∞ -delocalization
CountSketch/SSE	1	$1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2$	$I_{p^2} + P_p$	ℓ_4 -delocalization
i.i.d., $\kappa_{n,4} - 3 = o(1)$	1	$1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2$	$I_{p^2} + P_p$	
Haar	$1 - \gamma_n$	$1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2$	$I_{p^2} + P_p$	
Uniform Subsampling	$1 - \gamma_n$	$n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2$	$n \sum_{i=1}^n ((u_{n,i}u_{n,i}^\top) \otimes (u_{n,i}u_{n,i}^\top))$	See Section 3.3

2.2.2 Sketched PCA

We now turn to sketch-and-solve principal component analysis. For a $p \times p$ symmetric matrix Ξ and each $i \in [p]$, we denote by $\lambda_i(\Xi)$ the i -th largest eigenvalue of Ξ , and by $v_i(\Xi)$ an associated eigenvector such that the first non-zero coordinate of each vector is positive. We can define λ_i and v_i as continuous functions on $p \times p$ symmetric matrices, and if Ξ has distinct eigenvalues, we can also define them differentially in a small neighborhood of Ξ , see e.g., Magnus and Neudecker (2019). In this context, we also define $\Lambda_{n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$ for $i \in [p]$. Additionally, $v_{n,i}$ is an eigenvector of $X_n^\top X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\Lambda_{n,i}$, while $\hat{v}_{m,n,i}$ is an eigenvector of $X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}$.

For each $i \in [p]$, we define the function Δ_i below, used to characterize the asymptotic covariance structure of the i -th eigenvector, defined for $\Xi \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ with distinct eigenvalues and an absolutely symmetric G as per Definition 1.4 as

$$\Delta_i(\Xi, G) := \sum_{k \neq i, l \neq i} \frac{\lambda_i(\Xi) \sqrt{\lambda_k(\Xi) \lambda_l(\Xi)}}{(\lambda_i(\Xi) - \lambda_k(\Xi)) (\lambda_i(\Xi) - \lambda_l(\Xi))} G_{(ik),(il)} v_k(\Xi) v_l(\Xi)^\top. \quad (14)$$

For Ξ with repeated eigenvalues, we formally define $\Delta_i(\Xi, G) = \infty \cdot I_p$, so that for all nonzero $c \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $(c^\top \Delta_i(\Xi, G) c)^{-1/2} = 0$. Moreover, we define $\Delta_{n,i} := \Delta_i(X_n^\top X_n, G_n)$ and the plug-in estimator $\hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} := \Delta_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n, G_n)$. Our main result for the sketched PCA is the following. See Section 7.4 for the proof.

Theorem 2.5 (Inference in Sketched PCA). *Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition 2.2 B, $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P}' , and $(S_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition 2.1 Sym for some $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Then for any $i \in [p]$, we have the following inferential result for the unobserved data eigenvalues $\Lambda_{n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ based on the observed sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$:*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)}}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, for Δ_i from (14) and $\bar{\Delta}_{n,i} := \Delta_i(X_n^\top X_n, G_n)$, for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ with $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^\top \bar{\Delta}_{n,i} c > 0$, we have the following inferential result for the unobserved linear combinations $c^\top v_{n,i}$ of the eigenvector $v_{n,i}$ of $X_n^\top X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\Lambda_{n,i}$, based on the observed eigenvector $\hat{v}_{m,n,i}$ of $X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}$ and the plug-in estimator $\hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} := \Delta_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n, G_n)$:

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (16)$$

In particular, under Condition 2.1 **Sym-1'**, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{(2+\alpha)\tau_{m,n}}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (17)$$

and for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ satisfying $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{\tau_{m,n}}} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2} (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (18)$$

For inference on k -dimensional functionals $C^\top v_{n,i}$, where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k}$ satisfies $\liminf_n \lambda_{\min}(C^\top \bar{\Delta}_{n,i} C) > 0$, we have an almost identical argument that

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (C^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} C)^{-1/2} C^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_k).$$

By leveraging a subsequence argument, we avoid assuming convergence of the data, expanding the applicability of our approach compared to e.g., Lopes et al. (2020). Further, Table 2 summarizes some of the results we obtain in Section 3 for the limiting distributions for sketching in PCA by applying Theorem 2.5.

Table 2: Summary of some of our results for sketching in PCA. For various distributions of sketching matrices, and for any $i \in [p]$, the table shows the asymptotic variances $\sigma^2(T_\lambda)$ of $T_\lambda := \sqrt{m} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i})$ and $\sigma^2(T_{c^\top v})$ of $T_{c^\top v} := \sqrt{m} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k} / (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2 (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i})$. We also show Condition \mathfrak{P} used in Condition 2.1 for which we prove Theorem 2.5. We recall that $\gamma_n = m/n$. See Section 3 for the details.

Sketching Distribution	$\sigma^2(T_\lambda)$	$\sigma^2(T_{c^\top v})$	Condition \mathfrak{P}
Hadamard	$3(1 - \gamma_n)$	$1 - \gamma_n$	ℓ_∞ -delocalization
CountSketch/SSE	2	1	ℓ_4 -delocalization
i.i.d., $\kappa_{n,4} - 3 = o(1)$	2	1	
Haar	$2(1 - \gamma_n)$	$1 - \gamma_n$	
Uniform subsampling	$(n - m) \sum_{k=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4$	$(1 - \gamma_n) c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c$	See Section 3.3

For completeness, we also provide a result for inference when the data is assumed to be an i.i.d. sample from a statistical model; see Section 7.5 for the proof.

Corollary 2.6 (Inference for eigenvalues of the covariance matrix given an i.i.d. sample). *Let the rows of X_n be sampled i.i.d. from a p -dimensional distribution having finite fourth cumulant with a covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$. Denote $\lambda_i^* := \lambda_i(\Sigma)$ for $i \in [p]$. Under the conditions of Theorem 2.5, if in addition $m \cdot (n\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)})^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, we have for any $i \in [p]$ that*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)}}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \lambda_i^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (19)$$

Similar to the inference in a linear model as in Corollary 2.4, $m \cdot (n\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)})^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ usually reduces to $m/n \rightarrow 0$. Thus, we can use sketching for inference about the population eigenvalues if $m \ll n$. Results for eigenvectors are similar and thus omitted.

3 Inference for Specific Sketching Distributions

We now derive inference results in sketched LS and PCA for a variety of sketching distributions. We start with the Subsampled Randomized Hadamard Transform or SRHT (Ailon and Chazelle, 2006), which is computationally efficient and applies under broad conditions on the data, while being nontrivial to analyze (Section 3.1). We also provide results for the CountSketch (Charikar et al., 2002) and Sparse Sign Embeddings (Achlioptas, 2001), which have similar advantages (Section 3.2). We further analyze sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries (Section 3.4), uniform orthogonal (Haar) sketching (Section 3.5), and uniform sampling (Section 3.3). In these sections, we present the results for PCA first, as they are simpler to state.

We let $\gamma_n = m/n$ and for $i \in [p]$, we denote the i -th row of U_n by $U_{i\cdot}$.

3.1 Subsampled Randomized Hadamard Transform

Hadamard matrices H_t are defined for non-negative integers t inductively, starting with $H_0 = 1$ and letting for all $t \geq 0$,

$$H_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} H_t & H_t \\ H_t & -H_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

When $n = 2^l$ is a power of two, for some non-negative integer l , an $m \times n$, $m \leq n$, subsampled randomized Hadamard transform (SRHT) sketching matrix (Ailon and Chazelle, 2006) is defined as $S_{m,n} = \sqrt{n/m} B H_l D$, where B is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with a success probability of m/n . Furthermore, D is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with i.i.d. ± 1 Rademacher random variables on the diagonal. For other n , one can use the SRHT for the smallest power of two greater than n , and by padding the data with zeroes, see Section 7.1. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that n is a power of two because this does not affect the validity of the conditions specified below. Matrix-vector multiplication via the SRHT can be efficiently performed in $O(n \log n)$ floating-point operations, leveraging the Fast Fourier Transform (Ailon and Chazelle, 2006).

Our results rely on the following conditions, where $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and U_n is the $n \times p$ left singular matrix of X_n for all $n \geq 1$:

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{P} : \|a_n\|_\infty \rightarrow 0, \text{ or } \|\tilde{a}_n\|_\infty \rightarrow 0; \quad (20)$$

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{P}' : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \|U_{i\cdot}\| = 0. \quad (21)$$

Condition \mathfrak{P}' requires that all *leverage scores* tend to zero; which can be interpreted as there being no X_n -outliers. Condition \mathfrak{P} is used implicitly in our inference results, and explicitly in the supporting results (Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4). Moreover, Condition \mathfrak{P}' is used explicitly in our inference results.

PCA. We have the following inferential result for the unobserved data eigenvalues as well as eigenvectors using the observed sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$ and eigenvectors $\hat{v}_{m,n,i} = v_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$, $i \in [p]$.

Theorem 3.1 (Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with SRHT Sketching). *For all $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with SVD $U_n L_n V_n^\top$ satisfying Condition 2.2 B, suppose $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (21). Then as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ with p fixed, such that $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\limsup \gamma_n < 1$, for any $i \in [p]$, we have for the unobserved data eigenvalues $\Lambda_{n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ and the observed sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$ that (2) holds. Further, we have for the unobserved linear combinations $c^\top v_{n,i}$ of the eigenvector $v_{n,i}$ of $X_n^\top X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\Lambda_{n,i}$, and the observed eigenvector $\hat{v}_{m,n,i}$ of $X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}$ that for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1$:*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2} (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (22)$$

LS. The following result shows how to make inferences on least squares parameters based on sketched LS estimators when using SRHT.

Theorem 3.2 (Inference in Least Squares with SRHT Sketching). *Let $(S_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of sub-sampled randomized Hadamard sketching matrices, and let X_n satisfy Condition 2.2 A. Denoting for $i \in [p]$ the i -th row of U_n by U_i , if either*

$$(U_n)_{n \geq 1} \text{ satisfies Condition } \mathfrak{P}' \text{ from (21) \quad or \quad } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{|\varepsilon_{n,i}|}{\|\varepsilon_n\|} = 0, \quad (23)$$

then, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$, and for $\gamma_n = m/n$, $\limsup \gamma_n < 1$, we have for the sketch-and-solve LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ from (1) that

$$(m/(1 - \gamma_n))^{1/2} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^{-1} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p).$$

If either

$$(U_n)_{n \geq 1} \text{ satisfies Condition } \mathfrak{P}' \text{ from (21) \quad or \quad } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{|y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i}|}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|} = 0, \quad (24)$$

then, in the same asymptotic regime, we have for the partial sketching estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ from (1) that

$$(m/(1 - \gamma_n))^{1/2} \left(\|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|^2 \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} + 2\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} \right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p).$$

The second condition in (23) ensures that the normalized residuals are small, which can be viewed as there being no outliers in the outcome vector y_n .

Our result for the sketch-and-solve estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ is related to Theorem 3 (i) of Ahfock et al. (2021). They obtain the asymptotic distribution of the sketched data $S_{m,n} X_n$ for a finite m . In contrast, we focus on the case where the sketch size m tends to infinity, which leads to the additional $1 - \gamma_n$ factor in the variance. In contrast to the work by Ahfock et al. (2021), our approach allows for X_n -outliers, as long as there are no y_n -outliers. Moreover, we only require a bounded condition number for X_n , while their results require certain convergence conditions on X_n and y_n .

CLT. The following lemmas play a fundamental role in the proofs of the above theorems by specifying the boundedness and asymptotic normality of quadratic forms in Condition 2.1 for SRHT sketching. We show that normality holds if Condition \mathfrak{P} is satisfied, but does not need to hold otherwise.

Lemma 3.3 (Bounded Quadratic Forms for SRHT Sketching). *For any sequences of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) = O_P(1).$$

The next lemmas establish the normality of quadratic forms arising in SRHT. In the proof, finding the asymptotic variances requires intricate and novel calculations, using a dyadic representation for the Hadamard matrix elements.

Lemma 3.4 (Limiting Distributions of One-dimensional Quadratic Forms for SRHT Sketching). *For any sequences of vectors $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$, $(\tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying Condition \mathfrak{P} defined in (20) such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, if $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\limsup m/n < 1$, as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + 2(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (25)$$

Moreover, if Condition \mathfrak{P} fails, $\sqrt{m} a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n$ does not need to be asymptotically normal even if m/n converges.

Lemma 3.5 (Asymptotic Normality of Symmetric Quadratic Form for SRHT Sketching). *If $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , and $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\limsup m/n < 1$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, then for the $p^2 \times p^2$ rank-one-positive definite matrix $G = I_{p^2} + P_p + Q_p$,*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, G).$$

3.2 Sparse Sign Embeddings and CountSketch

Sparse Sign Embeddings are a type of sparse dimension reduction maps (e.g., Achlioptas, 2001; Meng and Mahoney, 2013, etc). For a given sparsity $\zeta_m > 0$, a sparse sign embedding is a random matrix of the form $S_{m,n} = (R_{m,1}, \dots, R_{m,n})$, where for all $i \in [n]$, $R_{m,i}$ are i.i.d. uniformly distributed on the set of n -vectors with ζ_m nonzero elements equal to $\pm 1/\sqrt{\zeta_m}$, i.e., $\{f/\sqrt{\zeta_m} \in \mathbb{R}^m : f_1, \dots, f_m \in \{\pm 1, 0\} \text{ and } \|e\|^2 = \zeta_m\}$. Due to their tunable sparsity, sparse sign embeddings allow the user to control the computational cost of sketching, see Section 4. Recently, they have been suggested as a ‘‘sensible default’’ sketching method (Epperly, 2023). For $\zeta_m = 1$, sparse sign embeddings are also known as CountSketch (Charikar et al., 2002), or Clarkson-Woodruff sketches (Clarkson and Woodruff, 2017).

Our results rely on the following conditions, where $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and U_n is the $n \times p$ left singular matrix of X_n for all $n \geq 1$:

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{P} : (\sqrt{m}/\zeta_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^4 \rightarrow 0, \text{ and } (\sqrt{m}/\zeta_m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4 \rightarrow 0; \quad (26)$$

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{P}' : (\sqrt{m}/\zeta_m) \cdot \|\text{vec}(U_n)\|_4^4 \rightarrow 0. \quad (27)$$

As before, these will be used explicitly or implicitly in our results. Further, in this section, we use $\sum_{i \neq j}$ to abbreviate the summation over $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ subject to $i \neq j$.

PCA. We have the following result on inference for eigenvalues and eigenvectors with sparse sign embeddings. This result allows the per-column sparsity ζ_m to be $o(\sqrt{m})$; which in particular includes the CountSketch.

Theorem 3.6 (Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with Sparse Sign Embeddings). *For $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying Condition 2.2 B, suppose $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , let $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, and suppose the sparsity satisfies $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$. Then we have for the unobserved data eigenvalues $\Lambda_{n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ and the observed sketched eigenvalues $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} = \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n)$ that*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{2}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Further, we have for the unobserved linear combinations $c^\top v_{n,i}$ of the eigenvector $v_{n,i}$ of $X_n^\top X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\Lambda_{n,i}$, and the observed eigenvector $\hat{v}_{m,n,i}$ of $X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n$ associated with the eigenvalue $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}$ that for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ satisfying $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1$,

$$\sqrt{m} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2} (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

LS. We also have the following result for inference about the least squares parameters based on sketch-and-solve with sparse sign embeddings.

Theorem 3.7 (Inference in Least Squares with Sparse Sign Embeddings). *Suppose X_n satisfies Condition 2.2 A, $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, and $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$. If*

$$(U_n)_{n \geq 1} \text{ satisfies Condition } \mathfrak{P}' \text{ from (27) and } (\sqrt{m}/\zeta_m) \cdot \frac{\|\varepsilon_n\|_4^4}{\|\varepsilon_n\|^4} \rightarrow 0, \quad (28)$$

then for the sketch-and-solve LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ from (1), we have with $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} = \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^2 \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1}$ that $\sqrt{m} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Similarly, if

$$(U_n)_{n \geq 1} \text{ satisfies Condition } \mathfrak{P}' \text{ from (27) and } (\sqrt{m}/\zeta_m) \cdot \frac{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|_4^4}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^4} \rightarrow 0, \quad (29)$$

then for the sketch-and-solve LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ from (1) we have with $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} = \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} + \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top}$ that $\sqrt{m} (\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)})^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

CLT. The inference results mentioned above are based on the following central limit theorems for quadratic forms from Condition 2.1 for Sparse Sign Embeddings. First, we have a result on one-dimensional quadratic forms.

Lemma 3.8 (Limiting Distributions of One-dimensional Quadratic Forms for Sparse Sign Embeddings). *For a fixed n , and any sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$, $(\tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, if Condition \mathfrak{P} from (26) holds as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$, then we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (30)$$

This lemma represents a novel result about CountSketch and Sparse Sign Embeddings. Our proof treats the quadratic forms as degenerate U-statistics and uses the martingale central limit theorem. We next have a result on vectorized symmetric quadratic forms.

Lemma 3.9 (Asymptotic Normality of Symmetric Quadratic Form for Sparse Signed Embeddings). *If as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (27) while $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\sqrt{m} \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_{p^2} + P_p). \quad (31)$$

3.3 Uniform Random Sampling

We assume $S_{m,n} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{m}} \bar{B}_n$, where $\bar{B}_n = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_n)$ with i.i.d. $B_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\gamma_n)$, $\gamma_n = m/n$ for all $i \in [n]$. Thus, \bar{B}_n represents a uniform random subsampling procedure. Our results rely on the following conditions, where $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, $u_{n,i}, i \in [n]$ are the rows of the $n \times p$ left singular matrix U_n of X_n , and $G_n := n \sum_{i=1}^n (u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top) \otimes (u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top)$:

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{p} : \text{for some } 0 < c < C, c \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \leq C; \quad \text{Condition } \mathfrak{P} : \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2} \rightarrow 0; \quad (32)$$

$$\text{Condition } \mathfrak{P}' : \text{for some } 0 < c < C, c I_{p(p+1)/2} \preceq D_p^\top G_n D_p \preceq C I_{p(p+1)/2}; \quad (33)$$

$$\text{for all upper triangular } \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} (u_{n,i}^\top \Phi u_{n,i})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (u_{n,i}^\top \Phi u_{n,i})^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Again, these results appear explicitly in our asymptotic normality results, and sometimes only implicitly in our inference results.

PCA. If the data X_n has very heterogeneous rows, then subsampling can introduce a great deal of variability in the resulting estimates. Therefore, obtaining inference and asymptotic normality requires stronger delocalization conditions on U_n , and leads to an asymptotic variance of a delicate form.

Theorem 3.10 (Asymptotic Normality and Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with Subsampling). *Suppose $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.2 B, $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , and $(S_{m,n})_{m,n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.1 Sym. Then we have for any $i \in [p]$ that*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{(1 - \gamma_n) \cdot n \sum_{k=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (34)$$

Let $\tilde{X}_{m,n} = \tilde{U}_{m,n} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n} \hat{V}_{m,n}^\top$ be the SVD of $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$. If $\liminf \gamma_n > 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_n) \cdot m \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{U}_{ji}^4}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (35)$$

For Δ_i defined in (14), and any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ satisfying $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > 0$,

$$\sqrt{m/(1 - \gamma_n)} (c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

LS. Additionally, we have the following theorem for inference about the least squares parameters based on uniform subsampling.

Theorem 3.11 (Inference in Least Squares with Uniform Random Sampling). *Let p be fixed and $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ with $0 < \liminf m/n \leq \limsup m/n < 1$. Suppose that X_n satisfies Condition 2.2 A, and $\|\text{vec}(U_n)\|_\infty = O(1/\sqrt{n})$. Also, suppose there exist some constants $0 < c < C$ such that*

$$cI_p \preceq nU_n^\top \text{diag} \left(\frac{|\varepsilon_n|}{\|\varepsilon_n\|} \odot \frac{|\varepsilon_n|}{\|\varepsilon_n\|} \right) U_n \preceq CI_p. \quad (36)$$

For

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} = m(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} \odot \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}) \tilde{X}_{m,n} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1}.$$

we have $m^{1/2}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Furthermore, assume there exist $0 < c < C$ such that

$$cI_p \preceq nU_n^\top \text{diag} \left(\frac{|y_n - \varepsilon_n|}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|} \odot \frac{|y_n - \varepsilon_n|}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|} \right) U_n \preceq CI_p. \quad (37)$$

Then with

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(\mathfrak{p})} = m(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag} \left((\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(\mathfrak{p})}) \odot (\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(\mathfrak{p})}) \right) \tilde{X}_{m,n} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1},$$

we have $m^{1/2}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(\mathfrak{p})})^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(\mathfrak{p})} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

In fact, (36) holds if there are constants $0 < c < C$ such that $c/\sqrt{n} \leq \min_{i \in [n]} |\varepsilon_{n,i}|/\|\varepsilon_n\|$ and $\max_{i \in [n]} |\varepsilon_{n,i}|/\|\varepsilon_n\| \leq C/\sqrt{n}$, and similarly (37) holds if $c/\sqrt{n} \leq \min_{i \in [n]} |y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i}|/\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|$ and $\max_{i \in [n]} |y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i}|/\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\| \leq C/\sqrt{n}$.

CLT. The following lemmas play a significant role in the proofs of the above theorems by establishing the limiting behavior from Condition 2.1 for uniform subsampling.

Lemma 3.12 (Boundedness and Asymptotic Normality of Quadratic Forms for Uniform Random Sampling). *For any sequences of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$ satisfying Condition \mathfrak{p} from (32), we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) = O_P(1). \quad (38)$$

Further, if Condition \mathfrak{P} from (32) holds, then

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (39)$$

Moreover, there exist sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of unit norm vectors with $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that do not satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P} , such that $\sqrt{m} a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n$ is not asymptotically normal.

Lemma 3.13 (Asymptotic Normality of Symmetric Quadratic Form for Uniform Random Sampling). *If U_n satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (33), then we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} (D_p^\top G_n D_p)^{-1/2} D_p^\top \text{vec} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_{p(p+1)/2}).$$

3.4 Sketching Matrices with i.i.d. Entries

We now let $S_{m,n}$ be an $m \times n$ random sketching matrix with i.i.d. entries for all $n \geq 1$. Moreover, we denote the entries of the scaled sketching matrix as $\sqrt{m} S_{m,n} = (T_{ij})_{i \in [m], j \in [n]}$, where $\mathbb{E} T_{ij} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E} T_{ij}^2 = 1$, so that $\mathbb{E} [S_{m,n}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E} [S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n}] = I_n$. Additionally, for some positive δ' , we assume $\mathbb{E} T_{ij}^4 = \kappa_{n,4} > 1 + \delta'$, which excludes distributions whose kurtosis is very close to the theoretical minimum of unity, such as the uniform distribution over $\{-1, 1\}$. See the discussion after Theorem 3.15 for more details. Moreover, for $\delta \geq 0$, we denote the moments $\kappa_{n,4+\delta} := \mathbb{E} T_{ij}^{4+\delta} < +\infty$.

Our results rely on the following conditions, where $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and $u_{n,i}$, $i \in [n]$ are the rows of the $n \times p$ left singular matrix U_n of X_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Condition } \mathfrak{P} : \sup_{n \geq 1} \kappa_{n,4+\delta} < +\infty; \text{ Or } \kappa_{n,4} \rightarrow \infty, \kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)} / \kappa_{n,4} = o(m^{\delta/(4+\delta)}), \\ \text{and for some } 0 < c < C, c \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 \leq C; \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Condition } \mathfrak{P}' : \sup_{n \geq 1} \kappa_{n,4+\delta} < +\infty; \text{ Or } \kappa_{n,4} \rightarrow \infty, \kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)} / \kappa_{n,4} = o(m^{\delta/(4+\delta)}), \\ \text{and there exists } c > 0 \text{ with } c I_{p(p+1)/2} \preceq D_p^\top \sum_{i=1}^n ((u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top) \otimes (u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top)) D_p. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Both conditions can be satisfied *either* if the $4 + \delta$ -th moments $\kappa_{n,4+\delta}$ are uniformly bounded, or if they grow sufficiently slowly, but the data satisfies certain additional regularity conditions. As before, these conditions are used implicitly or explicitly in our results.

PCA. We have the following result for inference in PCA for sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries.

Theorem 3.14 (Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with i.i.d. Sketching). *Consider the SVD of X_n given by $U_n L_n V_n^\top$. Let the entries of the scaled i.i.d. sketching matrix $\sqrt{m} S_{m,n} = (T_{ij})_{i,j}$ satisfy $\mathbb{E} T_{ij} = 0$, $\mathbb{E} T_{ij}^2 = 1$, $\mathbb{E} T_{ij}^4 = \kappa_{n,4} > 1 + \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$, and $\mathbb{E} T_{ij}^{4+\delta} < +\infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Suppose that $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.2 B and $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' . For all $n \geq 1$, define the $p^2 \times p^2$ matrix Γ_n , where $(\Gamma_n)_{(k_1 k_2), (k_3 k_4)} = (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{h=1}^n (U_n)_{hk_1} (U_n)_{hk_2} (U_n)_{hk_3} (U_n)_{hk_4}$ for every $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \in [p]$. Then*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{2 + (\Gamma_n)_{(ii), (ii)}}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1); \quad (42)$$

and letting

$$\hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} = \sum_{k \neq i, l \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \sqrt{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,l}}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,l})} (\delta_{kl} + (\Gamma_n)_{(ij), (kl)}) \hat{v}_{m,n,k} \hat{v}_{m,n,l}^\top,$$

for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p^2-1}$ satisfying $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > 0$, with $\Delta_{n,i} = \Delta_i(X_n^\top X_n, G_n)$ from Section 2.2.2,

$$\sqrt{m} (c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

In (42), the excess kurtosis term Γ_n vanishes if $\kappa_{n,4} = 3$, which holds for Gaussian distributions. In that case (42) depends only on the empirical data. For $\kappa_{n,4} \neq 3$, (42) only leads to inference if $(\Gamma_n)_{(ii), (ii)}$ vanishes, which can be viewed as a delocalization condition on the data. Theorem 3.14 is related to the results of Anderson (1963) for Gaussian sketching matrices and to those of Waternaux (1976). Those results obtain the joint limiting distribution of all eigenvalues, while our results focus on individual eigenvalues but (1) establish inference methods, and (2) broaden the conditions, not requiring the convergence of the data; see Section 7.27 for more discussion.

LS. We consider the problem of inference for β_n based on sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries. The result here is consistent with the special case of Theorem 3.2 in Zhang et al. (2023) for fixed p , but our conclusion holds for a broader class of sketching distributions, only assuming that a $4 + \delta$ -th moment (for any small $\delta > 0$) grows sufficiently slowly, whereas they assume all moments are bounded. In particular, our work allows sparse i.i.d. sketches, which requires the $4 + \delta$ -th moment to grow, whereas Zhang et al. (2023) does not allow this.

Theorem 3.15 (Inference in Least Squares with i.i.d. Sketching). *Let X_n satisfy Condition 2.2 A, let p be fixed and $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Also, let the entries of $S_{m,n}$ be i.i.d. copies of $S_{1,1}/m^{1/2}$, where $S_{1,1}$ has zero mean, unit variance and kurtosis $\kappa_{n,4} = \mathbb{E} S_{1,1}^4 > 1 + \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$. Suppose either that*

(i) for some fixed $\delta > 0$, $\kappa_{n,4+\delta} = \mathbb{E} |S_{1,1}|^{4+\delta}$ satisfies $\sup_{n \geq 1} \kappa_{n,4+\delta} < +\infty$; or

(ii) we have $\kappa_{n,4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\kappa_{n,4}^{4/(4+\delta)}/\kappa_{n,4} = o(m^{\delta/(4+\delta)})$ and also there exist some constants $0 < c < C$ such that

$$cI_p \preceq U_n^\top \text{diag} \left(\frac{|\varepsilon_n|}{\|\varepsilon_n\|} \odot \frac{|\varepsilon_n|}{\|\varepsilon_n\|} \right) U_n \preceq CI_p. \quad (43)$$

With

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} = m(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} \odot \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}) \tilde{X}_{m,n} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1}, \quad (44)$$

we have for the sketch-and-solve LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ from (1) that $m^{1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Furthermore, with

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} = m(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag} \left((\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}) \odot (\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}) \right) \tilde{X}_{m,n} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1},$$

if assuming either (i); or assuming (ii) with

$$cI_p \preceq U_n^\top \text{diag} \left(\frac{|y_n - \varepsilon_n|}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|} \odot \frac{|y_n - \varepsilon_n|}{\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|} \right) U_n \preceq CI_p$$

instead of (43), then we have for the partial sketching LS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ from (1) that $m^{1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)})^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

We know that $\kappa_{n,4} \geq 1$, and the minimum value is achieved for a Radamacher variable. This minimum is excluded from our analysis, because if $\kappa_{n,4} = 1$, some projections of $\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n$ in certain directions may be deterministically zero, allowing us to exactly recover some linear functionals of β_n . Thus, one will need a more complex result to describe the behavior of $\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n$. This can be inferred from equation (90) in the proofs by choosing specific a_n and \tilde{a}_n . For example, when $a_n = \tilde{a}_n = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ or $a_n = (1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and $\tilde{a}_n = (1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2}, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$, the right-hand side of (90) is zero. Since sketches whose entries are i.i.d. Rademacher variables are somewhat rarely used, we leave investigating this phenomenon to future work.

For Gaussian sketching, where $S_{m,n} = m^{-1/2} Z_{m,n}$ and $Z_{m,n}$ contains independent standard Gaussian entries, Theorem 1 of Ahfock et al. (2021) shows that the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ given $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ is normal, with a known mean and covariance matrix. Hence, exact finite-sample statistical inference—conditional on $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ —can be performed. Our result corresponds to taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1, part (ii) of Ahfock et al. (2021), for the marginal distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$, where our m is their k and our $\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 = \|y_n - X_n \beta_n\|^2$ is their RSS_F . An equivalent result for Gaussian sketching also appears in equation (5) of Bartan and Pilanci (2023).

CLT. The previous results are based on the following central limit theorems for quadratic forms from Condition 2.1 for i.i.d. sketching.

Lemma 3.16 (Limiting Distributions of One-dimensional Quadratic Forms for i.i.d. Sketching). *Suppose that the entries of $S_{m,n}$ are i.i.d. copies of $S_{1,1}/m^{1/2}$, where $S_{1,1}$ has zero mean, unit variance, kurtosis $\kappa_{n,4} = \mathbb{E}S_{1,1}^4 > 1 + \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$, and that for some fixed $\delta > 0$, Condition \mathfrak{P} from (40) holds. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Lemma 3.17 (Asymptotic Normality of Symmetric Quadratic Form for i.i.d. Sketching). *Suppose that the entries of $S_{m,n}$ are i.i.d. copies of $S_{1,1}/m^{1/2}$, where $S_{1,1}$ has zero mean, unit variance, kurtosis $\kappa_{n,4} = \mathbb{E}S_{1,1}^4 > 1 + \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$. Let $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P}' . Then for $G_n = I_{p^2} + P_p + \Gamma_n$ with Γ_n from Theorem 3.14, we have*

$$\sqrt{m} (D_p^\top G_n D_p)^{-1/2} D_p^\top \text{vec} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_{p(p+1)/2}).$$

3.5 Uniform Orthogonal Sketching

Now, we let $\gamma_n = m/n$ and introduce a sketching matrix $S_{m,n} = \gamma_n^{-1/2} S_0$, where S_0 is an $m \times n$ matrix drawn from the uniform measure over $m \times n$ partial orthogonal matrices; so that $\mathbb{E}S_{m,n} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} = I_n$. Here, Condition \mathfrak{P} and \mathfrak{P}' do not impose any restriction.

PCA. We have the following result for inference in PCA when using sketching matrices uniformly distributed on the space of all $m \times n$ partial orthogonal matrices.

Theorem 3.18 (Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with Uniform Orthogonal Sketching). *If $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.2 B and $m/n \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, 1)$, then*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{2(1-\gamma_n)}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

and for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ satisfying $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{(1-\gamma_n)}} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2} (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

LS. Theorem 3.19 provides a method to construct confidence regions for β_n for uniform orthogonal sketching. This result is a special case of Theorem 3.8 in Zhang et al. (2023) for fixed p , and is presented only for completeness. Moreover, we also present a shorter proof following our unified framework.

Theorem 3.19 (Inference in Least Squares with Haar Sketching, Zhang et al. (2023)). *Let p be fixed and $m, n - m \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that $\gamma_n^{1/2} S_{m,n}$ is uniformly distributed over the space of all partial $m \times n$ orthogonal matrices. Additionally, we assume that X_n satisfies Condition 2.2 A. For the estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}$ defined as $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} = \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^2 \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1}$, we have $(m/(1-\gamma_n))^{1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Furthermore, for the estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ defined as*

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} = \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \cdot (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{-1} + \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top},$$

we have $(m/(1-\gamma_n))^{1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)})^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

CLT. The results of the inference mentioned earlier are based on the following central limit theorems for quadratic forms arising from Haar sketching matrices.

Lemma 3.20 (Limiting Distributions of One-dimensional Quadratic Forms for Haar Sketching). *For any sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$, $(\tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, as $m, n - m \rightarrow \infty$ we have*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1-\gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{1+(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2}} (a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Lemma 3.21 (Asymptotic Normality of Symmetric Quadratic Form for Haar Sketching). *With the same notation as above and $G = I_{p^2} + P_p$, $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\sqrt{m}(1-\gamma_n)^{-1/2} \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, G).$$

4 Computational Considerations

We now examine the computational complexity of performing statistical inference using various sketching methods for both least squares and PCA. We are considering computation over a single machine, in which case communication cost is not a bottleneck. We perform floating-point operation (flop) count calculations based on standard matrix computation algorithms. For least squares, the original dataset (X_n, y_n) is of size $n \times (p+1)$, while the sketched dataset $(\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n})$ has size $m \times (p+1)$; for PCA, we only have the $n \times p$ matrix X_n and the $m \times p$ matrix $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$.

The computational cost consists of two primary components. The first part involves obtaining the sketched data $(\tilde{X}_{m,n}, \tilde{y}_{m,n})$ for least squares, or only $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ for PCA. The second part involves solving the normal equations for the least squares problem, or the computation of eigenvalues and eigenvectors for $\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n}$. The cost of the second part is $O(mp^2)$, using standard matrix computation methods (Golub and Van Loan, 1989) irrespective of the chosen sketching method. Therefore, we focus on the cost incurred in the initial step of obtaining the sketched data.

Computing $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ using i.i.d. sketching in general consists of multiplying two dense matrices of size $m \times n$ and $n \times p$, and in the worst case takes $O(mnp)$ flops. For uniform orthogonal sketching, a significant part of the computational cost arises from generating the sketching matrix. This is achieved by applying SVD to an $m \times n$ matrix with Gaussian entries and extracting the matrix of its right singular vectors. Since $m < n$, the cost is approximately $O(m^2n)$, which is an upper bound on the cost of obtaining $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$, resulting in an overall complexity of $O(m^2n)$. Hadamard sketching, implemented using the Fast Fourier Transform, incurs a cost of approximately $O(np \log_2 m)$. On the other hand, the cost of the Sparse Sign Embeddings for obtaining $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$ is $O(\zeta_m \text{nnz}(X_n))$, where $\text{nnz}(X_n)$ denotes the number of nonzero elements in X_n , see e.g., Clarkson and Woodruff (2017). These theoretical bounds on the computational cost are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Computational cost of performing sketched LS and PCA using various types of sketching matrices. Here, the sample size is n , the dimension of the data is $p \leq n$, and the sketched sample size is $p \leq m \leq n$; while $\text{nnz}(X_n)$ denotes the number of nonzeros of the matrix X_n .

	i.i.d.	Haar	Hadamard	Sparse Sign Embeddings
LS	$O(mnp)$	$O(m^2n)$	$O(np \log_2 m + mp^2)$	$O(\zeta_m \text{nnz}(X_n) + mp^2)$
PCA	$O(mnp)$	$O(m^2n)$	$O(np \log_2 m + mp^2)$	$O(\zeta_m \text{nnz}(X_n) + mp^2)$

The conclusions of this analysis in general align with the existing common beliefs that Hadamard sketching and Sparse Sign Embeddings are two of the best sketching methods among the ones considered. Their computational complexity is lower than that of the other approaches considered such as i.i.d. and Haar sketching. Moreover, we show in experiments (see Figure 7) that Hadamard sketching can have a better time accuracy trade-off than subsampling methods. However we emphasize that to achieve their full potential, each of these methods requires optimized numerical implementations.

5 Numerical Experiments

We conduct simulations to evaluate and compare various methods on both simulated and empirical data, in terms of both statistical performance and running time (Section 5.1.3). We compare various forms of sketching in Section 5.2. We consider the following three cases for the simulated data:

- Case 1: For both LS and PCA, we generate $X_n = U_n L_n V_n^\top$, where U_n is sampled uniformly from the set of $n \times p$ partial orthogonal matrices, V_n^\top is sampled uniformly from the set of $p \times p$ orthogonal matrices, and $L_n = \text{diag}(1, 1/2, \dots, 1/p)$. Additionally, for LS we generate $y_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with i.i.d. Uniform $(0, 1)$ entries.
- Case 2: As Lopes et al. (2018) in a slightly different setting, we let A_n be an $n \times p$ matrix with i.i.d. rows distributed according to the multivariate t-distribution $t_2(0, C)$ where $C = (c_{ij}) = (2 \cdot 0.5^{|i-j|})$. Let U_n be the left singular matrix of A_n . We construct L_n with entries equally spaced in the interval $[0.1, 1]$ and generate V_n^\top as the right singular matrix of a matrix with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries. Finally, we set $X_n = U_n L_n V_n^\top$ for both LS and PCA. To generate y_n in LS, we set $b = (1_{0.2p}, t1_{0.6p}, 1_{0.2p})^\top$ with $t = 0.1$, ensuring that $0.2p$ is an integer. Moreover, we generate $\mathcal{E}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with i.i.d. normal entries having a standard deviation of 0.01, and then let $y_n = X_n b + \mathcal{E}_n$.
- Case 3: For both LS and PCA, we let X_n be an $n \times p$ Gaussian random matrix such that for all $j \in [p]$, $(X_n)_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ when $i \leq n/2$, and $(X_n)_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(5, 1)$ otherwise. After that, we standardize each column to have zero mean and unit variance. For linear regression, we also generate $y_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with i.i.d. Uniform $(0, 1)$ entries.

In Case 1, the left singular matrix meets all delocalization conditions required by our results, due to the isotropy of the normal distribution. The design in Case 2 may not satisfy the delocalization conditions required for Hadamard sketching and CountSketch. This case illustrates that those conditions are in fact needed for asymptotic normality. The delocalization is governed by the distribution from which the rows are drawn. If we sample each row from a heavy-tailed distribution, we expect that more outliers—observations




Figure 3: Coverage of nominal 95% intervals, along with 95% Clopper-Pearson intervals for the coverage, for λ_k , $c^\top v_k$, and the first coordinates of two least squares solutions in Case 1, with $p = 15$, $n = 2048$, and 500 Monte Carlo trials for each setting.

with a large norm—may be present in the matrix. Consequently, the singular vectors are more likely to be localized. Simulations with several degrees of freedom for the t -distributions and with several covariance matrices show that our formulas are more accurate for larger degrees of freedom. For a given degree of freedom, our formulas have roughly the same level of accuracy for various covariance matrices.

In Case 3, before normalization, X_n has one spiked singular value of order \sqrt{n} and $p - 1$ singular values of order \sqrt{n} . The relative eigengap condition holds for the first singular value.

5.1 Inference from Sketch-and-Solve Estimators

We perform experiments to compare several sketching methods discussed in the paper.

5.1.1 Simulated Data

In this section, we compare the performance of various sketching methods for statistical inference in least squares and PCA. We generate simulated data with $n = 2,048$ and $p = 15$ for each of the cases. To evaluate the methods, we generate 500 independent sketches for each value of m ranging from 200 to 1600 with gaps of 200. We use three sketching methods: i.i.d. sketching, Hadamard sketching, and CountSketch. We note that SSE is very similar to CountSketch, both in theory and in our experiments, therefore we focus on CountSketch in the experiments.

For Case 1, Figure 3 presents the coverage of 95% intervals for the first coordinate of β_n , the largest eigenvalue and the first coordinate of the corresponding eigenvector of $X_n^\top X_n$, while Figure 8 shows the results for the second largest eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenvector. These figures also show a 95% Clopper-Pearson interval for the coverage. All methods under consideration exhibit coverage probabilities close to the nominal level of 0.95. For other cases, we show the corresponding simulation results in Figure 8; we sometimes observe some undercoverage for small m .

5.1.2 Empirical Data Example

An empirical illustration of sketched least squares, we consider the New York flights (nycflights13) dataset (Wickham, 2018). This has 60,448 observations and 21 features, with the response being the arrival delay. We show coverage results for the least squares solution in Figure 9. We observe that all methods have coverage close to the nominal level.

To illustrate sketch-and-solve PCA, we use the Human Genome Diversity Project (HGDP) dataset, previously analyzed in studies such as Cann et al. (2002); Li et al. (2008). We use the Centre d’Etude du Polymorphisme Humain panel, which contains Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP) data for 1,043 observations, representing 51 populations from Africa, Europe, Asia, Oceania, and the Americas. Focusing




Figure 4: Variances of $\sqrt{m}\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}$ and $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k}$, and logarithm of variances of $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ and $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ for Case 1, using $p = 15$, $n = 2048$, $k = 1$, and $c = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$. Here “iid_theory” is obtained from Theorem 7.8 and Theorem 3.15, “hadamard_theory” from Theorem 3.1 and Section 3.1, “CountSketch_theory” from Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.7, corresponding to least squares and PCA, respectively.

on the SNPs located on chromosome 22, we create the data matrix X_n by selecting the first 20 features. In this $n \times p$ matrix, X_{ij} represents the count of the minor allele of SNP j in the genome of individual i and takes values in $\{0, 1, 2\}$. To preprocess the data, we perform SNP-wise standardization by centering each SNP using its mean and scaling by its standard error. Subsequently, we impute the missing values as zeros, as in Dobriban and Owen (2019). Figures 8 and 10 shows the coverage results as well as the asymptotic variances for different sketching methods based on the HGDP dataset. We observe that the coverage probability of the considered methods is close to the nominal level.

We also perform sketch-and-solve PCA using the Million Song Dataset (MSD, Bertin-Mahieux et al. (2011)), as an example of a larger dataset, with $n = 515,344$ and $p = 90$. The analysis takes about two days on a personal computer. We present coverage results for the first singular value and its corresponding right singular vector in Figure 9, showing that the Clopper-Pearson intervals for the coverage of all approaches are centered near the nominal level.

5.1.3 Running Time

To empirically analyze the running time of our methods, we conduct experiments with various types of sketching methods for PCA in Cases 1 and 3. We choose m ranging from 200 to 1600 in increments of 200. For a fixed value of m , we repeat the experiment process 500 times.

From the results in Figure 6, Table 4 and 5, CountSketch is the fastest method, while sparse sign embeddings with $\zeta_m > 1$ are slower but still perform very well. In terms of computational cost, SRHT is slower than CountSketch and sparse sign embeddings. Sketching matrices with i.i.d. entries are slower, and Haar sketching matrices are the slowest. The results from Figure 6 qualitatively align with our theoretical analysis of computational complexity from Section 4. We emphasize that specific wall clock times depend on the numerical implementation used, and our experiments should be viewed as giving only a rough idea of the relative performance of the various methods.

We also analyze a larger data set in Case 1, with $n = 2^{21}$, $p = 100$, and $k = 1$. This leads to a dataset that is large enough to be somewhat challenging to be analyzed on a PC, but still realistic to occur in applications. We use SRHT as the primary sketching method for PCA. We vary the value of the sketch size m from 5,000 to 75,000 with increments of 10,000. The coverage and computation time results are presented in Figure 5. Our solution achieves the target coverage even when the sketch dimension is small. Additionally, as the sketch size increases, the computational time required for SRHT sketched PCA grows slowly, but remains significantly lower than that of PCA on the full data. At the same time, as the sketching dimension increases, the length of the confidence intervals for the SRHT sketched solution decreases, as expected. Here the values of the target parameters of interest are $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $c^\top v_1 = 0.087$; hence the confidence intervals are short and




Figure 5: The first two subfigures show the coverage of nominal 95% intervals, along with 95% Clopper-Pearson intervals for the coverage, for λ_1 and $c^\top v_1$ as a function of the sketch size m ; see Section 5.1.3. The results cover Case 1, with $p = 100, n = 2^{21}$, and 500 Monte Carlo trials. The third subfigure displays the computational time for the SRHT sketched PCA (red dashed line) and the original PCA solution (black solid line). The fourth subfigure shows the length of the confidence intervals of SRHT sketched eigenvalues (blue solid line) and eigenvectors (green dashed line).

informative. These experiments show the trade-off between statistical accuracy and computational costs.




Figure 6: Computational cost experiment in Case 1 with $p = 15, n = 2048$, where m ranges from 200 to 1600 in increments of 200. For each sketching method, 500 simulations are conducted, and the mean time of a single step is calculated and plotted. Standard errors over 500 simulations are shown. Here we use Sparse Sign Embeddings with $\zeta_m = 8$.

Table 4: Computational cost (in seconds) of the experiments for Case 1 with 500 simulations, $p = 15, n = 2048$.

m	200	400	600	800	1000	1200	1400	1600
i.i.d. Gaussian Sketching	4.54	8.13	11.96	15.73	19.52	23.28	27.27	31.31
SRHT Sketching	2.18	2.08	2.06	2.26	2.52	2.25	2.14	2.19
CountSketch	0.32	0.30	0.33	0.38	0.39	0.46	0.48	0.51
SSE, $\zeta_m = 8$	0.67	0.71	0.72	0.83	0.85	0.84	0.90	0.96

5.2 Comparison of Various Forms of Sketching

We proceed to compare the asymptotic variances across various sketching methods. Figures 4 and 10 compare various sketching methods in principal component analysis with respect to the ratio m/n of the sketch size

Table 5: Computational costs (in seconds) of the experiments for Case 3, using the same protocol as in Section 5.1.3.

m	200	400	600	800	1000	1200	1400	1600
i.i.d. Gaussian Sketching	4.48	8.22	12.13	16.31	19.93	24.78	29.98	33.26
SRHT Sketching	2.23	2.08	2.23	2.22	3.07	2.41	2.74	2.43
CountSketch	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.49	0.51	0.55	0.59	0.67
SSE, $\zeta_m = 8$	0.85	0.76	1.04	1.14	1.23	1.19	1.24	1.25

to the sample size. These figures display the variance of $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}$ for simulated data in Cases 1, 2, and 3, respectively, where $n = 2048$, $p = 10$, and 500 replications are considered for each m .

The asymptotic variances of i.i.d. sketching estimators for least squares are provided in equations (83) and (84) for the sketch-and-solve and partial sketching cases, respectively. Similarly, for PCA, the theoretical results can be derived from Table 2. Notably, the asymptotic properties of CountSketch closely resemble those of i.i.d. Gaussian sketching, denoted as “iid_cs.theory”. Furthermore, we use “hadamard.theory” to denote the asymptotic results for SRHT sketching.

For sketch-and-solve least squares in Case 1, when the signal-to-noise ratio R_n^2 approaches zero, partial sketching estimators have smaller variances than sketch-and-solve estimators, see Figure 4. This finding aligns with the comparison of the relative efficiency of complete and partial sketching from Ahfock et al. (2021). The empirical variances closely approximate the theoretical asymptotic variances.

In Case 1 for PCA, the eigengap is large for all $k \in [p]$, ensuring that the variances are close to the predicted values, see Figure 4. We also observe good performance in other cases, see Figure 10. Furthermore, when employing Hadamard sketching, the variances of both $\sqrt{m}\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}$ and $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k}$ show a linear decrease in m , and tend to zero when m approaches n . In contrast, there is no significant decreasing trend in the asymptotic variance of i.i.d. sketching and CountSketch when p remains fixed. Instead, these variances remain relatively stable as m increases. These observations are consistent with the theoretical results summarized in Table 2.

5.2.1 Comparison with Optimal Subsampling

We also compare our sketched least squares methods with the optimal subsampling algorithm from Yu et al. (2022). Their Algorithm 2 involves three steps. First, a pilot subsample of r_0 datapoints is chosen uniformly, and is used to form a rough estimate of the parameter. Then, this estimate is used to further estimate the optimal subsample weights, and the new datapoints are added by weighted subsampling. The final subset is used to solve the maximum likelihood equation and obtain the final estimate.

We compare the asymptotic MSE of the least squares solutions in Figure 7. We focus on Hadamard sketching due to the availability of an efficient implementation in the same language—R—for which the implementation of the methods from Yu et al. (2022) are available.

For Case 2, all subsampling methods are less accurate than Hadamard sketching. This shows the benefits of using sketching-type methods beyond subsampling. In Case 2, where the data matrices differ significantly from i.i.d. models, subsampling methods tend to be less stable. On the other hand, sketching methods like Hadamard sketching mix the data before subsampling, which helps mitigate the impact of “outlier” data points. Figure 7 shows that Hadamard sketching achieves the “empirical Pareto frontier”, which means that among the methods compared, empirically Hadamard sketching has the best tradeoff in balancing computational cost and statistical accuracy.

6 Summary

In this work, we propose a unified methodology for statistical inference in sketched PCA and LS built on the asymptotic normality of quadratic forms. This relies on finding the limiting distribution of quadratic forms of the output of several sketching algorithms. We find novel asymptotic distributions of quadratic forms for Sparse Sign Embeddings and SRHT sketching. For i.i.d. sketching matrices, we significantly expand the conditions on the data under which the results apply compared to prior works such as Zhang et al. (2023).




Figure 7: Comparison of subsampling methods for Case 2, using $p = 25$, $n = 4096$ with 2000 Monte Carlo trials for each setting. Here “optsubsamp_800” is the optimal subsampling method from Algorithm 2 in Yu et al. (2022) with pilot subsample size $r_0 = 800$, while “optsubsamp_1200” and “optsubsamp_1400” refer to the same algorithm using $r_0 = 1200$ and $r_0 = 1400$.

We also perform simulations to evaluate and compare our methods on both simulated and empirical data. Our simulations show that in certain scenarios, SRHT sketching achieves a better computation-accuracy tradeoff compared to subsampling-type methods.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the NSF, the ONR, and the Sloan Foundation.

7 Appendix

7.1 Technical Reminders

Additional notation. We use $\sum_{i < j}$ and $\sum_{i \neq j}$ to abbreviate the summation over $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ subject to $i < j$ and $i \neq j$, respectively. Also, we define $\mathbf{1}_m = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^m$ be the canonical orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^m . We will sometimes denote the Euclidean inner product by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Denote by $A =_d B$ that two random vectors A, B have the same distribution.

For any positive integer $p \geq 1$, we denote the probability distribution of a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by $L(X)$. Since the space of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^p is metrizable, there is a metric d_p on this space, such that for a sequence of random vectors $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and a random vector X , the weak convergence $X_n \Rightarrow X$ is equivalent to $d_p(L(X_n), L(X)) \rightarrow 0$.

Tensor Operations. Next, recall that for any matrices A, B and C of conformable sizes, we have that $\text{vec}(ABC) = (C^\top \otimes A)\text{vec}(B)$; see for example Theorem 2.4.2 in Magnus and Neudecker (2019). Additionally, for two vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have that

$$b \otimes a = (b \otimes I_p)a, \quad (45)$$

as well as $b \otimes a = \text{vec}(ab^\top)$. Further, for the matrix P_p from Definition 1.5, representing matrix transposition in the vectorized matrix space,

$$(a \otimes b)^\top P_p(c \otimes d) = (a \otimes b)^\top (d \otimes c) = (a^\top d)(b^\top c). \quad (46)$$

In particular, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $((a \otimes I_p)^\top P_p(a \otimes I_p))_{ij} = (a \otimes e_i)^\top P_p(a \otimes e_j) = (a^\top e_i)(a^\top e_j) = e_i^\top a a^\top e_j = (a a^\top)_{ij}$, for all $i, j \in [p]$, so

$$(a \otimes I_p)^\top P_p(a \otimes I_p) = a a^\top. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, for the matrix $Q_p = \text{vec}(I_p)\text{vec}(I_p)^\top$ from Definition 1.5, we have $(Q_p)_{ij,kl} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{kl}$. Thus, for all $p \times p$ matrices Φ, Ψ , we have

$$\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top Q_p \text{vec}(\Psi) = \sum_{(ij),(kl)} \Phi_{ij} \Psi_{kl} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} = \sum_{i,k} \Phi_{ii} \Psi_{kk} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \Phi_{ii} \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \Psi_{kk} \right) = (\text{tr } \Phi)(\text{tr } \Psi). \quad (48)$$

Thus, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $((a \otimes I_p)^\top Q_p (a \otimes I_p))_{ij} = (a \otimes e_i)^\top Q_p (a \otimes e_j) = (a^\top e_i)(a^\top e_j) = e_i^\top a a^\top e_j = (a a^\top)_{ij}$, for all $i, j \in [p]$, so

$$(a \otimes I_p)^\top Q_p (a \otimes I_p) = a a^\top. \quad (49)$$

Subsampled randomized Hadamard transform (SRHT). For a positive integer n , we let $l = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ and $n' := 2^l \geq n$. An SRHT sketching matrix (Ailon and Chazelle, 2006) can be expressed as $S_{m,n} = \sqrt{n'/m} B H_l D \Pi_n$, where B is an $n' \times n'$ diagonal matrix with i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with a success probability of m/n' .

Furthermore, D is an $n' \times n'$ diagonal matrix with i.i.d. ± 1 Rademacher random variables on the diagonal. Finally, Π_n is an $n' \times n$ with $\Pi_n^\top = [I_n, 0_{n'-n,n}]^\top$, where $0_{n'-n,n}$ is a $(n' - n) \times n$ zero matrix.

7.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Sketch-and-solve

We first present the proof for $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$. Condition 2.1 Bounded implies that for any sequence of nonzero vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of unit norm satisfying Condition \mathfrak{B} , $|a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n| = O_P(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}/\sqrt{m})$. By assumption, for any $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ for all n , $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{B} . Therefore, taking $a_n = U_n b_n$ and $\tilde{a}_n = \bar{\varepsilon}_n$, and noticing that $\|U_n b_n\|^2 = b_n^\top U_n^\top U_n b_n = b_n^\top b_n = 1$ and $\|\bar{\varepsilon}_n\| = 1$, we find that

$$|b_n^\top (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) b_n| = O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad |b_n^\top U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{\varepsilon}_n| = O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}}\right).$$

Therefore, since p is fixed, for any small $\varepsilon > 0$, we can take a union bound over b_n in a fixed ε -cover of $\mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ to conclude that

$$\|U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p\| = O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}}\right), \quad \|U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{\varepsilon}_n\| = O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}}\right). \quad (50)$$

Using that $\tau_{m,n}/m \rightarrow 0$, it follows that $\|(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} - I_p\| = O_P(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2}/\sqrt{m})$. From equation (3), we have that

$$\hat{\beta}_{m,n} = \beta_n + \|\varepsilon_n\| \cdot V_n L_n^{-1} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{\varepsilon}_n. \quad (51)$$

Therefore, from (50), for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $X_n^{\dagger\top} c \neq 0$, using also that $U_n^\top U_{n,\perp} = 0$ so that $U_n^\top \bar{\varepsilon}_n = 0$, and that $X_n^{\dagger\top} = U_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top$, we have that if $\varepsilon_n \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\varepsilon_n\|^{-1} \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \\ &= \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} [(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} - I_p] U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{\varepsilon}_n + \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{\varepsilon}_n \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}}{m}\right) + \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \bar{\varepsilon}_n + \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top \bar{\varepsilon}_n \\ &= \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \bar{\varepsilon}_n + O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}}{m}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

We will use this approximation to study the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$. The distribution of the first term of the last line of (52) can be studied via Condition 2.1 1-dim. In that condition, taking $a_n = U_n b_n$ and $\tilde{a}_n = \bar{\varepsilon}_n$ for every $n \geq 1$, where $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$, we find that with M_n defined in (4),

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (b_n^\top M_n b_n)^{-1/2} b_n^\top U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \bar{\varepsilon}_n \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Since $X_n^{\dagger\top} = U_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top$, by taking $b_n = L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c / \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\| \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ and cancelling out $\|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|$, we can rewrite this as

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} M_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c)^{-1/2} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \bar{\varepsilon}_n \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (53)$$

Noting that $L_n^{-1} = \text{diag}(\ell_{n,1}^{-1}, \dots, \ell_{n,p}^{-1})$, with $0 < \ell_{n,1}^{-1} \leq \dots \leq \ell_{n,p}^{-1}$, let

$$T_n := \frac{V_n L_n^{-1} M_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top}{\|L_n^{-2}\|} \text{ and } W_n := m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} T_n^{-1/2} \|\varepsilon_n\|^{-1} \|L_n^{-1}\|^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n).$$

where recall that $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm. Then, recalling the metric d_p metrizing weak convergence from Section 7.1, by simple algebra our desired claim (7) amounts to $d_p(L(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)) \rightarrow 0$.

We will prove this by a subsequence argument. First, we argue that we can find a compact set $B \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, $T_n \in B$. To see this, first, we have $\|T_n\| \leq \|M_n\|$; also, $\lambda_{\min}(T_n) \geq \lambda_{\min}(L_n^{-1})^2 \cdot \lambda_{\min}(M_n) / \|L_n^{-2}\| = \ell_{n,p}^2 / \ell_{n,1}^2 \lambda_{\min}(M_n)$. Since by Condition 2.1 **1-dim**, for all $n \geq 1$, $a^\top M_n a = \sigma_n^2(U_n a, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)$ are bounded uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity for any $a \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$, the spectra of all $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity, and thus using that $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.2 **A**, so are the the spectra of all $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$. This shows that there is a compact set $B \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, $T_n \in B$.

Next, we continue with the subsequence argument. Consider any subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of \mathbb{N} . Since $T_{n_k} \in B$ for all $k \geq 1$ and B is bounded, there exists a further sub-subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that $T_{n'_k} \rightarrow T$, for some $T \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$. We denote by $(m'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ the sequence of sketch sizes associated with $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Using that $(c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} M_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c)^{1/2} = \|T_n^{1/2} c\| \cdot \|L_n^{-1}\|$, it follows from (53) that

$$(m'_k)^{1/2} \tau_{m'_k, n'_k}^{-1/2} \|L_{n'_k}^{-1}\|^{-1} c^\top V_{n'_k} L_{n'_k}^{-1} U_{n'_k}^\top (S_{m'_k, n'_k}^\top S_{m'_k, n'_k} - I_{n'_k}) \bar{\varepsilon}_{n'_k} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c^\top T c).$$

Then, by (52), since $\|X_{n'_k}^{\dagger\top} c\| / \|L_{n'_k}^{-1}\| = O(1)$ and $\tau_{m,n}/m \rightarrow 0$, it follows that

$$(m'_k)^{1/2} \tau_{m'_k, n'_k}^{-1/2} \|\varepsilon_{n'_k}\|^{-1} \|L_{n'_k}^{-1}\|^{-1} c^\top \left(\hat{\beta}_{m'_k, n'_k}^{(s)} - \beta_{n'_k} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c^\top T c).$$

Using the Cramer-Wold device, we conclude that

$$(m'_k)^{1/2} \tau_{m'_k, n'_k}^{-1/2} \|\varepsilon_{n'_k}\|^{-1} \|L_{n'_k}^{-1}\|^{-1} \left(\hat{\beta}_{m'_k, n'_k}^{(s)} - \beta_{n'_k} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, T).$$

Consequently, using again that $T_{n'_k} \rightarrow T$, $d_p(L(W_{n'_k}), \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)) \rightarrow 0$ holds along the subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Thus, for any subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$, there exists a further sub-subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$, such that the distance $d_p(L(W_{n'_k}), \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)) \rightarrow 0$. Thus, $d_p(L(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, I_p))$ tends to zero, finishing the proof of (7).

Partial sketching

Continuing with partial sketching, if $X_n \beta_n \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} &= V_n L_n^{-1} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} U_n^\top y_n \\ &= \beta_n + \|X_n \beta_n\| \cdot V_n L_n^{-1} [(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n)^{-1} - I_p] \overline{X_n \beta_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Thus, using (50), we have for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $X_n^{\dagger\top} c \neq 0$ that

$$\|X_n \beta_n\|^{-1} \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) = -\|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|^{-1} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \overline{X_n \beta_n} + O_P\left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}}{m}\right). \quad (55)$$

Due to Condition 2.1 **1-dim**, for $a_n = U_n b_n$ and $\tilde{a}_n = \overline{X_n \beta_n}$, for every $n \geq 1$, where $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$, we have

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (b_n^\top M_n^{(p)} b_n)^{-1/2} b_n^\top U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \overline{X_n \beta_n} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $M_n^{(p)}$ is defined in (4). Choosing $b_n = L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c / \|X_n^{\dagger\top} c\|$, it follows that

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} M_n^{(p)} L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c \right)^{-1/2} c^\top V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top (S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} - I_n) \overline{X_n \beta_n} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Similar to the proof for sketch-and-solve least squares above, we define $T'_n := V_n L_n^{-1} M_n^{(p)} L_n^{-1} V_n^\top / \|L_n^{-2}\|$, $W'_n := m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \cdot (T'_n)^{-1/2} \|X_n \beta_n\|^{-1} \|L_n^{-1}\|^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n)$, and need to show that $d_p(L(W'_n), \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)) \rightarrow 0$. This is followed by a subsequence argument essentially identical to the one used above in the proof for sketch-and-solve least squares, and we omit the proof to avoid repetition.

Inference

In particular, if Condition 2.1 **1-dim'** holds, then $M_n = I_p$, and so (7) reduces to (11). Further, we can verify that Condition 2.1 **1-dim'** with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ implies that $M_n^{(p)}(\bar{X}_n \beta_n) = I_p + (\alpha + 1) U_n^\top \bar{X}_n \beta_n \bar{X}_n \beta_n^\top U_n$ for $M_n^{(p)}$ from (4). Hence, with $\Sigma_n^{(p)} = \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + (\alpha + 1) \beta_n \beta_n^\top$, we have

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)} \right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (56)$$

Without loss of generality, we can consider $y_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and X_n of unit spectral radius. Indeed, for general y_n and X_n , we let $y'_n = y_n / \|y_n\|$ and $X'_n = X_n / \|X_n\|$, and we consider the observed data $S_{m,n}(X'_n, y'_n)$. By applying a similar argument and corresponding rescaled estimators, $\|X_n\|$ and $\|y_n\|$ cancel out, leading to the desired result for general X_n and y_n .

Next, since $\|U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p\| = O_P(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} / \sqrt{m})$ and $\|X_n\| = 1$, we have

$$\|\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} - X_n^\top X_n\| = O_P(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} / \sqrt{m}). \quad (57)$$

Moreover, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^2 &= \|S_{m,n}(y_n - X_n \hat{\beta}_{m,n})\|^2 \\ &= \|S_{m,n}(y_n - X_n \beta_n)\|^2 + \|S_{m,n} X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n})\|^2 + 2 \langle S_{m,n}(y_n - X_n \beta_n), S_{m,n} X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

By using Condition 2.1 **Bounded**, we have $\|S_{m,n}(y_n - X_n \beta_n)\|^2 / \|\varepsilon_n\|^2 - 1 = O_P(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} / \sqrt{m}) = o_P(1)$. From (57),

$$\|S_{m,n} X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n})\|^2 = \|X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n})\|^2 + O_P(\|\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}\|^2 \cdot \tau_{m,n}^{1/2} / \sqrt{m}) \leq \|\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}\|^2 (1 + o_P(1)).$$

Also, from (11), since $\|X_n\| = 1$ and the condition number of X_n is bounded above from Condition 2.2 **A**, $\|(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}\| = O(1)$ and

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n\| = O_P \left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|\varepsilon_n\| \cdot \|(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|\varepsilon_n\|}{\sqrt{m}} \right).$$

Therefore, the second term on the second line of (58) is $O_P(m^{-1} \tau_{m,n} \|\varepsilon_n\|^2)$. Further, the third term is $O_P(m^{-1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|\varepsilon_n\|^2)$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Therefore, we can conclude that $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^2 / \|\varepsilon_n\|^2 \rightarrow_P 1$. This verifies (9).

Continuing with partial sketching, we have from (56) that

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n\| = O_P \left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|\Sigma_n^{(p)}\|^{1/2}}{\sqrt{m}} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|\beta_n\|}{\sqrt{m}} \right). \quad (59)$$

Thus, $\|\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} - \beta_n \beta_n^\top\| = o_P(\|\beta_n\|^2)$. Further, since we can write $\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 = \|X_n \beta_n\|^2$, using (57) and (59), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|^2 - \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 &= (\|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|^2 - \|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \beta_n\|^2) + (\|\tilde{X}_{m,n} \beta_n\|^2 - \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} - \beta_n \beta_n^\top) \right) + \beta_n^\top (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} - X_n^\top X_n) \beta_n \\ &\leq \|\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n}\| \|\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)\top} - \beta_n \beta_n^\top\| + \|\beta_n\|^2 \|\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} - X_n^\top X_n\| = o_P(\|\beta_n\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\Sigma_n^{(p)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(\|\beta_n\|^2)$. Now, $\min_{a \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}} a^\top (\|X_n \beta_n\|^2 (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + (\alpha + 1) \beta_n \beta_n^\top) a = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_n^{(p)})$, and we have for any $a \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ that

$$\|X_n \beta_n\|^2 a^\top (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} a \geq \lambda_{\min}(X_n^\top X_n) \|\beta_n\|^2 \lambda_{\min}((X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}) = \lambda_{\min}(X_n^\top X_n) \|\beta_n\|^2.$$

Combined with Condition 2.2 A, it follows that $\|(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1}\| = \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1} = O_P(\|\beta_n\|^{-2})$. Combined with $\|\Sigma_n^{(p)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)}\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(\|\beta_n\|^2)$, this leads to $\|(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} - I_p\| = o_P(1)$, and (10) follows.

7.3 Proof of Corollary 2.4

Recall from Theorem 2.3 that conditional on $(X_n, y_n)_{n \geq 1}$, (9) holds. This implies that we also have the unconditional result

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^{-1} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n})^{1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (60)$$

Moreover, we have $\sigma_o^{-1} (X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2} (\beta_n - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, see Example 2.28 in Van der Vaart (1998). From (57) and (58), we have $(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} (\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n}) \rightarrow_P I_p$ and $\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}\|^{-1} \|\varepsilon_n\| \rightarrow_P 1$. Due to the law of large numbers, we have $\|\varepsilon_n\|^2/n \rightarrow_P \sigma_o^2$. From Slutsky's theorem, since $m/(n\tau_{m,n}) \rightarrow 0$, we conclude (12).

For partial sketching we have from (56) in Section 7.2 that unconditionally,

$$m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p). \quad (61)$$

Now, $\sigma_o^{-1} (X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2} (\beta_n - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is equivalent to

$$\sqrt{\frac{\tau_{m,n}}{m}} \sigma_o^{-1} (X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{1/2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{m}{\tau_{m,n}}} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{-1/2} (\beta_n - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{-1/2} (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1/2} \right\| &= \lambda_{\min}^{-1} \left((X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{1/2} \right) \\ &= \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2} (\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 + (\alpha + 1) X_n^\top X_n \beta_n \beta_n^\top) \\ &\leq (\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 + (\alpha + 1) \lambda_{\min}(X_n^\top X_n) \lambda_{\min}(\beta_n \beta_n^\top))^{-1/2} \leq \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

From our assumptions, $m^{1/2}/(\tau_{m,n}^{1/2} \|X_n \beta^*\|) \rightarrow_P 0$. Therefore, $m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left\| \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{-1/2} (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1/2} \right\| \rightarrow_P 0$.

Combining with Slutsky's theorem, we have $m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \left(\Sigma_n^{(p)}\right)^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Finally, as in the proof of (10), we can replace $\Sigma_n^{(p)}$ to its consistent estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)}$. This completes the proof of (13).

7.4 Proof of Theorem 2.5

The proof relies on the following result about asymptotic distributions for the sketched PCA solutions, obtained leveraging the delta method.

Proposition 7.1 (Asymptotic Normality of Eigenvectors and Eigenvalues). *Suppose that the sequence $(X_n^\top X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of matrices converges to $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$, and $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to a positive semi-definite matrix G . Assume Σ has the spectral decomposition $V^\top L^2 V$, where $V = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_p)$ and $L = \text{diag}(\lambda_{1,0}, \dots, \lambda_{p,0})$. Under Condition 2.1 Sym, we have for all $i \in [p]$ that*

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \lambda_{i,0}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, G_{(ii),(ii)}) \quad (62)$$

and with Δ_i from (14),

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_i) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta_i(\Sigma, G)). \quad (63)$$

Proof. From (5) in Condition 2.1 Sym and $G_n \rightarrow G$, we conclude that (6) holds. Also, we can consider λ_i and v_i , $i \in [p]$, as functions on \mathbb{R}^{p^2} ; and since all eigenvalues of Σ are distinct, λ_i , v_i , $i \in [p]$, can be viewed as smooth functions in a neighborhood $N \subset \mathbb{R}^{p^2}$ of $\text{vec}(\Sigma)$. Given the assumption that $X_n^\top X_n \rightarrow \Sigma$, it follows that for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{vec}(X_n^\top X_n) \in N$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Further, (6) implies that $\text{vec}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n) \rightarrow_P 0$, so the events $\Omega_n = \{\text{vec}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) \in N\}$ have $P(\Omega_n) \rightarrow 1$. Now fix $i \in [p]$. By the mean value theorem, for some $\theta_{m,n} \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) - \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n) &= \nabla \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n + \theta_{m,n}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n))^\top \\ &\quad \cdot \text{vec}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n) I(\Omega_n) + (\lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) - \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)) I(\Omega_n^c). \end{aligned}$$

Since $P(\Omega_n^c) \rightarrow 0$, by Slutsky's theorem, the limiting distribution of $\lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) - \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)$ is determined by the first term on the event Ω_n . Applying the continuous mapping theorem on Ω_n , we have

$$\nabla \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n + \theta_{m,n}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n)) \rightarrow_P \nabla \lambda_i(\Sigma).$$

Now, defining $\bar{X}_n = X_n(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1/2} \Sigma^{1/2}$, we can write

$$\sqrt{m}(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n) = \sqrt{m}(X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2} \Sigma^{-1/2} (\bar{X}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{X}_n - \Sigma) \Sigma^{-1/2} (X_n^\top X_n)^{1/2}.$$

By Slutsky's theorem, it is sufficient to characterize the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\bar{X}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{X}_n - \Sigma)$.

Using the SVD $X_n = U_n L_n V_n^\top$ and that $\Sigma = V^\top L^2 V$, we can write $\bar{X}_n = U_n V_n^\top V L V^\top$. Denoting $\bar{U}_n = U_n V_n^\top V$, the SVD of \bar{X}_n is therefore $\bar{X}_n = \bar{U}_n L V^\top$. Thus, $\bar{X}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{X}_n - \Sigma = V L (\bar{U}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{U}_n - I_p) L V^\top$, and consequently, recalling the discussion from Section 7.1,

$$\text{vec}(\bar{X}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{X}_n - \Sigma) = ((V L) \otimes (V L)) \text{vec}(\bar{U}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{U}_n - I_p). \quad (64)$$

Additionally, since $X_n^\top X_n \rightarrow \Sigma$ and the eigenvalues of Σ are distinct, and as our conventions resolve the sign-ambiguity of eigenvectors, we have that $V_n \rightarrow V$. Since $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , by Condition 2.1 Sym and applying Slutsky's theorem to $U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p = V_n^\top V (\bar{U}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{U}_n - I_p) V^\top V_n$, we have $\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\bar{U}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{U}_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, G)$. Consequently, by (64), with $\rho := ((V L) \otimes (V L)) G ((L V^\top) \otimes (L V^\top))$, we have

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\bar{X}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \bar{X}_n - \Sigma) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \rho).$$

Next, we recall the gradient $\nabla \lambda_i(\Sigma)$ and the Jacobian $J v_i(\Sigma)$, in a form appropriate for our use. Based on Theorem 8.9 in Magnus and Neudecker (2019), we know that $d\lambda_i = v_i^\top d(X) v_i$. This implies that $d\lambda_i = (v_i \otimes v_i)^\top d(\text{vec}(X))$. Therefore, we can conclude that $\nabla \lambda_i(\Sigma) = v_i \otimes v_i$. Similarly, $dv_i = (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger d(X) v_i$, and thus $dv_i = (v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger)^\top d(\text{vec}(X))$. Consequently, we have $J v_i(\Sigma) = v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger$.

Applying Slutsky's theorem and combining terms, we find that

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (\lambda_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) - \lambda_i(X_n^\top X_n)) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, (v_i \otimes v_i)^\top \rho (v_i \otimes v_i)\right),$$

as well as

$$\sqrt{m} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (v_i(X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n) - v_i(X_n^\top X_n)) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, (v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger)^\top \rho (v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger)\right).$$

Since $V = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_p)$, we have $L V^\top v_i = L e_i = \lambda_{i,0} e_i$ for each $i \in [p]$. Therefore, $((L V^\top) \otimes (L V^\top))(v_i \otimes v_i) = (L V^\top v_i) \otimes (L V^\top v_i) = \lambda_{i,0}^2 e_i \otimes e_i$. Thus,

$$(v_i \otimes v_i)^\top \rho (v_i \otimes v_i) = \lambda_{i,0}^2 (e_i \otimes e_i)^\top G (e_i \otimes e_i) = \lambda_{i,0}^2 G_{(ii),(ii)}.$$

This shows (62). Moreover, $(\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger = V^\top \text{diag}((\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{k,0})^{-1} (1 - \delta_{ki}))_{k=1}^p V$, where we interpret $0/0 := 0$. Also, $L V^\top (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\lambda_{k,0}} (\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{k,0})^{-1} (1 - \delta_{ki}))_{k=1}^p V^\top$. Denote $\alpha_k = \sqrt{\lambda_{k,0}} / (\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{k,0})$ for all $k \neq i$ and $\alpha_i = 0$. Also let $\tilde{V} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\lambda_{k,0}} (\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{k,0})^{-1} (1 - \delta_{ki}))_{k=1}^p V^\top = (\alpha_1 \nu_1, \dots, \alpha_p \nu_p)^\top$. Then,

$$(v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger)^\top \rho (v_i \otimes (\lambda_{i,0} I_p - \Sigma)^\dagger) = \lambda_{i,0} (e_i \otimes \tilde{V})^\top G (e_i \otimes \tilde{V}).$$

We denote by \tilde{G}^i the $p \times p$ principal submatrix of G , for which $\tilde{G}_{kl}^i = G_{(ik),(il)}$ for all $k, l \in [p]$. Then

$$(e_i \otimes \tilde{V})^\top G(e_i \otimes \tilde{V}) = \tilde{V}^\top \tilde{G}^i \tilde{V} = (\alpha_1 \nu_1, \dots, \alpha_p \nu_p) \tilde{G}^i (\alpha_1 \nu_1, \dots, \alpha_p \nu_p)^\top = \sum_{k,l} \alpha_k \alpha_l (\tilde{G}^i)_{kl} \nu_k \nu_l^\top.$$

Hence,

$$\lambda_{i,0}(e_i \otimes \tilde{V})^\top G(e_i \otimes \tilde{V}) = \sum_{k \neq i, l \neq i} \frac{\lambda_{i,0} \sqrt{\lambda_{k,0} \lambda_{l,0}}}{(\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{k,0})(\lambda_{i,0} - \lambda_{l,0})} G_{(ik),(il)} \nu_k \nu_l^\top.$$

Due to the definition of Δ_i from (14), this proves (63). \square

We first show Theorem 2.5 for a sequence of data matrices $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and covariance matrices $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying the conditions of Proposition 7.1. In that case, by using that (62) holds due to Proposition 7.1, and from Slutsky's theorem, we conclude (15). Next, recall that from the continuous mapping theorem, since $X_n^\top X_n \rightarrow \Sigma$, $G_n \rightarrow G$, and $X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n - X_n^\top X_n \rightarrow_P 0$, we have $\Lambda_k \rightarrow \lambda_{k,0}$, $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k} \rightarrow_P \lambda_{k,0}$, $v_k \rightarrow \nu_k$, and $\hat{v}_{m,n,k} \rightarrow_P \nu_k$ for all $k \in [p]$. This shows that $\hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i}$ is well-defined with probability tending to unity, and $\hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} \rightarrow_P \Delta_i(\Sigma, G)$, $\Delta_{n,i} \rightarrow \Delta_i(\Sigma, G)$. Since $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and as a result, $c^\top \Delta_i(\Sigma, G) c \geq \varepsilon > 0$. Thus, the left-hand side in (16) is well-defined for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, using (63) and Slutsky's theorem, (16) holds under the conditions of Proposition 7.1.

Finally, we use a subsequence argument to show Theorem 2.5 under the conditions from its statement. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\|X_n\| = 1$ by working with $X_n/\|X_n\|$. Indeed, note that Δ_i from (14) is a homogeneous function with respect to Ξ , i.e., for any $c > 0$, any $G \in \mathbb{R}^{p^2 \times p^2}$, and all feasible choices of $\Xi \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$, $\Delta_i(\Xi, G) = \Delta_i(c\Xi, G)$. We observe that the left-hand side of (15) and (16) remains invariant when we scale the data X_n to $X'_n = X_n/g_n$ for some nonzero scaling sequence $(g_n)_{n \geq 1}$. In this case, we have $\hat{\Lambda}'_{m,n,i} = \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}/g_n^2$ and $\Lambda'_{n,i} = \Lambda_{n,i}/g_n^2$, leading to $\hat{\Lambda}'_{m,n,i}(\hat{\Lambda}'_{m,n,i} - \Lambda'_{n,i}) = (\hat{\Lambda}'_{m,n,i})^{-1}(\hat{\Lambda}'_{m,n,i} - \Lambda'_{n,i})$, and due to the homogeneity of the function Δ_i , we have $(c^\top \hat{\Delta}'_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}'_{m,n,i} - v'_{n,i}) = (c^\top \hat{\Delta}'_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}'_{m,n,i} - v'_{n,i})$. Hence, from now on, we assume without loss of generality that $\|X_n\| = 1$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &:= X_n^\top X_n, & W_n &:= m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (G_n)_{(ii),(ii)}^{-1/2} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} (\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i}), \\ \chi_n &:= m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}), & \tilde{\chi}_n &:= m^{1/2} \tau_{m,n}^{-1/2} (c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

We have that $\|T_n\| = 1$, and the singular values of T_n are $(\ell_{n,i}^2/\ell_{n,1}^2)_{i \in [p]} = (\ell_{n,i}^2)_{i \in [p]}$. Thus, due to Condition 2.2 B, there is a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, $T_n \in K$. Since there exists $0 < c \leq C$, such that $cI_{p(p+1)/2} \preceq D_p^\top G_n D_p \preceq CI_{p(p+1)/2}$, there is a compact set $\tilde{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^{p(p+1)/2 \times p(p+1)/2}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, $D_p^\top G_n D_p \in \tilde{K}$.

Moreover, (15) is equivalent to $d_1(L(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$. Now, consider any subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of \mathbb{N} . Since $T_{n_k} \in K$, $D_p^\top G_{n_k} D_p \in \tilde{K}$ for all $k \geq 1$ and K, \tilde{K} are compact, there exists a further sub-subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that $T_{n'_k} \rightarrow \Sigma$ and $D_p^\top G_{n'_k} D_p \rightarrow D_p^\top G D_p$, for some $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$ and absolutely symmetric $p^2 \times p^2$ matrix G . Since all eigenvalues of T_n are uniformly separated by Condition 2.2 B, all eigenvalues of Σ are distinct. Then $d_1(L(W_{n'_k}), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$ holds along the subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Thus, for any subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$, there exists a further sub-subsequence $(n'_k)_{k \geq 1}$ of $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that $d_1(L(W_{n'_k}), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, $d_1(L(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$, proving (15).

The proof of (16) is similar, with a few differences. We prove the result for χ_n first. By $c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq 1$, for every possible sub-subsequence limit Σ , $c^\top \Delta_i(\Sigma, G) c \geq \varepsilon > 0$. This shows that χ_n and $\tilde{\chi}_n$ are well defined for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As in the previous proof, $d_1(L(\chi_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$. Since $(c^\top \hat{\Delta}_{m,n,i} c)^{-1} c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c \rightarrow_P 1$, we have $d_1(L(\tilde{\chi}_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \rightarrow 0$ by Slutsky's theorem. This finishes the proof.

If Condition 2.1 **Sym-1'** holds, then $G_{(ii),(ii)} = 2 + \alpha$ and $\Delta_{n,i} = \sum_{k \neq i} \Lambda_{n,i} \Lambda_{n,k} / (\Lambda_{n,i} - \Lambda_{n,k})^2 v_{n,k} v_{n,k}^\top$. Since $\Lambda_{n,i} \Lambda_{n,k} / (\Lambda_{n,i} - \Lambda_{n,k})^2 \geq \Lambda_{n,p}^2 / \Lambda_{n,1}^2 > c_0^2$, for some $c_0 > 0$, we can conclude $c^\top \Delta_{n,i} c > c_0^2 \varepsilon$ if $\sum_{k \neq i} (c^\top v_{n,k})^2 > \varepsilon$, which is equivalent to $(c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1 - \varepsilon$. Based on the proof above, (17) and (18) hold.

7.5 Proof of Corollary 2.6

Recall from Theorem 2.5 that conditional on $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$, (15) holds. This implies that we also have the unconditional result

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)}}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,1). \quad (66)$$

Moreover, from Waternaux (1976) on inference for one eigenvalue, if we define κ_4^i as the kurtosis of the marginal distribution of the i -th dimension, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2 + \kappa_4^i / \lambda_i^{*2}}} \lambda_i^{*-1} (\Lambda_{n,i} - \lambda_i^*) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,1). \quad (67)$$

From (66) and (67), we have $\Lambda_{n,i} \rightarrow_P \lambda_i^*$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \rightarrow_P \lambda_i^*$. If $m \cdot (n\tau_{m,n}(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)})^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, from Slutsky's theorem, we can conclude (19).

7.6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

By Lemma 3.5, if $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , Condition 2.1 Sym-1 holds with $G = I_{p^2} + P_p + Q_p$ and $\tau_{m,n} = 1 - \gamma_n$. Therefore, Condition 2.1 Sym-1' holds with $\alpha = 1$. Then since Condition 2.2 B is satisfied, we conclude that (2) and (22) hold due to (17) and (18) from Theorem 2.5, respectively.

7.7 Proof of Theorem 3.2

From Lemma 3.3, we conclude that for any $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ for all $n \geq 1$, $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.1 Bounded. If (23) holds, $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P} . Thus, from Lemma 3.4 applied to $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1} = (U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, Condition 2.1 1-dim' holds for $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $\alpha = 1$. Then by Theorem 2.3, we conclude the first result.

Similarly, if (24) holds, then from Lemma 3.4, it follows that $(U_n b_n, \overline{X_n \beta_n})_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P} . Then the second claim is established similarly to the first one above.

7.8 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Recall that the sketching matrix is defined as $S_{m,n} = \sqrt{n/m} B H D$, where $H = H_l$ is the Hadamard matrix. Denote $R_i := (H D a_n)_i$ and $\tilde{R}_i := (H D \tilde{a}_n)_i$ for $i \in [n]$. Recall $\gamma_n = m/n$ and $B = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_n)$, where B_i are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with a success probability of γ_n^{-1} . Let h_{kl} , $k, l \in [n]$ be the entries of H , and $D = \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_n)$. Then, letting $a_n = (a_{n,1}, \dots, a_{n,n})^\top$ and $\tilde{a}_n = (\tilde{a}_{n,1}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{n,n})^\top$, we have $R_i = \sum_{j \in [n]} h_{ij} D_j a_{n,j}$. Moreover, we can write $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \tilde{R}_i \gamma_n^{-1} B_i$ and thus find that with

$$s_n^2 := \text{Var} \left[a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n \mid D \right] = \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 \tilde{R}_i^2, \quad (68)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [s_n^2] &= \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^n h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} h_{ij_3} h_{ij_4} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} D_{j_3} D_{j_4} a_{n,j_1} a_{n,j_2} \tilde{a}_{n,j_3} \tilde{a}_{n,j_4} \\ &= \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} n^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{n,j}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,j}^2 + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} a_{n,j_1}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,j_2}^2 + 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} a_{n,j_1} \tilde{a}_{n,j_1} a_{n,j_2} \tilde{a}_{n,j_2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} n^{-1} \left(1 + 2 (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{n,j}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,j}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step uses that B_i are i.i.d. Bernoulli(γ_n) variables, the third step uses that D_i are i.i.d. variables equal to ± 1 with probability $1/2$, and the last step uses that a_n and \tilde{a}_n are of unit norm. We also have

$$\text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n \mid D \right] \right] = \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n R_i \tilde{R}_i \right] = \text{Var} \left[a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n \right] = 0.$$

Combining the above two equations, we have $\text{Var} \left[a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n \right] = O((1 - \gamma_n)/m)$, and Condition 2.1 Bounded follows.

7.9 Proof of Lemma 3.4

Proof. For all $i \in [n]$, recall the notations $R_i = (HDa_n)_i$ and $\tilde{R}_i = (H\tilde{D}\tilde{a}_n)_i$ from the proof of Lemma 3.3 in Section 7.8. Recall that $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \tilde{R}_i \gamma_n^{-1} B_i$, is a weighted sum of the n independent Bernoulli variables B_i , $i \in [n]$, given D . With s_n^2 from (68), we will show that for a small $\delta > 0$,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |R_i \tilde{R}_i|^{2+\delta} \gamma_n^{-2-\delta} \mathbb{E} |B_i - \mathbb{E} B_i|^{2+\delta}}{s_n^{2+\delta}} = o_P(1), \quad (69)$$

and then, by the Lyapunov central limit theorem and Lemma 7.2 below, the result will follow. To verify (69), we will show the following bound:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{|R_i| \vee |\tilde{R}_i|\} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{8}{n}. \quad (70)$$

By writing $R_i = \sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij} D_j a_{n,j}$, we can apply Hoeffding's inequality to obtain $\mathbb{P}(|R_i| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-2nt^2)$ for any $t > 0$. Then (70) holds by taking $t = n^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n$ and further taking a union bound over $i \in [n]$. Define the event

$$\Xi := \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{|R_i| \vee |\tilde{R}_i|\} \leq (n^{-1} \log n)^{1/2} \right\} \cap \left\{ 1/2 < n \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 \tilde{R}_i^2 < 4 \right\}.$$

By (70) and Lemma 7.2 below, the event Ξ holds with probability tending to one. On Ξ , we have $\sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \tilde{R}_i)^{2+\delta} \leq 4(n^{-1} \log n)^\delta / n$ and $s_n^{2+\delta} > [2n\gamma_n / (1 - \gamma_n)]^{-1-\delta/2}$. We also find $\mathbb{E} |B_i - \mathbb{E} B_i|^{2+\delta} = \gamma_n(1 - \gamma_n)^{2+\delta} + \gamma_n^{2+\delta}(1 - \gamma_n) \leq \gamma_n(1 - \gamma_n)$. Combining these bounds, the left side of (69) is bounded by $C(m^{-1/2} \log n)^\delta / (1 - \gamma_n)^{\delta/2}$ for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore, since $m / \log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\limsup m/n < 1$, we conclude (69).

Lemma 7.2. *We have*

$$n \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 \tilde{R}_i^2 - [1 + 2(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2] = o_P(1). \quad (71)$$

Proof. Below, all sums over indices such as j_1, j_2, \dots will range over the index set $[n]$, and we recall $H = (h_{ij})_{i,j \in [n]}$. We start by considering

$$\begin{aligned} n \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 \tilde{R}_i^2 &= n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij} D_j a_{n,j} \right)^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij} D_j \tilde{a}_{n,j} \right)^2 \\ &= n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}^2 a_{n,j}^2 + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} a_{n,j_1} a_{n,j_2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n h_{ij}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,j}^2 + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} \tilde{a}_{n,j_1} \tilde{a}_{n,j_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can thus decompose $n \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 \tilde{R}_i^2$ into the sum of the following terms:

$$I_1 = n \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j_1, j_2} h_{ij_1}^2 h_{ij_2}^2 a_{n, j_1}^2 \tilde{a}_{n, j_2}^2; \quad I_2 = n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n, j}^2 \right);$$

$$I_3 = n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} \tilde{a}_{n, j_1} \tilde{a}_{n, j_2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j}^2 \right);$$

and

$$I_4 = n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \sum_{j_3 \neq j_4} h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} h_{ij_3} h_{ij_4} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} D_{j_3} D_{j_4} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} \tilde{a}_{n, j_3} \tilde{a}_{n, j_4} \right)$$

$$= n \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4)} \star + 2 \sum_{j_1=j_3, j_2=j_4, j_1 \neq j_2} \star + 2 \sum_{j_1=j_3, j_2 \neq j_4} \star \right) =: I_{41} + I_{42} + I_{43},$$

where \star stands for the term inside the sum on the first line, and (j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4) shows that these four indices must take different values.

To calculate I_1 , we observe that $h_{ij} = \pm 1/\sqrt{n}$ for all i, j , so that $I_1 = \sum_{j_1, j_2} a_{n, j_1}^2 \tilde{a}_{n, j_2}^2 = 1$. To calculate I_2 and I_3 , we change the order of summation and use that $\sum_{i=1}^n h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} = 0$ when $j_1 \neq j_2$, to find that $I_2 = I_3 = 0$. Similarly, we find that $I_{43} = 0$.

Next, $I_{42} = 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} \tilde{a}_{n, j_1} \tilde{a}_{n, j_2}$, since $h_{ij}^2 = 1/n$ and $D_j^2 = 1$ for any $i, j \in [n]$. If $a_n \neq \pm \tilde{a}_n$, define $a'_n = (I - a_n a_n^\top) \tilde{a}_n / \|(I - a_n a_n^\top) \tilde{a}_n\|$, otherwise, define a'_n as an arbitrary unit length vector orthogonal to a_n , so that we have

$$\tilde{a}_n = a_n a_n^\top \cdot \tilde{a}_n + (I - a_n a_n^\top) \cdot \tilde{a}_n = (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) a_n + (1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2)^{1/2} a'_n. \quad (72)$$

Moreover, denote $t_1 = a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n, t_2 = (1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2)^{1/2}$. Then, we can express I_{42} as

$$I_{42} = 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} (t_1 a_{n, j_1} + t_2 a'_{n, j_1}) (t_1 a_{n, j_2} + t_2 a'_{n, j_2})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} t_1^2 a_{n, j_1}^2 a_{n, j_2}^2 + 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} t_1 t_2 a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} (a_{n, j_1} a'_{n, j_2} + a'_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2}) + 2 \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} t_2^2 a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} a'_{n, j_1} a'_{n, j_2}$$

$$=: I_{42}^{(1)} + I_{42}^{(2)} + I_{42}^{(3)}.$$

Due to Condition \mathfrak{A} defined in (20), without loss of generality, we can assume that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_{n, i}| \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we have

$$I_{42}^{(1)} = 2t_1^2 \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j}^2 \right)^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j}^4 \right] = 2t_1^2 (1 + o(1));$$

and since a'_n is orthogonal to a_n ,

$$I_{42}^{(3)} = 2t_2^2 \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j} a'_{n, j} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j}^2 (a'_{n, j})^2 \right] = o(t_2^2).$$

Moreover, we find

$$\left| I_{42}^{(2)} \right| = \left| -4 \sum_{j=1}^n t_1 t_2 a_{n, j}^3 a'_{n, j} \right| \leq 4t_1 t_2 \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |a_{n, j} a'_{n, j}| \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n a_{n, j}^2 = o(t_1 t_2),$$

Therefore, $I_{42} = 2(a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 + o(1)$.

To analyze I_{41} , we further introduce $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = \sum_{i=1}^n h_{ij_1} h_{ij_2} h_{ij_3} h_{ij_4}$ for any indices $j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 \in [n]$, and express

$$I_{41} = n \sum_{(j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4)} t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} D_{j_1} D_{j_2} D_{j_3} D_{j_4} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} \tilde{a}_{n, j_3} \tilde{a}_{n, j_4}.$$

Then, we consider

$$\mathbb{E}I_{41}^2 = n^2 \mathbb{E} \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_4), (j_5, \dots, j_8)} t_{j_1, \dots, j_4} t_{j_5, \dots, j_8} D_{j_1} \dots D_{j_8} a_{n, j_1} a_{n, j_2} \tilde{a}_{n, j_3} \tilde{a}_{n, j_4} a_{n, j_5} a_{n, j_6} \tilde{a}_{n, j_7} \tilde{a}_{n, j_8}.$$

Now, only terms such that $\{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4\} = \{j_5, j_6, j_7, j_8\}$ have a non-zero expectation. Thus after decomposing \tilde{a}_n into two orthogonal vectors as in handling I_{42} above, using Lemma 7.3 and the assumption that $\max_{i \in [n]} |a_{n, i}| \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that the above expectation is $o(1)$. Thus $I_{41} = o_P(1)$ and we conclude (71) by summing up the above bounds. \square

Lemma 7.3. *For any $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in [n]$ there is a unique j_4 such that $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} \neq 0$, and then $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = 1/n$.*

Proof. With $l = \log_2 n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the binary representation of $j_i - 1$ by $j_{i, l-1} 2^{l-1} + \dots + j_{i, 2} 2^2 + j_{i, 1} 2 + j_{i, 0} 1$, and define the binary representation $(\ell_{l-1}, \dots, \ell_0)$ of $\ell - 1$ similarly. Then $h_{j_i, \ell} = n^{-1/2} (-1)^{\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} j_{i, k} \ell_k}$, and it follows that

$$t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (-1)^{\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_k}.$$

We claim the following two facts: First, if $\sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k}$ is even for any $k \in [0 : l] := \{0, 1, \dots, l\}$, then $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = 1/n$. Second, if $\sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k_0}$ is odd for some $k_0 \in [0 : l]$, then $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = 0$. These two claims imply Lemma 7.3.

Next, we prove the two claims. The first claim holds by noting that $\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_k$ is even for any $\ell \in [n]$. To conclude the second claim, we write

$$t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (-1)^{\ell_{k_0}} \cdot (-1)^{\sum_{k=0, k \neq k_0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_k} =: \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n g_\ell.$$

For any $\ell_1 \in [n]$, we can find a unique $\ell_2 \in [n]$ such that $\ell_{1, k_0} + \ell_{2, k_0} = 1$ and the other coefficients of their binary representations match. For such a pair of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\ell_1} + g_{\ell_2} &= (-1)^{\ell_{1, k_0}} \cdot (-1)^{\sum_{k=0, k \neq k_0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_{1, k}} + (-1)^{\ell_{2, k_0}} \cdot (-1)^{\sum_{k=0, k \neq k_0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_{2, k}} \\ &= [(-1)^{\ell_{1, k_0}} + (-1)^{\ell_{2, k_0}}] \cdot (-1)^{\sum_{k=0, k \neq k_0}^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^4 j_{i, k} \ell_{1, k}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we can find $n/2$ such pairs that run through $[n]$, thus $t_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4} = n^{-2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n g_\ell = 0$. \square

Finally we provide an example to show that (25) is generally not true if Condition \mathfrak{P} define(20) is not satisfied. Let $n \geq 4$ and consider $a_n = (1/2, 1/2, -1/2, -1/2, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and $\tilde{a}_n = (-1/2, 1/2, -1/2, 1/2, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$. For all $i \in [n]$, denote the i -th column of H by h_i . By the structure of the Hadamard matrix, for any diagonal matrix B , we have $h_1^\top B h_2 = h_3^\top B h_4$, $h_1^\top B h_3 = h_2^\top B h_4$, and $h_1^\top B h_4 = h_2^\top B h_3$. Additionally, we have $h_i^\top B h_i = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i/n$. Then, we can calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} a_n^\top D H B H D \tilde{a}_n &= \sum_{i=1}^4 a_{n, i} \tilde{a}_{n, i} h_i^\top B h_i \\ &+ [(a_{n, 1} \tilde{a}_{n, 2} + a_{n, 2} \tilde{a}_{n, 1}) D_1 D_2 + (a_{n, 3} \tilde{a}_{n, 4} + a_{n, 4} \tilde{a}_{n, 3}) D_3 D_4] h_1^\top B h_2 \\ &+ [(a_{n, 1} \tilde{a}_{n, 3} + a_{n, 3} \tilde{a}_{n, 1}) D_1 D_3 + (a_{n, 2} \tilde{a}_{n, 4} + a_{n, 4} \tilde{a}_{n, 2}) D_2 D_4] h_1^\top B h_3 \\ &+ [(a_{n, 1} \tilde{a}_{n, 4} + a_{n, 4} \tilde{a}_{n, 1}) D_1 D_4 + (a_{n, 2} \tilde{a}_{n, 3} + a_{n, 3} \tilde{a}_{n, 2}) D_2 D_3] h_1^\top B h_4 = \frac{1}{2} (D_1 D_4 - D_2 D_3) h_1^\top B h_4. \end{aligned}$$

Since D_i are uniformly distributed over ± 1 for all $i \in [4]$, the above random variable places a non-vanishing point mass at zero, and is thus not asymptotically normal. \square

7.10 Proof of Lemma 3.5

With the Cramer-Wold device, since $U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p$ is a symmetric matrix, it suffices to show that for any symmetric $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$,

$$\sqrt{m} \operatorname{tr}(\Phi(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p)) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \operatorname{vec}(\Phi)^\top G \operatorname{vec}(\Phi)). \quad (73)$$

By the spectral decomposition $\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i w_i w_i^\top$ of Φ , where $(w_i)_{i \in [p]}$ forms an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^p , we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(\Phi(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p)) = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i (w_i^\top U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n w_i - 1).$$

Now $U_n w_i, i \in [p]$ constitutes an orthogonal basis of the p -dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^n given by the span of the columns of U_n . Since $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , we have $\|U_n w_i\|_\infty \leq \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \|U_i\| \|w_i\| \rightarrow 0$ for every $i \in [p]$, due to Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (21). We now denote $R_i^k := (H D U_n w_k)_i$ for $i \in [n], k \in [p]$, so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i w_i^\top U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n w_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \cdot (R_j^i)^2 \right) \gamma_n^{-1} B_j.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, conditional on D , this is a weighted sum of n independent Bernoulli variables, with D -conditional variance $s_n^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1-\gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \cdot (R_j^i)^2 \right)^2$. We write $n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \cdot (R_j^i)^2 \right)^2 = n \sum_{i_1, i_2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{i_1} \mu_{i_2} \cdot (R_j^{i_1})^2 (R_j^{i_2})^2$. Since $(w_j)_{j \in [p]}$ are orthonormal, we have according to (71) that for $i_1 \neq i_2 \in [p]$, it holds that $\sum_{j=1}^n (R_j^{i_1})^2 (R_j^{i_2})^2 \rightarrow_P 1$, and for $i_1 = i_2 \in [p]$, it holds that $\sum_{j=1}^n (R_j^{i_1})^2 (R_j^{i_2})^2 \rightarrow_P 3$. Therefore,

$$n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \cdot (R_j^i)^2 \right)^2 - \left(2\|\mu\|^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \right)^2 \right) = o_P(1),$$

Now, since μ_i are the eigenvalues of Φ , $2\|\mu\|^2 = 2\|\Phi\|_F^2 = \operatorname{vec}(\Phi)^\top (I_p + P_p) \operatorname{vec}(\Phi)$. Also,

$$\operatorname{vec}(\Phi)^\top Q_p \operatorname{vec}(\Phi) = \sum_{(ij), (kl)} \Phi_{ij} \Phi_{kl} \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} = \sum_{i,k} \Phi_{ii} \Phi_{kk} = (\operatorname{tr} \Phi)^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \right)^2.$$

Thus, $ms_n^2/(1-\gamma_n)$ tends to $\operatorname{vec}(\Phi)^\top (I_{p^2} + P_p + Q_p) \operatorname{vec}(\Phi)$.

Moreover, we can verify similarly to the proof of (69) that for a small $\delta > 0$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \cdot (R_j^i)^2 \right)^{2+\delta} \gamma_n^{-2-\delta} \mathbb{E}|B_i - \mathbb{E}B_i|^{2+\delta} s_n^{-(2+\delta)} = o_P(1),$$

assuming that $m/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$. This can be verified by Hoeffding's inequality similar to how it is used above in the proof for (69). Thus, we conclude (73).

7.11 Proof of Theorem 3.6

From Lemma 3.9, if $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , Condition 2.1 Sym-1 holds with $G = I_{p^2} + P_p$ and $\tau_{m,n} = 1$. Therefore, Condition 2.1 Sym-1' holds with $\alpha = 0$. Then, since Condition 2.2 B holds by assumption, we conclude the desired results based on Theorem 2.5.

7.12 Proof of Theorem 3.7

Due to (28), we conclude that for any $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$, $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P} . Thus, from Lemma 3.8 Condition 2.1 1-dim' holds for $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $\alpha = 0$. Then by Theorem 2.3, we conclude the first result. Similarly, if (29) holds, $(U_n b_n, \bar{X}_n \beta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P} . Then the second claim follows similarly from Lemma 3.8.

7.13 Proof of Lemma 3.8

For all $i \in [n]$, we denote the i -th column of $S_{m,n}$ as $R_{m,i}$. Then, we have $R_{m,i} = \bar{D}_i G_{m,i}$, where $\bar{D}_i = \text{diag}(D_{1,i}, \dots, D_{m,i})$, $D_{m,i}$ are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables, and $G_{m,i}$ are uniformly distributed on the set $\{f/\sqrt{\zeta_m} \in \mathbb{R}^m : f_1, \dots, f_m \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \|f\|^2 = \zeta_m\}$, independently across i . We can express $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,j}$.

Defining $h_n(x, y) = x^\top y$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\sum_{i \neq j} a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,j} = \sum_{i < j} (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i}) h_n(R_{m,i}, R_{m,j}).$$

The variables $T_i := R_{m,i}$ are i.i.d. across $i \in [n]$, making the sum a weighted U-statistic of order two. Moreover, for $i \neq j$, $\mathbb{E}[h_n(T_i, T_j) | T_i] = (R_{m,i})^\top \mathbb{E}[R_{m,j}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_n(T_i, T_j) | T_j] = 0$. This shows that the U-statistic is degenerate.

We use the martingale central limit theorem, see e.g., Corollary 3.1 from Hall and Heyde (2014), to derive our result. In particular, we focus on analyzing the sum $\sum_{i < j} w_{ij} h_n(T_i, T_j)$, where $w_{ij} = a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i}$ for all i, j . To analyze this sum, we construct the sequence

$$\Upsilon_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w_{jk} h_n(T_j, T_k), \quad k \in [n]. \quad (74)$$

Due to the independence between T_j and T_k for all $j \neq k$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Upsilon_k | T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}] = 0$ for all $k \in [n]$. Consequently, the sequence $\{S_i = \sum_{l=2}^i \Upsilon_l, 2 \leq i \leq n\}$ forms a martingale with respect to the σ -field generated by $T_1, \dots, T_i, i \in [n]$. Moreover, we can write $S_n = \sum_{i < j} w_{ij} h_n(T_i, T_j)$.

To show that $S_n/\sqrt{\text{Var}[S_n]}$ tends to a standard normal distribution, it is enough to show the Lyapunov condition $s_n^{-4} \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbb{E} \Upsilon_i^4 \rightarrow 0$. Additionally, we need to show that $s_n^{-2} q_n^2 \rightarrow_P 1$, where $q_n^2 := \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon_i^2 | T_1, \dots, T_{i-1}]$.

Proof of the Lyapunov condition

First we show the Lyapunov condition $s_n^{-4} \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbb{E} \Upsilon_i^4 \rightarrow 0$. Using the properties of square-integrable martingales, we have $s_n^2 = \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbb{E} \Upsilon_i^2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \Upsilon_k^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w_{jk} h_n(T_j, T_k) \right)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} \mathbb{E}[h_n(T_j, T_k) h_n(T_i, T_k)] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} \mathbb{E}[R_{m,j}^\top R_{m,k} R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k}] = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 \mathbb{E}[(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for $i \neq j$, we use the independence of $R_{m,i}$, $R_{m,j}$ and $R_{m,k}$. Also, since $D_{m,i}$ are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables, and in particular $D_{k,i}^2 = 1$ for all k, i

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(G_{m,i}^\top \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_k G_{m,k})^2] = \mathbb{E}[G_{m,i}^\top \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_k G_{m,k} G_{m,k}^\top \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_k G_{m,i}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G_{m,i}^\top \text{diag}(G_{m,k} \odot G_{m,k}) G_{m,i}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $G_{m,i}$, $G_{m,j}$ are independently and uniformly distributed on the set $\{f/\sqrt{\zeta_m} \in \mathbb{R}^m : f_1, \dots, f_m \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } \|f\|^2 = \zeta_m\}$, every component of $G_{m,i}$ equals to zero or $1/\sqrt{\zeta_m}$, and hence $G_{m,i} \odot G_{m,i} = G_{m,i}/\sqrt{\zeta_m}$ for all i . Further, $\mathbb{E}[G_{m,k}] = \sqrt{\zeta_m} \mathbf{1}_m/m$, and we have for $i \neq k$ that

$$\mathbb{E}[G_{m,i}^\top \text{diag}(G_{m,k} \odot G_{m,k}) G_{m,i}] = \mathbb{E}[(G_{m,i} \odot G_{m,i})^\top (G_{m,k} \odot G_{m,k})] = \mathbb{E}[G_{m,i}^\top] \mathbb{E}[G_{m,k}] / \zeta_m = 1/m.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
s_n^2 &= \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E} \Upsilon_k^2 = \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i < k} w_{ik}^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i < k} (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,k} + a_{n,k} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i < k} (a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2 + a_{n,k}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 + 2a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} a_{n,k} \tilde{a}_{n,k}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \neq k} (a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2 + a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} a_{n,k} \tilde{a}_{n,k}) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \right) - \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \left(1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \right). \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, $\mathbb{E} \Upsilon_k^4$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w_{jk} h_n(T_j, T_k) \right]^4 &= \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4=1}^{k-1} w_{i_1 k} w_{i_2 k} w_{i_3 k} w_{i_4 k} \mathbb{E} [h_n(T_{i_1}, T_k) h_n(T_{i_2}, T_k) h_n(T_{i_3}, T_k) h_n(T_{i_4}, T_k)] \\
&= \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4=1}^{k-1} w_{i_1 k} w_{i_2 k} w_{i_3 k} w_{i_4 k} \mathbb{E} [R_{m, i_1}^\top R_{m, k} R_{m, i_2}^\top R_{m, k} R_{m, i_3}^\top R_{m, k} R_{m, i_4}^\top R_{m, k}].
\end{aligned}$$

Due to independence and as $\mathbb{E}[R_{m,i}] = 0$ for all $i \in [k-1]$, if an index occurs only once in (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) , the corresponding term is zero. Therefore, the sum becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^4 \mathbb{E} [(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^4] + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik}^2 w_{jk}^2 \mathbb{E} [(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^2 (R_{m,j}^\top R_{m,k})^2].$$

Define $M_{\zeta_m} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, with $(M_{\zeta_m})_{ii} = 1$ for $i \in [m]$ and $(M_{\zeta_m})_{ij} = (\zeta_m - 1)/(m - 1)$ for $i \neq j, i, j \in [m]$. Then one can verify that for all k , $\mathbb{E}[G_{m,k} G_{m,k}^\top] = M_{\zeta_m}/m$. Therefore, since $D_{k,i}^2 = 1$ for all k, i , and $G_{m,i} \odot G_{m,i} = G_{m,i}/\sqrt{\zeta_m}$ for all i we have for all distinct i, j, k that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^2 (R_{m,j}^\top R_{m,k})^2] &= \mathbb{E} [(G_{m,i}^\top \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_k G_{m,k})^2 (G_{m,j}^\top \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_k G_{m,k})^2] \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} [G_{m,i}^\top G_{m,k} G_{m,k}^\top G_{m,j}] = \frac{1}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} [G_{m,i}]^\top \mathbb{E} [G_{m,k} G_{m,k}^\top] \mathbb{E} [G_{m,j}] = \frac{1}{\zeta_m^3} \left(\frac{\zeta_m}{m} \right)^2 \frac{1_m^\top M_{\zeta_m} 1_m}{m} = \frac{1}{m^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for all $i \neq k$, again since $G_{m,i} \odot G_{m,i} = G_{m,i}/\sqrt{\zeta_m}$ for all i

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(R_{m,i}^\top R_{m,k})^4] &= \mathbb{E} [(G_{m,i}^\top \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_k G_{m,k})^4] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^m D_{l,i} D_{l,k} (G_{m,i})_l (G_{m,k})_l \right)^4 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l^4 (G_{m,k})_l^4 \right] + 6 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l_1 < l_2} (G_{m,i})_{l_1}^2 (G_{m,k})_{l_1}^2 (G_{m,i})_{l_2}^2 (G_{m,k})_{l_2}^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta_m^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l (G_{m,k})_l \right] + \frac{3}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l_1 \neq l_2} (G_{m,i})_{l_1} (G_{m,k})_{l_1} (G_{m,i})_{l_2} (G_{m,k})_{l_2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta_m^3} \mathbb{E} [G_{m,i}^\top G_{m,k}] + \frac{3}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l (G_{m,k})_l \right)^2 - \sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l^2 (G_{m,k})_l^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This further equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\zeta_m^3} \mathbb{E} [G_{m,i}^\top G_{m,k}] + \frac{3}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l (G_{m,k})_l \right)^2 \right] - \frac{3}{\zeta_m^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l (G_{m,k})_l \right] \\
&= -\frac{2}{m\zeta_m^2} + \frac{3}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [G_{m,i}^\top G_{m,k} G_{m,k}^\top G_{m,i} | G_{m,i}]] \\
&= -\frac{2}{m\zeta_m^2} + \frac{3}{\zeta_m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=1}^m (G_{m,i})_l^2 + \frac{\zeta_m - 1}{m - 1} \sum_{l_1 \neq l_2} (G_{m,i})_{l_1} (G_{m,i})_{l_2} \right] \\
&= -\frac{2}{m\zeta_m^2} + \frac{3}{m\zeta_m^2} \left(\frac{m}{\zeta_m} \cdot \frac{\zeta_m}{m} + \frac{\zeta_m - 1}{m - 1} \cdot \frac{m(m-1)}{\zeta_m} \cdot \frac{\zeta_m(\zeta_m - 1)}{m(m-1)} \right) = \frac{m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2}{m(m-1)\zeta_m^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can express $\mathbb{E}\Upsilon_k^4$ as

$$\mathbb{E}\Upsilon_k^4 = \frac{m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2}{m(m-1)\zeta_m^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^4 + \frac{3}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik}^2 w_{jk}^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}\Upsilon_k^4}{s_n^4} = \frac{\frac{m(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)}{(m-1)\zeta_m^2} \sum_{i < k} w_{ik}^4 + 3 \sum_{k=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik}^2 w_{jk}^2}{(1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)^2}.$$

Thus, we only need to show that

$$\frac{m(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)}{(m-1)\zeta_m^2} \sum_{i < k} w_{ik}^4 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 w_{jk}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (76)$$

where recall that $w_{ij} = a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i}$ for all i, j . Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we find $w_{ij}^2 = (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 \leq (a_{n,i}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)(a_{n,j}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,j}^2)$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{i < k} w_{ik}^4 \leq \sum_{i,k} (a_{n,i}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)^2 (a_{n,k}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2)^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2) \right)^2 \leq \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i}^4 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4) \right)^2.$$

Based on Condition \mathfrak{P} from (26) and since $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$, we find $\sqrt{(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)/\zeta_m^2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^4 \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)/\zeta_m^2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4 \rightarrow 0$, and thus $m(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)/((m-1)\zeta_m^2) \cdot \sum_{i < k} w_{ik}^4 \rightarrow 0$.

Similarly, since $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$, $\sum_{k=1}^n (a_{n,i}^4 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4) = o(1)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=2}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 w_{jk}^2 &= \sum_{k=2}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 \right)^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (a_{n,i}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)(a_{n,k}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)(a_{n,k}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2) \right)^2 = 4 \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{n,k}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k}^2)^2 \leq 8 \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{n,i}^4 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4) \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equation, we have used that for all i , $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 = 1$.

Additionally, $2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i}^4 + \tilde{a}_{n,i}^4) \rightarrow 0$. In summary, we have shown that $\sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}\Upsilon_k^4/s_n^4 \rightarrow 0$, which verifies the Lyapunov condition.

Proof of ratio-consistency of variance

Next, recalling $q_n^2 = \sum_{k=2}^n \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon_k^2 | T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}]$, and s_n^2 from (75), we aim to prove that $s_n^{-2} q_n^2 \rightarrow_P 1$. For this, we calculate, for any $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon_k^2 | T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}] &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} \mathbb{E}[h_n(T_j, T_k) h_n(T_i, T_k) | T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top \mathbb{E}[R_{m,k} R_{m,k}^\top] R_{m,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i} / m. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$q_n^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w_{ik}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i} \right).$$

and thus

$$q_n^2 - s_n^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(q_n^2 - s_n^2)^2] &= \frac{1}{m^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 - \delta_{ij}) w_{ik} w_{jk} R_{m,j}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i_1 \neq j_1 < k_1} \sum_{i_2 \neq j_2 < k_2} w_{i_1 k_1} w_{j_1 k_1} w_{i_2 k_2} w_{j_2 k_2} \mathbb{E} [R_{m,i_1}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,j_1} R_{m,i_2}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,j_2}], \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where $\sum_{i_1 \neq j_1 < k_1} \star$ is an abbreviation for $\sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{i_1=1}^{k_1-1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{k_1-1} (1 - \delta_{i_1 j_1}) \star$. From the computation of the fourth moment of Υ_k , we know that the terms above are nonzero only when either $i_2 = i_1, j_2 = j_1$ or $i_2 = j_1, j_2 = i_1$. Due to the symmetry of the inner product, $R_{m,i_2}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,j_2} = R_{m,i_1}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,j_1}$ in both cases. Moreover, based on our previous results, for $i_1 \neq j_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(R_{m,i_1}^\top M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,j_1})^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} [R_{m,i_1}^\top M_{\zeta_m} \mathbb{E}[R_{m,j_1} R_{m,j_1}^\top] M_{\zeta_m} R_{m,i_1}] = 1/m \cdot \mathbb{E} [\text{tr}(M_{\zeta_m}^2 R_{m,i_1} R_{m,i_1}^\top)] \\ &= 1/m^2 \cdot \text{tr}(M_{\zeta_m}^2) = 1/m \cdot (1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2 / (m - 1)). \end{aligned}$$

This yields that (77) equals

$$\frac{1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2 / (m - 1)}{m^3} \sum_{k_1=2}^n \sum_{k_2=2}^n \sum_{i_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} (1 - \delta_{i_1 j_1}) w_{i_1 k_1} w_{j_1 k_1} w_{i_1 k_2} w_{j_1 k_2}. \quad (78)$$

Now, recalling that $w_{ij} = a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i}$ for all i, j , and applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|w_{i_1 k_1} w_{j_1 k_1} w_{i_1 k_2} w_{j_1 k_2}| \leq (a_{n,i_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i_1}^2) (a_{n,j_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,j_1}^2) (a_{n,k_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_1}^2) (a_{n,k_2}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_2}^2).$$

Thus, using that for all i , $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 = 1$, (78) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2}{m^3} \sum_{k_1=2}^n \sum_{k_2=2}^n \sum_{i_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} (a_{n,i_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i_1}^2) (a_{n,j_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,j_1}^2) (a_{n,k_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_1}^2) (a_{n,k_2}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_2}^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2}{m^3} \sum_{i_1, j_1, k_1, k_2} (a_{n,i_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,i_1}^2) (a_{n,j_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,j_1}^2) (a_{n,k_1}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_1}^2) (a_{n,k_2}^2 + \tilde{a}_{n,k_2}^2) = \frac{16 \left(1 + \frac{(\zeta_m - 1)^2}{m - 1} \right)}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\zeta_m^2/m \rightarrow 0$, we have established that

$$s_n^{-4} \mathbb{E}[(q_n^2 - s_n^2)^2] \leq \frac{16/m^3 \cdot (1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2/(m-1))}{(1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2)/m^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

This shows that $s_n^{-2} q_n^2 \xrightarrow{\ell_2} 1$, and thus $s_n^{-2} q_n^2 \rightarrow_P 1$. Since $s_n^{-1} S_n \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $ms_n^2/(1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2) \rightarrow_P 1$, (30) follows.

7.14 Proof of Lemma 3.9

We will use a martingale central limit theorem argument, as in the proof of Lemma 3.8. By the Cramer-Wold device as shown in (73), we can focus on

$$\text{tr}(\Phi(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p)) = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i (w_i^\top U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n w_i - 1).$$

We denote $t_i^k := (U_n w_i)_k$ for $i \in [p], i \in [n]$. Then, we can rewrite the above as

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \left(\sum_{k \neq j} t_k^i t_j^i R_{m,k}^\top R_{m,j} \right) = \sum_{k < j} 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i t_k^i t_j^i \right) R_{m,k}^\top R_{m,j}.$$

As in (74), this is a weighted degenerate U-statistic, where $w_{kj} = 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i t_k^i t_j^i \right)$ for all k, j . Using notations from Lemma 3.8, as well as $t^k = (t_i^k)_{i \in [n]}$ for $k \in [p]$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} ms_n^2 &= \sum_{i < j} w_{ij}^2 = 4 \sum_{i < j} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k t_i^k t_j^k \right)^2 = 4 \sum_{k_1, k_2} \mu_{k_1} \mu_{k_2} \sum_{i < j} t_i^{k_1} t_j^{k_1} t_i^{k_2} t_j^{k_2} \\ &= 2 \sum_{k_1, k_2} \mu_{k_1} \mu_{k_2} \left((t^{k_1, \top} t^{k_2})^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the orthogonality of U_n , $t^{k_1, \top} t^{k_2} = w_{k_1}^\top w_{k_2} = \delta_{k_1 k_2}$, and so this equals

$$2 \sum_{k_1, k_2} \mu_{k_1} \mu_{k_2} \left(\delta_{k_1 k_2} - \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2 \right) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 - 2 \sum_{k_1, k_2} \mu_{k_1} \mu_{k_2} \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2.$$

Since $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (27), we have $\sum_{i=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4 = o(\zeta_m/\sqrt{m})$ for every $k \in [p]$, and so recalling that $t_i^k = (U_n w_k)_i$ for $k \in [p], i \in [n]$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can derive that $\sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2 = o(\zeta_m/\sqrt{m})$ for every $k_1, k_2 \in [p]$. Thus, $ms_n^2 - 2 \sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 \rightarrow 0$. By applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality once more, we find that

$$w_{ij}^2 = 4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k t_i^k t_j^k \right)^2 \leq 4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 (t_i^k)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right) \leq 4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right).$$

Denoting $C := 4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 \right)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i < j} w_{ij}^4 &\leq C^2 \sum_{i < j} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right)^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right)^2 \leq C^2 \sum_{i,j} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right)^2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right)^2 \\ &= \left(C \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right)^2 \right)^2 = \left(C \sum_{k_1, k_2} \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n \left(t_i^{k_1}\right)^2 \left(t_i^{k_2}\right)^2 = o(\zeta_m/\sqrt{m})$, we conclude that $\frac{m(m-1+3(\zeta_m-1)^2)}{((m-1)\zeta_m^2)} \cdot \sum_{i < j} w_{ij}^4 \rightarrow 0$, which verifies the first part of (76). Additionally, since for all $k \in [p]$, $\sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^k)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n w_k)_i^2 = \|w_k\|^2 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} w_{ij}^2 \right)^2 &\leq C^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right) \right]^2 \leq C^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_i^k)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right) \right]^2 \\ &= C^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left(p \sum_{k=1}^p (t_j^k)^2 \right)^2 = p^2 C^2 \sum_{k_1, k_2} \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^{k_1})^2 (t_i^{k_2})^2 \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the second part of (76). Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2/(m - 1)}{m} \sum_{k_1=2}^n \sum_{k_2=2}^n \sum_{i_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} \sum_{j_1=1}^{k_1 \wedge k_2 - 1} w_{i_1 k_1} w_{j_1 k_1} w_{i_1 k_2} w_{j_1 k_2} \\ &\leq \frac{C^2 (1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2/(m - 1))}{m} \sum_{i_1, j_1, k_1, k_2} \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (r_{i_1}^l)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (r_{j_1}^l)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (r_{k_1}^l)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^p (r_{k_2}^l)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{C^2 (1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2/(m - 1))}{m} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^p (r_i^l)^2 \right)^4 = \frac{C^2 p^4 (1 + (\zeta_m - 1)^2/(m - 1))}{m} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the conditions needed for the martingale central limit theorem, as used previously in the proof of Lemma 3.8, are satisfied. Since $2 \sum_{k=1}^p \mu_k^2 = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top (I_{p^2} + P_p) \text{vec}(\Phi)$, we conclude that

$$\sqrt{m} \text{tr} \left(\Phi (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N} \left(0, \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top (I_{p^2} + P_p) \text{vec}(\Phi) \right),$$

and (31) follows.

7.15 Proof of Theorem 3.10

The proofs of all claims other than (35) can be directly obtained from Theorem 2.5 by letting $G_n := n \sum_{i=1}^n ((u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top) \otimes (u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top))$, as $(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)} = n \sum_{k=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4$. Now, to conclude (35) from (34), let $u_{n,i}$ be the i -th column of U_n . By calculating variances, we argue that

$$\frac{m \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j^\top u_{n,i})^4}{n \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4} \rightarrow_P 1. \quad (79)$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^m (s_j^\top u_{n,i})^4 = n^2/m^2 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^n (b_l(U_n)_{li})^4 = n^2/m^2 \cdot \sum_{l=1}^n (U_n)_{li}^4 b_l$, by Condition \mathfrak{P}' , the variance of the left hand side of (79) is

$$\frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^n (U_n)_{li}^8}{\left(\sum_{l=1}^n (U_n)_{li}^4 \right)^2} \leq \frac{1 - \gamma_n}{\gamma_n} \frac{\max_{l \in [n]} (U_n)_{li}^4}{\sum_{l=1}^n (U_n)_{li}^4} \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Now, recall that $\tilde{X}_{m,n} = \tilde{U}_{m,n} \hat{L}_{m,n} \hat{V}_{m,n}^\top$ is the SVD of $\tilde{X}_{m,n}$. By Condition \mathfrak{P}' defined in (33), $n \sum_{k=1}^n (U_n)_{ki}^4/m = (G_n)_{(ii),(ii)}/m \rightarrow 0$; combining this with Theorem 3.10, we have $L_n^{-1} \hat{L}_{m,n} \rightarrow_P I_p$ and $V_n^{-1} \hat{V}_{m,n} \rightarrow_P I_p$. Noting that $\tilde{U}_{m,n} = \tilde{X}_{m,n} \hat{V}_{m,n} \hat{L}_{m,n}^{-1} = S_{m,n} U_n L_n V_n^\top \hat{V}_{m,n} \hat{L}_{m,n}^{-1}$, and $L_n V_n^\top \hat{V}_{m,n} \hat{L}_{m,n}^{-1} \rightarrow_P I_p$. Expanding the summation in the numerator according to the rules of matrix element multiplication, we conclude that

$$n^{-1} m \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{U}_{ji}^4 / \left[n^{-1} m \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j^\top u_{n,i})^4 \right] \rightarrow_P 1.$$

Hence, (35) follows from (34).

7.16 Proof of Theorem 3.11

The proof is based on the following asymptotic distribution and consistency properties.

Lemma 7.4 (Asymptotic Normality in Least Squares with Uniform Random Sampling). *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.11, with*

$$\Sigma_n := n(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top \right) (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}, \quad (80)$$

we have $m^{1/2}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-1/2} \Sigma_n^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Similarly, defining

$$\Sigma_n^{(p)} := n(X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i})^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top \right) (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}, \quad (81)$$

we have $m^{1/2}(1 - \gamma_n)^{-1/2} (\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1/2} (\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

The asymptotic result (80) coincides with Theorem 2 of Yu et al. (2022) by taking $\Psi(x) = x$ and $p_i = r/n$ therein. Their result assumes that X_n has i.i.d. rows and y_n has i.i.d. entries, and then conditions on X_n and y_n . In contrast, we do not make this assumption on X_n and y_n .

Proof. For any $b_n \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$, $n \geq 1$, since $\|\text{vec}(U_n)\|_\infty = O(1/\sqrt{n})$, we have $\|U_n b_n\|_\infty = O(1/\sqrt{n})$. Then $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition **p**, and due to Lemma 3.12, Condition 2.1 **Bounded** holds for the sequences $(U_n b_n, U_n b_n)_{n \geq 1}$.

From Lemma 3.12, $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n) = n \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2$. By (36), $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition **\mathfrak{F}** and the sequence of variances $\sigma_n^2(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n) = n \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n b_n)_i^2 (\bar{\varepsilon}_n)_i^2$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity. Therefore, Condition 2.1 **1-dim** holds for the sequences $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, and $M_n = n U_n^\top \text{diag}(\bar{\varepsilon}_n \odot \bar{\varepsilon}_n) U_n$. Similarly to the proof in Theorem 7.6, combining this with Lemma 3.12, we conclude the desired claim for $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$.

Similarly, Condition 2.1 **1-dim** holds for $(U_n b_n, \overline{X_n \beta_n})_{n \geq 1}$, and using Lemma 3.12, we have $M_n^{(p)} = n \|X_n \beta_n\|^{-2} U_n^\top \text{diag}((X_n \beta_n) \odot (X_n \beta_n)) U_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$. Therefore, if we take $b_n = L_n^{-1} V_n^\top c / \|X_n^\dagger c\|$, the claim for $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ follows as in Theorem 7.6. \square

Proposition 7.5 (Consistency of the Uniform Random Sampling Estimator of the Covariance Matrices). *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.11, we have*

$$\|\Sigma_n^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} - I_p\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} - I_p\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1).$$

Proof. We consider $y_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and X_n of a unit spectral radius first. From (50), $\|\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} - X_n^\top X_n\| = o_P(1)$. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\left\| \frac{m}{n} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} \odot \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}) \tilde{X}_{m,n} - \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top \right\| = o_P(1).$$

Since $S_{m,n} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{n/m} B_1, \dots, \sqrt{n/m} B_n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} \odot \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n}) \tilde{X}_{m,n} &= \sqrt{n/m} X_n^\top S_{m,n} \text{diag}(B_1^2 (y_n - X_n \hat{\beta}_{m,n})_1^2, \dots, B_n^2 (y_n - X_n \hat{\beta}_{m,n})_n^2) S_{m,n} X_n \\ &= (n/m) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (n/m) B_i (\varepsilon_n + X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}))_i^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can check that $\sum_{i=1}^n [(n/m) B_i - 1] \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 (x_{n,i}^\top c)^2 = o_P(1)$, while $\|\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}\| = O_P(\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_n)/m})$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (n/m) B_i \cdot 2 \varepsilon_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}) (x_{n,i}^\top c)^2 = O_P(\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_n)/m} \cdot n/m)$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^n (n/m) B_i \cdot (x_{n,i}^\top (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}))^2 (x_{n,i}^\top c)^2 = O_P((1 - \gamma_n)/m \cdot n/m)$.

Thus, the first claim of Proposition 7.5 holds when $\|y_n\| = 1$ and $\|X_n\| = 1$. For general y_n and X_n , the proof is similar to that of Proposition 7.7. For the second conclusion, the proof is almost identical to the above argument. \square

7.17 Proof of Lemma 3.12

To show (38), notice that $\text{Var} [a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n] = n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \cdot (1-\gamma_n)/m$. Then (38) follows by Condition \mathfrak{p} from (32).

To see (39), we know that $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = \frac{n}{m} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} B_i$ and $\mathbb{E} B_i = m/n$. Denoting $J_i = (1/\gamma_n - 1)^{-1/2} (\frac{n}{m} B_i - 1)$, we have that J_i are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E} J_i = 0$ and $\mathbb{E} J_i^2 = 1$. As a consequence, $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n = (1/\gamma_n - 1)^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} J_i$. We check the Lindeberg condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 J_i^2 I\{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 J_i^2 > \varepsilon s_n^2\}] / s_n^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad (82)$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$, where $s_n^2 = \text{Var} [\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} J_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2 \text{Var} [J_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[J_i^2 I\{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 J_i^2 > \varepsilon s_n^2\}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[J_i^2 I \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}{s_n^2} J_i^2 > \varepsilon \right\} \right],$$

so the left hand side of (82) is upper bounded by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}{s_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[J_i^2 I \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}{s_n^2} J_i^2 > \varepsilon \right\} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[J_i^2 I \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{(a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2}{s_n^2} J_i^2 > \varepsilon \right\} \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

where the convergence to zero holds due to Condition \mathfrak{P} . Then (39) follows.

A counterexample that does not satisfy Condition \mathfrak{P} , such that $\sqrt{m} a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n$ is not asymptotically normal is $a_n = \tilde{a}_n = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1-\gamma_n}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,i}^2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} J_i = \sqrt{\frac{m}{n-m}} J_1.$$

This random variable takes two values, so it is not asymptotically normal.

7.18 Proof of Lemma 3.13

By the subsequence argument and Cramer-Wold device as in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.17, it suffices to show that for any upper triangular $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{1-\gamma_n}} (\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi))^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Denote $U_n = (u_{n,1}, \dots, u_{n,n})^\top$, where $u_{n,i}^\top$ is the i -th row of U_n . Then

$$\text{tr}(\Phi(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p)) = \text{tr} \left(\Phi \sum_{i=1}^n u_{n,i} u_{n,i}^\top \left(\frac{n}{m} B_i - 1 \right) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_{n,i}^\top \Phi u_{n,i} \left(\frac{n}{m} B_i - 1 \right).$$

Denote $J_i = (1/\gamma_n - 1)^{-1/2} (\frac{n}{m} B_i - 1)$ for all $i \in [n]$, so that $\mathbb{E} J_i = 0, \mathbb{E} J_i^2 = 1$. Then from Lemma 3.12, if U_n satisfies $\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} (u_{n,i}^\top \Phi u_{n,i})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (u_{n,i}^\top \Phi u_{n,i})^2} \rightarrow 0$ in Condition \mathfrak{P}' from (33), the above term is asymptotically normal.

7.19 Proof of Theorem 3.14

By Lemma 3.17, since $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , Condition 2.1 Sym holds with $\tau_{m,n} = 1$ and $G_n = I_{p^2} + P_p + \Gamma_n$. Moreover, for all $i \in [p]$, $(G_n)_{(ii),(ii)} = 2 + (\Gamma_n)_{(ii),(ii)}$, and thus from (14),

$$\Delta_i = \Delta_i(\Xi, G_n) = \sum_{k \neq i, l \neq i} \frac{\lambda_i(\Xi) \sqrt{\lambda_k(\Xi) \lambda_l(\Xi)}}{(\lambda_i(\Xi) - \lambda_k(\Xi)) (\lambda_i(\Xi) - \lambda_l(\Xi))} (\delta_{kl} + (\Gamma_n)_{(ij),(kl)}) v_k(\Xi) v_l(\Xi)^\top.$$

Since $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition 2.2 B, the conclusion holds due to Theorem 2.5.

7.20 Proof of Theorem 3.15

We first show the following result, which establishes the asymptotic normality of sketched least squares estimators. The result can be regarded as a special case of Theorem 3.2 in Zhang et al. (2023) for a fixed dimension p , but with the weaker condition that the moments of the sketching matrices have a $(4 + \delta)$ -th moment, as opposed to having all moments finite. Also, it turns out that for i.i.d. sketching, using our general framework would require assuming that $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.17. However, by a more direct analysis, we can avoid this condition; and so the proof we present deviates from our general framework.

In the remainder, we denote $X_n = (x_{n,1}^\top, \dots, x_{n,p}^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $y_n = (y_{n,1}, \dots, y_{n,p})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Lemma 7.6 (Asymptotic Normality in Least Squares with i.i.d. Sketching). *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.15, with*

$$\Sigma_n := (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 [X_n^\top X_n + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top] \right\} (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1}, \quad (83)$$

we have $m^{1/2}\Sigma_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\beta}_{m,n} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$. Similarly, defining

$$\Sigma_n^{(p)} := (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 + (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left[(\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i})^2 x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top \right] (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + \beta_n \beta_n^\top, \quad (84)$$

we have $m^{1/2}(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1/2}(\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)} - \beta_n) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$.

Proof. Consider a sequence of vectors $(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that $a_n, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ for all n . From Lemma 3.16, we have Condition 2.1 Bounded.

For the first claim, (93) in the proof of Lemma 3.16 in Section 7.21 shows that the sequence of variances $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n) = 1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity. Therefore, Condition 2.1 1-dim holds for the sequence $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$, and we have $M_n = I_p + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)U_n^\top \text{diag}(\bar{\varepsilon}_n \odot \bar{\varepsilon}_n)U_n$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} V_n L_n^{-1} M_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top &= V_n L_n^{-2} V_n^\top + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top \text{diag}(\bar{\varepsilon}_n \odot \bar{\varepsilon}_n) U_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top \\ &= (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} X_n^\top \text{diag}(\varepsilon_n \odot \varepsilon_n) X_n (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} / \|\varepsilon_n\|^2 \\ &= (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top \right) (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} / \|\varepsilon_n\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the claim for $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}$ follows from (7) in Theorem 2.3; where we remark that all necessary conditions hold due to the stated assumptions.

For the second claim, we define $\tau_{m,n} = \kappa_{n,4}$, so that by the Hölder inequality, $\tau_{m,n} = o(m)$. Also, $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n) = (1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2) / \kappa_{n,4} = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 + o(1)$. From the proof of Lemma 3.16, $\sigma_n^2(a_n, \tilde{a}_n)$, are uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity for $n \geq 1$. Similarly, Condition 2.1 1-dim holds for $(U_n b_n, \overline{X_n \beta_n})_{n \geq 1}$, and using Lemma 3.16, we have $M_n^{(p)} = I_p + \|X_n \beta_n\|^{-2} L_n V_n \beta_n \beta_n^\top V_n^\top L_n + \|X_n \beta_n\|^{-2} (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) U_n^\top \text{diag}((X_n \beta_n) \odot (X_n \beta_n)) U_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^{p \times p}$. Therefore, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_n^{(p)} &= \|X_n \beta_n\|^2 V_n L_n^{-1} M_n^{(p)} L_n^{-1} V_n^\top \\ &= \|X_n \beta_n\|^2 (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + \beta_n \beta_n^\top + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) V_n L_n^{-1} U_n^\top \text{diag}((X_n \beta_n) \odot (X_n \beta_n)) U_n L_n^{-1} V_n^\top \\ &= (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 + (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} \left[(\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (y_{n,i} - \varepsilon_{n,i})^2 x_{n,i} x_{n,i}^\top \right] (X_n^\top X_n)^{-1} + \beta_n \beta_n^\top, \end{aligned}$$

the claim for $\hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ follows from Theorem 2.3. \square

We will also use the following proposition, which shows that $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)}$ are ratio-consistent estimators of Σ_n and $\Sigma_n^{(p)}$, respectively.

Proposition 7.7 (Consistency of the i.i.d. Sketching Estimator of the Covariance Matrices). *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.15, we have*

$$\|\Sigma_n^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n} - I_p\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|(\Sigma_n^{(p)})^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}_{m,n}^{(p)} - I_p\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1).$$

Proof. We consider $y_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and X_n of a unit spectral radius first. For each $i \in [m]$, we denote the i -th row of $\sqrt{m}S_{m,n}$ by s_i^\top . To prove the first claim, due to (44) and (83), it suffices to show that

$$\|\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \tilde{X}_{m,n} - X_n^\top X_n\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1) \quad (85)$$

and

$$\left\| m\tilde{X}_{m,n}^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n} \odot \tilde{\varepsilon}_{m,n})\tilde{X}_{m,n} - \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 [X_n^\top X_n + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top] \right\|_{\text{Fr}} = o_P(1). \quad (86)$$

We can conclude (85) from (50). Also, since $\sqrt{m}\tilde{\varepsilon}_{n,i} = s_i^\top(y_n - X_n\hat{\beta}_{m,n})$, to establish (86), it is sufficient to show that for any fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $c \neq 0$, for $\sigma_n^2 := c^\top \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{n,i}^2 [X_n^\top X_n + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top] \right\} c$, we have

$$\sigma_n^2 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(c^\top X_n^\top s_i s_i^\top (y_n - X_n\hat{\beta}_{m,n}) \right)^2 = o_P(1). \quad (87)$$

From (90) with $a_n = X_n c$ and $\tilde{a}_n = \varepsilon_n = y_n - X_n\beta_n$, and using the law of large numbers for triangular arrays (see, for instance, Theorem 2.2.6 in Durrett (2019)), we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_n^{-2} \left(c^\top X_n^\top s_i s_i^\top (y_n - X_n\beta_n) \right)^2 \rightarrow_P 1. \quad (88)$$

We claim that

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_n^{-2} \left(c^\top X_n^\top s_i s_i^\top X_n (\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}) \right)^2 \rightarrow_P 0. \quad (89)$$

This claim follows from the following three facts:

$$\|\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}\| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\sigma_n), \quad \max_{i \in [m]} \|s_i^\top X_n\| = o_P(m^{1/2}), \quad \text{and} \quad c^\top X_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} X_n c = O_P(1).$$

The first claim follows from Lemma 7.6; the second is a consequence of Markov's inequality and a union bound, and the third one follows from $\|a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n\| = O_P(m^{-1/2})$.

Then, from (88), (89), we can conclude (87). Thus, the first claim of Proposition 7.7 holds when $\|y_n\| = 1$ and $\|X_n\| = 1$.

For general y_n and X_n , we let $y'_n = y_n/\|y_n\|$ and $X'_n = X_n/\|X_n\|$, and we consider the observed data $S_{m,n}(X'_n, y'_n)$. By applying the above argument with $\sigma_n^2 = c^\top \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (\varepsilon_{n,i}/\|y_n\|)^2 [X_n^\top X_n + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top]/\|X_n\|^2 \right\} c$ rescaled by $\|X_n\|$ and $\|y_n\|$, and corresponding rescaled estimators, as well as all other appropriate quantities rescaled, the $\|X_n\|$ and $\|y_n\|$ terms cancel out, leading to the desired result for general X_n and y_n .

Next, we consider the second conclusion from Proposition 7.7. Similarly to the analysis of the first conclusion, it suffices to consider $y_n \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. By choosing $a_n = X_n c$ and $\tilde{a}_n = X_n\beta_n$ in (90), we can apply the law of large numbers for triangular arrays (see, for instance, Theorem 2.2.6 in Durrett (2019)) to obtain that with

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_n^{(p)})^2 &:= (c^\top X_n^\top X_n c)(\beta_n^\top X_n^\top X_n \beta) + (c^\top X_n^\top X_n \beta_n)^2 + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)c^\top X_n^\top \text{diag}(X_n\beta_n \odot X_n\beta_n)X_n c \\ &= c^\top (\|y_n - \varepsilon_n\|^2 [X_n^\top X_n + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3)x_{n,i}x_{n,i}^\top] + X_n^\top y_n y_n^\top X_n) c, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\sigma_n^{(p)})^{-2} (c^\top X_n^\top s_i s_i^\top X_n \beta_n)^2 \rightarrow_P 1$. The conclusion follows similarly as for sketch-and-solve above, using that $\|\beta_n - \hat{\beta}_{m,n}^{(p)}\| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\sigma_n^{(p)})$. \square

Combining the above two results, the conclusion follows.

7.21 Proof of Lemma 3.16

We start by observing that $a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (s_i^\top a_n \tilde{a}_n^\top s_i - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)$. By applying equation (9.8.6) in Bai and Silverstein (2010), each of the above i.i.d. centered random variables has variance

$$\sigma_n^2 := \mathbb{E}(s_i^\top a_n \tilde{a}_n^\top s_i - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 = (a_n^\top a_n)(\tilde{a}_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2 + (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2. \quad (90)$$

To establish the asymptotic normality, we use the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem for triangular arrays for $\xi_{n,i} := (s_i^\top a_n \tilde{a}_n^\top s_i - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)/\sigma_n$, so that $\xi_{n,1}, \dots, \xi_{n,m}$ are i.i.d. random variables with unit variance, whose distribution may depend on n . To check the Lindeberg condition, we denote $r = 1 + \delta/4 > 1$ and use the Hölder inequality to obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_{n,1}^2 I\{|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}\}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,1}^{2r}]^{1/r} \cdot \mathbb{P} [|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}]^{1-1/r}. \quad (91)$$

Applying Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P} [|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,1}^2]}{\varepsilon^2 m} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 m}. \quad (92)$$

Furthermore, by Lemma B.26 in Bai and Silverstein (2010) for the centered quadratic form $\xi_{n,1}$ in s_1 , we find $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,1}^{2r}] \leq C(\kappa_{n,4}^r + \kappa_{n,4r})/\sigma_n^{2r}$, where C is an absolute constant. Therefore, $\mathbb{E} [\xi_{n,1}^2 I\{|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}\}] \leq [C(\kappa_{n,4}^r + \kappa_{n,4r})]^{1/r}/\sigma_n^2 \cdot (\varepsilon^2 m)^{1/r-1}$.

Now consider the first condition from Condition \mathfrak{P} defined in (40). We observe that if $\kappa_{n,4} \geq 3$, then $1 \leq \sigma_n^2 \leq 2 + \kappa_{n,4} - 3 \leq \kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)} - 1 < +\infty$. Otherwise, if $1 + \delta' \leq \kappa_{n,4} < 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_n^2 &= \frac{\kappa_{n,4} - 1}{2} + \frac{\kappa_{n,4} - 1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} \right)^2 + \frac{3 - \kappa_{n,4}}{2} \left[\sum_{i \neq j} a_{n,i}^2 \tilde{a}_{n,j}^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,j} \right] \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{n,4} - 1}{2} + \frac{\kappa_{n,4} - 1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i} \right)^2 + \frac{3 - \kappa_{n,4}}{4} \sum_{i \neq j} (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,j} + a_{n,j} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 \geq \frac{\delta'}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Thus σ_n^2 are bounded uniformly away from zero. Hence, $\mathbb{E} [\xi_{n,1}^2 I\{|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}\}] \rightarrow 0$.

Next, consider the second condition from Condition \mathfrak{P} defined in (40). In this case, since $\kappa_{n,4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\sigma_n^2/\kappa_{n,4} = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_{n,i} \tilde{a}_{n,i})^2 + o(1)$ from the expression in (90), so $\sigma_n^2/\kappa_{n,4}$ are uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity. Therefore, we can choose a $\delta'' > 0$ in this case such that $\sigma_n^2/\kappa_{n,4} \geq \delta''$. Consequently, using Hölder's inequality again, and as $\kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)}/\kappa_{n,4} = o(m^{\delta/(4+\delta)})$, $\mathbb{E} [\xi_{n,1}^2 I\{|\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon\sqrt{m}\}]$ is bounded above by

$$\frac{C(\kappa_{n,4}^r + \kappa_{n,4r})^{1/r}}{(\varepsilon^2 m)^{1-1/r} \kappa_{n,4}(\delta' \wedge \delta'')^2} \leq \frac{C' \kappa_{n,4r}^{1/r}}{(\varepsilon^2 m)^{1-1/r} \kappa_{n,4}(\delta' \wedge \delta'')^2} = o\left(\frac{C'(m^{1-1/r})}{(\varepsilon^2 m)^{1-1/r}(\delta' \wedge \delta'')^2}\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

By the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem, the conclusion follows.

7.22 Proof of Lemma 3.17

By the subsequence argument as in the proof of (7) from Theorem 2.3, it suffices to show that for any $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$,

$$\sqrt{m} (\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top D_p^\top G_n D_p \text{vec}(\Phi))^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top D_p^\top \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (94)$$

Since $D_p \text{vec}(\Phi) = \text{vec}(\tilde{\Phi})$, where $\tilde{\Phi}$ is an upper triangular matrix, we only need to show that for any upper triangular $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$,

$$\sqrt{m} (\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi))^{-1/2} \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

For each $i \in [m]$, we denote by s_i^\top the i -th row of $\sqrt{m}S_{m,n}$, where $S_{m,n}^\top = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$. Since $S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m s_i s_i^\top$, we can write

$$\sqrt{m} \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top \text{vec}(U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) = \sqrt{m} \text{tr}(\Phi (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^m (s_i^\top U_n \Phi U_n^\top s_i - \text{tr}(\Phi)).$$

Denoting $\xi_{n,i} = s_i^\top U_n \Phi U_n^\top s_i - \text{tr}(\Phi)$ for all $i \in [n]$, $\xi_{n,1}, \dots, \xi_{n,m}$ are i.i.d. random variables. According to (9.8.6) in Bai and Silverstein (2010),

$$\text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}] = (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)_{ii}^2 + 2 \text{tr}(U_n \Phi U_n^\top (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)^\top).$$

Now

$$\text{tr}(U_n \Phi U_n^\top (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)^\top) = \text{tr}(\Phi U_n^\top U_n \Phi^\top U_n^\top U_n) = \text{tr}(\Phi \Phi^\top) = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top \text{vec}(\Phi) = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top P_p \text{vec}(\Phi),$$

and thus $2 \text{tr}(U_n \Phi U_n^\top (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)^\top) = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top (I_{p^2} + P_p) \text{vec}(\Phi)$.

On the other hand, $(\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)_{ii}^2 = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top \Gamma_n \text{vec}(\Phi)$, where for every $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \in [p]$,

$$(\Gamma_n)_{(k_1 k_2), (k_3 k_4)} = (\kappa_{n,4} - 3) \sum_{h=1}^n (U_n)_{hk_1} (U_n)_{hk_2} (U_n)_{hk_3} (U_n)_{hk_4}.$$

Therefore, $\text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}] = \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi)$.

In order to apply the central limit theorem for triangular arrays $(1/\sqrt{m}) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m (\xi_{n,i}/\sqrt{\text{Var}[\xi_{n,i}]})$, we need to verify the Lindeberg-Feller condition that for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\xi_{n,1}^2}{\text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}]} I \left\{ |\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon \sqrt{m \text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}]} \right\} \right] \rightarrow 0$. With $r = 1 + \delta/4 > 1$, by an argument identical to the one in the proof of Lemma 3.16, we can conclude (91) and the first inequality in (92). Then $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,1}^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{n,1}^{2r}]$ can be bounded as in that argument via Lemma B.26 in Bai and Silverstein (2010), and using that Φ does not depend on m and n .

Now consider the first condition from Condition \mathfrak{P} defined in (40). One can check as in the proof of Lemma 3.16, calculating similarly as in (93) that $(\delta'/2) \cdot \|\Phi\|_{\text{Fr}}^2 \leq \text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi) \leq (\kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)} - 1) \|\Phi\|_{\text{Fr}}^2$.

Next, consider the second condition from Condition \mathfrak{P} defined in (40), so that $\kappa_{n,4} \rightarrow \infty$, and $\kappa_{n,4+\delta}^{4/(4+\delta)}/\kappa_{n,4} = o(m^{\delta/(4+\delta)})$. Moreover, $\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi)/\kappa_{n,4} = \sum_{i=1}^n (U_n \Phi U_n^\top)_{ii}^2 + o(1)$, so $\text{vec}(\Phi)^\top G_n \text{vec}(\Phi)/\kappa_{n,4}$ are uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity, as in the previous proof for Lemma 3.16. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\xi_{n,1}^2}{\text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}]} I \left\{ |\xi_{n,1}| > \varepsilon \sqrt{m \text{Var}[\xi_{n,1}]} \right\} \right] \leq \frac{C' \kappa_{n,4r}^{1/r}}{(\varepsilon^2 m)^{1-1/r} \delta'^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

verifying the Lindeberg-Feller condition.

7.23 Proof of Theorem 3.18

By Lemma 3.21, if $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition \mathfrak{P}' , Condition 2.1 Sym-1 holds with $G = I_{p^2} + P_p$ and $\tau_{m,n} = 1 - \gamma_n$. Therefore, Condition 2.1 Sym-1' holds with $\alpha = 0$. Then under Condition 2.2 B, we finish the proof based on Theorem 2.5.

7.24 Proof of Theorem 3.19

From Lemma 3.20, we know that Condition 2.1 1-dim' holds for $(U_n b_n, \bar{\varepsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $\alpha = 0$. Then by Theorem 2.3, we conclude the first result, and the second one follows similarly.

7.25 Proof of Lemma 3.20

If $a_n \neq \pm \tilde{a}_n$, define $a'_n = (I - a_n a_n^\top) \tilde{a}_n / \|(I - a_n a_n^\top) \tilde{a}_n\|$, otherwise, define a'_n as an arbitrary unit length vector orthogonal to a_n , so that we have (72). Thus, we can write

$$a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n) a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} a_n + (1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2)^{1/2} a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} a'_n. \quad (95)$$

Now, let $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^\top$, $\tilde{Z} = (\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n)^\top$ be two independent vectors, each containing independent standard normal entries. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some integers m, m' with $1 \leq m \leq m' \leq n$, we denote $v_{m:m'} = (v_m, \dots, v_{m'})^\top$. We then claim that we have the following representation:

$$S_{m,n} a_n =_d \gamma_n^{-1/2} \frac{Z_{1:m}}{\|Z\|}, \quad S_{m,n} a'_n =_d \gamma_n^{-1/2} \frac{\tilde{Z}_{1:m} - \frac{Z^\top \tilde{Z}}{\|Z\|^2} Z_{1:m}}{\sqrt{\|\tilde{Z}\|^2 - \frac{(Z^\top \tilde{Z})^2}{\|Z\|^2}}}. \quad (96)$$

This follows because $\gamma_n^{1/2} S_{m,n}(a_n, a'_n)$ has the same distribution as an $m \times 2$ submatrix of a Haar distributed matrix. By generating the Haar matrix using the Gram-Schmidt process starting from (Z, \tilde{Z}) , we obtain the representation from (96). Specifically, the first column is given by $w_1 = Z/\|Z\|$, and the second is obtained as $[\tilde{Z} - (w_1^\top \tilde{Z})w_1]/\|\tilde{Z} - (w_1^\top \tilde{Z})w_1\|$. Taking the first m coordinates of these columns gives us the representation in (96).

We define the following quantities:

$$\mathcal{X}_{n,1} = m^{-1} \|Z_{1:m}\|^2, \quad \mathcal{X}_{n,2} = (n-m)^{-1} \|Z_{(m+1):n}\|^2, \quad \mathcal{C}_{n,1} = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m Z_i \tilde{Z}_i, \quad \mathcal{C}_{n,2} = (n-m)^{-1} \sum_{i=m+1}^n Z_i \tilde{Z}_i,$$

and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,1}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,2}$ are defined by replacing the coordinates of Z in the definitions of $\mathcal{X}_{n,1}, \mathcal{X}_{n,2}$ with the corresponding ones of \tilde{Z} . According to the central limit theorem, the asymptotic distribution as $m, n-m \rightarrow \infty$ of the vector

$$\left(\sqrt{m}(\mathcal{X}_{n,1} - 1), \sqrt{n-m}(\mathcal{X}_{n,2} - 1), \sqrt{m}\mathcal{C}_{n,1}, \sqrt{n-m}\mathcal{C}_{n,2}, \sqrt{m}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,1} - 1), \sqrt{n-m}(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,2} - 1) \right) \quad (97)$$

follows a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and a diagonal covariance matrix with the vector $(2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2)$ on the diagonal. Finally, we have

$$\|S_{m,n} a_n\|^2 = \frac{n}{m} \frac{\|Z_{1:m}\|^2}{\|Z_{1:m}\|^2 + \|Z_{(m+1):n}\|^2} = \frac{\mathcal{X}_{n,1}}{\gamma_n \mathcal{X}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{X}_{n,2}},$$

and

$$a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} a'_n = \frac{\mathcal{C}_{n,1} - \frac{\mathcal{X}_{n,1}}{\gamma_n \mathcal{X}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{X}_{n,2}} (\gamma_n \mathcal{C}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{C}_{n,2})}{\sqrt{\gamma_n \mathcal{X}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{X}_{n,2}} \left[\gamma_n \mathcal{X}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{X}_{n,2} - \frac{(\gamma_n \mathcal{C}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{C}_{n,2})^2}{\gamma_n \mathcal{X}_{n,1} + (1 - \gamma_n) \mathcal{X}_{n,2}} \right]}.$$

Combining (95) with the above two equations, we define the function $g : (0, \infty)^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for all values of $\mathcal{X}_{n,p,i}, \mathcal{C}_{n,p,i}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,p,i}$, for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$a_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} \tilde{a}_n = g(\mathcal{X}_{n,1}, \mathcal{X}_{n,2}, \mathcal{C}_{n,1}, \mathcal{C}_{n,2}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,1}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,2}).$$

By direct calculation, we find that

$$\nabla g(1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1) = (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n (1 - \gamma_n), -a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n (1 - \gamma_n), \sqrt{1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2} (1 - \gamma_n), -\sqrt{1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2} (1 - \gamma_n), 0, 0).$$

Using the delta method, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{m}{1 - \gamma_n}} \left(g(\mathcal{X}_{n,1}, \mathcal{X}_{n,2}, \mathcal{C}_{n,1}, \mathcal{C}_{n,2}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,1}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_{n,2}) - g(1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1) \right) \\ &= a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n \sqrt{1 - \gamma_n} \sqrt{m} (\mathcal{X}_{n,1} - 1) - a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n \sqrt{\gamma_n} \sqrt{n - m} (\mathcal{X}_{n,2} - 1) \\ &+ \sqrt{1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2} \sqrt{1 - \gamma_n} \sqrt{m} \mathcal{C}_{n,1} - \sqrt{1 - (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2} \sqrt{\gamma_n} \sqrt{n - m} \mathcal{C}_{n,2} + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\sqrt{1 + (a_n^\top \tilde{a}_n)^2}$ and using the limiting distribution in (97), we can conclude the desired result.

7.26 Proof of Lemma 3.21

We denote $\tilde{U}_n = (U_n, U_{n,\perp})$, so $S_{m,n}U_n = S_{m,n}\tilde{U}_n(I_p, 0)^\top$. Since the distribution of $S_{m,n}$ is rotationally invariant, i.e., $S_{m,n} =_d S_{m,n}\tilde{U}_n$, we have

$$U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n = (I_p, 0)\tilde{U}_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n}\tilde{U}_n(I_p, 0)^\top =_d (I_p, 0)S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n}(I_p, 0)^\top.$$

We can represent $S_0 = (ZZ^\top)^{-1/2}Z$, where Z is an $m \times n$ matrix with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ entries, see for example, Theorem 8.2.5 in Gupta and Nagar (1999). Thus, we can write $S_0 = (Z_1Z_1^\top + Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1/2}(Z_1, Z_2)$, where $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-p)}$. Since $S_{m,n} = \gamma_n^{-1/2}S_0$, we have

$$(I_p, 0)S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n}(I_p, 0)^\top = \gamma_n^{-1}Z_1^\top (Z_1Z_1^\top + Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}Z_1.$$

Applying the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we obtain

$$P_1 := Z_1^\top (Z_1Z_1^\top + Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}Z_1 = Z_1^\top (Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}Z_1 (I + Z_1^\top (Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}Z_1)^{-1}.$$

Now, to show that $Z_1^\top (Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}Z_1$ is asymptotically normal, we have that if the following almost sure limits exist:

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left((Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))_{ii}^{-1} \right)^2 = \omega; \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \text{tr} \left((Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))^{-2} \right) = \theta, \quad (98)$$

then by Theorem 11.8 in Yao et al. (2015) with $A_n = (Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))^{-1}$ and $W = Z_1^\top$,

$$R_m := \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \left(Z_1^\top (Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))^{-1} Z_1 - \text{tr} \left((Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))^{-1} \right) I_p \right) \Rightarrow R, \quad (99)$$

where R follows a Gaussian distribution described below. By the Skorokhod representation theorem, instead of the almost sure limits in (98), it is enough to assume convergence in probability, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left((Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))_{ii}^{-1} \right)^2 \rightarrow_P \omega; \quad \frac{1}{m} \text{tr} \left((Z_2Z_2^\top / (n-p))^{-2} \right) \rightarrow_P \theta. \quad (100)$$

Let $x_i, i \in [p]$, represent i.i.d. random variables with a standard normal distribution. Then, recalling Wick's formula $\mathbb{E}(x_i x_j x_{i'} x_{j'}) = \delta_{ij} \delta_{i'j'} + \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'} + \delta_{ij'} \delta_{ji'}$, according to Lemma 11.7 of Yao et al. (2015), the covariance matrix of R is given by

$$\text{Cov}[R_{ij}, R_{i'j'}] = \omega \{ \mathbb{E}(x_i x_j x_{i'} x_{j'}) - \delta_{ij} \delta_{i'j'} \} + (\theta - \omega) \{ \delta_{ij} \delta_{i'j'} + \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'} \} = \theta \{ \delta_{ij'} \delta_{i'j} + \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'} \}.$$

Now, $Z_2Z_2^\top \sim W_m(n-p, I_m)$ follows a Wishart distribution. Hence, $(Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1} \sim IW_m(n-p+m+1, I_m)$ follows an inverted Wishart distribution, see e.g., Theorem 3.4.1 in Gupta and Nagar (1999). Furthermore, Corollary 3.4.2.1 in Gupta and Nagar (1999) allows us to deduce that each diagonal element of $(Z_2Z_2^\top)^{-1}$ follows an inverted Gamma distribution $Q_i := (Z_2Z_2^\top)_{ii}^{-1} \sim \text{InvGamma}(\frac{n-p-m+1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$. Using the properties of this distribution,

$$\mathbb{E}(n-p)^2 Q_i^2 = \frac{(n-p)^2}{(n-p-m-1)(n-p-m-3)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{(1-c)^2},$$

as well as

$$\text{Var} [Q_i^2] = \mathbb{E}Q_i^4 - (\mathbb{E}Q_i^2)^2 = \frac{8(n-p-m-4)}{(n-p-m-1)^2(n-p-m-3)^2(n-p-m-5)(n-p-m-7)};$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(n-p)^2 \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (Q_i^2 - \mathbb{E}Q_i^2) \right) \right]^2 &\leq \frac{(n-p)^4}{m} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^m (Q_i^2 - \mathbb{E}Q_i^2)^2 = (n-p)^4 \text{Var} [Q_1^2] \\ &= \frac{8(n-p-m-4)(n-p)^4}{(n-p-m-1)^2(n-p-m-3)^2(n-p-m-5)(n-p-m-7)}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ with $m/n \rightarrow c > 0$. Therefore, by using Chebyshev's inequality, we conclude that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left((Z_2 Z_2^\top / (n-p))_{ii}^{-1} \right)^2 - \mathbb{E}(n-p)^2 Q_1^2 \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Consequently, we have $\omega = 1/(1-c)^2$.

Furthermore, $Z_2 Z_2^\top / (n-p) \sim W_m(n-p, \frac{1}{n-p} I_m)$, and by equation (9.3.9.g) in Section 9.3.9 of Holgersson and Pielaszkiwicz (2020) it follows that $\theta = 1/(1-c)^3$, and the proof of (100) is complete. As a result, (99) follows.

Moreover, based on Theorem 4.2 in Pielaszkiwicz and Holgersson (2020), we conclude that

$$\frac{n-p}{\sqrt{m}} \left(\text{tr} \left((Z_2 Z_2^\top)^{-1} \right) - \frac{m}{n-m-p-1} \right) \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Thus $\sqrt{m} \left(Z_1^\top (Z_2 Z_2^\top)^{-1} Z_1 - \frac{m}{n-m-p-1} I_p \right) \Rightarrow cR$. By the delta method, we can deduce that

$$\sqrt{m} \left(Z_1^\top (Z_2 Z_2^\top)^{-1} Z_1 (I + Z_1^\top (Z_2 Z_2^\top)^{-1} Z_1)^{-1} - \frac{m}{n-p-1} I_p \right) \Rightarrow (1-c)^2 cR.$$

Hence, $\sqrt{m} \left(P_1 - \frac{m}{n-p-1} I_p \right) \Rightarrow (1-c)^2 cR$, and thus

$$\sqrt{m} \left(\frac{m}{n} U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - \frac{m}{n-p-1} I_p \right) \Rightarrow (1-c)^2 cR.$$

Equivalently, $\sqrt{m} (U_n^\top S_{m,n}^\top S_{m,n} U_n - I_p) \Rightarrow (1-c)^2 R$. Since the covariance matrix of $\text{vec}(R)$ is $\theta(I_{p^2} + P_p)$, that of $\text{vec}((1-c)^2 R)$ is $(1-c)^4 \theta(I_{p^2} + P_p) = (1-c)(I_{p^2} + P_p)$. Therefore, by Slutsky's theorem, Condition 2.1 Sym holds for $G = I_{p^2} + P_p$.

7.27 PCA after Sketching with i.i.d. Gaussian Matrices

Here we present how our result from Section 3.4 simplifies for a Gaussian sketch, recovering results of Anderson (1963) for individual eigenvalues.

Corollary 7.8 (Inference for Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors with i.i.d. Gaussian Sketching). *Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy Condition 2.2 B, and the sketching matrices $m^{1/2} S_{m,n}$ have i.i.d. standard normal entries. Then,*

$$\sqrt{\frac{m}{2}} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \Lambda_{n,i} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (101)$$

and for any vector $c \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ satisfying $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (c^\top v_{n,i})^2 < 1$,

$$\sqrt{m} \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}}{(\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,i} - \hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k})^2} (c^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k})^2 \right)^{-1/2} c^\top (\hat{v}_{m,n,i} - v_{n,i}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (102)$$

This result is implied by Theorem 3.14.

7.28 Additional Experimental Results

In this section, we present some additional experimental results. For each setting, we use 500 Monte Carlo trials. For the simulated datasets given in Section 5, we use $p = 15, n = 2048, c = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ as in the figures in the main text, and vary m from 200 to 1600.

In Figures 8 and 9, we show coverage results of 95% intervals using sketched PCA and LS, for various sketching methods and datasets; along with 95% Clopper-Pearson intervals for the coverage. We provide details in the figure caption.

In Figure 10, we show the empirical variances of sketched PCA solutions over 500 Monte Carlo trials using various sketching methods and datasets.




Figure 8: Coverage rates of λ_k and $c^\top v_k$ in a variety of cases, using the same protocol as in Figure 3: (a) $k = 2$, Case 1. (b) $k = 1$, Case 2. (c) $k = 1$, Case 3. (d) $k = 1$, HGDP dataset.

References

- D. Achlioptas. Database-friendly random projections. In *Proceedings of the twentieth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 274–281. ACM, 2001.
- D. C. Ahfock, W. J. Astle, and S. Richardson. Statistical properties of sketching algorithms. *Biometrika*, 108(2): 283–297, 2021.
- N. Ailon and B. Chazelle. Approximate nearest neighbors and the fast johnson-lindenstrauss transform. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 557–563. ACM, 2006.
- T. W. Anderson. Asymptotic theory for principal component analysis. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 122–148, 1963.
- Z. Bai and J. W. Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, volume 20. Springer, 2010.
- Z. Bai and J.-f. Yao. Central limit theorems for eigenvalues in a spiked population model. *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 44(3):447–474, 2008.
- B. Bartan and M. Pilanci. Distributed sketching for randomized optimization: Exact characterization, concentration, and lower bounds. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(6):3850–3879, 2023.
- T. Bertin-Mahieux, D. P. Ellis, B. Whitman, and P. Lamere. The million song dataset. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2011)*, 2011.
- H. M. Cann, C. De Toma, L. Cazes, M.-F. Legrand, V. Morel, L. Piouffre, J. Bodmer, W. F. Bodmer, B. Bonne-Tamir, A. Cambon-Thomsen, et al. A human genome diversity cell line panel. *Science*, 296(5566):261–262, 2002.
- T. I. Cannings. Random projections: Data perturbation for classification problems. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 13(1):e1499, 2021.




Figure 9: Coverage of 95% intervals for the first coordinate of the least squares solution using the New York flights dataset; as well as the largest eigenvalue and associated eigenvector from the Million Songs dataset. Also shown are 95% Clopper-Pearson intervals for the coverage, where we use the same protocol as in Figure 3.

- M. Charikar, K. Chen, and M. Farach-Colton. Finding frequent items in data streams. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 693–703. Springer, 2002.
- S. Chen, Y. Liu, M. R. Lyu, I. King, and S. Zhang. Fast relative-error approximation algorithm for ridge regression. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 201–210, 2015.
- K. L. Clarkson and D. P. Woodruff. Low-rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 63(6):1–45, 2017.
- M. Dereziński, Z. Liao, E. Dobriban, and M. Mahoney. Sparse sketches with small inversion bias. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1467–1510. PMLR, 2021.
- E. Dobriban and S. Liu. Asymptotics for sketching in least squares regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3675–3685, 2019.
- E. Dobriban and A. B. Owen. Deterministic parallel analysis: an improved method for selecting factors and principal components. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 81(1):163–183, 2019.
- P. Drineas and M. W. Mahoney. RandNLA: randomized numerical linear algebra. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(6):80–90, 2016.
- P. Drineas, M. W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Sampling algorithms for l_2 regression and applications. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 1127–1136. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2006.
- R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- E. N. Epperly. Which sketch should I-use?, 2023. URL <https://www.ethanepperly.com/index.php/2023/11/27/which-sketch-should-i-use/>.
- A. Frieze, R. Kannan, and S. Vempala. Fast monte-carlo algorithms for finding low-rank approximations. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 51(6):1025–1041, 2004.
- G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, USA, 1989.
- A. Gupta and D. Nagar. *Matrix Variate Distributions*, volume 104. CRC Press, 1999.
- N. Halko, P.-G. Martinsson, Y. Shkolnisky, and M. Tygert. An algorithm for the principal component analysis of large data sets. *SIAM Journal on Scientific computing*, 33(5):2580–2594, 2011a.
- N. Halko, P.-G. Martinsson, and J. A. Tropp. Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions. *SIAM review*, 53(2):217–288, 2011b.
- P. Hall and C. C. Heyde. *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic press, 2014.
- T. Holgersson and J. Pielaszkiewicz. A collection of moments of the wishart distribution. *Recent Developments in Multivariate and Random Matrix Analysis: Festschrift in Honour of Dietrich von Rosen*, pages 147–162, 2020.
- J. Lacotte, S. Liu, E. Dobriban, and M. Pilanci. Limiting spectrum of randomized hadamard transform and optimal iterative sketching methods. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- S. Lee and S. Ng. An econometric perspective on algorithmic subsampling. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12(1):45–80, 2020.




Figure 10: The variance of $\sqrt{m}\hat{\Lambda}_{m,n,k}$ and $\sqrt{mc}^\top \hat{v}_{m,n,k}$ for various cases, using the same protocol as in Figure 4: (a) $k = 2$, Case 1. (b) $k = 1$, Case 2. (c) $k = 1$, Case 3. (d) $k = 1$, HGDP dataset.

- S. Lee and S. Ng. Least squares estimation using sketched data with heteroskedastic errors. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12498–12520. PMLR, 2022.
- J. Z. Li, D. M. Absher, H. Tang, A. M. Southwick, A. M. Casto, S. Ramachandran, H. M. Cann, G. S. Barsh, M. Feldman, L. L. Cavalli-Sforza, and R. M. Myers. Worldwide human relationships inferred from genome-wide patterns of variation. *Science*, 319(5866):1100–1104, 2008.
- P. Li, T. J. Hastie, and K. W. Church. Very sparse random projections. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 287–296. ACM, 2006.
- C. Liu, X. Zhao, and J. Huang. A random projection approach to hypothesis tests in high-dimensional single-index models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–21, 2022.
- M. Liu, Z. Shang, and G. Cheng. Sharp theoretical analysis for nonparametric testing under random projection. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2175–2209. PMLR, 2019.
- S. Liu and E. Dobriban. Ridge regression: Structure, cross-validation, and sketching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02373*, *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2020*, 2019.
- M. Lopes, L. Jacob, and M. J. Wainwright. A more powerful two-sample test in high dimensions using random projection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1206–1214, 2011.
- M. Lopes, S. Wang, and M. Mahoney. Error estimation for randomized least-squares algorithms via the bootstrap. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3217–3226. PMLR, 2018.
- M. Lopes, N. B. Erichson, and M. Mahoney. Error estimation for sketched svd via the bootstrap. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6382–6392. PMLR, 2020.
- M. E. Lopes, S. Wang, and M. W. Mahoney. A bootstrap method for error estimation in randomized matrix multiplication. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):1434–1473, 2019a.

- R. G. Lopes, D. Yin, B. Poole, J. Gilmer, and E. D. Cubuk. Improving robustness without sacrificing accuracy with patch gaussian augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02611*, 2019b.
- Y. Lu, P. Dhillon, D. P. Foster, and L. Ungar. Faster ridge regression via the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 369–377, 2013.
- P. Ma, Y. Chen, X. Zhang, X. Xing, J. Ma, and M. W. Mahoney. Asymptotic analysis of sampling estimators for randomized numerical linear algebra algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(177):1–45, 2022.
- J. R. Magnus and H. Neudecker. *Matrix differential calculus with applications in statistics and econometrics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- M. W. Mahoney. Randomized algorithms for matrices and data. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 3(2):123–224, 2011.
- P.-G. Martinsson and J. A. Tropp. Randomized numerical linear algebra: Foundations and algorithms. *Acta Numerica*, 29:403–572, 2020.
- X. Meng and M. W. Mahoney. Low-distortion subspace embeddings in input-sparsity time and applications to robust linear regression. In *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 91–100, 2013.
- A. B. Owen. Monte carlo book: the quasi-monte carlo parts, 2019.
- J. Pielaszkiewicz and T. Holgersson. Mixtures of traces of wishart and inverse wishart matrices. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 50(21):5084–5100, 2020.
- M. Pilanci and M. J. Wainwright. Randomized sketches of convex programs with sharp guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5096–5115, 2015.
- M. Pilanci and M. J. Wainwright. Iterative hessian sketch: Fast and accurate solution approximation for constrained least-squares. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1842–1879, 2016.
- M. Pilanci and M. J. Wainwright. Newton sketch: A near linear-time optimization algorithm with linear-quadratic convergence. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(1):205–245, 2017.
- D. N. Politis, J. P. Romano, and M. Wolf. *Subsampling*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- T. Sarlos. Improved approximation algorithms for large matrices via random projections. In *47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2006(FOCS'06)*, pages 143–152. IEEE, 2006.
- J. C. Spall. *Introduction to stochastic search and optimization: estimation, simulation, and control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- R. Srivastava, P. Li, and D. Ruppert. Raptt: An exact two-sample test in high dimensions using random projections. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 25(3):954–970, 2016.
- A. W. Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- S. S. Vempala. *The random projection method*, volume 65. American Mathematical Soc., 2005.
- H. Wang and Y. Ma. Optimal subsampling for quantile regression in big data. *Biometrika*, 108(1):99–112, 2021.
- H. Wang, R. Zhu, and P. Ma. Optimal subsampling for large sample logistic regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522):829–844, 2018a.
- S. Wang, A. Gittens, and M. W. Mahoney. Sketched ridge regression: Optimization perspective, statistical perspective, and model averaging. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(218):1–50, 2018b.
- C. M. Waternaux. Asymptotic distribution of the sample roots for a nonnormal population. *Biometrika*, 63(3):639–645, 1976.
- H. Wickham. *nycflights13: Flights that Departed NYC in 2013*, 2018. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nycflights13>. R package version 1.0.0.
- D. P. Woodruff. Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 10(1–2):1–157, 2014.
- F. Yang, S. Liu, E. Dobriban, and D. P. Woodruff. How to reduce dimension with pca and random projections? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(12):8154–8189, 2021.
- J. Yao, Z. Bai, and S. Zheng. *Large Sample Covariance Matrices and High-Dimensional Data Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2015.
- J. Yu, H. Wang, M. Ai, and H. Zhang. Optimal distributed subsampling for maximum quasi-likelihood estimators with massive data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(537):265–276, 2022.
- Y. Zhang and M. Tang. Perturbation analysis of randomized svd and its applications to high-dimensional statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10262*, 2022.
- Z. Zhang, S. Lee, and E. Dobriban. A framework for statistical inference via randomized algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11255*, 2023.