

On the consistent estimators of the population covariance matrix and its reparameterizations

Ming-Tien Tsai and Chia-Hsuan Tsai

Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, R.O.C.

Abstract. For the high-dimensional covariance estimation problem, when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n = c \in (0, 1)$ the orthogonally equivariant estimator of the population covariance matrix proposed by Tsai and Tsai (2024b) enjoys some optimal properties. Under some regularity conditions, they showed that their novel estimators of eigenvalues are consistent for the eigenvalues of the population covariance matrix. In this note, first, we show that their novel estimator is consistent estimator of the population covariance matrix under a high-dimensional asymptotic setup. Moreover, we also show that the novel estimator is the MLE of population covariance matrix when $c \in (0, 1)$. The novel estimator is incorporated to establish the optimal decomposite T_T^2 -test for a high-dimensional statistical hypothesis testing problem.

Keywords: High-dimensional covariance matrix, MLEs, the consistent estimator, the decomposite T_T^2 -test.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 62C20, 62F10.

1. Introduction

The problem in high-dimensional covariance estimation has been one of the most interesting topics in statistics (Pourahmadi, 2013; Zagidullina, 2021). Stein (1975, 1986) investigated the orthogonally equivariant nonlinear shrinkage estimator for the population covariance matrix. Stein's estimator has been considered as a gold standard, and from which a large strand of literature on orthogonally equivariant estimation of covariance matrix was generated (Ledoit and Wolf, 2012; Rajaratnam and Vincenzi, 2016, and the references therein).

Tsai and Tsai (2024b) also restricted attentions on the rotation-equivariant estimators, they showed that the Stein's estimator can be inadmissible when the dimension p is fixed. Under a high-dimensional asymptotic setup, namely both sample size n and the dimension p are sufficiently large with the concentration $c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n, c \in (0, 1)$, they re-examined the asymptotic optimal property of estimators proposed by Stein (1975) and Ledoit and Wolf (2018). Moreover, Tsai and Tsai (2024b) looked into the insight of the Marčenko-Pastur equation (Silverstein, 1995) to get an explicit equality relationship of the quantiles of limiting spectral distributions, and used the obtained equality to propose a new kind of orthogonally equivalent estimator for the population covariance matrix. They showed that their novel estimators of the eigenvalues are consistent to the eigenvalues of the population covariance matrix. When $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, they further showed their proposed covariance estimator is the best orthogonally equivariant estimator for the population covariance matrix under the normalized Stein loss function, while both Stein's estimator and the sample covariance matrix can be inadmissible.

The question naturally arises as to whether the consistent estimator of the population covariance matrix exists or not. In this paper we further show that the estimator proposed by Tsai and Tsai (2024b) is the consistent estimator of population covariance matrix Σ when $p/n \rightarrow c \in [0, 1)$. To do that first, we show that the components for spectral decomposition of the sample covariance matrix are the maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) of those of population covariance matrix when the dimension p is fixed and the sample size n is large (i.e., $c=0$) in Section 3. Then we extend the results of Section 3 to the boundary case, i.e., $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, in Section 4, namely to show that the novel estimator is not only consistent but also the MLE of the population covariance matrix. Based on the proposed covariance estimator, the optimal decomposite T_T^2 -test for a high-dimensional statistical hypothesis testing problem is established in Section 5. Some remarks of estimator proposed by Tsai and Tsai (2024b) are mentioned in the final section.

2. Preliminary notations

Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be independent p -dimensional random vectors with a common multivariate normal distribution $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$. A basic problem considered in the literature is the estimation of the $p \times p$ covariance matrix Σ , which is unknown and assumed to be non-singular. It is also assumed that $n \geq p$, as such the sufficient statistic

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^\top \quad (2.1)$$

is positive definite with probability one. In the literature, the estimators $\phi(\mathbf{A})$ of Σ are the functions of \mathbf{A} . The sample space \mathcal{S} , the parameter space Θ , and the action space \mathcal{A} are taken to be the set \mathcal{P}_p of $p \times p$ symmetric positive definite matrices. The general linear group $Gl(p)$ acts on the space \mathcal{P}_p . Note that \mathbf{A} has a Wishart distribution $W(\Sigma, n)$, and the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of Σ is expressed as below

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{ML} = \mathbf{S}, \text{ where } \mathbf{S} = n^{-1} \mathbf{A}, \quad (2.2)$$

which is unbiased (Anderson, 2003).

We consider invariant loss function L , i.e., L satisfies the condition that $L(g\phi(\mathbf{A})g^\top, g\Sigma g^\top) = L(\phi(\mathbf{A}), \Sigma)$ for all $g \in Gl(p)$. An estimator $\hat{\Sigma}$ is called $Gl(p)$ -equivariant if $\hat{\Sigma}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}^\top) = \mathbf{G}\hat{\Sigma}(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{G}^\top, \forall \mathbf{G} \in Gl(p), \forall \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{P}_p$. Suppose that \mathbf{G} acts on \mathcal{P}_p , whereby the orbit through $x \in \mathcal{P}_p$ is the set $\mathbf{G}x = \{gx | g \in \mathbf{G}\} \subset \mathcal{P}_p$. The action is called transitive if Θ is one orbit, i.e., $\forall x, y \in \Theta$ there is some $g \in \mathbf{G}$ with $gx = y$. It may then be easy to note the fact that if L is $Gl(p)$ -invariant, $\hat{\Sigma}$ is $Gl(p)$ -equivariant, and \mathbf{G} acts transitively on \mathcal{P}_p , then the risk function is constant on \mathcal{P}_p : $R(\hat{\Sigma}, \Sigma) = R(\hat{\Sigma}, \mathbf{I}), \forall \Sigma \in \mathcal{P}_p$.

One of the most interesting loss functions was introduced by Stein (1956)

$$L(\phi(\mathbf{S}), \Sigma) = \text{tr} \Sigma^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{S}) - \log \det \Sigma^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{S}) - p, \quad (2.3)$$

where tr and \det denote the trace and the determinant of a matrix, respectively. Because $Gl(p)$ acts transitively on the space \mathcal{P}_p , the best $Gl(p)$ -equivariant estimator exists. It can be easily found that the MLE \mathbf{S} of Σ is the best $Gl(p)$ -equivariant estimator. The minimum risk is

$$R_m(\hat{\Sigma}_{ML}, \Sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^p \{\log n - \mathcal{E}[\log \chi_{n-i+1}^2]\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\mathcal{E}[X]$ denotes the expectation of the random variable of X .

3. Optimal estimators of Σ when it is reparameterized

3.1 The minimax estimators

Since the general linear group $Gl(p)$ is not an amenable group, to study the minimax problem James and Stein (1961) reparameterized the parameter $\Sigma \rightarrow \Theta\Theta^\top$, $\Theta \in G_T^+$, where G_T^+ denotes the group of $p \times p$ lower triangular matrices with positive diagonal elements; the loss function is also invariant under G_T^+ . Using the Cholesky decomposition, we may express that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^\top$, where $\mathbf{T} \in G_T^+$. Since G_T^+ acts transitively on the space \mathcal{P}_p , the best G_T^+ -equivariant estimator was proposed by James and Stein (1961) as $\hat{\Sigma}_S = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{D}_S^{-1}\mathbf{T}^\top$, where \mathbf{D}_S is a positive diagonal matrix with elements $d_{Sii} = n + p - 2i + 1$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. The minimum risk for the best G_T^+ -equivariant estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_S$ is

$$R_m(\hat{\Sigma}_S, \Sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^p \{\log(n + p - 2i + 1) - \mathcal{E}[\log \chi_{n-i+1}^2]\}. \quad (3.1)$$

It is easy to see that $R(\hat{\Sigma}_S, \Sigma) \leq R(\hat{\Sigma}_{ML}, \Sigma)$, this is the well-known Stein phenomenon for covariance estimation problem, i.e., the MLE \mathbf{S} is inadmissible which people are encouraged to use estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_S$ instead of \mathbf{S} , for details see Anderson (2003). Because G_T^+ is the solvable group, and hence it is amenable. Thus, the Stein's estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_S$ is minimax.

In order to seek the reasons why the Stein phenomenon, which is the MLE \mathbf{S} of Σ inadmissible, happens. We began to think about the inner meaning of Stein phenomenon. Tsai (2018) further extended Stein's method to establish another minimax estimator. Let $\Sigma_{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$ be partitioned as

$$\Sigma_{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{(k)11} & \Sigma_{(k)12} \\ \Sigma_{(k)21} & \Sigma_{(k)22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}_{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{(k)11} & \mathbf{A}_{(k)12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{(k)21} & \mathbf{A}_{(k)22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, p$ with $\Sigma_{(1)} = \Sigma$ and $\mathbf{A}_{(1)} = \mathbf{A}$. Define

$$\Sigma_{(k+1)} = \Sigma_{(k)22:1} = \Sigma_{(k)22} - \Sigma_{(k)21}\Sigma_{(k)12}/\sigma_{(k)11} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}_{(k+1)} = \mathbf{A}_{(k)22:1} = \mathbf{A}_{(k)22} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)21}\mathbf{A}_{(k)12}/a_{(k)11}. \quad (3.4)$$

Note that the dimension of $\Sigma_{(k+1)}$ is one less than that of $\Sigma_{(k)}$, which is a process of successive diagonalization. Let

$$\mathbf{g}_{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ -\Sigma_{(k)21}\sigma_{(k)11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{h}_{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{A}_{(k)21}a_{(k)11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p. \quad (3.5)$$

We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}_{(k)} &= \mathbf{g}_{(k)}\Sigma_{(k)}\mathbf{g}_{(k)}^\top \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{(k)11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \Sigma_{(k)22:1} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(k)} = \mathbf{h}_k \mathbf{A}_{(k)} \mathbf{h}_{(k)}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} a_{(k)11} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{(k)22:1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p. \quad (3.7)$$

Let

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^* = \text{Diag}(\sigma_{(1)11}, \dots, \sigma_{(p)11}) \text{ and } \mathbf{A}^* = \text{Diag}(a_{(1)11}, \dots, a_{(p)11}). \quad (3.8)$$

Consequently $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and \mathbf{A} are individually transformed into the diagonal matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*$ and \mathbf{A}^* so that the one-to-one correspondences of: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*$ and $\mathbf{A} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{A}^*$ are established to allow $\phi(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A}^*$ for Stein loss function, $\mathbf{D} \in D(p)$, the group of positive diagonal matrices. By the properties of the Wishart distribution (see Theorem 4.3.4, Theorem 7.3.4, and Theorem 7.3.6 of Anderson, 2003), it is easy to note that $a_{(i)11}/\sigma_{(i)11}, i = 1, \dots, p$, are independent χ^2 random variables with $n - i + 1$ degrees of freedom, respectively. Let \mathbf{D}_0 be the diagonal matrix with elements $d_{0ii} = n - i + 1, i = 1, \dots, p$, and we may conclude that \mathbf{A}^* is Wishart distributed with mean matrix $\mathbf{D}_0 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*$ then. Furthermore, it should be noted that all the p Jacobins of the transformation of $\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^*$ are one, and the Wishart density of \mathbf{A} is equivalent to the Wishart density of \mathbf{A}^* . Thus the Stein loss function is

$$L(\phi(\mathbf{A}^*), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*) = \text{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{*-1} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A}^* - \log \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{*-1} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A}^* - p. \quad (3.9)$$

Since \mathbf{A}^* also acts transitively on the space \mathcal{P}_p , the best $D(p)$ -equivariant estimator can be expressed as the form of

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^* = \mathbf{D}_0^{-1} \mathbf{A}^*. \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, the minimum risk for the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_I^*$ is

$$R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^p \{\log(n - i + 1) - \mathcal{E}[\log \chi_{n-i+1}^2]\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Since the group $D(p)$ is also solvable, and hence we may conclude that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*$ is a minimax. By (3.1) and (3.11) it is easy to see that $R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*) \leq R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_S, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, and hence the Stein's estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_S$ is inadmissible, while the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*$ is admissible.

We all know that the MLE \mathbf{S} of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the best $Gl(p)$ -equivariant estimator, James and Stein (1961) used the Cholesky decomposition to reparameterize the parameter $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ to get the Stein estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_S$, which is the best G_T^+ -equivariant estimator, Tsai (2018) used the full Iwasawa decomposition to get the best $D(p)$ -equivariant estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*$. Note that the inequality $R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*) \leq R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_S, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \leq R_m(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{ML}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ holds. Because that $D(p) \subseteq G_T^+ \subseteq Gl(p)$, we can easily see that the above inequality holds. The minimum risk of estimator is larger with respect to the larger group, and is smaller with respect to the smaller group. Tsai (2018) showed that the minimum risks of the MLEs under the Cholesky decomposition and under the full Iwasawa decomposition are exactly the same with respect to the geodesic distance loss function on a non-Euclidean space P_p . To compare the minimum risks of estimators under different groups does not have much statistical sense. The comparison of different estimators may make sense when they are compared under the same reparameterized decomposition. For the spectral decomposition, Tsai and Tsai (2024b) claimed that

the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is the best orthogonally equivariant estimator of spectral decomposition under Stein loss function, on the other hand, the Stein (1975, 1986) another orthogonally equivariant estimator can be inadmissible under the spectral decomposition. Those results are contrary to the previous one of Stein phenomenon that \mathbf{S} is inadmissible. Hence, the Stein phenomena seem to due to the reparamterized decompositions, and it seems to be no much special statistical meaning.

Each of three estimators has their own optimal property for the corresponding reparamterized decomposition, respectively. All the three estimators \mathbf{S} , $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ are the best $Gl(P)$ -equivariant, G_T^+ -equivariant and $D(p)$ -equivariant estimators, respectively. Now, the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is not only the best $Gl(p)$ -equivariant estimator but also the best $O(p)$ -equivariant estimator. They are the MLEs with respect to $Gl(P)$, G_T^+ and $D(p)$ decompositions, respectively. The optimal property of MLE is essentially not affected at all. Besides, the Stein loss function is essentially equivalent to the entropy loss function under the multinormal set up. When the dimension p is fixed and the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, it has been known in the literature that \mathbf{S} and $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ converge to Σ and Σ^* almost surely (*a.s.*) when $n \rightarrow \infty$, respectively (Anderson, 2003). We will investigate whether \mathbf{S} is MLE of Σ under spectral decomposition so that the components \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{L} converge to \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ *a.s.* as $n \rightarrow \infty$, respectively.

3.2 The best orthogonally equivariant estimators

For the application to the statistical inference of principal component analysis, we need the notation of so-called spectral decomposition of population covariance matrix, it can be viewed as another type of reparametrization of Σ . Stein (1975, 1986) considered the orthogonally equivariant estimator for the population covariance matrix, which has been considered as a gold standard. Consider the spectral decomposition of population covariance matrix, namely $\Sigma = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{V}^T$, where $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is a diagonal matrix with eigenvalues $\gamma_{i,p}$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, and $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_p)^T$ is the corresponding orthogonal matrix with \mathbf{v}_i being the eigenvector associated to the i th largest eigenvalue $\gamma_{i,p}$, $v_{i1} \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, p$. Similarly, for the sample spectral decomposition, i.e., $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^T$, where \mathbf{L} is a diagonal matrix with eigenvalues $l_{i,p}$, and $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_p)^T$ is the corresponding orthogonal matrix with \mathbf{u}_i being the eigenvector corresponding to $l_{i,p}$, $u_{i1} \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, p$. Write $\mathbf{L} = \text{diag}(l_{1,p}, \dots, l_{p,p})$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \text{diag}(\gamma_{1,p}, \dots, \gamma_{p,p})$. Note that the matrices \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{L} are the consistent estimators of \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, respectively when the dimension p is fixed and the sample size n is large (for the details see Anderson, 2003). Hence, we may conclude that there are two situations when the dimension p is fixed: (i) When Σ is not reparameterized, the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is unbiased and hence it is consistent. (ii) When Σ is reparameterized via spectral decomposition, the the components \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{L} are the consistent estimators of \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, respectively. Then the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is still consistent.

We would like to study the consistency property via the help of optimal property of MLEs. The main reason is based on the fact from the general theory of estimation, it is known that the maximum likelihood estimator is consistent, that is, it tends to the true value with probability one as sample size becomes large under some regularity conditions, which are satisfied by the Wishart distribution.

We may note that when Σ is not reparameterized, it is easy to see that the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is the MLE of Σ . When the spectral decomposition for Σ is adopted, then it is expected that the sample components \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{L} are the MLEs of corresponding

population components \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, respectively.

First, when the dimension p is fixed, we find the MLEs of \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ in the following. Note that $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{O}(p)$, the set of orthogonal matrices. Let $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U}$, then $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{O}(p)$. Assume that $n \geq p + 1$, and then $-\frac{2}{n} \log$ likelihood function of \mathbf{S} is

$$\begin{aligned} l(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{\Sigma}) &= \text{tr}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{S} - \log\det\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{S} - \frac{2}{n}\log c_n(\mathbf{S}) \\ &= \text{tr}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^\top - \log\det\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^\top - \frac{2}{n}\log c_n(\mathbf{L}) \\ &= \text{tr}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{H}^\top - \log\det\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{L} - \frac{2}{n}\log c_n(\mathbf{L}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where $c_n(\mathbf{S}) = \frac{n^{(n-p-1)/2}|\mathbf{S}|^{-(p+1)/2}}{2^{np/2}\pi^{p(p-1)/4}\prod_{i=1}^p\Gamma[\frac{1}{2}(n-i+1)]} = c_n(\mathbf{L})$ which is independent of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{\Gamma}$). The equation (3.12) is essentially equivalent to the Stein loss function.

Theorem (von Neumann, 1937). *For \mathbf{H} orthogonal and \mathbf{D}_γ and \mathbf{D}_1 diagonal ($\gamma_1 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_p > 0, l_1 > \dots > l_p > 0$)*

$$\min_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} \text{tr}\mathbf{D}_\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{H}^\top = \text{tr}\mathbf{D}_\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{D}_1, \quad (3.13)$$

and a minimizing value of \mathbf{H} is $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{I}$. For the details of proofs, see Theorem A.4.7 and Lemma A.4.6 of Anderson (2003).

By the result of von Neumann Theorem, we then have the MLE of V is that $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{U}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} \text{tr}\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{V}^\top\mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^\top \\ = \text{tr}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{L}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, we may have

$$\min_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} l(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{\Sigma}) = \text{tr}\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{L} - \log\det\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1}\mathbf{L} - \frac{2}{n}\log c_n(\mathbf{L}). \quad (3.15)$$

After some calculations, the function $\min_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} l(\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{\Sigma})$ in (3.15) is further minimized with respect to $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ at $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = \mathbf{L}$. As such, when p is fixed, we have that \mathbf{U} is the MLE of \mathbf{V} and $l_{i,p}$ is the MLE of $\gamma_{i,p}, i = 1, \dots, p$. Thus, when p is fixed and the sample size n is large, according to the property of MLE we have $\mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{L} \rightarrow \mathbf{\Gamma}$ almost surely (a.s.), and thus \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{L} are the consistent estimators of \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, respectively. And hence, $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^\top \rightarrow \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{V}^\top = \mathbf{\Sigma}$ a.s. Therefore, in terms of the spectral decompositions, when the dimension p is fixed the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is the consistent estimator of the population covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. From the above arguments, when the dimension p is fixed we may note that the MLEs play the important role to be optimal no matter whether it is reparameterized or not. When it is not reparameterized, the MLE \mathbf{S} of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unbiased, and hence it is consistent, while it is reparameterized, the MLEs of component parameters for spectral decomposition are consistent.

However, situation may be different because the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is no longer to be the MLE of the population covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ any more when the dimension p is large such that $c \in (0, 1)$. Hence, the question naturally arises as to whether the consistent

estimator of Σ exists or not under the large dimensional asymptotics setup. Under the spectral decomposition, Tsai and Tsai (2024b) proved the consistency for the estimator of population eigenvalues with the help of random matrix theory. Some notations of it are presented in the following.

4. High-dimensional case

For a large (n, p) set up, the large dimensional asymptotics framework is set up when $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$ such that $c = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n$ is fixed, $0 \leq c < 1$. In this section, we extend the class of orthogonally equivariant estimators to the realm of large dimensional asymptotics with the concentration $c \in (0, 1)$.

4.1 The Marčenko-Pastur equation

The same as Ledoit and Pécché (2011), we make the following assumptions:

A1. Note that $\mathbf{x}_i = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, where \mathbf{z}_i are independent and identically distributed with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix \mathbf{I} . Assume that the 12th absolute central moment of each variable z_{ij} bounded by a constant.

A2. The population covariance matrix Σ is nonrandom positive definite. $\liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{p,p} > 0$ and $\limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{1,p} < \infty$.

A3. For large (n, p) set-up, the large dimensional asymptotics framework is set up when $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$ such that $c = p/n$ is fixed $0 \leq c < 1$ in this paper.

A4. Let $0 < \gamma_{p,p} < \dots < \gamma_{1,p}$. The empirical spectral distribution of Σ defined by $H_n(\gamma) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p 1_{[\gamma_{i,p}, \infty)}(\gamma)$, converges as $p \rightarrow \infty$ to a probability distribution function $H(\gamma)$ at every point of continuity of H . The support of H , $\text{Supp}(H)$, is included in a compact set $[h_1, h_2]$ with $0 < h_1 \leq h_2 < \infty$.

Let $F_n(\lambda) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p 1_{[l_{i,p}, \infty)}(\lambda)$ be the sample spectral distribution and F be its limiting. It is proved that F_n converges to F a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (Marčenko-Pastur, 1967).

The Stieltjes transform of distribution function F is defined by

$$m_F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l-z} dF(l), \forall z \in C^+, \quad (4.1)$$

where C^+ is the half-plane of complex numbers with a strictly positive imaginary part. Let

$$m_{F_n}(z) = p^{-1} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{S} - z\mathbf{I})^{-1}], \quad (4.2)$$

then from the results of random matrix theory $F_n(x)$ converges to $F(x)$ if and only if $m_{F_n}(z)$ converges to $m_F(z)$. Subsequently, the well-known Marčenko-Pastur equation (Silverstein, 1995) can be expressed in the following form

$$m_F(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma[1-c-czm_F(z)]-z} dH(\gamma), \forall z \in C^+, \quad (4.3)$$

where H denotes the limiting behavior of the population spectral distribution. Upon the Marčenko-Pastur equation, meaningful information of the population spectral distribution can be retrieved under the large dimensional asymptotics framework. Choi and Silverstein (1995) further showed that

$$\lim_{z \in C^+ \rightarrow l} m_F(z) = \check{m}_F(l) \quad (4.4)$$

exists for any $l \in R/\{0\}$.

Using the Sokhotski-Plemelj formula, the term $\check{m}_F(l)$ can be separated into the real part which becomes a principal value integral (the so-called Hilbert transform), while the imaginary part becomes π times the limiting sample spectral density function $f(l)$. Namely,

$$\check{m}_F(l) = \text{Re}[\check{m}_F(l)] + i\pi f(l), \quad (4.5)$$

where the Hilbert transform denotes

$$\text{Re}[\check{m}_F(x)] = Pr \int \frac{dF(t)}{t-x}. \quad (4.6)$$

For some special cases, $\check{m}_F(x)$ can be expressed explicitly. For example, let $\lambda_+ = (1 + \sqrt{c})^2$ and $\lambda_- = (1 - \sqrt{c})^2$. When $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}$, then the Marčenko-Pastur density function is of the form

$$f_{MP}(x) = \frac{\sqrt{(x - \lambda_-)(\lambda_+ - x)}}{2\pi cx}, \quad x \in (\lambda_-, \lambda_+). \quad (4.7)$$

By the resolvent method, we then have

$$\check{m}_F(x) = \frac{1 - c - x + i\sqrt{(x - \lambda_-)(\lambda_+ - x)}}{2cx}, \quad (4.8)$$

where the real part is the Cauchy principal value, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}[\check{m}_F(x)] &= Pr \int f_{MP}(t) \frac{dt}{t-x} \\ &= \frac{1 - c - x}{2cx}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Generally, Σ is unknown, and the form of $\text{Re}[\check{m}_F(x)]$ will not be explicit,

Stein (1975) used the naive empirical counter part $\check{m}_{F_n}(l_{i,p}) (= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{l_{j,p} - l_{i,p}})$ to estimate the Hilbert transformation $\text{Re}[\check{m}_F(l_i)]$, where l_i denotes the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of limiting sample spectral distribution F so that $[p(1 - \alpha)] = i, i = 1, \dots, p$, with $[x]$ denoting the largest integer of x . Since that $F_n(x)$ converges to $F(x)$ a.s., as such $m_{F_n}(z)$ converges to $m_F(z)$ a.s. Thus we have that $l_{i,p}$ converges to l_i a.s., $i = 1, \dots, p$. And then the estimator $\check{m}_{F_n}(l_{i,p})$ proposed by Stein is a consistent estimator of $\text{Re}[\check{m}_F(l_i)]$.

4.2 The consistent estimators of population eigenvalues

The Marčenko-Pastur equation in (4.3) shows the implicit relationship between F and H , Tsai and Tsai (2024b) further established the following explicit equality relationship

$$\gamma_i = \frac{l_i}{1 - c - cl_i \text{Re}[\check{m}_F(l_i)]}, \quad i = 1, \dots, p, \quad (4.10)$$

where γ_i and l_i denote the $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantiles of limiting population and sample spectral distributions H and F , respectively, so that $[p(1 - \alpha)] = i, i = 1, \dots, p$, with $[x]$ denoting the largest integer of x . Let $\text{Supp}(F)$ be the support of F . Via Theorem 4.1 of Choi and Silverstein (1995), Ledoit and Péché (2011) pointed out that if $l_i \notin \text{Supp}(F)$, then $l_i/1 - c - cl_i \text{Re}[\check{m}_F(l_i)] \notin \text{Supp}(H)$, for $l_i \in R/\{0\}, i = 1, \dots, p$.

Write $\gamma_i = \psi_i(\mathbf{L}), i = 1, \dots, p$, Tsai and Tsai (2024b) proposed a new kind of orthogonally equivariant estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ of Σ , which is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_T &= \mathbf{U}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{U}^\top, \text{ where } \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L}) = \text{diag}(\hat{\psi}_1(\mathbf{L}), \dots, \hat{\psi}_p(\mathbf{L})) \text{ with} & (4.11) \\ \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{L}) &= \frac{nl_{i,p}}{n-p+1-pl_{i,p}\check{m}_{F_n}(l_{i,p})} \\ &= nl_{i,p}(n-p+1-l_{i,p}\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{l_{j,p}-l_{i,p}})^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

When $c = 0$ as discussed in Section 3, we have $\gamma_{i,p} \rightarrow \gamma_i$ and $\gamma_i = l_i, i = 1, \dots, p$. However, when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma_{i,p} \rightarrow \gamma_i$ and γ_i is no longer to be l_i any more. But via the equation (4.10) it should be of the form $\frac{l_i}{1-c-cl_i[\text{Re}\check{m}_F(l_i)]}, i = 1, \dots, p$. Note that by the assumption A4 that H_n converges to H when $c \in (0, 1)$, thus $\gamma_{i,p}$ converges to $\gamma_i, i = 1, \dots, p$, namely Γ converges to $\Psi(\mathbf{L})$ defined in Proposition 4.1. And hence to estimate $\gamma_{i,p}$ is the same as to estimate γ_i under the large dimensional asymptotics set up, $i = 1, \dots, p$. Under some regularity conditions, Tsai and Tsai (2024b) claimed that their proposed estimators of the population eigenvalues are consistent. We summarize it in the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Psi(\mathbf{L}) = \text{diag}(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)$ and $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L}) = \text{diag}(\hat{\psi}_1(\mathbf{L}), \dots, \hat{\psi}_p(\mathbf{L}))$ be defined in (4.10) and (4.11), respectively. Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 of Tsai and Tsai (2024b), then $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$ is the consistent estimator of $\Psi(\mathbf{L})$, namely $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$ is the consistent estimator of Γ , when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$.*

Remark 1. Under some regularity conditions, the new explicit equality relationship between the quantiles of limiting sample spectral distribution F and limiting population spectral distribution H is established in (4.10), as such the consistent estimators of population eigenvalues can then be easily found. This result makes up for the deficiency of both Stein's estimator and Ledoit and Wolf's estimator, which are not consistent estimators of population eigenvalues. Random matrix theory did the essential help of our finding. However, it remains unsolved whether the estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is consistent for Σ or not. To overcome this difficulty, we will adopt the MLE approach to investigate it.

4.3 The consistent estimator of population covariance matrix

When the dimension p is large, the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is no longer to be the MLE of Σ any more. It is difficult to directly find out the functional form of \mathbf{S} so that it is the MLE of Σ , as such we may take the detour of the reparameterization of Σ via spectral decomposition to overcome the difficulty. The main goal next is to see whether the orthonormal matrix \mathbf{U} is the MLE of \mathbf{V} or not. The result of $\mathcal{E}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}$ implies that the limiting distribution of \mathbf{U} on $\mathcal{O}(p)$ is entirely concentrated at \mathbf{V} , the unbiasedness is not a useful optimal property, the role of which would be replaced by the property of equivariance. Ledoit and P  ch   (2011) pointed out that the projection of the sample eigenvector onto the population eigenvector $p|\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j|^2$ will wipe out the non-rotation equivariant behavior and the average of the quantities of $p|\mathbf{u}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_j|^2$ over the sample eigenvectors associate with the sample eigenvalues, quantities how the eigenvectors of the sample covariance matrix deviate from those of the population covariance matrix under the large-dimensional asymptotics. This is one of the main reasons why we prefer to restrict it on the class of rotation-equivariant

estimators. Tsai and Tsai (2024b) established the best orthogonally equivariant estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ for Σ . We continue to study whether the proposed estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the consistent estimator of population covariance matrix Σ or not when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$.

When Σ is reparameterized via the spectral decomposition, we would like to study the consistency property of component parameters when the dimension p is large. Under the multivariate normal setup, when the dimension p is fixed, then $n\mathbf{S}$ is Wishart distributed with mean matrix Σ . However, when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n = c \in (0, 1)$, $n\mathbf{S}$ is no longer to be Wishart distributed with mean Σ , while $n\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is Wishart-type distributed with mean Σ . When $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$ we may note that the log-likelihood function of $n\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is similar to (3.12), with $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ in (4.11) replacing \mathbf{S} in (3.12) (i.e., with $\Psi(\hat{\mathbf{L}})$ replacing \mathbf{L}), which still satisfies the regularity conditions. It does not degenerate.

First, we will find the MLE of \mathbf{V} when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, namely to extend the von Neumann Theorem to the case $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$. Note that $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{I}$, thus $d\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\top + \mathbf{H}d\mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{0}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} d\text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top &= \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}d\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top + \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})d\mathbf{H}^\top \\ &= \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}d\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top - \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top d\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

then the derivative becomes $\frac{d\text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top}{d\mathbf{H}} = \Gamma^{-1}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top - \Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{H}^\top$. Thus, $\frac{d\text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top}{d\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{0}$ implies that $\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top = \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$. Similar arguments as above, we can also show that $\mathbf{H}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}^\top = \Gamma^{-1}$. And hence we may have that $\min_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top = \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$, namely the minimum of $\text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\mathbf{H}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})\mathbf{H}^\top$, with respect to $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{O}(p)$, occurs at $\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{I}$. Thus, the von Neumann Theorem still holds for the boundary case, i.e., when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$. As such, in terms of the spectral decompositions, we may have that \mathbf{U} is also the MLE of \mathbf{V} when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$. And hence by the property of MLE, we may summarize it as in the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be independent p -dimensional random vectors with a common multivariate normal distribution $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$. Consider the spectral decompositions $\Sigma = \mathbf{V}\Gamma\mathbf{V}^\top$ and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}^\top$, and let $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ be defined as in (4.11). Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.1. When $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n = c \in (0, 1)$, then we have that \mathbf{U} is the MLE of \mathbf{V} , and hence it is the consistent estimator of \mathbf{V} .*

By Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.1, we then have that the proposed estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is consistent for the population covariance matrix Σ when the dimension p is large. Next, it is interesting to see whether the proposed estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the MLE of Σ or not. Note that

$$\min_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} l(\hat{\Sigma}_T | \Sigma) = \text{tr}\Gamma^{-1}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L}) - \log \det \Gamma^{-1}\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L}) - \frac{2}{n} \log c_n(\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})). \quad (4.13)$$

After some calculations the function $\min_{\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)} l(\hat{\Sigma}_T | \Sigma)$ in (4.13) is further minimized with respect to Γ at $\hat{\Gamma} = \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$. As such, when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, we have that $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$, not \mathbf{L} , is the MLE of Γ . Thus, when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$ we have that $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the MLE of Σ , while the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is not. According to the property of MLE we have that \mathbf{U} , $\hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{L})$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ are the consistent estimators of \mathbf{V} , Γ and Σ , respectively. Therefore we have the following.

Theorem 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. For the boundary case, i.e., when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$, then $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the MLE of Σ . And hence, it is consistent.*

Remark 2. We may conclude three-fold in the following: (i) The sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is the MLE of population covariance matrix Σ when the dimension p is fixed. (ii) The estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the MLE of Σ when the dimension p is large such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n = c \in (0, 1)$. (iii) It is easy to see that $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ reduces to the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} when the dimension p is fixed and the sample size n is large (i.e., $c = 0$). Those are insightful parallels. Hence, for simplicity we may integrate the above results into a unified one. $n\hat{\Sigma}$ is Wishart-type distributed with mean matrix Σ when $p/n \rightarrow c \in [0, 1)$. $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is the MLE of Σ . Hence $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ is consistent for Σ , and $\hat{\Sigma}$ converges to Σ *a.s.* as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As such we may use $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ to replace \mathbf{S} for making statistical inferences when $n > p$ (i.e., $c \in [0, 1)$).

Remark 3. We use the very basic statistical concept to get the quantile equality relationship of limiting sample and population spectral distributions so that the consistent problems between the sample eigenvalues and the population eigenvalues can be easily handled. Then use the concept of the likelihood function to get things done. As long as the density function does not degenerate, the statistical inference can then be performed similarly to the traditional one. The key point in having this conclusion is to find a consistent estimator of the population covariance matrix. Namely, it is directly to find out the MLE of Σ when $n > p$. We provide an outline for the likelihood ratio test (LRT) of the hypothesis testing problem in the next section.

Johnstone and Paul (2018) provided a detailed discussion on sample eigenvalue biased and eigenvector inconsistency under the spiked covariance model and for high-dimension PCA-related phenomena. When $c \in [0, 1)$, our approach unifies the traditional ($c = 0$) and high-dimensional ($c \in (0, 1)$) multivariate statistical method without adding any extra conditions, even for the high-dimensional PCA.

When the dimension p is fixed, we have that $l_{i,p}$ is the MLE of $l_i, i = 1, \dots, p$. Although $l_{i,p}$ converges to l_i *a.s.*, it is not true that $l_{i,p}$ is the MLE of l_i , when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1), i = 1, \dots, p$.

5. The decomposite T_T^2 -test when the dimension p is large

From the above arguments, we may suggest using the proposed consistent estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_T$ to replace the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} to make the multivariate statistical inference directly for the cases as long as (i) when p is fixed and n is large, i.e., $c = 0$, and (ii) when $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$.

Let $\mathbf{X}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, be n *i.i.d* random vector having a p -dimensional multinormal distribution with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and unknown positive definite covariance matrix Σ . Consider the hypothesis testing problem

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \text{ versus } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0} \quad (5.1)$$

when both the dimension p and the sample size n are large. Let

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})(\mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}})^\top, \quad (5.2)$$

then the well-known Hotelling's T^2 -test statistics in the literature is denoted as

$$T^2 = n\bar{\mathbf{X}}^\top \mathbf{S}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}. \quad (5.3)$$

When the dimension p is fixed, the Hotelling's T^2 -test is optimal for the problem (5.1).

However, when the dimension p is large, the performance of Hotelling's T^2 -test is not optimal due to the fact that the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} is no longer to be the consistent estimator of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. To overcome the difficulty, we may adopt the novel estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_T$ to replace the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S} , and then consider the following decomposite T_T^2 -test statistic

$$T_T^2 = n\bar{\mathbf{X}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_T^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_T$ is defined in (4.11) with \mathbf{S} in (5.2) replacing the one in (2.2).

It is easy to notice that T_T^2 -test is the LRT statistics for the problem (5.1). Since the power of any reasonable test goes to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to avoid the difficulty we may consider the asymptotical distribution under the local alternatives

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \text{ versus } H_{1n} : \boldsymbol{\mu} = n^{-1/2} p^{1/4} \boldsymbol{\delta}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is a fixed p -dimensional vector, which means to assume that $\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\delta} < \infty$ when p is large. For the asymptotical power behavior of the test, we still follow Le Cam contiguity concept to study the asymptotically local distribution function with a little bit change of converge rate. Note that in the traditional local alternatives do not depend on the dimension p . Let

$$T_0^2 = n\bar{\mathbf{X}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}, \quad (5.6)$$

then similar arguments as that of Tsai and Tsai (2024a), it can be shown that T_T^2 converges to T_0^2 in distribution locally when $p/n \rightarrow c \in [0, 1)$, though T_T^2 does not converge to T_0^2 in probability. Moreover, it has no difficulty to see that T_T^2 -test statistics asymptotically locally (under H_{1n} with the rate $n^{-1/2} p^{1/4}$) reduces to non-central chi-square $\chi_p^2(\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\delta})$ distributed. This asymptotically local power function is still the monotone function of non-centrality $\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\delta}$. And hence, when $p/n \rightarrow c \in [0, 1)$ it is easy to see that the proposed decomposite T_T^2 -test is optimal for the problem (5.1), see Tsai and Tsai (2024a) for the details.

6. Remarks

When $p/n \rightarrow c \in [0, 1)$, the results of Theorem 4.2 can be directly applied to make statistical inference for the principal canonical analysis (PCA) problem. The problem has been mainly studied under the spiked covariance models, there needs to make the sparsity assumption on the population eigenvectors for the consistent problem (Johnstone and Lu, 2009, and the references therein).

Under the multivariate normal setup, we may note that when $p > n$, i.e., $c \in [1, \infty)$, then the density function of \mathbf{S} becomes the singular Wishart distribution (Uhlig, 1994), which it degenerates. In this situation, assume that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}) = n$ we then may have the notations: \mathbf{L} is a $n \times n$ diagonal matrix, and the reparameterization $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}_1^\top$, where $\mathbf{U}_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{n,p}$, the

$np - n(n+1)/2$ -dimensional Stiefel manifold of $p \times n$ matrix \mathbf{U}_1 with orthonormal columns $\mathbf{U}_1^\top \mathbf{U}_1 = \mathbf{I}$. Note that $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{O}(p)$, thus $\text{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{S} = \text{tr} \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}_1^\top = \text{tr} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{L} \mathbf{H}_1^\top$, where $\mathbf{H}_1 = \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{U}_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{n,p}$. Note that $\mathbf{H}_1 \notin \mathcal{O}(p)$, the von Neumann Theorem then might fail to be true in general.

We may also notice that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is a positive definite symmetric matrix, so its p eigenvalues are all positive, however $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}) = n$, so it has $p - n$ sample eigenvalues being 0 in probability. As such it seems to be difficult to get all the consistent eigenvalue estimators of the population eigenvalues. Since the sample size n and the dimension p are all large, maybe we only need the n largest eigenvalue estimators to be consistent for the first n largest population eigenvalue. If this is the case, then the method developed in this note is still applicable. We make it a future project for investigation.

Acknowledgements.

References

1. Anderson, T. W. (2003). *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, 3rd edition, Wiley, New York.
2. Choi, S. I. and Silverman, J. W. (1995). Analysis of the limiting spectral distribution of large dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.* 54, 295-309.
3. James, W. and Stein, C. (1961). Estimation with quadratic loss. *Proc. Fourth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab.* 1, 361-379. California Press, Berkeley, CA.
4. Johnstone, I. M. and Lu, A.Y. (2009). On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association.* 104, 682-693.
5. Johnstone, I. M. and Paul, D. (2018). PCA in high dimensions: An orientation. *Proceedings of the IEEE.* 106, 1277-1292.
6. Ledoit, O. and P ech e, S. (2011). Eigenvectors of some large sample covariance matrix ensembles. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.* 151, 233-264.
7. Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2012). Nonlinear shrinkage estimation of large-dimensional covariance matrices. *Ann. Statist.* 40, 1024-1060.
8. Ledoit, O. and Wolf, M. (2018). Optimal estimation of a large-dimensional covariance matrix under Stein's loss. *Bernoulli* 24, 3791-3832.
9. Mar enko, V. A. and Pastur, L. A. (1967). Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Sb. Math.* 1, 457-483.
10. Rajaratnam, B. and Vincenzi, D. (2016). A theoretical study of Stein's covariance estimator. *Biometrika* 103, 653-666 (2016).
11. Pourahmadi, Mohsen. (2013). *High-Dimensional Covariance Estimation*. Wiley, New York.

12. Silverstein, J. W. (1995). Strong convergence of the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional random matrices. *J. Multivariate Anal.* 55, 331-339.
13. Stein, C. (1956). Inadmissibility of the usual estimator of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *Proc. Third Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab.* 1, 197-206. California Press, Berkeley, CA.
14. Stein, C. (1975). Estimation of a covariance matrix. Rietz lecture, 39th Annual Meeting IMS, Atlanta, Georgia.
15. Stein, C. (1986). Lectures on the theory of estimation of many parameters. *J. Math. Sci.* 43, 1373-1403.
16. Tsai, M.-T. (2018). On the maximum likelihood estimator of a covariance matrix. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **27** 71-82.
17. Tsai, C.-H. and Tsai, M.-T. (2024a). On the decomposite T^2 -test when the dimension is large. arXiv.2403.01516.
18. Tsai, M.-T. and Tsai, C.-H. (2024b). On the orthogonally equivariant estimators of a covariance matrix. arXiv.2405.06877.
19. Zagidullina, A. (2021). *High-Dimensional Covariance Matrix Estimation: An Introduction to Random Matrix Theory*. SpringerBriefs in Applied Statistics and Econometrics. Switzerland
20. Uhlig, H. (1994). On singular Wishart and singular multivariate Beta distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **22** 395-405.