

CLT for Generalized Linear Spectral Statistics of High-dimensional Sample Covariance Matrices and Applications

Yanlin Hu, Qing Yang and Xiao Han

International Institute of Finance, School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China.

Email: hyl11@mail.ustc.edu.cn, yangq@ustc.edu.cn, and xhan011@ustc.edu.cn

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the **Generalized Linear Spectral Statistics** (GLSS) of a high-dimensional sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_n , denoted as $\text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n)\mathbf{B}_n$, which effectively captures distinct spectral properties of \mathbf{S}_n by involving an ancillary matrix \mathbf{B}_n and a test function f . The joint asymptotic normality of GLSS associated with different test functions is established under weak assumptions on \mathbf{B}_n and the underlying distribution, when the dimension n and sample size N are comparable. Specifically, we allow the rank of \mathbf{B}_n to diverge with n . The convergence rate of GLSS is determined by $\sqrt{N/\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_n)}$. As a natural application, we propose a novel approach based on GLSS for hypothesis testing on eigenspaces of spiked covariance matrices. The theoretical accuracy of the results established for GLSS and the advantages of the newly suggested testing procedure are demonstrated through various numerical studies.

Keywords: Sample covariance matrix; Eigenspaces; Generalized linear spectral statistics

1. Introduction

The covariance matrix holds paramount importance in statistics and its associated fields, serving as a fundamental component for numerous widely-used methodologies that heavily rely on comprehending its structural characteristics. For instance, methodologies such as principal component analysis [35] and factor analysis [17, 27] depend on understanding the eigenstructure corresponding to the leading eigenvalues, while spectral methods in clustering [19] depend on understanding the asymptotic properties of the eigenvectors containing the clustering information. Although the sample covariance matrix is a consistent estimator of its population counterpart in the low dimensional setting with a fixed number of variables n , it is widely recognized that drawing direct inferences from the sample covariance matrix may lead to erroneous conclusions when the dimensionality n is comparable to or significantly larger than the sample size N [39]. Specifically, for example, [20, 21, 38] have shown that when $n/N \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$, the largest eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix is an inconsistent estimator for the largest eigenvalue of the population covariance matrix, and the eigenvectors of the sample covariance matrix can be nearly orthogonal to the true ones.

In the high-dimensional setting, numerous monographs have been dedicated to investigating the asymptotic behavior of the largest few eigenvalues or the spectrum of sample covariance matrices. [6] and [41] established

the almost sure convergence to the edge of Marchenko-Pastur (M-P) law for the largest and smallest eigenvalues of sample covariance matrix, respectively. Subsequently, many efforts have been devoted to characterizing the asymptotic distribution of the largest eigenvalue or joint distribution of a few leading eigenvalues. We refer the readers to the literatures [7, 11, 13, 20, 23, 26, 34] and the references therein for more detailed discussions. Regarding the spectrum, [4] established the central limit theorem (CLT) for linear spectral statistics of sample covariance matrices, which considers the sum of eigenvalues of $f(\mathbf{S}_n)$ (i.e. $\text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n)$), where f is assumed to be analytic. The Gaussian-like fourth moment assumption therein and the constraints made on the test function f were later relaxed by [31, 33, 42]. Many statistical inference problems on population covariance matrices can be addressed by employing the CLT of linear spectral statistics, as exemplified in studies [1, 43].

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the literature regarding the properties of eigenvectors of sample covariance matrices. Considering different assumptions on the structure of population covariance matrices and on the distribution of underlying variables, various works have focused on deriving the asymptotic behavior of the inner product between eigenvectors of sample covariance matrices and some non-random vectors. To name a few, we refer the reader to [11, 13, 21, 22, 28, 30, 34, 40]. Recently, [8] established the asymptotic expansion of the spiked eigenvalues and linear combination of spiked eigenvectors for a high-dimensional spiked covariance matrix model. Their theoretical results necessitate that the non-spiked part of the population covariance matrix is an identity matrix, while also assuming a finite number of spiked eigenvalues and arbitrary finite moments for the data entries. [2] proposed another statistic to analyze eigenvalues and eigenvectors by introducing a non-random unit test vector \mathbf{b}_n . To be more specific, they conducted an investigation on $\mathbf{b}_n^* f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{b}_n$ and established its CLT, while referring to [33] for related work under weaker assumptions.

The purpose of the present paper is to establish the CLT for **Generalized Linear Spectral Statistics** (GLSS) of sample covariance matrices, which is formally defined as follows:

$$\text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{B}_n, \quad (1)$$

where the sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_n takes the form

$$\mathbf{S}_n = \frac{1}{N} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{X}_n^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

and $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_{i,j}^n)$ is an $n \times N$ random matrix whose entries are i.i.d with zero mean and unit variance. The matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2}$ represents the square root of the population covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n$. When \mathbf{B}_n equals to the identity matrix \mathbf{I}_n , GLSS is the standard linear spectral statistics introduced in [4]. In the case of \mathbf{B}_n being a rank one Hermitian matrix, GLSS reduces to the statistic considered in [2]. We mention three other relevant works. Firstly, [14] established the CLT for $\text{tr} f(\mathbf{W}_n) \mathbf{B}_n$, where \mathbf{W}_n is a Wigner matrix. Given the existence of arbitrary finite moments and $\|\mathbf{B}_n\|_F \geq cn^\epsilon$ for some $c, \epsilon > 0$, they proved that $\text{tr} f(\mathbf{W}_n) \mathbf{B}_n$ is asymptotic Gaussian. While in our paper the CLT of GLSS is developed for various ranks of \mathbf{B}_n under mild assumptions on its structure and existence of fourth moment of X_{ij}^n . To our best knowledge, this is

the first work concerning general \mathbf{B}_n for covariance matrices. Secondly, [25] determined the almost sure limit of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_n - z\mathbf{I}_n)^{-1}g(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$ for some bounded function g and complex number z , under the condition $\mathbb{E}|X_{ij}|^{12} < \infty$. Lastly, in our parallel working paper, we have developed the CLT of GLSS for high-dimensional sample correlation matrices.

Given that the matrix \mathbf{B}_n has a rank of k_n and possesses a spectral decomposition $\mathbf{B}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} s_i \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{b}_i^*$, GLSS (1) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} s_i \mathbf{b}_i^* f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{b}_i, \quad (3)$$

which is a weighted sum of the vector linear spectral statistics (i.e. $k_n = 1$) considered by [2, 33]. The extension to general k_n , especially when k_n diverges with n is non-trivial and the proof is much more complicated. A further spectral decomposition on \mathbf{S}_n yields an alternative representation of GLSS as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \sum_{j=1}^n s_i f(\lambda_j) |\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle|^2, \quad (4)$$

where λ_j is the j -th largest eigenvalue of \mathbf{S}_n and \mathbf{u}_j is the corresponding eigenvector. It is evident from (4) that by selecting different choices of f and \mathbf{B}_n , GLSS reflects distinct aspects of the spectrum of \mathbf{S}_n . Therefore it becomes feasible to assess a partial spectral structure of \mathbf{S}_n through appropriate selection of f and \mathbf{B}_n . This has been verified in our application, where we introduce a novel approach - functional projection - for conducting hypothesis testing on eigenspaces of spiked covariance matrices.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a flexible statistic - GLSS to study the properties of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices. The statistics studied in [2] and [4] are special cases of GLSS.
- We establish the CLT of GLSS both when k_n is finite and when k_n diverges with n by an adaptive proof procedure for different k_n . Due to the existence of f and \mathbf{B}_n , this CLT helps to understand the eigenvalue and eigenvector structure of \mathbf{S}_n in a flexible way. For instance, choosing \mathbf{B}_n as a projection matrix allows $f(\mathbf{S}_n)\mathbf{B}_n$ to represent the projection of $f(\mathbf{S}_n)$ onto the space of \mathbf{B}_n . Additionally, by utilizing different ranks k_n , we could keep arbitrary number of projection directions.
- We apply our theory to conduct hypothesis testing for eigenspaces of spiked covariance matrices. To be more specific, assuming $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n = \mathbf{I}_n + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} d_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$, we aim to test the equality between the column space spanned by $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{r_n}\}$ and a given space, where r_n may diverge with n . In this regard, we propose a novel testing method based on GLSS. Our approach exhibits significant advantages over existing works ([8, 36]) in terms of both size accuracy under the null hypothesis and power performance under alternative hypotheses, particularly when r_n is large.

The remaining of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the CLT for GLSS by considering both cases when k_n is comparable to n and when $k_n = o(n)$. Various simulations are conducted

in Section 3 to verify our theoretical results. Motivated by GLSS and building upon a slight modification to our Theorem 2.1, we propose a novel test statistic in Section 4 for testing eigenspaces of spiked covariance matrices. To demonstrate the advantages of our proposed method, we conduct comprehensive comparisons with various alternative methods across multiple aspects, including computational complexity, accuracy under null hypotheses, and power under alternative hypotheses. All auxiliary lemmas and proofs, as well as further results are postponed to the Appendix. To be more specific, a strategy outline for proving our theorems and addressing notable challenges is presented in Section A. In Section B, we collect some elementary lemmas which will be frequently used in our proof. In Sections C, E and F, we provide detailed proofs for Theorem 2.1, 2.2 and 4.1, along with some auxiliary lemmas whose proofs are deferred to Section G.

Notations. We introduce some notations that will be used throughout this paper. Bold capital and lowercase letters are used to denote matrices and vectors, respectively. The notation \xrightarrow{D} (or $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$) means convergence in distribution (or in probability). For any quantities a_n and b_n , we use the notation $a_n \ll b_n$ to denote the relation $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if there exists some constant $C > 1$ such that $C^{-1}|a_n| \leq |b_n| \leq C|a_n|$. For random variable sequences x_n , the symbol $x_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(a_n)$ means $x_n/a_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Besides, $x_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(a_n)$ stands for $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sup_n \mathbb{P}(|x_n/a_n| > M) = 0$. For a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times q}$, we use $\|\mathbf{M}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F$ to denote its spectral norm and Frobenius norm. In addition, denote by $(\mathbf{M})_{ij}$, $\lambda_i(\mathbf{M})$ and $s_i(\mathbf{M})$ the entry located in the i -th row and j -th column, the i -th largest eigenvalue and the i -th largest singular value, respectively. Let \mathbf{M}^* (or \mathbf{M}^\top) represent the conventional conjugate transpose (or transpose) of \mathbf{M} . The notation $\text{diag}(\mathbf{M})$ in the context of a square matrix \mathbf{M} denotes a diagonal matrix whose entries on the main diagonal correspond to those of \mathbf{M} . For a σ -field \mathcal{F}_i generated by $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i\}$, we use $\mathbb{E}_i(\cdot)$ to denote the conditional expectation with respect to \mathcal{F}_i . Similarly, for a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\mathbb{E}_{-\mathcal{S}}(\cdot)$ is defined as the conditional expectation with respect to the σ -field generated by $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i \notin \mathcal{S}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Furthermore, denote by \mathbb{I}_E the indicator function of an event E .

2. Asymptotic results for GLSS

In this section, the asymptotic distribution of our GLSS is established both when $\frac{k_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{k_n}{n} \geq c_0$ for some positive constant c_0 . Before delving into the main theorems in Section 2.2, we provide an introduction to some preliminary results regarding the limiting spectral distribution of the conventional sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_n in Section 2.1.

2.1. Some preliminary results on the sample covariance matrix

In random matrix theory, the Stieltjes transform is a fundamental function, which is formally defined in Definition 2.1.

Definition 2.1. For any function G with bounded variation on the real line, its Stieltjes transform is defined by

$$m_G(z) = \int \frac{1}{x - z} dG(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } \Im z \neq 0.$$

It has been demonstrated that a bijective correspondence exists between G and its Stieltjes transform $m_G(z)$ when G is a proper distribution function (see Theorem B.8 in [5]). Recalling the definition of \mathbf{S}_n in (2), an elementary limit theorem concerning the eigenvalues of \mathbf{S}_n is focused on its empirical spectral distribution $F^{\mathbf{S}_n}$. To be more specific,

$$F^{\mathbf{S}_n}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{\lambda_i(\mathbf{S}_n) \leq x\}}.$$

If we assume that for all n , X_{ij}^n are i.i.d. standardized random variables, $F^{\mathbf{S}_n}$ converges in distribution to H and $n/N \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$, then almost surely, $F^{\mathbf{S}_n}$ converges in distribution to $F^{c,H}$, whose Stieltjes transform $m(z)$ is the unique solution to

$$m(z) = \int \frac{1}{x(1-c-czm(z))-z} dH(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \quad (5)$$

Considering $\underline{\mathbf{S}}_n \equiv (1/N)\mathbf{X}_n^* \underline{\Sigma}_n \mathbf{X}_n$ whose spectra differs from that of \mathbf{S}_n by $|n-N|$ zeros, we know that its limiting empirical distribution function satisfies

$$\underline{F}^{c,H} \equiv (1-c)\mathbb{I}_{[0,\infty)} + cF^{c,H}.$$

Furthermore, its Stieltjes transform

$$\underline{m}(z) \equiv m_{\underline{F}^{c,H}}(z) = -\frac{1-c}{z} + cm(z) \quad (6)$$

has inverse

$$z = z(\underline{m}) = -\frac{1}{\underline{m}} + c \int \frac{t}{1+t\underline{m}} dH(t), \quad (7)$$

which takes a simpler form. One may refer to [5] for more detailed discussions. Let $m_n^0(z)$ and $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ represent the quantities obtained from equations (5) and (6) when replacing (c, H) by (c_n, H_n) , which will be frequently used in establishing our main theorems. The corresponding distribution functions for $m_n^0(z)$ and $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ are denoted as F^{c_n, H_n} and \underline{F}^{c_n, H_n} , respectively. In addition, $m_n(z)$ and $\underline{m}_n(z)$ are employed to denote the Stieltjes transforms of $F^{\mathbf{S}_n}$ and $F^{\underline{\mathbf{S}}_n}$.

2.2. Main theoretical results

The following assumptions will be used in our theoretical analysis.

Assumption 2.1. For each n , $X_{ij} = X_{ij}^n, i \leq n, j \leq N$ are i.i.d. for all n, i, j . Moreover, $\mathbb{E}X_{11} = 0$, $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^2 = 1$, $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 < \infty$, $n/N \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$. For complex case we assume $\mathbb{E}X_{11}^2 = 0$.

Assumption 2.2. The matrices Σ_n and \mathbf{B}_n are $n \times n$ non-random Hermitian matrices such that their non-zero eigenvalues are bounded away from 0 and infinity. Moreover, we assume that Σ_n is non-negative definite ($\Sigma_n \succeq \mathbf{0}$) and $H_n = F^{\Sigma_n} \xrightarrow{D} H$, where H is a distribution function.

Assumption 2.3. Let $k_n = \text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_n)$. Either one of the following two cases holds:

- (i) [k_n is comparable to n]. There exists a positive constant c_0 such that $\frac{k_n}{n} \geq c_0$.
- (ii) [k_n is much smaller than n]. $\frac{k_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$.

Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are standard in random matrix theory (see [2, 4, 33] for example). The asymptotic behavior of GLSS $\text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{B}_n$ depends on the rank of \mathbf{B}_n . In the following Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, we summarize the different limiting distributions under the two different cases of k_n stated in Assumption 2.3, respectively.

Theorem 2.1. *[k_n is comparable to n]. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (i) hold. Let f_1, \dots, f_r be analytic functions on an open interval containing $[d_-, d^+]$, where*

$$[d_-, d^+] = \left[\liminf_n \lambda_{\min}^{\Sigma_n} \mathbb{I}_{(0,1)}(c) (1 - \sqrt{c})^2, \limsup_n \|\Sigma_n\| (1 + \sqrt{c})^2 \right]. \quad (8)$$

Recall the definition of GLSS in (1) and define

$$\Theta_n(f) = \text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{B}_n - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \text{tr}(z \mathbf{I}_n + z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \Sigma_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n dz, \quad (9)$$

where Γ is a contour taken in the positive direction enclosing an open interval covering $[d_-, d^+]$. Then we have the following results:

(i) the random vector

$$(\Theta_n(f_1), \dots, \Theta_n(f_r)) \quad (10)$$

forms a tight sequence in n .

(ii) Let $\mu_X = \mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 - |\mathbb{E}X_{11}^2|^2 - 2$ and $v_X = 1 + |\mathbb{E}X_{11}^2|^2$. After suitable centralization, the random vector (10) converges weakly to an r -dimensional Gaussian distribution, i.e.,

$$(\Theta_n(f_1) - \omega_n(f_1), \dots, \Theta_n(f_r) - \omega_n(f_r)) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Omega}_1), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n(f) = & -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{(v_X - 1) f(z) \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2}{z (1 - c \int \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2 t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-2} dH_n(t))} \\ & \times \left(\frac{c P_n(z) \int \underline{m}_n^0(z) t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-3} dH_n(t)}{(1 - c \int \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2 t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-2} dH_n(t))} - Q_n(z) \right) dz \\ & - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \mu_X f(z) z^2 \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2 \left[\underline{m}_n^0(z) P_n(z) \tilde{U}_n^1(z, z) \right. \\ & \left. \times \left(1 - c \int \frac{\underline{m}_n^0(z)^2 t^2 dH_n(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z) t)^2} \right)^{-1} - \tilde{V}_n^1(z, z) \right] dz \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ is an $r \times r$ matrix with the (s, t) th entry being

$$(\mathbf{\Omega}_1)_{st} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \iint_{\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2} f_s(z_1) f_t(z_2) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (v_X C_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \mu_X C_n^2(z_1, z_2)) dz_1 dz_2. \quad (13)$$

The functions C_n^1, C_n^2 are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n^1(z_1, z_2) = & \frac{(m_2 - m_1)z_1z_2}{z_2 - z_1} \left(V_n^3(z_1, z_2) + z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_2) V_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \\
& + z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 g_n(z_1) V_n^2(z_1, z_2) + z_1^2 z_2^2 \underline{m}_1^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) U_n^2(z_1, z_2) \left. \right) \\
& + \frac{(m_2 - m_1)^2 z_1 z_2}{\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2 (z_2 - z_1)^2} \left(z_1 z_2 \underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2 \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) \zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) \right. \\
& \left. - z_1 \underline{m}_1 g_n(z_1) \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_2 \underline{m}_2 g_n(z_2) \zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) a_n(z_1, z_2) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n^2(z_1, z_2) = & z_1 z_2 \underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2 \left(\tilde{V}_n^3(z_1, z_2) + z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_2) \tilde{V}_n^2(z_2, z_1) + z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 g_n(z_1) \tilde{V}_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right. \\
& z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_2) z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 g_n(z_1) \tilde{U}_n^2(z_1, z_2) - z_1 \underline{m}_1 g_n(z_1) \tilde{V}_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_1 \underline{m}_1 z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \tilde{U}_n^1(z_1, z_2) \\
& \left. - z_2 \underline{m}_2 g_n(z_2) \tilde{V}_n^1(z_2, z_1) - z_2 \underline{m}_2 z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \tilde{U}_n^1(z_2, z_1) + g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \tilde{a}_n(z_1, z_2) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Here \underline{m}_i means $\underline{m}(z_i)$ for simplicity and the other n -associated terms are defined in detail in Lemma C.1, Lemma D.1 and (56) in the Appendix. The contours Γ_1 and Γ_2 are disjoint and have the same properties as Γ .

We look at the special case when $\mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{I}_n$. Obviously it satisfies Assumption 2.3 (i) since $k_n = n$ now. It can be easily checked that $\frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(z \mathbf{I}_n + z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n = \int \frac{dH_n(t)}{z(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z)t)} = m_n^0(z)$. Then $\Theta_n(f)$ in equation (9) reduces to

$$\Theta_n(f) = n \int f(x) d(F^{\mathbf{S}_n}(x) - F^{c_n, H_n}(x)),$$

which is the conventional linear spectral statistic corresponding to the sample covariance matrix (see [4]). And our theoretical result in Theorem 2.1 coincides with the traditional one (see our Remark C.1 for detailed calculations).

The asymptotic covariances (13) are mainly determined by two functions $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ defined in (14) and (15). If the first four moments of the underlying distribution matches with that of a standard Gaussian distribution, then $\mu_X = 0$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ disappears in (13). Our Remark C.1 shows that under many cases, the n -associated terms in (14) and (15) are convergent and have succinct forms. Moreover, it can be seen from our proof that these terms are uniformly bounded in $z \in \mathcal{C}$ (see (34)), where \mathcal{C} is any contour in the complex plane enclosing the closed interval (8). Therefore, in application, we often use a normalized version of Theorem 2.1, which is summarized in the following Proposition 1.

Proposition 1. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (i) hold. We further assume that $\lambda_r(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^1) \geq c_1 > 0$ for large n and some positive constant c_1 , where*

$$(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n^1)_{st} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \iint_{\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2} f_s(z_1) f_t(z_2) (v_X C_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \mu_X C_n^2(z_1, z_2)) dz_1 dz_2.$$

Then we have

$$(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^1)^{-1/2}(\Theta_n(f_1) - \omega_n(f_1), \dots, \Theta_n(f_r) - \omega_n(f_r))^\top \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_r). \quad (16)$$

Remark 2.1. The condition $\lambda_r(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^1) \geq c_1 > 0$ actually implies the linearly independence of f_1, \dots, f_r in the sense that for any unit vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$, the variance of $\Theta_n(\mathbf{u}^\top(f_1, \dots, f_r))$ does not approach 0. We conjecture the converse for this statement also holds. Even though $\lambda_r(\mathbf{\Omega}_n^1) \geq c_1 > 0$ is easy to be satisfied in application, it is still theoretically difficult to be verified (see also Remark 3.4 in [29]).

The asymptotic distribution of GLSS is now investigated when $k_n = o(n)$. It should be noted that when $k_n/n \rightarrow 0$, the quantities relevant to \mathbf{B}_n in Theorem 2.1 all become zeros, resulting in $\Theta_n(f) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Consequently, we need to seek for a suitable sequence $a_n \rightarrow \infty$, such that $a_n \Theta_n(f)$ converges to a non-degenerate distribution.

Theorem 2.2. [k_n is much smaller than n]. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (ii) hold. Define

$$H_n^1(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{k_n} \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{B}_n \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma}_n \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \right)^2,$$

and

$$H_n^2(z_1, z_2) = \frac{m(z_1)m(z_2)}{k_n z_1 z_2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii}.$$

Then we have

(i) the random vector

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} (\Theta_n(f_1), \dots, \Theta_n(f_r)) \quad (17)$$

forms a tight sequence in n .

(ii) The random vector (17) converges weakly to a mean-zero r -dimensional Gaussian distribution, i.e.,

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} (\Theta_n(f_1), \dots, \Theta_n(f_r)) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Omega}_2), \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega}_2$ is an $r \times r$ matrix with the (s, t) th entry being

$$(\mathbf{\Omega}_2)_{st} = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \iint_{\Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2} f_s(z_1) f_t(z_2) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{v_X(m(z_2)) - m(z_1)}{z_1 z_2 (z_2 - z_1)} H_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \mu_X H_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right) dz_1 dz_2, \quad (19)$$

where Γ_1, Γ_2 are assumed to be disjoint.

Remark 2.2. Our Theorem 2.2 generalizes the results in [2] and [33], which specifically consider the case $k_n = 1$. To elaborate, by assuming $\mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{b}_n \mathbf{b}_n^*$, [2] obtained the CLT under Gaussian-like fourth moment assumption, i.e., $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 = 3$ in the real case and $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 = 2$ in the complex case. Moreover, they require

$$\sqrt{N} \left| \mathbf{b}_n^* \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{b}_n - \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (20)$$

Condition (20) implies the convergence of $H_n^1(z_1, z_2)$, as confirmed by the equality (4.25) in [2]. [33] extended the moment condition to $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 < \infty$, and additionally they required both (20) and

$$\max_i \left| \mathbf{b}_n^* \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (21)$$

It is evident that (21) directly indicates $H_n^2(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore within their specified frameworks, our result established in Theorem 2.2 aligns with theirs.

Remark 2.3. In application, we may also use a normalized version of Theorem 2.2 as done in Proposition 1. Comparing Theorem 2.2 with Theorem 2.1, one can see that the asymptotic mean in (18) is zero, which is totally different from that in (11) where a bias $\omega_n(f)$ appears. Also, the expression for asymptotic variance is significantly simplified when $k_n = o(n)$ compared to the case when $k_n/n \geq c_0$.

We give a further illustration on the non-random part $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \text{tr}(z\mathbf{I}_n + z\mathbf{m}_n^0(z)\mathbf{\Sigma}_n)^{-1}\mathbf{B}_n dz$ in $\Theta_n(f)$. Analogous to expression (4), it can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle|^2 \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{s_i f(z)}{z(1 + \lambda_j(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n)\mathbf{m}_n^0(z))} dz, \quad (22)$$

where the decomposition $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(\mathbf{\Sigma}_n)\mathbf{v}_j\mathbf{v}_j^*$ is employed. Each summation term in (22) is divided into two parts: one determined by the inner product of eigenvectors of \mathbf{B}_n and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$, and the other solely influenced by the eigenvalues. Consequently, if $\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle = 0$ for some i, j , then the corresponding summation term becomes zero. The non-random part (22) is governed by the non-orthogonal eigenvectors of \mathbf{B}_n and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$. Therefore, it is possible for us to design a suitable GLSS for a specified hypothesis testing regarding the eigenspace structure, as exemplified in Section 4.

3. Simulations

In this section, a series of simulations are conducted with varying choices of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$, \mathbf{B}_n and underlying distributions of X_{ij} to empirically validate the theoretical results presented in Section 2. In Section 3.1, we choose $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_n) = n$ to satisfy the conditions stated in Theorem 2.1, while in Section 3.2 we select some constant values for $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_n)$ that align with Theorem 2.2. Let $r = 1$, $f(z) = z^2$ and $n = N = 1000$. Denote

$$\tilde{\Theta}_n(f) = \Omega_n(f)^{-1/2} (\Theta_n(f) - \omega_n(f)).$$

When verifying Theorem 2.1 in Section 3.1, the value of $\omega_n(f)$ is provided in (12), and the scalar $\Omega_n(f) = \Omega_n^1$ is defined in Proposition 1. When validating Theorem 2.2 in Section 3.2, we have $\omega_n(f) = 0$ and $\Omega_n(f) = k_n/N\Omega_n^2$, where Ω_n^2 represents a non-asymptotic version of Ω_2 defined in (19) according to Remark 2.3. Our theoretical findings suggest that the distribution of $\tilde{\Theta}_n(f)$ converges to $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. All numerical results presented below are based on $M = 1000$ replications, yielding 1000 simulated estimates $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ of $\tilde{\Theta}_n(f)$. The empirical mean and variance are

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}X_f} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \tilde{\Theta}_n^k(f), \quad (23)$$

and

$$\widehat{\text{Var}X_f} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M (\tilde{\Theta}_n^k(f) - \widehat{\mathbb{E}X_f})^2. \quad (24)$$

Eight different models will be considered. For each model, we plot the histogram of $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and compare it with the density function of the theoretical $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Additionally, the normal QQ-plot is presented to further validate the asymptotical normality.

3.1. The matrix B_n is of full rank

This section will investigate six distinct models, each offering different choices of Σ_n and B_n , as well as varying underlying distributions of X_{ij} . In all these models, B_n possesses full rank, which aligns with the condition stated in Theorem 2.1.

Model 1. $\Sigma_n = I_n$, $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and B_n is a diagonal matrix with the i -th entry being $(i/n + 1)$. Under this model, $\Theta_n(f)$ can be accurately calculated due to a closed-form representation of $m_n^0(z) = \underline{m}_n^0(z) = m(z)$, where

$$m(z) = \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4z}}{2z}, \quad \Im z \neq 0.$$

Moreover, it is easy to see the non-random part in $\Theta_n(f)$ equals to

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \operatorname{tr}(zI_n + z\underline{m}_n^0(z)\Sigma_n)^{-1} B_n dz = 2 \operatorname{tr}(B_n).$$

Model 2. $\Sigma_n = I_n$, $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$ and B_n is a diagonal matrix with the i -th entry being $(i/n + 1)$. Model 2 differs from Model 1 in the way of selecting the distribution of X_{ij} . In Model 2, X_{ij} follows a t-distribution with degree of freedom 10. The constant $\sqrt{5/4}$ is introduced to ensure that $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^2 = 1$. One can easily check that $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 = 4$, different from that of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Model 3. Σ_n is the covariance matrix of AR(1) sequence with coefficient 0.5 (i.e. the (i, j) entry is $0.5^{|i-j|}$), $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $B_n = \Sigma_n$. Obtaining a close-form for $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ within this model poses a challenge. To address this issue, we independently generate 100 sample covariance matrices S_n^1, \dots, S_n^{100} , and replace $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ with the average of $\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}(S_n^i - zI)^{-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, 100$. Subsequently in the simulations, whenever $\Sigma_n \neq I_n$, we consistently adopt this replacement strategy.

Model 4. Σ_n is a diagonal matrix with $(\Sigma_n)_{ii} = (i/n)^2 + 0.2$, $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$ and B_n is a diagonal matrix with $(B_n)_{ii} = i/n + 0.2$.

Model 5. Σ_n is the same as in Model 3, $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and B_n is chosen to be an arbitrary realization of the standard Wigner matrix.

Model 6. Σ_n and B_n are the same as in Model 5, and $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$ whose fourth moment is different from that of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

The histogram plots and QQ plots for Models 1-6 are depicted in Figures 1-6, respectively. These results confirm the accuracy of our theoretical results.




Figure 1: Model 1: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.




Figure 2: Model 2: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.




Figure 3: Model 3: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.




Figure 4: Model 4: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.




Figure 5: Model 5: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.




Figure 6: Model 6: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (dark red line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records.

3.2. The matrix B_n is of low rank

For the models considered in this section, the ranks of B_n are constant values, which aligns with the condition stated in Theorem 2.2.

Model 7. $\Sigma_n = I_n$, $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\text{rank}(B_n) = 5$. Specifically, B_n is a diagonal matrix with $(B_n)_{ii} = i/2$, for $i = 1, \dots, 5$.

Model 8. Σ_n is the same as in Model 3, $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$ and $\text{rank}(B_n) = 10$. Specifically, $B_n =$

$\sum_{i=1}^{10} \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{b}_i^*$, where \mathbf{b}_i 's are selected from the eigenvectors of a realization for Wigner matrix.

Figures 7 and 8 present the histograms and QQ plots for the above two models, which demonstrate the accuracy of our theoretical results in Theorem 2.2.




Figure 7: Model 7: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))^T$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (darkred line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records




Figure 8: Model 8: (a): Histogram of the standardized records $(\tilde{\Theta}_n^1(f), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_n^M(f))^T$ and density curve of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (darkred line) (b): QQ-plot of the standardized records

Finally, the empirical means and variances calculated by (23) and (24) for the aforementioned eight models are recorded in Table 1. It is evident that, across all models, the empirical mean closely approximates zero while the variance closely approximates one, thereby providing strong support for our theoretical findings.

Table 1: Empirical mean and variance defined in (23) and (24) for the eight different models.

| Model | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| $\widehat{\mathbb{E}X_f}$ | 0.0006 | 0.0762 | -0.0904 | 0.0943 | -0.0212 | -0.0267 | 0.0511 | 0.0306 |
| $\widehat{\text{Var}X_f}$ | 0.9821 | 1.0411 | 0.9365 | 1.0946 | 1.0690 | 1.0165 | 1.0162 | 0.9604 |

4. Application to Hypothesis Testing for Eigenspaces of Spiked Covariance Matrices

In this section, we will employ our previously established theory to examine the eigenspaces of spiked covariance matrices. Hypothesis testing for eigenspaces of the spiked covariance matrix plays a crucial role in statistical machine learning and is encountered in various modern algorithms, see [36] for an extensive discussion on this topic. However, existing methods for such problems are limited to the case when $n \ll N$, both theoretically and practically, unless there are constraints on the structure of the covariance matrix. See for example, bootstrap based approach[36, 32], Bayesian or Frequentist-Bayes related method[36, 37], sample splitting method[24], and the Le Cam optimal test proposed in [18]. In the high-dimensional setting where $n \asymp N$, for the spiked covariance matrix model Σ_n that admits the decomposition

$$\Sigma_n = \mathbf{I}_n + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} d_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top, \quad (25)$$

[8] proposed a statistic based on the accurate results on the joint distribution of the few leading extreme eigenvalues and the generalized components of their associated eigenvectors. We would like to mention two assumptions required in [8]. Firstly, $r_n = r$ is a fixed constant. Secondly, their Assumption 2.4 imposes a restriction on the minimal distance of $|d_i - d_j|$ when $d_i \neq d_j$ and requires a positive lower bound for the spiked eigenvalues d_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$. In contrast, in our approach as well as the theories we will consider, r_n is allowed to diverge as n tends to infinity. Additionally, we only assume that $0 < \sup_n \max_{i=1, \dots, r_n} d_i < \infty$ without further imposing a positive lower bound for the spiked eigenvalues.

4.1. Methodology and theoretical results

We now present our methodology for testing whether the eigenspace spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to the r_n spikes is equivalent to a given subspace. Denote $\mathcal{Z}_n := \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$. Then the testing problem is

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \mathcal{Z}_n = \mathcal{Z}_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad \mathbf{H}_1 : \mathcal{Z}_n \neq \mathcal{Z}_0, \quad (26)$$

for a given projection matrix \mathbf{Z}_0 . In the ideal case when $r_n/N \rightarrow 0$ and accurate estimation of all d_i 's at a rate of $o_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{-1/2})$ is possible, Theorem 2.2 suggests a natural test statistic $\Theta_n(f)$ defined in (9) by using $\mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{Z}_0$ for testing hypothesis (26). However, it is practically impossible to achieve such an ideal estimator for d_i . Even when r_n is fixed, according to Theorem 2.10 in [8], the estimation of spiked eigenvalues exhibits robustness only up to a rate $O_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{-1/2})$, not to mention when r_n diverges. In order to eliminate the effect of unknown d_i 's, we select \mathbf{B}_n as the projection matrix orthogonal to \mathbf{Z}_0 , i.e. $\mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0$. Consequently, the rank(\mathbf{B}_n) now satisfies Assumption 2.3(i) and Theorem 2.1 implies a limiting Gaussian distribution for the test statistic $\Theta_n(f)$. Encouragingly, through this selection of \mathbf{B}_n , under the null hypothesis, neither the non-random component nor its asymptotic mean and variance in $\Theta_n(f)$ incorporate any unknown spiked eigenvalues. The sole remaining unknown term is $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$. Simply substituting $\underline{m}_n(z)$ for $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ would impact the asymptotic distribution stated in Theorem 2.1 due to an $O_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{-1})$ order discrepancy between $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ and $\underline{m}_n(z)$, which constitutes a non-negligible error. To surmount this challenge, we adapt $\Theta_n(f)$ by defining our test statistic as follows:

$$\Delta_n(f) = \text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n)(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0) - \frac{n - r_n}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z)}{z + z\underline{m}_n(z)} dz, \quad (27)$$

and refer to this testing approach as **Functional Projection**. Focusing on the case of real variables, which is commonly encountered in practical applications, we establish the asymptotic distribution of $\Delta_n(f)$ as presented in the following Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that the population covariance matrix Σ_n admits the decomposition (25). In addition to Assumption 2.1, we further assume that*

$$(FP). \quad 0 < \sup_n \max_{i=1, \dots, r_n} d_i < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad r_n/N \rightarrow 0.$$

Then under the null hypothesis \mathbf{H}_0 in (26), we have

$$\frac{\Delta_n(f) - \mu(f, r_n, n, N)}{\sqrt{\varrho(f, r_n, n, N)}} \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (28)$$

where $\mu(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\varrho(f, r_n, n, N)$ are explicitly defined by means of equations (107)-(127) in the Appendix.

Remark 4.1. *In practice, we need to estimate d_i and $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ in $\mu(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\varrho(f, r_n, n, N)$. A good estimator for $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ is $\underline{m}_n(z)$ since $\underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(N^{-1})$. Regarding d_i , we use a shrinkage estimator \hat{d}_i to replace d_i :*

$$\hat{d}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(-c_n - 1 + \lambda_i(\mathbf{S}_n)) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(-c_n - 1 + \lambda_i(\mathbf{S}_n))^2 - 4c_n}, & \lambda_i(\mathbf{S}_n) \geq (1 + \sqrt{c_n})^2 + \delta \\ 0 & , \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is any pre-specified constant. When $d_i > \sqrt{c_n}$ and is bounded away from infinity, it is verified from [8] that \hat{d}_i is a consistent estimator for d_i given a fixed r_n . Define $\hat{\mu}(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\hat{\varrho}(f, r_n, n, N)$ with d_i and $\underline{m}_n^0(z)$ replaced by \hat{d}_i and $\underline{m}_n(z)$. Since the d_i associated terms in $\hat{\mu}(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\hat{\varrho}(f, r_n, n, N)$ are of an order $O(r_n/N)$ (see eg. (107)), it is evident that $\hat{\varrho}(f, r_n, n, N) = \varrho(f, r_n, n, N) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(r_n/N)$ and $\hat{\mu}(f, r_n, n, N) = \mu(f, r_n, n, N) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(r_n/N)$ by the assumption (FP) in Theorem 4.1. As a consequence, (28) still holds when $\mu(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\varrho(f, r_n, n, N)$ are estimated by $\hat{\mu}(f, r_n, n, N)$ and $\hat{\varrho}(f, r_n, n, N)$.

The covariance matrix under \mathbf{H}_1 can be explicitly written as

$$\Sigma_n^{(\varphi)} = \begin{bmatrix} (1+d_1)\cos^2\varphi + \sin^2\varphi & 0 & \dots & 0 & d_1\cos\varphi\sin\varphi & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1+d_2 & & & 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & & & 1+d_{r_n} & 0 & & & \\ d_1\cos\varphi\sin\varphi & 0 & \dots & 0 & (1+d_1)\sin^2\varphi + \cos^2\varphi & & & \\ 0 & & & & & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A smaller φ indicates a comparatively weaker alternative. The following scenarios will be taken into consideration.

- **Scenario I.** Set $r_n = 3$ with $d_1 = 9$, $d_2 = 5$ and $d_3 = 2$ (the spiked eigenvalues are simple with no multiplicity). The angle φ varies within $\{1\%, 2\%, \dots, 80\%\} \times \pi/2$ to capture the power performance trend. Both $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$ are taken into account.

- **Scenario II.** Set $d_1 = 9$ and $d_2 = \dots = d_{r_n} = 4$ (eigenvalue multiplicity exists). $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Larger ranks $r_n = 7$ and $r_n = 11$ are considered. The angle φ varies within $\{1\%, 2\%, \dots, 80\%\} \times \pi/2$ to obtain the power performance trend.

- **Scenario III.** Set $d_1 = 9$ and $d_2 = \dots = d_{r_n} = 4$. $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Fix $\varphi = \pi/8$ or $\varphi = 0$, where the former reflects \mathbf{H}_1 and the latter corresponds to \mathbf{H}_0 . The rank r_n varies within $\{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$ to check the tendency.

The choices for the remaining parameters are as follows: the nominal level $\alpha = 0.1$, the threshold δ in (29) is $\delta = 0.1$, the dimension $n = 500$, the sample size $N \in \{500, 1000\}$, and the function $f(z) = z^2$ or z^3 . The comparison of empirical powers is conducted using 100 replications, while the empirical sizes are calculated based on 1000 replications.

By setting $\varphi = 0$, we record the empirical sizes in Scenarios I and II, as presented in Table 2. It is observed that both our statistics FP_{z^2} and FP_{z^3} exhibit excellent accuracy, with the empirical size closely aligning with the nominal level 0.1. In Scenario II, Fr_Ad shows significantly inflated sizes, particularly when the number of spikes is large ($r_n = 11$). Both En_Bo and En_Ba suffer from severe size distortion across all settings in Scenarios I and II.

Figures 9 and 10 present the power comparison in Scenario I when $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$, respectively. We can observe that our FP with $f(z) = z^3$ exhibits greater sensitivity and statistical power compared to other methods, particularly when the angle φ is not large. The power of FP with $f(z) = z^2$ is comparable to that of Fr_Ad . Both En_Bo and En_Ba show significantly reduced sensitivity to φ . This is evident from that observation that their power approaches 1 only within the range of $(\pi/2 \times 0.6, \pi/2 \times 0.8)$ for φ , while for smaller values of φ than $\pi/2 \times 0.4$, the power remains close to zero.

Figures 11 and 12 illustrate the power comparison in Scenario II when $r_n = 7$ and $r_n = 11$, respectively. Similar to Scenario I, our statistics maintain satisfactory performance, and both En_Bo and En_Ba show significant power loss especially when φ is small, say less than $\pi/2 \times 0.4$. One may notice that Fr_Ad demonstrates the highest power under an extremely weak alternative (e.g., $\varphi = \pi/2 \times 0.01$). However, we mention that this high power may not be trusted due to its empirical size being much larger than the nominal level 0.1 as observed from Table 2.

Figure 13 displays the the power performances of these methods when $\varphi = \pi/8$ in Scenario III. Our statistic FP- z^3 demonstrates superior power performance, especially for large rank r_n . We observe that the power of Fr_Ad exhibits excellent performance for small values of rank r_n , but experiences a significant decline as r_n increases. The powers of both En_Bo and En_Ba are close to zero across all r_n . The empirical sizes corresponding to Scenario III when $\varphi = 0$ are depicted in Figure 14. It is evident that both our methods FP- z^3 and FP- z^2 consistently exhibit accurate distribution, with empirical sizes closely approximating 0.1. Fr_Ad experiences inflated sizes as r_n increases, while the sizes of En_Bo and En_Ba remain close to zero.

Table 2: Empirical sizes at the nominal level $\alpha = 0.1$, based on 1000 replications. The two values closest to 0.1 are highlighted in bold.

| Method | $N = 500$ | | | | | $N = 1000$ | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | FP- z^2 | FP- z^3 | Fr-Ad | En-Bo | En-Ba | FP- z^2 | FP- z^3 | Fr-Ad | En-Bo | En-Ba |
| Scenario I: $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ | 0.105 | 0.094 | 0.108 | 0.013 | 0.005 | 0.094 | 0.095 | 0.109 | 0.006 | 0.007 |
| Scenario I: $t(10)$ | 0.104 | 0.103 | 0.099 | 0.010 | 0.009 | 0.096 | 0.097 | 0.112 | 0.003 | 0.005 |
| Scenario II: $r_n = 7$ | 0.095 | 0.104 | 0.271 | 0.009 | 0.008 | 0.096 | 0.102 | 0.216 | 0.010 | 0.004 |
| Scenario II: $r_n = 11$ | 0.101 | 0.091 | 0.720 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.103 | 0.095 | 0.508 | 0.007 | 0.009 |




Figure 9: Power comparison for Scenario I when $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The angle φ varies within $\{1\%, 2\%, \dots, 80\% \} \times \pi/2$. The data dimension $n = 500$. The sample size in the left plot (a) is $N = 500$, while in the right plot (b) it is $N = 1000$. FP_z2 and FP_z3 represents our approach FP with $f(z) = z^2$ and z^3 , respectively.




Figure 10: Power comparison for Scenario I when $X_{ij} \sim t(10)/\sqrt{5/4}$. Others parameters are the same as introduced in Figure 9.




Figure 11: Power comparison for Scenario II when $r_n = 7$.




Figure 12: Power comparison for Scenario II when $r_n = 11$.




Figure 13: Power comparison for Scenario III when the angle $\varphi = \pi/8$. The rank r_n varies within $\{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$.




Figure 14: Empirical sizes for Scenario III when the angle $\varphi = 0$. The rank r_n varies within $\{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$. The black line is the nominal level $\alpha = 0.1$.

APPENDIX

A. Proof strategy of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2

The proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are complicated. In this section we present a concise overview of their key elements while highlighting notable challenges encountered during the proof process.

First of all, we translate $\Theta_n(f)$ into an integral on some proper contour \mathcal{C} , i.e., $\Theta_n(f) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} f(z)M_n(z)dz + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ (see [4] as an example). Then by the continuous mapping theorem, we only need to investigate the process $M_n(z)$ on \mathcal{C} or equivalently, the truncated version $\widehat{M}_n(z)$ on \mathcal{C}_n , whose limiting behavior will be summarized as Lemma C.1 in due course. Before proceeding, a truncation step is required to bound the higher moments of the underlying distribution, and to provide a suitable upper bound when using the trace inequality (Lemma B.4). Then we will contribute to studying the limiting distribution of the stochastic part with zero mean and the convergence of the non-random part separately, where the former is implied by CLT for martingale difference sequences (Lemma B.6) and the latter follows modified arguments in [4]. Equipped with these general strategies, we confront several new technical obstacles, in contrast to the discussions in [2], [4] and [33]. We list them in the following three aspects.

- The generality of \mathbf{B}_n introduces complexity and difficulty in the truncation steps. We would like to emphasize that we propose a two-step truncation strategy when $k_n/n \rightarrow 0$. To be more specific, we initially truncate the variables at the level $\delta_n\sqrt{n}$, followed by centralizing and standardizing them. This step provides suitable a.s. upper bounds for certain quantities, see (73) for example. Subsequently, we further truncate the aforementioned truncated variables at an adaptive level $\delta_n(k_n n)^{1/4}$ and establish the truncation Lemma E.1, which states that the limiting distribution of GLSS is preserved after this truncation.
- When computing the asymptotic covariance, we need to calculate the non-random limit of the following term

$$\frac{1}{k_n N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n, \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbf{D}_j(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} - z \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ are non-random matrices bounded in spectral norm and with rank k_n . In our proof, both \mathbf{M}_1 and \mathbf{M}_2 are selected as \mathbf{B}_n ; however, this method can be extended to encompass general scenarios where distinct matrices are chosen for \mathbf{M}_1 and \mathbf{M}_2 . In the case where $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{M}_2 = \mathbf{I}_n$ (see [4]), (30) simplifies to a more concise form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \left(\frac{1}{nN} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} (\mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n) \right).$$

When $k_n = 1$ (see [2]), it becomes the summation of several products of quadratic forms of $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)$. However, in our general setting for both \mathbf{B}_n and k_n , the term (30) is much more complicated. More

intricate technical treatments and meticulous computations are required when substituting the random matrix \mathbf{D}_j with some non-random matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_n(z)$ and analyzing the resulting deviation.

- Without assuming a Gaussian-like fourth moment, a non-negligible term arises:

$$\frac{1}{k_n N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii}.$$

It is worth noting that in the special case when $k_n = 1$, [33] imposes strong assumptions on the eigenvector of \mathbf{B}_n (refer to (21)) to eliminate the influence of this term. In our paper, we refrain from imposing such assumptions on \mathbf{B}_n . Furthermore, we will calculate the non-random limits of the above term for three different levels: $k_n = O(1)$, $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $k_n/n \rightarrow 0$ and $k_n/n = O(1)$. This process demands substantial effort and poses challenges.

B. Preliminary Lemmas

Before proceeding to the proof of our theorems, we list some necessary lemmas.

Lemma B.1. *For $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$ with i.i.d. standardized (complex) entries, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N} $n \times n$ (complex) matrix, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x} - \text{tr} \mathbf{M}) (\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{N} \mathbf{x} - \text{tr} \mathbf{N}) = \left(\mathbb{E} |X_1|^4 - |\mathbb{E} X_1^2|^2 - 2 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{M})_{ii} (\mathbf{N})_{ii} + |\mathbb{E} X_1^2|^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{N}^T) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{N})$$

Lemma B.1 is essential for computing the asymptotic mean and variance of $\Theta_n(f)$. The following inequalities about martingale difference sequences will be used to control error terms and establish some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma B.2 ([12]). *Let $\{X_k\}$ be a complex martingale difference sequence with respect to the increasing σ -field $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$. Then, for $p > 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum X_k \right|^p \leq K_p \mathbb{E} \left(\sum |X_k|^2 \right)^{p/2},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum X_k \right|^p \leq K_p \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\sum \mathbb{E}_{k-1} |X_k|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum |X_k|^p \right) \right).$$

Lemma B.3 ([15]). *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$ be a sequence of increasing σ -field and $\{X_k\}$ be a sequence of integrable random variables. Then for any $1 \leq q \leq p < \infty$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}(X_k | \mathcal{F}_k)|^q \right)^{p/q} \leq C_{p,q} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |X_k|^q \right)^{q/p}$$

Lemma B.4 (Lemma 2.7 in [3]). *Given $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^T$, where X_1, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. standardized (complex) entries with $2p$ -th moment, and \mathbf{M} is an $n \times n$ matrix (complex), we have, for any $p \geq 2$*

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x} - \text{tr} \mathbf{M}|^p \leq K_p \left(\left(\mathbb{E} |X_1|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^*) \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |X_1|^{2p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^*)^{p/2} \right).$$

Lemma B.4, also known as trace inequality, is necessary to provide error bound for some negligible terms. We sometimes use the following general version of Lemma B.4, which is essential for our truncation step when $k_n/n \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma B.5. *Assuming that $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$ is a n -dimensional vector with i.i.d. entries, we define $\mathbf{x}_f = (f(X_1), \dots, f(X_n))^\top$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}f(X_1) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}|f(X_1)|^2 = 1$, where f is a certain measurable function. \mathbf{x}_g is defined similarly. If we assume $\mathbb{E}|g(X_1)f(X_1)|^p$, $\mathbb{E}|g(X_1)|^p$, $\mathbb{E}|f(X_1)|^p$ are finite, then we have for any $p \geq 2$ and $n \times n$ non-random matrix \mathbf{M}*

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}_g^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}_f - \mathbb{E}(\overline{g(X_1)} f(X_1)) \text{tr} \mathbf{M}|^p \leq C_p \left\{ \left[\left(\mathbb{E}|g(X_1)f(X_1)|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{1/2}|g(X_1)|^4 + \mathbb{E}^{1/2}|f(X_1)|^4 \right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M}) \right]^{p/2} + \left(\mathbb{E}|g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E}|f(X_1)|^p + \mathbb{E}|g(X_1)f(X_1)|^p \right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\}$$

We also need the following well-known central limit theorem for martingale difference sequences.

Lemma B.6 (Theorem 35.12 of [10]). *Suppose for each n , $Y_{n1}, Y_{n2}, \dots, Y_{nr_n}$ is a real martingale difference sequence with respect to the increasing σ -field $\{\mathcal{F}_{nj}\}$ having second moments. If as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

(i)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{nj}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,j-1}) \xrightarrow{i.p.} \sigma^2,$$

where σ^2 is a positive constant, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

(ii)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{nj}^2 I_{(|Y_{nj}| \geq \varepsilon)}) \rightarrow 0$$

then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} Y_{nj} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2)$$

In addition, we need the following Arzela-Ascoli Theorem that provides a criterion whether we can select a sequence of continuous functions converging uniformly from a given set.

Lemma B.7 (Arzela-Ascoli Theorem). *If (\mathcal{K}, d) is a compact metric space, then a subset $F \subset C(\mathcal{K}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ of the space of continuous complex-valued functions on \mathcal{K} equipped with the uniform norm, is relatively compact if and only if F is uniformly equicontinuous and bounded, i.e.,*

(i) (uniformly equicontinuity) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that*

$$\sup_{d(s,t) < \delta, f \in F} |f(s) - f(t)| < \varepsilon,$$

(ii) (uniformly boundedness) *For all $t \in \mathcal{K}$,*

$$\sup_{f \in F} |f(t)| < \infty.$$

C. Proof of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\sup_n \{\max(\|\mathbf{B}_n\|, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n\|)\} \leq 1, \quad (31)$$

in view of assumption 2.2.

C.1. Truncation, Centralization and Standardization

In order to prove Theorem 2.1, we need to replace the entries of X_n with truncated and centralized variables. Since $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 < \infty$, we can find a sequence of real number δ_n tending to zero and satisfying

$$\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left(|X_{11}|^4 \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{11}| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (32)$$

We remark here that the order of δ_n can not be further specified if only $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 < \infty$ is assumed and δ_n can approach zero at an arbitrarily slow speed. Hence, we select δ_n to satisfy $\delta_n^4 n^s \rightarrow \infty$ for any $s > 0$. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n = (1/N) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2}$, where $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n$ is an $n \times N$ matrix with (i, j) entry $\widehat{X}_{ij} = X_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{ij}| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}$. By (32), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{S}_n \neq \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n \right) \leq nN \mathbb{P} \left(|X_{11}| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n} \right) \leq \frac{N}{n} \delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left(|X_{11}|^4 \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{11}| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \right) = o(1).$$

We then similarly define $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n = (1/N) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2} \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n^{1/2}$ where $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_n$ is an $n \times N$ matrix with (i, j) entry $\widetilde{X}_{ij} = \left(\widehat{X}_{ij} - \mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{ij} \right) / \sigma_n$ and $\sigma_n^2 = \mathbb{E} \left| \widehat{X}_{ij} - \mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{ij} \right|^2$. The truncation step will be accomplished by verifying

$$\text{tr} f(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n) \mathbf{B}_n - \text{tr} f(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n) \mathbf{B}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (33)$$

which needs different analysis from those of [4], because the existence of \mathbf{B}_n and generality of $f(z)$ make it difficult to control the above quantity by simply eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n$. To this end, we fully utilize the properties of Stieltjes transform, and rewrite (1) as a contour integral on certain appropriate curve. Notice that the eigenvalues of \mathbf{S}_n are all contained in the interval $[d_-, d^+]$ for n large enough almost surely (see [6, 41]). Then for any curve Γ enclaving an open interval containing $[d_-, d^+]$ and f analytic on the closure of the area enclosed by Γ , we have with probability one,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n) \mathbf{B}_n &= \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr} U_n f(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_n) U_n^* s_j \mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{b}_j^* && (\mathbf{S}_n = U_n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_n U_n^*) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n s_j \mathbf{y}_j^* f(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_n) \mathbf{y}_j && (\mathbf{y}_j = U_n^* \mathbf{b}_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n s_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dF_j(x) && \left(F_j(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n |y_{ji}|^2 \mathbb{I}_{(\lambda_i \leq x)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j=1}^n s_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z)}{z-x} dz dF_j(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{j=1}^n s_j \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \mathbf{y}_j^* (\mathbf{A}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{y}_j dz \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \sum_{j=1}^n s_j \mathbf{b}_j^* (\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{b}_j dz \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n dz,
\end{aligned}$$

where the forth equality we use Cauchy integral formula.

Consequently, our proof of the main theorem relies on establishing limiting results on

$$M_n(z) = \operatorname{tr}((\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n) - \operatorname{tr}((-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n),$$

due to the fact that with probability one,

$$\Theta_n(f) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C} \cup \bar{\mathcal{C}}} f(z) M_n(z) dz.$$

More precisely, we focus on $\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)$, a truncated version of $M_n(\cdot)$ when viewed as a random two-dimensional process defined on a contour \mathcal{C} of the complex plane, described as follows. Let $v_0 > 0$ be arbitrary. Let x_r be any number greater than d^+ . Let x_l be any negative number if $d_- = 0$. Otherwise choose $x_l \in (0, d_-)$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_u = \{x + iv_0 : x \in [x_l, x_r]\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{C} \equiv \{x_l + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\} \cup \mathcal{C}_u \cup \{x_r + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\}$$

We define now the subsets \mathcal{C}_n of \mathcal{C} on which $M_n(\cdot)$ agrees with $\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)$. Choose sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ decreasing to zero satisfying for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\varepsilon_n \geq n^{-\alpha}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{C}_l = \begin{cases} \{x_l + iv : v \in [n^{-1}\varepsilon_n, v_0]\}, & \text{if } x_l > 0, \\ \{x_l + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\}, & \text{if } x_l < 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_r = \{x_r + iv : v \in [n^{-1}\varepsilon_n, v_0]\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{C}_l \cup \mathcal{C}_u \cup \mathcal{C}_r$. The process $\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)$ can now be defined. For $z = x + iv$ we have

$$\widehat{M}_n(z) = \begin{cases} M_n(z), & \text{for } z \in \mathcal{C}_n, \\ M_n(x_r + in^{-1}\varepsilon_n), & \text{for } x = x_r, v \in [0, n^{-1}\varepsilon_n] \\ & \text{and if } x_l > 0, \\ M_n(x_l + in^{-1}\varepsilon_n), & \text{for } x = x_l, v \in [0, n^{-1}\varepsilon_n] \end{cases}.$$

Then $\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)$ can be viewed as a random element in the metric space $C(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ of continuous functions from \mathcal{C} to \mathbb{R}^2 . All of Chapter 2 of [9] applies to continuous functions from a set such as \mathcal{C} (homeomorphic to $[0, 1]$) to finite dimensional Euclidean space, with $|\cdot|$ interpreted as Euclidean distance.

Together with equation (4.2) and the arguments above (4.4) in [4], we have

$$\sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}} \left\| (\mathbf{I}_n + \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-1} \right\| < \infty, \quad (34)$$

which further yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{C} \cup \bar{\mathcal{C}}} f(z) \left(M_n(z) - \widehat{M}_n(z) \right) dz \right| = \left| \int_{(\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_n) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \bar{\mathcal{C}}_n)} f(z) \left(M_n(z) - \widehat{M}_n(z) \right) dz \right| \\ & \leq 8K \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n} \sup_{z \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}_n} \left| \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n + \text{tr}(-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n \right| \\ & \leq K' \varepsilon_n \left(\left| \lambda_{\max}^{\mathbf{S}_n} - x_r \right|^{-1} + \left| \lambda_{\min}^{\mathbf{S}_n} - x_l \right|^{-1} + \sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}} \left\| (\mathbf{I}_n + \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n)^{-1} \right\| \right), \end{aligned}$$

tending to zero almost surely. Hence,

$$\Theta_n(f) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C} \cup \bar{\mathcal{C}}} f(z) \widehat{M}_n(z) dz + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (35)$$

which gives rise to an alternative way to prove (33) by analyzing the difference between $M_n(z)$ and the one with all underlying variable being replaced by the truncated version, uniformly in $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$.¹ To be more specific, we will end this part by proving the following equality, whose proof is deferred to subsection G.1, as an application of the techniques utilized in the later subsection D.1.5.

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\left(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} - \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} \right) \mathbf{B}_n \right| = o(1). \quad (36)$$

Thus, throughout this paper, we assume that the variable is truncated by $\delta_n \sqrt{n}$, centralized and standard, i.e., $|X_{11}| \leq \delta_n \sqrt{n}$, $\mathbb{E}(X_{11}) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^2 = 1$. Further, due to the truncation step, we shall assume $\mathbb{E}(X_{11}^2) = o(\frac{1}{n})$ for complex case.

C.2. An Intermediate Lemma

After truncation, as pointed out by [4], we have the following

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}_n\| \geq \eta) = o(n^{-\ell}) \quad (37)$$

for any $\eta > d^+$ and any positive ℓ , and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{\min}^{\mathbf{S}_n} \leq \eta\right) = o(n^{-\ell}) \quad (38)$$

¹Notice that the eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n$ are also contained in the interval $[d_-, d^+]$ almost surely, we can express $\text{tr} f(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n) \mathbf{B}_n$ and $\text{tr} f(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n) \mathbf{B}_n$ in the same manner as (35).

whenever $0 < \eta < d_-$. In view of (35), to prove the asymptotic normality of $\Theta_n(f)$, we only need to analyze the behaviour of the stochastic process $\widehat{M}_n(z)$. We now give an intermediate lemma concerning $\widehat{M}_n(z)$ that most of the paper will be dealing with.

Lemma C.1. *Define $\bar{\Sigma}_n(z) = \mathbf{I}_n + \underline{m}_n^0(z)\Sigma_n$ and the following quantities*

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z) \Sigma_n \mathbf{B}_n \right), & Q_n(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-3}(z) \Sigma_n^2 \mathbf{B}_n \right) \\
V_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n^2 \mathbf{B}_n \right), & U_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n^3 \right) \\
V_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_1) \Sigma_n^3 \mathbf{B}_n \right), & U_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_1) \Sigma_n^4 \right) \\
V_n^3(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \text{tr} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma_n \mathbf{B}_n \right) \\
\tilde{V}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
\tilde{V}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_1) \Sigma_n^2 \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
\tilde{U}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n \right)_{ii} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \Sigma_n^2 \right)_{ii}, & \tilde{U}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_1) \Sigma_n^2 \right)_{ii} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_2) \Sigma_n^2 \right)_{ii} \\
\tilde{V}_n^3(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma_n^{1/2} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B}_n \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma_n^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
\tilde{a}_n(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{m_n^0(z_1) m_n^0(z_2)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n \right)_{ii} \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma_n \right)_{ii}, & \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= V_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2) U_n^1(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition to assumption 2.1 and 2.2, if we further assume $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $\mu_X C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ defined in (14) and (15) convergence to some function $C_1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_2(z_1, z_2)$, then $\{\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)\}$ forms a tight sequence on \mathcal{C} , and after some suitable centralization, $\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)$ converges weakly to a mean-zero two-dimensional Gaussian process $M(\cdot)$. To be more specific, we have

$$\widehat{M}_n(\cdot) - \hat{\omega}_n(\cdot) \xrightarrow{D} M(\cdot), \quad (39)$$

where $M(\cdot)$ is a mean-zero Gaussian process on \mathcal{C} satisfying for $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\text{Cov}(M(z_1), M(z_2)) = v_X C_1(z_1, z_2) + \mu_X C_2(z_1, z_2),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\omega}_n(z) &= \frac{(v_X - 1) \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2}{z \left(1 - c \int \underline{m}_n^0(z) t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-2} dH_n(t) \right)} \left(\frac{c P_n(z) \int \underline{m}_n^0(z) t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-3} dH_n(t)}{\left(1 - c \int \underline{m}_n^0(z) t^2 (1 + t \underline{m}_n^0(z))^{-2} dH_n(t) \right)} - Q_n(z) \right) dz \\
&\quad + \mu_X z^2 \underline{m}_n^0(z)^2 \left[\underline{m}_n^0(z) P_n(z) \tilde{U}_n^1(z, z) \left(1 - c \int \frac{\underline{m}_n^0(z) t^2 dH_n(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z) t)^2} \right)^{-1} - \tilde{V}_n^1(z, z) \right] dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark C.1. *Though the convergence for $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ is hard to check in general, it is still worth mentioning that they could be verified in many cases, which leads to an asymptotic normality of $\theta_n(f)$. Firstly, by equation (7), it is easy to check that*

$$U_n^1(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2} \left(\frac{z_1 - z_2}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} - \frac{1}{\underline{m}'(z_2)(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)} + \frac{1}{\underline{m}_2^2 \underline{m}_1} \right)$$

and

$$U_n^2(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2} \left(\frac{2(z_1 - z_2)}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^3} - \frac{1}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} \left(\frac{1}{\underline{m}'(z_1)} + \frac{1}{\underline{m}'(z_2)} \right) + \frac{1}{\underline{m}_1^2 \underline{m}_2^2} \right),$$

which is independent of \mathbf{B}_n . If $\mathbf{B}_n = \mathbf{I}_n$, then it is not hard to check that

$$P_n(z) \rightarrow \frac{\underline{m}(z) + z\underline{m}'(z)}{\underline{m}'(z)}, \quad g_n(z) \rightarrow \frac{\underline{m}(z) + z\underline{m}'(z)}{z^2 \underline{m}^2(z)},$$

$$V_n^1(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2} \left(\frac{\underline{m}_1(z_2 - z_1)}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} + \frac{\underline{m}_2}{\underline{m}'(z_2)(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)} \right),$$

$$V_n^2(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2} \left(\frac{(z_2 - z_1)(\underline{m}_1 + \underline{m}_2)}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^3} + \frac{1}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} \left(\frac{\underline{m}_1}{\underline{m}'(z_1)} + \frac{\underline{m}_2}{\underline{m}'(z_2)} \right) \right),$$

and

$$V_n^3(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2} \left(\frac{2(z_1 - z_2)\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^3} - \frac{1}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} \left(\frac{\underline{m}_1^2}{\underline{m}'(z_1)} + \frac{\underline{m}_2^2}{\underline{m}'(z_2)} \right) \right).$$

Then substitute these quantities into (14), we obtain the result in [4]. Moreover, when $\Sigma_n = \mathbf{I}$ and \mathbf{B}_n is a general Hermitian matrix with

$$\frac{\text{tr } \mathbf{B}_n}{n} \rightarrow \mu_B, \quad \frac{\text{tr } \mathbf{B}_n^2}{n} \rightarrow s_B, \quad (40)$$

then the limit of $P_n(z)$, $V_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $V_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ will be multiplied by μ_B , and that of $V_n^3(z_1, z_2)$ will be multiplied by s_B . Regarding general Σ_n , we may take $\mathbf{B}_n = \Phi(\Sigma_n)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is a positive function defined on $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, then the corresponding quantities become

$$P_n(z) \rightarrow c \int \frac{t\Phi(t)dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}(z)t)^2},$$

$$V_n^1(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{c}{z_1 z_2^2} \int \frac{t^2 \Phi(t) dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_1 t)(1 + \underline{m}_2 t)^2},$$

$$V_n^2(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{c}{z_1^2 z_2^2} \int \frac{t^3 \Phi(t) dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_1 t)^2 (1 + \underline{m}_2 t)^2},$$

and

$$V_n^3(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \frac{c}{z_1^2 z_2^2} \int \frac{t^2 \Phi(t)^2 dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_1 t)^2 (1 + \underline{m}_2 t)^2}.$$

In all of the above circumstances, the convergence of $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ is fulfilled. Similarly, we know this is true for $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ under quantities of cases, including that Σ_n is diagonal and \mathbf{B}_n is certain function of Σ_n .

Actually, Theorem 2.1 follows directly from Lemma C.1. To be more specific,

$$\widehat{M}_n(\cdot) \rightarrow \left(-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int f_1(z) \widehat{M}_n(z) dz, \dots, -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int f_r(z) \widehat{M}_n(z) dz \right)$$

is a continuous mapping of $C(\mathcal{C}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ into \mathbb{R}^r , it follows that the above vector and, subsequently, (10) form tight sequences. Letting $M(\cdot)$ denote the limit of any weakly converging subsequence of $\{\widehat{M}_n(\cdot)\}$ we have that under the convergence condition (c) and (d), the weak limit of (10) equal in distribution to

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int f_1(z) M(z) dz, \dots, -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int f_r(z) M(z) dz \right).$$

The fact that this vector is multivariate Gaussian follows from the fact that Riemann sums corresponding to these integrals are multivariate Gaussian and that weak limits of Gaussian vectors can only be Gaussian.

The limiting expressions for the mean (12) and covariance (13) follow immediately by changing the order of expectation and integral.

Regarding Proposition 1, notice that even under many situations, the quantities $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ are convergent, for very general cases, the conditions are hard to be clarified, as indicated in Remark C.1. For such circumstances, we apply Theorem 3.2.15 in [16] which concludes that for a given sequence of random vectors \mathbf{x}_n , if for any subsequence n_k , if there exists a further subsequence n_{k_j} , such that $\mathbf{x}_{n_{k_j}} \xrightarrow{D} \mathbf{x}$, then $\mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{D} \mathbf{x}$. Without loss of generality, we let $n = n_k$, and according to Lemma C.1, we only need to find a convergent subsequence for $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ ². To this end, we utilize Arzela-Ascoli Theorem (Lemma B.7), where the second condition are easy to be verified by (34). Hence we only need to check the uniform equicontinuity of the quantities (functions of z or (z_1, z_2)). We first have

$$\begin{aligned} |P_n(z_1) - P_n(z_2)| &= \left| \frac{m_n^0(z_1) - m_n^0(z_2)}{N} \text{tr} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) + \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \right) \Sigma_n^2 \mathbf{B}_n \right| \\ &\leq C |m_n^0(z_1) - m_n^0(z_2)| = C \left| \int \left(\frac{1}{\lambda - z_1} - \frac{1}{\lambda - z_2} \right) dF^{c_n, H_n}(\lambda) \right| \\ &\leq C |z_1 - z_2|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step we use that fact that $1/|\lambda - z| \leq C$ for any $z \in \mathcal{C}$ and λ in the support of F^{c_n, H_n} for sufficiently large n . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |z_1 z_2^2 V_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_3 z_4^2 V_n^1(z_3, z_4)| &\leq \left| \frac{m_n^0(z_2) - m_n^0(z_4)}{N} \text{tr} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_4) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \left(\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_4) + \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \right) \Sigma_n^3 \mathbf{B}_n \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{m_n^0(z_1) - m_n^0(z_3)}{N} \text{tr} \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z_4) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_3) \bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma_n^3 \mathbf{B}_n \right| \\ &\leq C |m_n^0(z_1) - m_n^0(z_3)| + C |m_n^0(z_2) - m_n^0(z_4)| \\ &\leq C (|z_1 - z_3| + |z_2 - z_4|), \end{aligned}$$

the verification for the other functions is similar.

D. Proof of Lemma C.1

In this section, we aim at proving Lemma C.1. For $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$, we write $M_n(z) - \hat{\omega}_n(z) = M_n^1(z) + M_n^2(z)$, where

$$M_n^1(z) = \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n \right) - \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n \right), \quad (41)$$

$$M_n^2(z) = \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{S}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n \right) - \text{tr} \left((-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \Sigma_n)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_n \right) - \hat{\omega}_n(z). \quad (42)$$

Then our proof contains the following three steps: (i) finite dimensional convergence in distributions of $M_n^1(z)$, and calculation for the covariance function, (ii) tightness of $M_n^1(z)$ and (iii) convergence of non-random part $M_n^2(z)$ (convergent to 0 uniformly in $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$).

²Actually, we will find convergent subsequence for all the quantities defined in the beginning of Lemma C.1

D.1. Finite Dimensional Convergence in Distributions of $M_n^1(z)$

In this part, we will show for any positive integer r , the sum

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_n^1(z_i) \quad (\Im z_i \neq 0)$$

is tight, and, under the assumptions in Theorem 2.1, will converge in distribution to a Gaussian random variable. And the covariance function (14) and (15) will be calculated.

Let $v = \Im z$. For the following analysis we will assume $v > 0$. To facilitate notation, we will denote $\Sigma = \Sigma_n$, $B = B_n$. Constants appearing in inequalities will be denoted by K and may take on different values from one expression to the next. Let $\mathbf{s}_j = (1/\sqrt{N})\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{x}_j$, then $\mathbf{S}_n = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^*$. Recalling the truncation steps, we derive from Lemma B.4 that for any non-random matrix M

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* M \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\Sigma M) \right|^p \leq K_p \|M\|^p \delta_n^{2p-4} N^{-1}, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (43)$$

Let $D(z) = \mathbf{S}_n - z\mathbf{I}_n$, $D_j(z) = D(z) - \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^*$, we define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_j(z) &= \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\Sigma D_j^{-1}(z)), & \tau_j(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\Sigma D_j^{-1} B D_j^{-1}(z)), \\ \sigma_j(z) &= \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) B D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\Sigma D_j^{-1} B D_j^{-1}(z)), \\ \beta_j(z) &= \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j}, & b_n(z) &= \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\Sigma D_1^{-1}(z))}, & \tilde{b}_j(z) &= \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\Sigma D_j^{-1}(z))}. \end{aligned}$$

All of the three latter quantities are bounded in absolute value by $|z|/v$ (see (3.4) of [3]). We have

$$D^{-1}(z) - D_j^{-1}(z) = -D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) \beta_j(z), \quad (44)$$

and from Lemma 2.10 of [3] for any $n \times n$ M

$$|\text{tr}((D^{-1}(z) - D_j^{-1}(z)) M)| \leq \frac{\|M\|}{\Im z}. \quad (45)$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_0(\cdot)$ denote expectation and $\mathbb{E}_j(\cdot)$ denote conditional expectation with respect to the σ -field generated by $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_j$, we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(z) - \mathbb{E} M_n(z) &= \text{tr}(D^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E} D^{-1}(z)) B \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1})(D^{-1}(z) - D_j^{-1}(z)) B \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \text{tr}(\beta_j(z) D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) B) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{s}_j^* D_j^{-1}(z) B D_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \beta_j(z). \end{aligned}$$

By definition, we have $\beta_j(z) = \tilde{b}_j(z) - \beta_j(z)\tilde{b}_j(z)\varepsilon_j(z) = \tilde{b}_j(z) - \tilde{b}_j^2(z)\varepsilon_j(z) + \tilde{b}_j^2(z)\beta_j(z)\varepsilon_j^2(z)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \beta_j(z) \\
&= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\beta_j(z) \sigma_j(z) + \beta_j(z) \tau_j(z)) \\
&= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \sigma_j(z) - \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) + \tilde{b}_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z) + \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \sigma_j(z) - \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right) \\
&\quad - (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left(\tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) - \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation we use $\mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \sigma_j(z) \right) = \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left(\tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right) = \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right)$ Using (43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) \right|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) \right|^2 \\
&\leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) \right|^2 \leq 4 \frac{|z|^4}{v^4} N (\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_j(z)|^4)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma_j(z)|^4)^{1/2} \leq K \delta_n^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) (\sigma_j(z) + \tau_j(z)) \right|^2 \\
&\leq 8 \frac{|z|^6}{v^6} N (\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_j(z)|^8)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma_j(z)|^4)^{1/2} + 8 \frac{|z|^6}{v^{10}} n \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_j(z)|^4 \\
&\leq K \delta_n^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Moreover, using (45) and Burkholder inequality (Lemma B.2), we acquire

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |\tilde{b}_1(z) - b_n(z)|^4 &\leq \frac{|z|^8}{v^8 N^4} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)) \right|^4 \\
&= \frac{K}{N^4} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=2}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \text{tr} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1}(z)) \right|^4 \\
&\leq \frac{K}{N^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=2}^N \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \text{tr} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1}(z)) \right|^2 \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{K}{N^4} \left(2(N-1) \frac{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}\|^2}{v^2} \right)^2 \leq K N^{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

from which we yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \sigma_j(z) - b_n(z) \sigma_j(z) \right) \right|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} |(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\tilde{b}_j(z) - b_n(z)) \sigma_j(z)|^2 \\ &\leq 4N \left(\mathbb{E} |\tilde{b}_1(z) - b_n(z)|^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^4 \right)^{1/2} \leq K \delta_n^2 N^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j (\tilde{b}_j^2(z) - b_n^2(z)) \varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z) \right|^2 \leq K \delta_n^2 N^{-1/2}. \quad (49)$$

Together with (46)-(49), we have

$$M_n^1(z) = \sum_{j=1}^N Y_j(z) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

where we define

$$Y_j(z) := -b_n(z) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z) + b_n^2(z) \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z).$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_n^1(z_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Next we check the condition (ii) in Lemma B.6. Actually,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |Y_j(z)|^4 &\leq K \left(|b_n(z)|^4 \mathbb{E} |\sigma_j(z)|^4 + |b_n(z)|^8 \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_j(z) \tau_j(z)|^4 \right) \\ &\leq K \left(\frac{|z|^4}{v^4} \mathbb{E} |\sigma_j(z)|^4 + c_n^4 \frac{|z|^8}{v^{16}} \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_j(z)|^4 \right) \\ &\leq K \delta_n^4 N^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i) \right|^2 I_{(|\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i)| \geq \varepsilon)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i) \right|^4 \leq K \delta_n^4,$$

which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, thus we have done. And it is enough to prove, under the assumptions in Theorem 2.1, for z_1, z_2 with non-zero imaginary parts

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [Y_j(z_1) Y_j(z_2)] \quad (50)$$

converges in probability (in L_1 , indeed) to a constant (and to determine the constant).

D.1.1. Two technical lemmas and simplification of (50)

By the assumption 2.3 (i), the term containing $\tau_j(z)$ is not negligible in general, we thus need the following Lemma D.1 that provides an non-random approximation for $\tau_j(z)$ in the L_1 sense.

Lemma D.1. *For any fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, let $g_n(z) = \frac{P_n(z)}{z^2} \left(1 - \frac{(m_n^0(z))^2}{N} \text{tr} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z) \Sigma^2 \right)^{-1}$, then there exists an absolute constant K such that*

$$\mathbb{E} |\tau_1(z) - g_n(z)| \leq K N^{-1/2}.$$

Lemma D.2. Let $\mathbf{x} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$ be two n -dimensional random vector with i.i.d. (complex) entries and \mathbf{x} is independent of \mathbf{y} . Assume $\mathbb{E}(X_1) = \mathbb{E}(Y_1) = 0$, $\mathbb{E}|X_1|^2 = \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}|X_1|^4, \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 < \infty$, then for any non-random $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{M}

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y}|^2 = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \quad \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y}|^4 \leq (\mathbb{E}|X_1|^4 \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 + 2) \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^4,$$

Now we continue our process to find the L_1 limit of (50). Directly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [Y_j(z_1) Y_j(z_2)] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [-b_n(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z_1) + b_n^2(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_1) \tau_j(z_1)] \times [-b_n(z_2) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_2) \tau_j(z_2)] \\ &= b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_1) b_n^2(z_2) \mathcal{A}_2(z_2, z_1) - b_n(z_2) b_n^2(z_1) \mathcal{A}_2(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) b_n^2(z_1) \mathcal{A}_3(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z_2)], \\ \mathcal{A}_2(z_1, z_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_1) \tau_j(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z_2)] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_3(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_1) \tau_j(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_2) \tau_j(z_2)].$$

Applying Lemma B.1 (a version for conditional expectation case) to $\mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\underbrace{\text{tr} \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)) \Sigma^{1/2}}_{\mathbf{H}_1} \underbrace{\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)) \Sigma^{1/2}}_{\mathbf{H}_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbb{E} X_{11}^2|^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_2^\top + (\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 - |\mathbb{E} X_{11}^2|^2 - 2) \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{H}_1)_{ii} (\mathbf{H}_2)_{ii} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$|\text{tr} \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_2^\top| \leq n \|\mathbf{H}_1\| \|\mathbf{H}_2\| \leq n v_1^{-2} v_2^{-2},$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{H}_1)_{ii} (\mathbf{H}_2)_{ii} \right| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |(\mathbf{H}_1)_{ii}|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |(\mathbf{H}_2)_{ii}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \|\mathbf{H}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_2\|_F \leq n \|\mathbf{H}_1\| \|\mathbf{H}_2\| \leq n v_1^{-2} v_2^{-2}.$$

After truncation steps, we have $\mathbb{E} X_{11}^2 = o(n^{-1})$ for complex case and $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4$ is altered by an infinitesimal amount, thus we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\mu_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_j (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii}$$

$$+ \frac{v_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\mu_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_j \tau_j(z_1) \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\ &\quad + \frac{v_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tau_j(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

To further simplify the above terms, we have by Lemma D.1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tau_j(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tau_j(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tau_j(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{g_n(z_1)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \frac{g_n(z_1)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\check{\mathbf{D}}_j(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* + \sum_{k=j+1}^N \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* - z \mathbf{I}$$

and $\check{\mathbf{s}}_1, \dots, \check{\mathbf{s}}_N$ are i.i.d. copies of \mathbf{s}_1 but independent of $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_N$. The second and third equalities are obvious by i.i.d. structure, and the fourth uses Lemma D.1. For convenience of notation and later use, in last equality, we utilize (45) again, where the

$$\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}(z) = \check{\mathbf{D}}_j(z) + \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^*.$$

We use the subscript (j) to emphasize the location we replace the rear variables with i.i.d. copies. An analogous treatment leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\mu_X g_n(z_1)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_j \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\ &\quad + \frac{v_X g_n(z_1)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \mu_X g_n(z_1) \mathcal{B}_2(z_1, z_2) + v_X g_n(z_1) \mathcal{C}_2(z_1, z_2) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\mu_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_j \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + \frac{v_X}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma + \text{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
&= \mu_X \mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2) + v_X \mathcal{C}_1(z_1, z_2) + \text{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_3(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\mu_X g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_j \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + \frac{v_X g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2)}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma + \text{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
&= \mu_X g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \mathcal{B}_3(z_1, z_2) + v_X g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \mathcal{C}_3(z_1, z_2) + \text{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Therefore, by our assumption, we only need to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1(z_1, z_2) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \left(C_1(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_1) g_n(z_1) C_2(z_1, z_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_n(z_2) g_n(z_2) C_2(z_2, z_1) + b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) C_3(z_1, z_2) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2(z_1, z_2) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \left(\mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_1) g_n(z_1) \mathcal{B}_2(z_1, z_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_n(z_2) g_n(z_2) \mathcal{B}_2(z_2, z_1) + b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) \mathcal{B}_3(z_1, z_2) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

respectively, where $C_1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_2(z_1, z_2)$ are the limit of $C_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and $C_n^2(z_1, z_2)$ which are defined in (14) and (15).

D.1.2. Calculation of the limit of $C_1(z_1, z_2)$ and covariance function $C_1(z_1, z_2)$.

We begin by replacing $\mathcal{C}_1(z_1, z_2)$ with some non-random quantities in the L_1 sense, which is a little complicated but implicatures the approximation of $\mathcal{C}_2(z_1, z_2)$ and $\mathcal{C}_3(z_1, z_2)$. Thus the covariance function is acquired by direct algebraic operation.

Following the same strategy in Lemma D.1, we decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ in the same manner as (131) in the Appendix G.3, and an essentially identical argument yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&= - \text{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + R_1(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where $\mathbb{E}|R_1(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. To facilitate our proceeding, we introduce some notations here. Likely to the beginning of section D.1, for $i \leq j$, let $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}(z) = \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}(z) - \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^*$ and for $i > j$, let $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}(z) = \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}(z) - \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^*$.

Correspondingly, for $i \leq j$, define $\check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z) = 1/(1 + \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_i)$ and for $i > j$, $\check{\beta}_{i > j}(z) = 1/(1 + \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \mathbf{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i)$. Then the equations for $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}(z)$ and $\mathbf{D}_{(j)}(z)$ similar to (44) still hold. Therefore we further decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2)$ as (44), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{A}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \left(\mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* - \frac{1}{N} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i(z_1) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=j+1}^N \check{\beta}_{i > j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=j+1}^N \check{\beta}_{i > j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^j \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^N \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i > j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^j \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^N \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i > j}(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}^2(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^N \check{\beta}_{i > j}^2(z_2) \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \Big) \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^j \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
& - \sum_{i=j+1}^N \beta_i(z_1) \check{\beta}_{i > j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_i \check{\mathbf{s}}_i^* \check{D}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + R_2(z_1, z_2) \\
& = A_1(z_1, z_2) - A_2(z_1, z_2) - A_{31}(z_1, z_2) - A_{32}(z_1, z_2) - A_{41}(z_1, z_2) - A_{42}(z_1, z_2) + A_{51}(z_1, z_2) \\
& \quad + A_{52}(z_1, z_2) + A_{61}(z_1, z_2) + A_{62}(z_1, z_2) + A_{71}(z_1, z_2) + A_{72}(z_1, z_2) - A_{81}(z_1, z_2) - A_{82}(z_1, z_2) \\
& \quad + R_2(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Where $|R_2(z_1, z_2)| \leq K$, for a similar reason why we get (134). Regarding $A_1(z_1, z_2)$, Lemma B.4 indicates that $E|A_1(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. Next we show that $E|A_{i2}(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$ for $i = 3, \dots, 8$. Due to the basically identical treatment, we focus on dealing with $A_{82}(z_1, z_2)$ for an example. Indeed, using Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E|A_{82}(z_1, z_2)| & \leq \frac{|z_1||z_2|^2}{v^3} N \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_N \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N^*|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{D}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{D}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \mathbf{D}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
& \leq K,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $E|\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{s}_N|^p \leq K$ and $E|\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \mathbf{M} \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^4 \leq KN^{-2}$ for any $n \times n$ \mathbf{M} independent of \mathbf{s}_N , $\check{\mathbf{s}}_N$ and uniformly bounded on the spectral norm for all parameters governing \mathbf{M} and under all realizations of \mathbf{M} , which are direct conclusions of (43) and Lemma D.2. Notice that $\check{\beta}_{i > j}(z) \stackrel{d}{=} \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z) \stackrel{d}{=} \beta_i(z)$, thus we have $\mathbb{E}|\check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z) - b_n(z)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. Then following a similar line as (136)

which is easy to derive from inequality (140), (141) and (2.17) of [4].

Then we utilize the above techniques repeatedly to substitute the random part in (55), and throughout the following, we use $\Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2)$ to denote a random part satisfying $\mathbb{E}|\Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{-1/2}$, which may take different values from one place to another.

We start from two simple quantities. Firstly, similar to the proof of Lemma D.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) &= \frac{\operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) / N}{1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)} + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \frac{a_n(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)} / (b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2)) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Secondly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\ &= -\frac{b_n(z_2)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-2}(z_2) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{B} \right) - \frac{b_n^2(z_2)}{N^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^3 \right) \\ &\quad + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-2}(z_2) \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2 \mathbf{B} \right) + \frac{b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2)}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-2}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^3 \right) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= V_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2) U_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) = \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where we define $\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) = V_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2) U_n^1(z_1, z_2)$. Then two analogous quantities can be approximated in the same manner, one is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-2}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^3 \right) &= V_n^2(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2) U_n^2(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \zeta_n^2(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

another is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) &= V_n^3(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2) g_n(z_2) V_n^2(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\ &= \zeta_n^3(z_1, z_2) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where ζ_n^2 and ζ_n^3 is defined similarly to ζ_n^1 .

Next we focus on the remaining terms that contains both $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2)$. All of these verifications are tedious but elementary by the same argument as in (55). So we simply taking $\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right)$ for an example. Indeed,

$$\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{b_n(z_1)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{b_n(z_1)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{b_n(z_1)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^j \check{\beta}_{i \leq j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \mathbf{D}_i^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_i \mathbf{s}_i^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)i}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\
&= -\frac{j}{N^3} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{j}{N^3} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{j}{N^4} b_n(z_1) b_n^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\
&= -\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) - \frac{j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)} \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \frac{j}{N^2} a_n(z_1, z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{g_n(z_2)}{b_n(z_1)} \frac{j/N a_n^2(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)} + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (57)-(59). Utilizing (2.19) in [4], we take one step further to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2))^2} \left(-\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) - \frac{j}{N} \frac{g_n(z_2) a_n^2(z_1, z_2)}{b_n(z_1)} \right) + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \\
&= -\frac{j/N}{(1 - j/N a_n)^2} (b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) U_n^1(z_2, z_1) \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + a_n b_n(z_2) g_n(z_2) U_n^1(z_2, z_1)) \\
&\quad - \frac{\zeta_n^2(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n} + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \right) \\
&= -\frac{j/N}{(1 - j/N a_n)^2} (b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) V_n^1(z_2, z_1) \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + a_n b_n(z_2) g_n(z_2) V_n^1(z_2, z_1)) \\
&\quad - \frac{\zeta_n^3(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n} + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2)
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

for which we may use (60), (61) and (62). Now substitute (58), (59) and (62)-(64) into (55), we get (for

simplicity, we simply write a_n instead of $a_n(z_1, z_2)$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&= \left[\frac{\zeta_n^3(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/Na_n} + \frac{j/N}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} (b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)V_n^1(z_2, z_1)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + a_nb_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)V_n^1(z_2, z_1)) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{j/Nb_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} (b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)U_n^1(z_2, z_1)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + a_nb_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)U_n^1(z_2, z_1)) \\
&\quad + \frac{b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)\zeta_n^2(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/Na_n} + \frac{j/Nb_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2)}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} \left(\zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + \frac{j}{N} \frac{g_n(z_1)a_n^2}{b_n(z_2)} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{j/Nb_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)a_n}{1 - j/Na_n} \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \frac{j/Nb_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)a_n}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} \left(\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \frac{j}{N} \frac{g_n(z_2)a_n^2}{b_n(z_1)} \right) \\
&\quad + \left. \frac{j/Nb_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)a_n}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} \left(\zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + \frac{j}{N} \frac{g_n(z_1)a_n^2}{b_n(z_2)} \right) + \frac{j/Ng_n(z_1)g_n(z_2)a_n^2}{1 - j/Na_n} \right] / (1 - j/Na_n) \\
&\quad + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} [\zeta_n^3(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)\zeta_n^2(z_1, z_2)] + \frac{1}{(1 - j/Na_n)^3} \left\{ 2 \frac{j}{N} b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) \right. \\
&\quad \times \zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + 2 \frac{j}{N} a_n [b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + a_n + j/Na_n^2] \left. \right\} + \Upsilon_n(z_1, z_2). \tag{65}
\end{aligned}$$

Ultimately, together with (51), (53), (131), (58), (62) and (65), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathcal{C}_1(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)\mathcal{C}_2(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)\mathcal{C}_2(z_2, z_1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)g_n(z_1)g_n(z_2)\mathcal{C}_3(z_1, z_2) \right) \times b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \frac{b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)}{N} + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{2}{(1 - j/Na_n)^2} \left(V_n^3(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)V_n^2(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)V_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)U_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right) \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1 + j/Na_n}{(1 - j/Na_n)^3} \left(b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + g_n(z_1)g_n(z_2)a_n \right) \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{2j/N}{(1 - j/Na_n)^3} b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2)\zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) \right] \times \frac{b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)}{N} + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$a_n(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow 1 + \frac{\underline{m}(z_1)\underline{m}(z_2)(z_1 - z_2)}{\underline{m}(z_2) - \underline{m}(z_1)} \triangleq a(z_1, z_2), \quad (66)$$

which is easily derived from (7). Then together with the fact $b_n(z) \rightarrow -z\underline{m}(z)$, we have (for simplicity, we write \underline{m}_i instead of $\underline{m}(z_i)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_1(z_1, z_2)}{z_1 z_2 \underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_0^1 \frac{2tdt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^2} \left[V_n^3(z_1, z_2) + z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 g_n(z_1) V_n^2(z_1, z_2) + z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_2) V_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + z_1^2 \underline{m}_1^2 z_2^2 \underline{m}_2^2 g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) U_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right] + \int_0^1 \frac{2tdt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^3} \left[z_1 \underline{m}_1 z_2 \underline{m}_2 \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) \zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^1 \frac{1 + ta(z_1, z_2)dt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^3} \left[-z_1 \underline{m}_1 \zeta_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_2 \underline{m}_2 \zeta_n^1(z_2, z_1) + g_n(z_1) g_n(z_2) a(z_1, z_2) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then solve the above integration, i.e.

$$\int_0^1 \frac{2tdt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^2} = \frac{1}{1 - a(z_1, z_2)} = \frac{\underline{m}(z_2) - \underline{m}(z_1)}{\underline{m}(z_1)\underline{m}(z_2)(z_2 - z_1)},$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \frac{2tdt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^3} = \int_0^1 \frac{1 + ta(z_1, z_2)dt}{(1 - ta(z_1, z_2))^3} = \frac{1}{(1 - a(z_1, z_2))^2} = \frac{(\underline{m}(z_2) - \underline{m}(z_1))^2}{\underline{m}^2(z_1)\underline{m}^2(z_2)(z_2 - z_1)^2},$$

we finally yield the covariance function (14).

D.1.3. Calculation of the limit of $\mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2)$ and covariance function $C_2(z_1, z_2)$.

Before giving the proof of this Theorem, we first establish the following lemma, which owns independent interest in our opinion.

Lemma D.3. *For any bounded non-random $n \times n$ $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ and non-random $n \times 1$ vectors \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} with bounded Euclidean norm, we have for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) + z^{-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y}| \leq KN^{-1/2},$$

where $\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_n(z)\Sigma = \widehat{\Sigma}_n(z)$, and the invertibility of $\widehat{\Sigma}_n(z)$ is verified by (74).

Then the approximation for $\mathcal{B}_3(z_1, z_2)$ is straightforward due to Lemma D.3, thus we begin by dealing with $\mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2)$, which implicatures the treatment for $\mathcal{B}_2(z_1, z_2)$. In the sequel, we will frequently utilize the following equation, that is for any $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{M}_1)_{ii} (\mathbf{M}_2)_{ii} = \text{tr } \mathbf{M}_1 \text{diag}(\mathbf{M}_2). \quad (67)$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma D.1, we decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ as $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) = -\widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) + b_n(z_1)\mathbf{A}(z_1) + \mathbf{B}(z_1) + \mathbf{C}(z_1)$. Together with (67) and the process we have done in Lemma D.1, we assert the contribution of $\mathbf{B}(z_1)$ and $\mathbf{C}(z_1)$ is negligible. As for $\mathbf{A}(z_1)$, we further decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2)$ using (44) to get

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{A}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \left(\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \frac{1}{N} \Sigma \right) \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) + \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) + \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \mathbf{B} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) + \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \left(\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \frac{1}{N} \Sigma \right) \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \mathbf{B} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left[\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \mathbf{B} \left[\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&+ \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_2(z_1, z_2) \\
&= \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_2(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_3(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_4(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_5(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_6(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_7(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_8(z_1, z_2) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1(z_1, z_2)| \leq K$, due to (67) and (45) again. By (67) and (43), we have $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. We now claim that $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i(z_1, z_2)|$ are both $o(N)$, for $i = 3, \dots, 8$. Actually, taking $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_8(z_1, z_2)$ for an instance, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}_8(z_1, z_2) &= - \sum_{k=1}^j \beta_k(z_1) \check{\beta}_{k \leq j}^2(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=j+1}^N \beta_k(z_1) \check{\beta}_{k > j}^2(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
&\quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
&= \tilde{A}_{81}(z_1, z_2) + \tilde{A}_{82}(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (145) we have for $k \leq j$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\leq K \delta_n^2 N^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly utilizing Lemma D.2, for $k > j$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N \right|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\leq KN^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we have $E|\tilde{A}_{81}(z_1, z_2)| \leq K \delta_n^2 N$ and $E|\tilde{A}_{82}(z_1, z_2)| \leq K$. Hence our assertion is attained by the same treatment for other five terms. Regarding $\tilde{A}_2(z_1, z_2)$, similar to (136) and (137), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}_2(z_1, z_2) &= - \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k(z_1) \operatorname{tr} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \operatorname{diag} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right) \right) \\
&= - \frac{b_n(z_1)}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \operatorname{diag} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right) \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad \times \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) + \tilde{R}_2(z_1, z_2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
&\quad + \tilde{R}_3(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_2(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$ and $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_3(z_1, z_2)| \leq KN^{1/2}$, which uses Lemma D.1 and (67) indeed. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad - b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} + \tilde{R}_4(z_1, z_2) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} + \tilde{R}_5(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_4(z_1, z_2)| = o(N)$ and $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_5(z_1, z_2)| = o(N)$. The last equality factually uses Lemma D.3 and the fact that $\|z^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) - \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\| = o(1)$. Taking one step further, we decompose $\check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2)$ in the same way as dealing with $D^{-1}(z_1)$ previously to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad + \tilde{R}_6(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_6(z_1, z_2)| = o(N)$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) B \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad - b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} + \tilde{R}_7(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} + \tilde{R}_8(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_7(z_1, z_2)|$ and $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{R}_8(z_1, z_2)|$ are both $o(N)$. Ultimately, together with (68)-(70), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)\mathcal{B}_1(z_2, z_1) - b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)\mathcal{B}_1(z_1, z_2) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)g_n(z_1)g_n(z_2)\mathcal{B}_3(z_1, z_2) \right] \times b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2) \\
&= \frac{b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)}{N} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \right. \\
& \quad + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& \quad \left. + b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2)g_n(z_1)g_n(z_2) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \right] + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
&= b_n(z_1)b_n(z_2) \left[\tilde{V}_n^3(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)\tilde{V}_n^2(z_1, z_2) + b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)\tilde{V}_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \\
& \quad + b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)\tilde{U}_n^2(z_1, z_2) + b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)\tilde{V}_n^1(z_1, z_2) + b_n(z_1)g_n(z_1)b_n^2(z_2)g_n(z_2)\tilde{U}_n^1(z_1, z_2) \\
& \quad \left. + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)\tilde{V}_n^1(z_2, z_1) + b_n(z_2)g_n(z_2)b_n^2(z_1)g_n(z_1)\tilde{U}_n^1(z_2, z_1) + g_n(z_1)g_n(z_2)\tilde{a}_n(z_1, z_2) \right] + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses $\|z^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\| = o(1)$ and $|b_n(z) + z\underline{m}_n^0(z)| = o(1)$. Thus by our assumptions and $b_n(z) \rightarrow -z\underline{m}(z)$, it is obvious that the above quantity tends to $C_2(z_1, z_2)$. So far we have proven

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [Y_j(z_1) Y_j(z_2)] \rightarrow v_X C_1(z_1, z_2) + \mu_X C_2(z_1, z_2),$$

which completes the proof of this part.

D.1.4. *Tightness of $M_n^1(z)$*

In this subsection, we devote to prove the tightness of $M_n^1(z)$. Since the proof is essentially the same as that in [4], we omit it. Instead we here list some results therein for later use. Actually, in this subsection and latter one, we need to establish some inequalities holding uniformly for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$ rather than fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, which have been fully established in section 3 in Bai and Silverstein [4]. We collect some results here as follows:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \{ |b_n(z)|, \|\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\|, \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\| \} \leq C. \quad (71)$$

Besides, we define $\gamma_j(z) = \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j - 1/N \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)$, then the following holds

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \{ \mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)|^p, \mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z)|^p, \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^p \} \leq C_p \eta_n^{2p-4} N^{-1}. \quad (72)$$

In addition, we introduce some quantities which could be reduced to constant in the following sense that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \{ |\beta_1(z)|, |\mathbf{s}_1|, \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\|, \|\mathbf{A}_1^{-1}(z)\| \} \leq C + Cn^s \mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n}, \quad (73)$$

where Ξ_n is an event holds with probability $o(n^{-\ell})$ for any $\ell > 0$ and $s > 0$ is certain constant.

D.1.5. *convergence of non-random part $M_n^2(z)$*

In this subsection, we prove that $M_n^2(z) = \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{S}_n - z\mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{B} - \operatorname{tr} (-z\mathbf{I} - z\underline{m}_n^0(z)\Sigma)^{-1} \mathbf{B} - \widehat{\omega}_n(z)$ convergences uniformly to zero for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$. In the sequel, all inequalities and limits hold uniformly for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$, but we do not point it out every time, for simplicity. According to (4.3) in [4], we know that the spectral norm of $\widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)$ is uniformly bounded for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$, i.e.

$$\sup_{n, z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left\| (\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_n(z)\Sigma + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \right\| < \infty. \quad (74)$$

For further analysis, we decompose $M_n^2(z) + \widehat{\omega}_n(z)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{S}_n - z\mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{B} - \operatorname{tr} (-z\mathbf{I} - z\underline{m}_n^0(z)\Sigma)^{-1} \mathbf{B} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - (-z\mathbf{I} - z\underline{m}_n^0(z)\Sigma)^{-1} \right) \mathbf{B} + \frac{1}{z} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) - \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{B} \\ &= M_n^{21}(z) + M_n^{22}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Regarding $M_n^{22}(z)$, we can rewrite it as

$$M_n^{22}(z) = \frac{\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z)}{z} \operatorname{tr} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{B},$$

where we use the fact $\mathbf{M}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{M}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{M}_2^{-1}(\mathbf{M}_2 - \mathbf{M}_1)\mathbf{M}_1^{-1}$ for any invertible matrix $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$. From Theorem 1.4 in [33], we know that

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z)) &\simeq \mu_X z^3 \underline{m}^3(z) \tilde{U}_n^1(z, z) \left(1 - c \int \frac{\underline{m}^2(z)t^2 dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}(z)t)^2}\right)^{-1} \\ &\quad + (v_X - 1)c \int \frac{\underline{m}^3(z)t^2 dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}(z)t)^3} \Big/ \left(1 - c \int \frac{\underline{m}^2(z)t^2 dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}(z)t)^2}\right)^2 \\ &\triangleq S_n(z), \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where we use $a_n \simeq b_n$ to denote $a_n - b_n \rightarrow 0$. Then by (74), (4.1) and (4.2) in [4], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{22}(z) &= \frac{N(\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z))}{z} \text{tr} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-2}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{B} / N + o(1) \\ &\simeq \frac{S_n(z) P_n(z)}{z}. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Now we only need to investigate the convergence of $M_n^{21}(z)$. Following the decomposition above (2.5) in [2], we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{21}(z) &= \frac{N}{z} \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right] \\ &= \frac{N}{z} \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{z} \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} - \text{tr} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{z} (M_n^{211}(z) + M_n^{212}(z)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, together with Lemma B.4 and (71), we have for any matrix $\mathbf{E}_n(z)$, which is a product of one or several $\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)$ and bounded non-random matrix

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{E}_n(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{E}_n(z) \Sigma \right|^p \leq K_p N^{-1} \delta_n^{2p-4}, \quad p \geq 2, \quad (77)$$

and further,

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{E}_n(z) \mathbf{s}_1|^p \leq K_p, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (78)$$

We first focus on $M_n^{212}(z)$. By (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{B} &= \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \\ &= b_n(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - b_n(z) \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \gamma_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1, \end{aligned}$$

Then utilizing Hölder inequality and (71), (72), (78), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \gamma_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z)|^4)^{1/4} (\mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z)|^2)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\ &\leq KN^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right) - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \leq KN^{-1/2}. \quad (80)$$

Combining (79)-(80), we have

$$M_n^{212}(z) = \frac{b_n^2(z)}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + o(1). \quad (81)$$

We then analyze $M_n^{211}(z)$. Since $\beta_1(z) = b_n(z) - b_n^2(z)\gamma_1(z) + \beta_1(z)b_n^2(z)\gamma_1^2(z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{211}(z) &= -b_n^2(z)N\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z)\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 + b_n^2(z)N\mathbb{E}\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z)\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 \\ &\quad - b_n^2(z)\mathbb{E}(\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z))\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \\ &= -b_n^2(z)N\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z)\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 + b_n^2(z) \operatorname{Cov}(\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z), \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\ &\quad + b_n^2(z)N \left[\mathbb{E}\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z) \left(\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (71), (72) and (4.8) in [4], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Cov}(\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z), \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\ &\leq K (E|\beta_1(z)|^4)^{1/4} (E|\gamma_1(z)|^8)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K\delta_n^3 N^{-1/4}. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Similarly, using (71), (72) and (77), we have

$$N \left| \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z) \left(\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \leq K\delta_n^2. \quad (83)$$

Rewriting the first term of $M_n^{211}(z)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &N\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z)\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Cov} \left(\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\ &\quad + N\mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon_1(z) \left(\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right] \\ &= N\mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon_1(z) \left(\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right] + O(N^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where the last equality we use (4.8) of [4] again. Therefore, together with (81)-(84), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{211}(z) &= -\frac{b_n^2(z)N}{z} \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_1(z) \left(\mathbf{s}_1^*\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{b_n^2(z)}{zN} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then using Lemma B.1 on the above equality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
M_n^{21}(z) &= -\frac{\mu_X b_n^2(z)}{zN} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&\quad - \frac{b_n^2(z)(v_X - 1)}{zN} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + o(1) \\
&= -\mu_X \widetilde{M}_n^{211}(z) - (v_X - 1) \widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we focus on finding the limit of $\widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z)$, the treatment for $\widetilde{M}_n^{211}(z)$ is similar, due to equation (149) and a uniform version of Lemma D.3. Actually, the strategy is basically the same as we obtain Lemma D.1, with a slight difference on uniformity. To start with, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right| \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right| \leq K,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to (78). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right| \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right| \\
&\leq K \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1|^2 \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\|^4 \right)^{1/2} \leq K.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we only need to consider $\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Then we decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ as in the proof of Lemma D.1,

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) = -\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) + b_n(z) \mathbf{A}(z) + \mathbf{B}(z) + \mathbf{C}(z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) (\mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* - N^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z), \\
\mathbf{B}(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^N (\beta_j(z) - b_n(z)) \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}(z) = N^{-1} b_n(z) \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)).$$

As pointed out by [4], that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\| < \infty.$$

Denote $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma$, by (71), it is obviously that $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{M}\|^p \leq Kp$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}|\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{B}(z)\mathbf{M}| &= \mathbb{E} \left| (\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)\mathbf{s}_1^*) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right| \\ &\leq K \left(\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1|^4 \|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{M}\| \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K\delta_n N^{-1/4}, \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where the last step we use

$$\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)|^2 = |b_n(z)|^2 \mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z)\gamma_1(z)|^2 \leq K \left(\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z)|^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z)|^4 \right)^{1/2} \leq K\delta_n^2 N^{-1/2}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\frac{1}{N}|\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{B}(z)\mathbf{M}| \leq KN^{-1}. \quad (86)$$

Regarding $\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{A}(z)\mathbf{M}$, we further decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ in \mathbf{M} by (44) to acquire

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{A}(z)\mathbf{M} &= -\mathbb{E}\beta_1(z)\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}\beta_1(z)\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{s}_1 \\ &= A_1(z) + A_2(z) \end{aligned}$$

Using (72) and (78), we immediately have

$$|A_2(z)| \leq KN^{-1}. \quad (87)$$

Then by a similar argument as (136) and (137), we have

$$\left| A_1(z) + \frac{b_n(z)}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma \right| = o(1). \quad (88)$$

Further, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N^2} \left| \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma - \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \left| \operatorname{Cov} \left(\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma, \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}\Sigma \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}) \Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{K}{N^2} n \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\|^4 \right)^{1/2} \leq KN^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where the penultimate inequality uses (4.8) of [4] again. Now we combine (85)-(89), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_n^{212}(z) &= -\frac{b_n^2(z)}{zN} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma \\ &\quad - \tilde{M}_n^{212}(z) \frac{b_n^2(z)}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\Sigma + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for any non-random matrix \mathbf{M} , we have $\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{A}(z) \mathbf{M} = 0$. Then following a similar line in (85) and (86), it is easy to check for any bounded non-random \mathbf{M} ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} = -\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} + o(1).$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) &= \frac{b_n^2(z)}{zN} \operatorname{tr} \widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma + \widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) \frac{b_n^2(z)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \widetilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma + o(1) \\ &= \frac{b_n^2(z)}{z^3 N} \operatorname{tr} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-3}(z) \Sigma^2 \mathbf{B} + \widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) \frac{b_n^2(z)}{z^2 N} \operatorname{tr} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma^2 + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (4.1), (4.2) in [4]. Taking one step further, we utilize (4.4) therein to obtain

$$\widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) = \left(1 - c_n \int \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2 t^2 dH_n(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z)t)^2} \right)^{-1} \frac{b_n^2(z) Q_n(z)}{z^3} + o(1).$$

Thus, under assumption 2.2, it holds that

$$\widetilde{M}_n^{212}(z) \simeq \frac{\underline{m}^2(z) Q_n(z)}{z} \left(1 - c \int \frac{(\underline{m}(z))^2 t^2 dH(t)}{(1 + \underline{m}(z)t)^2} \right)^{-1}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\widetilde{M}_n^{211}(z) \simeq z^2 \underline{m}^2(z) \widetilde{V}_n^1(z, z).$$

So far we have found that $M_n^{21}(z) + M_n^{22}(z) \simeq \hat{\omega}_n(z)$, thus Lemma C.1 is proved.

E. Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 2.2, which is analogous to that of Theorem 2.1 in general, but quite different in specific technical details.

E.1. Truncation, Centralization and Standardization

To start with, we need to truncate the variables. In the settings that \mathbf{B} is of low rank, we select a sequence of adaptive truncation level, i.e. $\delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}$ where η_n tending to zero arbitrarily slowly and satisfying

$$\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} \left(|X_{11}|^4 \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{11}| \geq \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (90)$$

In the sequel, we choose δ_n satisfying the following

$$\delta_n \rightarrow 0, \quad \delta_n^4 n^s \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for all } s > 0. \quad (91)$$

The key step in this part is a two-stage truncation. To be more specific, since (90) essentially implies (32), we could first replace the entries of \mathbf{X}_n with variables truncated by $\delta_n \sqrt{n}^3$. To be more specific, we assume

³We emphasize that multiplying the scalar $\sqrt{n/k_n}$ does not influence the results, since the procedure in subsection C.1 still works in this case. One can check the proof steps in subsection C.1 and G.1 to verify this point.

$|X_{ij}| \leq \delta_n \sqrt{n}$, $\mathbb{E}X_{11} = 0$, $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}X_{11}^2 = o(\frac{1}{n})$ for complex case. We now let $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n$ is an $n \times N$ matrix with (i, j) entry $\widehat{X}_{ij} = X_{ij}I_{\{|X_{ij}| < \eta_n(k_n n)^{1/4}\}} - \mathbb{E}X_{ij}I_{\{|X_{ij}| < \eta_n(k_n n)^{1/4}\}}$ and similarly define $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z)$. We further let $\check{X}_{ij} = \widehat{X}_{ij} / \left(\mathbb{E}|\widehat{X}_{ij}|^2\right)^{1/2}$ and denote the corresponding random matrix by $\check{\mathbf{X}}_n, \check{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z)$ and $\check{\mathbf{S}}$. Then the following Lemma holds

Lemma E.1. *Suppose assumption 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (ii) are satisfied, then*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C}_n} \frac{N}{k_n} \mathbb{E} |\operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \check{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{B}|^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (92)$$

The proof of this Lemma is tedious but elementary, we leave it in subsection G.6. We also remark here there are more difficulty in verifying (92) than (36), since the truncation levels of underlying random variables contained in $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z)$ in (92) are distinct, which makes Lemma B.4 not available for the terms such as $\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \check{\mathbf{s}}_1$. Therefore, we propose a generalized version of Lemma B.4, i.e. Lemma B.5 to deal with this obstacle.

E.2. Calculation of the Covariance Function in Theorem 2.2

Due to Lemma E.1, in the sequel, we assume $|X_{11}| \leq \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}$, $\mathbb{E}(X_{11}) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^2 = 1$. Further, due to the truncation step, we shall assume $\mathbb{E}(X_{11}^2) = o(\frac{1}{n})$ for the complex case. Let us first derive some useful bounds. For any non-random $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{M} , by Lemma B.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \mathbf{M} \right|^p \leq C_p \|\mathbf{M}\|^p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2-1} N^{-p/2}, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (93)$$

Further, for any $n \times n$ non-random \mathbf{M}_1 and \mathbf{M}_2 , using Lemma B.4 again we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \Sigma \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \right|^p \\ & \leq \frac{C_p}{N^p} \left((\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \Sigma^2 \mathbf{M}_2^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_1^*)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^{2p} \operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 T \Sigma^2 \mathbf{M}_2^* \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_1^*)^{p/2} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{C_p}{N^p} \left(k_n^{p/2} \|\mathbf{M}_1\|^p \|\mathbf{M}_2\|^p + \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2-1} n^{p/2-1} k_n \|\mathbf{M}_1\|^p \|\mathbf{M}_2\|^p \right) \\ & \leq C_p \|\mathbf{M}_1\|^p \|\mathbf{M}_2\|^p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2} N^{-p/2-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

We continue to use the notations in the previous sections. Thus, for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^p \leq C_p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2-1} N^{-p/2}, \quad (95)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^p \leq C_p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2} N^{-p/2-1}. \quad (96)$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \sigma_j(z) \right|^2 \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^2 |\sigma_1(z)|^2 \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} (\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^4)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^4)^{1/2} \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} (\delta_n^4 k_n N^{-2})^{1/2} (\delta_n^4 k_n^2 N^{-3})^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C\delta_n^4(k_n/N)^{1/2}.$$

Again by (95) and (96), we acquire

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \right|^2 \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} (\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^4 |\sigma_1(z)|^2 + \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^4 |\tau_1(z)|^2) \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} \left((\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^8)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^4)^{1/2} + \frac{k_n^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^4 \right) \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} (\delta_n^1 2k_n^3 N^{-4})^{1/2} (\delta_n^4 k_n^2 N^{-3})^{1/2} + C k_n \delta_n^4 k_n N^{-2} \\ & \leq C \left(\delta_n^8 (k_n/N)^{3/2} + \delta_n^4 (k_n/N)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \tilde{b}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \tau_j(z) \right|^2 \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^2 |\tau_1(z)|^2 \leq C k_n \mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^2 \leq C k_n / N.$$

Notice that in subsection D.1 we already have $\mathbb{E} |\tilde{b}_1(z) - b_n(z)|^4 \leq K N^{-2}$ (the process therein is regardless of the truncation), thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \left(\tilde{b}_j(z) \sigma_j(z) - b_n(z) \sigma_j(z) \right) \right|^2 \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} (\mathbb{E} |\tilde{b}_1(z) - b_n(z)|^4)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^4)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n} N^{-1} \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-3/2} \leq C \delta_n^2 N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_n^1(z_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

where we define

$$Y_j(z) := -\sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z) \mathbb{E}_j \sigma_j(z).$$

Using (96) we get

$$\mathbb{E} |Y_j(z)|^4 \leq C \frac{N^2}{k_n^2} \mathbb{E} |\sigma_1(z)|^4 \leq C N^2 k_n^{-2} \delta_n^4 k_n^2 N^{-3} \leq C \delta_n^4 N^{-1}.$$

Then the Linderberg condition is similarly checked. Therefore, according to the previous discussion, we only need to find the L_1 approximation of

$$\Omega_n^1(z_1, z_2) \triangleq \frac{1}{k_n N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma},$$

and

$$\Omega_n^2(z_1, z_2) \triangleq \frac{1}{k_n N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} D_j^{-1}(z_1) B D_j^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii}.$$

E.2.1. Calculation of the limit of $\Omega_n^1(z_1, z_2)$

In this part, we assume $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, since there is no difficulty in extending the result for $k_n = 1$ in [2] to the case when k_n is finite. Due to equation (45) and $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\Omega_n^1(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{k_n N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}_j \operatorname{tr} D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma + o(1)$$

We then decompose $D^{-1}(z_1)$ into $\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) + b_n(z_1) \mathbf{A}(z_1) + \mathbf{B}(z_1) + \mathbf{C}(z_1)$ first. For a similar reason why we obtain (133), we have

$$\operatorname{tr} \mathbf{C}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma = O(1) = o(k_n),$$

which means that the contribution of $\mathbf{C}(z_1)$ is negligible. Regarding $\mathbf{B}(z_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{B}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} (D^{-1}(z_1) - D_k^{-1}(z_1) + D_k^{-1}(z_1)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \Sigma \left(\check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) + \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \mathbf{B} \left(\check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) - \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) + \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \Sigma \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \beta_k(z_1) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \check{\beta}_{k > j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\ & \quad - \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1)) \check{\beta}_{k > j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma}) \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\check{\beta}_{k \leq j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^* \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\check{\beta}_{k > j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k > j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k > j}(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^j (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k \leq j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=j+1}^N (\beta_k(z_1) - b_n(z_1))\beta_k(z_1)\check{\beta}_{k > j}^2(z_2) \operatorname{tr} \left(\check{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{s}_k\mathbf{s}_k^*\mathbf{D}_k^{-1}(z_1)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{B}\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\check{\mathbf{s}}_k\check{\mathbf{s}}_k^*\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2)\mathbf{\Sigma} \right) \\
& = B_1(z_1, z_2) - B_2(z_1, z_2) - B_{31}(z_1, z_2) - B_{32}(z_1, z_2) - B_{41}(z_1, z_2) - B_{42}(z_1, z_2) + B_{51}(z_1, z_2) \\
& \quad + B_{52}(z_1, z_2) + B_{61}(z_1, z_2) + B_{62}(z_1, z_2) + B_{71}(z_1, z_2) + B_{72}(z_1, z_2) - B_{81}(z_1, z_2) - B_{82}(z_1, z_2)
\end{aligned}$$

By (94), we have that for any $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ bounded in norm and independent of \mathbf{s}_1 and $\check{\mathbf{s}}_1$,

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1|^p \leq C \left(k_n^p N^{-p} + \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2} N^{-p/2-1} \right), \quad p \geq 2. \quad (97)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1|^p \leq C, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (98)$$

Moreover, by Lemma D.2, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \check{\mathbf{s}}_1|^2 \leq C k_n N^{-2}, \quad \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{M}_2 \check{\mathbf{s}}_1|^4 \leq C k_n^2 N^{-4}, \quad (99)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \Sigma \mathbf{M}_2 \check{\mathbf{s}}_1|^2 \leq C N^{-1}, \quad \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \Sigma \mathbf{M}_2 \check{\mathbf{s}}_1|^4 \leq C N^{-2}. \quad (100)$$

Ultimately, directly calculating shows

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \Sigma \mathbf{M}_2 \check{\mathbf{s}}_1|^8 \leq C N^{-1}. \quad (101)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |B_{81}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C N (E|\beta_1(z_1) - b_n(z_1)|^2)^{1/2} \left(E|\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. |\mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 |\mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C N^{1/2} (E|\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1|^8)^{1/8} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1|^8 \right)^{1/8} \\ &\leq C N^{1/2} (k_n^8 N^{-8} + \delta_n^{12} k_n^4 N^{-5})^{1/4} \leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-3/2} + \delta_n^3 k_n N^{-3/4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |B_{81}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C N (E|\beta_N(z_1) - b_n(z_1)|^2)^{1/2} \left(E|\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^2 |\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^2 |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C N^{1/2} (E|\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^8)^{1/8} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_N^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^8 \right)^{1/8} \\ &\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^8 \right)^{1/8} \left(\mathbb{E} |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)N}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^8 \right)^{1/8} \\ &\leq C N^{1/4} (k_n^8 N^{-8} + \delta_n^{12} k_n^4 N^{-5})^{1/4} \leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-7/4} + \delta_n^3 k_n N^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By properly utilizing (97)-(101) and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |B_{71}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |B_{61}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |B_{51}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-3/2} + \delta_n^3 k_n N^{-3/4} \right), \\ \mathbb{E} |B_{72}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |B_{62}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |B_{52}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^{3/2} N^{-3/2} + \delta_n^{3/2} k_n N^{-5/4} \right), \\ \mathbb{E} |B_{41}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n N^{-1/2} + \delta_n k_n^{1/2} N^{-1/4} \right), \quad \mathbb{E} |B_{42}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C k_n^{1/2} N^{-1}, \\ \mathbb{E} |B_{31}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-3/2} + \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-1} \right), \quad \mathbb{E} |B_{32}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C k_n N^{-2}, \\ \mathbb{E} |B_2(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-3/2} + \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-1} \right), \quad \mathbb{E} |B_1(z_1, z_2)| \leq C k_n N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

All the above 14 terms are $o(k_n)$, thus negligible. As for $\mathbf{A}(z_1)$, the same process is implemented as in subsection D.1, but many of the corresponding quantities are negligible. Specifically,

$$\mathbb{E} |A_{81}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |A_{71}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |A_{61}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E} |A_{51}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-1} + \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-1/2} \right),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|A_{62}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E}|A_{52}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^{3/2} N^{-3/2} + \delta_n k_n N^{-5/4} \right), \\
\mathbb{E}|A_{72}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-2} + \delta_n k_n^{3/2} N^{-7/4} \right), & \mathbb{E}|A_{32}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C k_n N^{-1}, \\
\mathbb{E}|A_{82}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C \left(k_n^2 N^{-2} + \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-3/2} \right), & \mathbb{E}|A_{42}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C k_n N^{-1/2}. \\
\mathbb{E}|A_{31}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E}|A_2(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C k_n^2 N^{-1}, & \mathbb{E}|A_1(z_1, z_2)| &\leq C k_n^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It reveals that the only non-trivial term is $A_{41}(z_1, z_2)$, i.e.

$$-\sum_{k=1}^j \check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k.$$

Using (97) and (98), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k=1}^j (\check{\beta}_{k \leq j}(z_2) - b_n(z_2)) \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \right| \\
&\leq C N^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* D_1^{-1}(z_1) B D_1^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1|^4 \right)^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \check{D}_{(j)1}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1|^4 \right)^{1/4} \\
&\leq C N^{1/2} \left(k_n^4 N^{-4} + \delta_n^4 k_n^2 N^{-3} \right)^{1/4} \leq C \left(k_n N^{-1/2} + \delta_n k_n^{1/2} N^{-1/4} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (93), (94) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k=1}^j \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^j \text{tr} \left(D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \text{tr} \left(\check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \right| \\
&\leq C \left(k_n^{1/2} + k_n N^{-1/2} \right) = o(k_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (134), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N^2} \left| \text{tr} \left(D_k^{-1}(z_1) B D_k^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \text{tr} \left(\check{D}_{(j)k}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \text{tr} \left(D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \text{tr} \left(\check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \right| \leq C N^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{tr} \left(D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&= -\frac{b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) j}{N^2} \text{tr} \left(D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \text{tr} \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n) \\
&= \frac{a_n(z_1, z_2) j}{N} \text{tr} \left(D^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(\check{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) B D^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) B \check{D}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses (57) (we should emphasize the derivation therein is independent of truncation).

Now we will decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1)$ again, and by a extremely similar argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&= -\frac{b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) j}{N^2} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&\quad - \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n) \\
&= -\text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \left(1 + j/N \frac{a_n(z_1, z_2)}{1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2)} \right) + o(k_n) \\
&= -\frac{1}{(1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2))} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality we uses (58). Together with the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2))^2} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2))^2} \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma \right) + o(k_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to the same decomposition for $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{(j)}^{-1}(z_2)$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) H_n^1(z_1, z_2)}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{(1 - j/N a_n(z_1, z_2))^2} + o(1) \\
&\simeq \frac{(\underline{m}(z_2) - \underline{m}(z_1)) H_n^1(z_1, z_2)}{z_1 z_2 (z_2 - z_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof of this part is complete.

E.2.2. Calculation of the limit of $\Omega_n^2(z_1, z_2)$

The strategy in this part is to decompose $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)$ in the following way, which is analogous to E.q.(131).

Factually,

$$\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) = -\tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) + b_{n1}(z_1) \mathbf{A}_j(z_1) + \mathbf{B}_j(z_1) + \mathbf{C}_j(z_1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_j(z_1) &= \sum_{k \neq j} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \Sigma/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1), \\
\mathbf{B}_j(z_1) &= \sum_{k \neq j} (\beta_{jk}(z_1) - b_{n1}(z_1)) \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_j(z_1) = N^{-1} b_{n1}(z_1) \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma \sum_{k \neq j} \left(\mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right).$$

The definition of some of the above quantities is similar to the previous. Concretely, we let $\mathbf{D}_{jk}(z) = \mathbf{D}_j(z) - \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^*$, $b_{n1}(z) = 1/(1 + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z))$, $\Sigma_{n1}(z) = z \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{N-1}{N} b_{n1}(z) \Sigma$ and $\beta_{jk}(z) = 1/(1 + \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_k)$.

We similarly define $\check{\beta}_{jk}(z)$ and $\check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z)$. Significant difference appears in this situation, where the contributions of $\mathbf{A}_j(z_1)$, $\mathbf{B}_j(z_1)$ and $\mathbf{C}_j(z_1)$ are all negligible. The handling for $\mathbf{B}_j(z)$ associated term is similar to that in subsection E.2.1, meanwhile, a flexible use of (67) is needed. Thus we omit the tedious calculation here. Regarding $\mathbf{C}_j(z_1)$, the technique utilized before based on (45) and (67) may only obtain that the relevant term is $O(1)$, which is invalid for the case $k_n = O(1)$. Hence a more careful check is needed. In detail, we still decompose $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)$ and $\check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)$ using (44), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{C}_j(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
&= \frac{b_{n1}(z_1)}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left(\left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \right) + \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&\quad \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \left(\left(\check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) + \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \mathbf{B} \left(\left(\check{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) + \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \\
&= C_j^{111}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{112}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{121}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{122}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{211}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{212}(z_1, z_2) \\
&\quad + C_j^{221}(z_1, z_2) + C_j^{222}(z_1, z_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the subscripts 1 and 2 represents $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}$ and \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1} respectively, in the corresponding location. We assert that the above eight terms are all negligible. Before verify this assertion, we first introduce the following inequality, which is a simple application of Lemma B.4. In detail, we have for any bounded non-random matrix \mathbf{M}_1 and \mathbf{M}_2 and non-random vector \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} bounded in Euclidean norm,

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{y} \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1|^p \leq C_p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2-1} N^{-p/2-1}. \quad (102)$$

Hence, using (94), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |C_j^{222}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \times \text{diag} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right) \right) \right| \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C k_n N^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E} |C_j^{122}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C k_n N^{-1}$. We then use (102) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |C_j^{212}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k>j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{3/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_k \check{\mathbf{s}}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{j1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{j1}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{3/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{j1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{j1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{j1}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{j1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_1|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& + C \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} |\check{\mathbf{s}}_N^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jN}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jN}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{3/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jN}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_N|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_N^* \mathbf{D}_{jN}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jN}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jN}^{-1}(z_2) \check{\mathbf{s}}_N|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq CN^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\mathbb{E}|C_j^{221}(z_1, z_2)| \leq CN^{-1}$. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}|C_j^{211}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E}|C_j^{112}(z_1, z_2)| + \mathbb{E}|C_j^{121}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C\delta_n^2 k_n^{3/2} N^{-3/2},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|C_j^{111}(z_1, z_2)| \leq C \left(\delta_n^2 k_n^{5/2} N^{-5/2} + \delta_n^4 k_n^{3/2} N^{-2} \right).$$

We see that the above eight terms are all $o(k_n)$, thus negligible. The handling for the term associated with $\mathbf{A}_j(z_1)$ is more complicated, when $K_n = O(1)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_j \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{A}_j(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} \right)_{ii} \\
& = \mathbb{E}_j \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \Sigma/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \left(\left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \right) + \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \right) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
& \quad \times e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \left(\left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) + \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \mathbf{B} \left(\left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) + \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \\
& = A_j^{111}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{112}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{121}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{122}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{211}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{212}(z_1, z_2) \\
& \quad + A_j^{221}(z_1, z_2) + A_j^{222}(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We first use (94) and (102) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|A_j^{122}(z_1, z_2)| & \leq \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk} \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{3/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \right) \\
& + C \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk} \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left| e_i^* \Sigma^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \Sigma^{1/2} e_i \right| \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{C}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \right) \\
&\quad + C \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \times \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \right) \\
&\leq C (N^{-2} + k_n N^{-2}) \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \\
&\leq C k_n^2 N^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from that for any $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{M} ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |M_{ii}| \leq \|\mathbf{M}\| \text{rank}(\mathbf{M}). \tag{103}$$

Regarding $A_j^{212}(z_1, z_2)$, by the same method, we first have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \neq j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \left(\check{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \right) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \leq C k_n N^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $k < j$, if $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, we use (102) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \check{\beta}_{jk}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C N^{-1} = o(k_n N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

If $k_n = O(1)$, without of loss of generality, we assume $\mathbf{B} = \sum_{u=1}^{k_n} \theta_u \mathbf{b}_u \mathbf{b}_u^*$ and still utilize (102) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \check{\beta}_{jk}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sum_{u,s=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{b}_u \mathbf{s}_k^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{b}_s \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{b}_u^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{b}_s^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i \right| \\
&\leq C \sum_{u,s=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{b}_u^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{b}_s^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{b}_u \mathbf{b}_s^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \right|^2 \\
&\leq CN^{-1/2} \sum_{u,s=1}^{k_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_k^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{e}_i^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{b}_u \mathbf{b}_s^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq CN^{-3/2} \sum_{u,s=1}^{k_n} \left(\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{b}_u \mathbf{b}_s^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq Ck_n^2 N^{-3/2} = o(k_n N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

The treatment for the case when $k > j$ is similar. Therefore, combining the above three equality, we get $\mathbb{E}|A_j^{212}(z_1, z_2)| = o(k_n)$, which is negligible. Then properly using (102), (94) and (93), the conclusion also holds for $A_j^{221}(z_1, z_2)$, $A_j^{112}(z_1, z_2)$, $A_j^{121}(z_1, z_2)$, $A_j^{211}(z_1, z_2)$ and $A_j^{111}(z_1, z_2)$. As for $A_j^{222}(z_1, z_2)$, there is essential difficulty in the case $k_n = O(1)$, where the above arguments are invalid. Instead, we will prove

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} |A_j^{222}(z_1, z_2)|^2 = o(k_n^2). \quad (104)$$

Factually,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |A_j^{222}(z_1, z_2)|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{k < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \\
&= C \sum_{k < j} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_k \mathbf{s}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \\
&+ C \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$=\mathcal{A}_{j_1}^{222}(z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{A}_{j_2}^{222}(z_1, z_2).$$

Then by (67) and (94), we have

$$|\mathcal{A}_{j_1}^{222}(z_1, z_2)| \leq Ck_n^2 N^{-1} = o(k_n).$$

When $k_1 \neq k_2$, we introduce $\mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}(z_1)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}(z_2)$ defined analogous to $\mathbf{D}_{jk}(z_1)$ and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}(z_2)$. Our strategy to analyze $\mathcal{A}_{j_2}^{222}(z_1, z_2)$ is to decompose all \mathbf{D}_{jk}^{-1} and $\check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk}^{-1}$ using (44), which leads to 256 extra terms. For simplicity, we only calculating some typical terms as an illustration. First, obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

due to the conditional independence of \mathbf{s}_{k_1} and \mathbf{s}_{k_2} when given $\mathcal{F}_{-jk_1k_2}$. Also, using Lemma B.4, (67), (94),(102) and (103), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \times \text{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right) \right| \\ & \leq Ck_n^{1/2} N^{-1} \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk_1k_2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \right| \\ & = Ck_n^{1/2} N^{-1} \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbb{E}_{-jk_1k_2} \left[\mathbb{E}_{-j k_1} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \Big| \Big|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \Big| \\
& \leq C k_n^{1/2} N^{-2} \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \mathbb{E}_{-jk_1k_2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \times \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \right| \\
& \leq C k_n^{1/2} N^{-3} \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right| \leq C k_n^{3/2} N^{-1} = o(k_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) (\mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/N) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right| \\
& \leq C N^{-2} \sum_{k_1 \neq k_2 < j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{-jk_1k_2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_1) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_2} \mathbf{s}_{k_2}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(z_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{-jk_1k_2} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{3/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_1) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^* \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{B} \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \mathbf{s}_{k_1} \mathbf{s}_{k_1}^* \check{\mathbf{D}}_{jk_1k_2}^{-1}(\bar{z}_2) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_i \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq C N (k_n^8 N^{-8} + \delta_n^{12} k_n^4 N^{-5})^{1/2} \delta_n^6 k_n^{3/2} N^{-5/2} = o(k_n).
\end{aligned}$$

The treatment for the other 253 terms are similar, by a flexible using of Lemma B.4, (67), (94), (102) and (103), thus omitted here. Then the conclusion is followed by replacing \mathbf{D}_j^{-1} with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}$ repeatedly and using $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n1}^{-1}(z) - \frac{1}{z} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\| = o(1)$.

E.3. Tightness of $M_n^1(z)$

In this subsection, we focus on proving

$$\sup_{n, z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \frac{|M_n^1(z_1) - M_n^1(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} < \infty. \quad (105)$$

Notice that under our truncation, (37) and (38) still hold. On the other hand, similar to (73), we have that $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\|$, $\|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\|$, $|\mathbf{s}_1 \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1|$, $|\mathbf{s}_1 \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \mathbf{s}_1|$, $|\beta_1(z)|$, $\text{tr} \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})/N$, $\text{tr} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B})/k_n$ are all bounded by

$C_1 + C_2 n^s \mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n}$, for some constant $C_1, C_2, s > 0$, where the event $\Xi_n = \{\|\mathbf{S}_n\|, \|\mathbf{S}_n^{(1)}\| > \eta_r \text{ or } \lambda_{\min}^{\mathbf{S}_n}, \lambda_{\min}^{\mathbf{S}_n^{(1)}} < \eta_l\}$, which holds with overwhelming probability $o(n^{-1})$. We use $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B})$ to represent a product of \mathbf{B} and one or several matrices that are bounded in norm almost surely and independent of \mathbf{s}_1 , the meaning of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1)$ is similar. As a consequence, (71) still holds. Moreover (72) is also correct with a slight change of the order on the right side, i.e.

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z)|^p \leq C_p \delta_n^{2p-4} k_n^{p/2-1} N^{-p/2}, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (106)$$

Now we use (44) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M_n^1(z_1) - M_n^1(z_2)}{z_1 - z_2} &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z_1) \beta_j(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j \\ &= I_1(z_1, z_2) - I_2(z_1, z_2) - I_3(z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

Regarding I_2 , we further decompose it as

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(z_1, z_2) &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[b_n(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \beta_j(z_1) b_n(z_1) \gamma_j(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \right] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z_1) \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma} \right] \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z_1) \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z_1) \gamma_j(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \\ &= b_n(z_1) I_{21}(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_1) I_{22}(z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

By (94) and (71), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |I_{21}(z_1, z_2)|^2 &\leq CN k_n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma} \right|^2 \\ &\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{\Sigma} \right|^2 \\ &\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} k_n N^{-2} \mathbb{E} (\|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1)\|^4 \|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_2)\|^2) \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (106), (94) and the argument in subsection E.3, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} |I_{22}(z_1, z_2)|^2 \leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(|\gamma_1(z_1)|^2 \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^2 + C n^s \mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(|\gamma_1(z_1)|^2 \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \right|^2 + \frac{k_n^2}{N^2} |\gamma_1(z_1)|^2 \left| \frac{\operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B})}{k_n} \right|^2 \right) + o(n^{-l}) \\
&\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \left((\mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z_1)|^4)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \right|^4 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{k_n^2}{N^2} \mathbb{E} |\gamma_1(z_1)|^2 \right) + o(n^{-l}) \\
&\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \left(\delta_n^2 k_n^{1/2} N^{-1} \delta_n^2 k_n N^{-3/2} + k_n^2 N^{-3} \right) + o(n^{-l}) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

As a conclusion, we have $\mathbb{E}|I_2(z_1, z_2)|^2 < \infty$. By the same method, we can also derive that $\mathbb{E}|I_3(z_1, z_2)|^2 < \infty$.

Regarding I_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(z_1, z_2) &= \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[(b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) + \beta_j(z_1) (\beta_j(z_2) - b_n(z_2)) + b_n(z_2) (\beta_j(z_1) - b_n(z_1))) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j \right] \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left(\mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\beta_j(z_1) \beta_j(z_2) \gamma_j(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} b_n(z_1) b_n(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\beta_j(z_1) \gamma_j(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{s}_j) \\
&= b_n(z_2) b_n(z_1) I_{11}(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_2) I_{12}(z_1, z_2) - b_n(z_2) b_n(z_1) I_{13}(z_1, z_2).
\end{aligned}$$

The treatment for I_{12} and I_{13} is similar to that of I_{22} , from which we conduct the second moments of the two terms are all bounded. For I_{11} , we use the elementary inequality

$$|a_1 a_2 - b_1 b_2|^2 \leq 4|a_1 - b_1|^2 |a_2 - b_2|^2 + 4|b_1|^2 |a_2 - b_2|^2 + 2|b_2|^2 |a_1 - b_1|^2,$$

for any complex number a_i, b_i , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|I_{11}(z_1, z_2)|^2 &\leq 4N^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \right|^2 \\
&\leq CN^2 k_n^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \right|^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \right|^4 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + CN^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{D}_1) \right|^2 \frac{k_n^2}{N^2} + Cn^s \mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n} \right) \\
&\quad + CN^2 k_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{B}) \right|^2 + Cn^s \mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\delta_n^4 k_n^{1/2} N^{-1/2} + k_n/N + 1 \right) + o(n^{-l}) \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (105) is proved.

E.4. Convergence of the non-random part

We assert that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \sqrt{\frac{N}{k_n}} \left| \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} - \operatorname{tr} (-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Factually, the process is absolutely the same as in subsection D.1.5 due to a minor modification of the order.

Thus we omit the repeated steps here.

F. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Notice that under H_0 , we can rewrite (27) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n(f) &= \operatorname{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n)(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0) - \frac{n - r_n}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z)}{z + z \underline{m}_n(z)} dz \\ &= \operatorname{tr} f(\mathbf{S}_n)(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0) - \frac{n - r_n}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z)}{z + z \underline{m}_n^0(z)} dz \\ &\quad + \frac{n - r_n}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z)(\underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z))}{z(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))(1 + \underline{m}_n(z))} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - (-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1} \right) (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0) dz \\ &\quad + \frac{n - r_n}{2\pi i N} \oint_{\Gamma} \frac{f(z) N(\underline{m}_n(z) - \underline{m}_n^0(z))}{z(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} dz + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - (-z \mathbf{I}_n - z \underline{m}_n^0(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1} \right) \times \\ &\quad \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0 - \frac{n - r_n}{zN(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \mathbf{I}_n \right) dz + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus our Lemma C.1 can be applied to the case that \mathbf{B}_n is z -dependent, i.e. $\mathbf{B}_n(z) = \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0 - \frac{n - r_n}{zN(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \mathbf{I}_n$.

Thus we only need to plug this into the representations for the quantities appeared in Theorem 2.1. Taking

$P_n(z)$ for example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_n(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \overline{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-2}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0 - \frac{n - r_n}{zN(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \mathbf{I}_n \right) \\ &= \frac{n - r_n}{N(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} - \frac{(n - r_n)^2}{zN^2(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^4} - \frac{n - r_n}{zN^2(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{1 + d_i}{(1 + (1 + d_i) \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Similarly, we define

$$\mathcal{Q}_n(z) = \frac{n - r_n}{N(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^3} \left(1 - \frac{n - r_n}{zN(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \right) - \frac{n - r_n}{zN^2(1 + \underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1 + d_i)^2}{(1 + (1 + d_i) \underline{m}_n^0(z))^3}. \quad (108)$$

In the sequel, we write \underline{m}_i for $\underline{m}_n^0(z_i)$ for notation simplicity. We further define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{n - r_n}{z_1(1 + \underline{m}_1)z_2^2(1 + \underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n - r_n}{z_2 N(1 + \underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{n - r_n}{z_1 z_2^3 N^2 (1 + \underline{m}_2)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1 + d_i)^2}{(1 + (1 + d_i) \underline{m}_2)^2 (1 + (1 + d_i) \underline{m}_1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2 z_2^3 N^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1+d_i)^3}{(1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_1)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

$$\mathcal{U}_n^1(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1+d_i)^3}{(1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_1)} + \frac{n-r_n}{z_1(1+\underline{m}_1) z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N}, \quad (111)$$

$$\mathcal{U}_n^2(z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 N} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1+d_i)^4}{(1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_1)^2} + \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N}, \quad (112)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_n^3(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1 N(1+\underline{m}_1)^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{(n-r_n)^2}{z_1^3 z_2^3 N^3 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \frac{(1+d_i)^2}{(1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+(1+d_i)\underline{m}_1)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

To give the expression for $V_n^1(z_1, z_2)$ and simplify notation, we first introduce the following functions defined for $d > 0$,

$$g_1(d, z) = \frac{1+d}{1+(1+d)\underline{m}_n^0(z)}, \quad g_2(d, z) = \frac{1+d}{(1+(1+d)\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}, \quad g_3(d, z) = \frac{(1+d)^2}{(1+(1+d)\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}.$$

Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1(1+\underline{m}_1) z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\ &\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_1)(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_2) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\ &\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_2(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_3(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\ &\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_2) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\ &\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_3(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_2(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^3(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1 N(1+\underline{m}_1)^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^3 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_2 N(1+\underline{m}_2)^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1^2 z_2^3 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N^2} \left(1 - \frac{n-r_n}{z_1 N(1+\underline{m}_1)^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{(n-r_n)^2}{z_1^3 z_2^3 N^3 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_2(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1(1+\underline{m}_1) z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_1) N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_2) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_2(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{1}{z_1^2(1+\underline{m}_1)^2 z_2^2(1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_2)^2 N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1^2 z_2^2 (1+\underline{m}_1)^2 N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_2) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z_1 z_2^2 N} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_2(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_2(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{A}}(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2}{(1+\underline{m}_1)(1+\underline{m}_2) N} \sum_{k=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk}]^2 + \frac{\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2}{(1+\underline{m}_2) N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} \\
&\quad + \frac{\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2}{(1+\underline{m}_1) N} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_2) v_{ik}^2 (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z}_0)_{kk} + \frac{\underline{m}_1 \underline{m}_2}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g_1(d_i, z_1) v_{ik}^2 \cdot g_1(d_j, z_2) v_{jk}^2
\end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

We finally analogously define

$$\mathcal{G}_n(z) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_n(z)}{z^2} \left(1 - \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2 (n-r_n)}{N(1+\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} - \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_3(d_i, z)\right)^{-1}, \tag{120}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_n(z_1, z_2) = 1 + \frac{\underline{m}_n^0(z_1) \underline{m}_n^0(z_2) (z_1 - z_2)}{\underline{m}_n^0(z_2) - \underline{m}_n^0(z_1)}, \tag{121}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_n^1(z_1, z_2) = \mathcal{V}_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{G}_n(z_2)z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{U}_n^1(z_1, z_2). \quad (122)$$

Now we are in a position to give the mean and covariance function, before doing so, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^1(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2) - \underline{m}_n^0(z_1))z_1z_2}{z_2 - z_1} \left(\mathcal{V}_n^3(z_1, z_2) + z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{G}(z_2)\mathcal{V}_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + z_1^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{V}_n^2(z_1, z_2) + z_1^2z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\mathcal{U}_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2) - \underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2z_1z_2}{\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)\underline{m}_n^0(z_2)(z_2 - z_1)^2} \left(z_1z_2\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)\underline{m}_n^0(z_2)\mathcal{Z}_n^1(z_1, z_2)\mathcal{Z}_n^1(z_2, z_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - z_1\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)g(z_1)\mathcal{Z}_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_2\underline{m}_n^0(z_2)g(z_2)\mathcal{Z}_n^1(z_2, z_1) + \mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\mathcal{A}_n(z_1, z_2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_n^2(z_1, z_2) &= z_1z_2\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)\underline{m}_n^0(z_2) \left(\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 - 3 \right) \left(\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^3(z_1, z_2) + z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{G}(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^2(z_2, z_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + z_1^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^2(z_1, z_2) + z_1^2z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^2(z_1, z_2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - z_1\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)g(z_1)\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^1(z_1, z_2) - z_1\underline{m}_n^0(z_1)z_2^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_2))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^1(z_1, z_2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - z_2\underline{m}_n^0(z_2)g(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^1(z_2, z_1) - z_2\underline{m}_n^0(z_2)z_1^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z_1))^2\mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^1(z_2, z_1) + \mathcal{G}(z_1)\mathcal{G}(z_2)\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_n(z_1, z_2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_n(z) &= \frac{(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}{z \left(1 - \frac{n(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}{N(1+\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \right)} \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_n(z) \frac{n\underline{m}_n^0(z)}{N(1+\underline{m}_n^0(z))^3}}{\left(1 - \frac{n(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}{N(1+\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \right)} - \mathcal{Q}_n(z) \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\mathbb{E}|X_{11}|^4 - 3 \right) z^2(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2 \left(\underline{m}_n^0(z)\mathcal{P}_n(z)\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n^1(z, z) \left(1 - \frac{n(\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2}{N(1+\underline{m}_n^0(z))^2} \right)^{-1} - \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^1(z, z) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

Then the asymptotic mean and variance can be written as

$$\mu(f, r_n, n, N) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma} f(z)\mathcal{E}_n(z)dz, \quad (126)$$

and

$$\varrho(f, r_n, n, N) = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\Gamma_1} \oint_{\Gamma_2} f(z_1)f(z_2) (2\mathcal{C}_n^1(z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{C}_n^2(z_1, z_2)) dz_1 dz_2. \quad (127)$$

G. Proof of Auxiliary Lemmas and results

In this section, we will give the proof of some auxiliary lemmas and results utilized in the proof.

G.1. Proof of (36)

Proof. Firstly, it is easy to derive from (32) that

$$1 - \sigma_n < 1 - \sigma_n^2 = o(n^{-1}), \quad |\mathbb{E}\hat{X}_{11}| = o(n^{-3/2}).$$

Then by the techniques in subsection D.1.5, on the one hand, both $\|(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n - z\mathcal{I}_n)^{-1}\|$ and $\|(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_n - z\mathcal{I}_n)^{-1}\|$ can boil down to $C + Cn^s\mathbb{I}_{\Xi_n}$ uniformly in $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n}$, where Ξ_n holds with overwhelming probability. On the other

hand, all underlying random variables are bounded by \sqrt{n} , which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\left(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} - \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} \right) \mathbf{B} \right| \\
& \leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} n \mathbb{E} \left\| \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \left(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n - z \mathbf{I}_n \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_n \right\| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n^* - \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \right\| + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
& \leq \frac{1 - \sigma_n^2}{\sigma_n^2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \right\| + \frac{2}{\sigma_n^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\| \left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n^* \right\| + \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|^2 \\
& \leq Cn(1 - \sigma_n^2) + Cn^{1/2} \left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\| + C \left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|^2 = o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step we use the fact

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\| = \sqrt{nN} |\mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{11}| = o(n^{-1/2}).$$

We thus complete the proof of this part. \square

G.2. Proof of Lemma B.5

Proof. We follow the method of [3]. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{x}_g^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}_f - \mathbb{E}(\overline{g(X_1)} f(X_1)) \text{tr} \mathbf{M} &= \sum_{i=1}^n m_{ii} \left(\overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_j) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ji} \overline{g(X_j)} f(X_i) = \mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 + \mathcal{R}_3
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, using Lemma B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{R}_1|^p &\leq C_p \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |m_{ii}|^2 \mathbb{E} \left| \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \sum_{i=1}^n |m_{ii}|^p \mathbb{E} \left| \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_i) \right|^p \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E} |g(X_1) f(X_1)|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n |m_{ii}|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1) f(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n |m_{ii}|^p \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E} |g(X_1) f(X_1)|^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1) f(X_1)|^p \text{tr} (\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality we use that for any convex function f ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f(m_{ii}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i(\mathbf{M})). \tag{128}$$

Similarly, we denote \mathbb{E}_i by taking conditional expectation given (X_1, \dots, X_i) , and properly utilize Lemma B.2, Lemma B.3 and Lemma B.4 to acquire

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{R}_2|^p \leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{i-1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_j) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} \overline{g(X_i)} f(X_j) \right|^p \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} f(X_j) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} f(X_j) \right|^p \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E}_{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} f(X_j) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |m_{ij}|^p \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |m_{ij}|^2 \right)^{p/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{i-1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} f(X_j) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left((\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})_{ii} \right)^{p/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{ij} f(X_j) \right|^2 \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left((\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})_{ii} \right)^{p/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}_f^* \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}_f|^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ (\text{tr} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} + \left(\mathbb{E}^{1/2} |f(X_1)|^4 \text{tr} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\} \\
&\leq C_p \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E}^{1/2} |f(X_1)|^4 \text{tr} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

By the same method, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{R}_3|^p \leq C_p \left\{ \left(\mathbb{E}^{1/2} |g(X_1)|^4 \text{tr} \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M} \right)^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |g(X_1)|^p \mathbb{E} |f(X_1)|^p \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{M})^{p/2} \right\}$$

Hence the proof is complete by combining the above three inequalities. \square

G.3. Proof of Lemma D.1

Proof. First of all, by (45) we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right| \leq \frac{2}{Nv^2}. \quad (129)$$

Define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n(z) = z\mathbf{I} - b_n(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, (2.10) in [4] shows that

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\| \leq \frac{1 + c_n/v}{v}. \quad (130)$$

We then decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ in the following way:

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) = -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) + b_n(z)\mathbf{A}(z) + \mathbf{B}(z) + \mathbf{C}(z), \quad (131)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A}(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) (\mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* - N^{-1} \Sigma) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z), \\ \mathbf{B}(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^N (\beta_j(z) - b_n(z)) \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}(z) = N^{-1} b_n(z) \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)).$$

By now, together with (4.3) in [3] and (130), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \mathbf{B}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right| &\leq N \mathbb{E} \left| (\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right| \\ &\leq N \left(\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(|\mathbf{s}_1|^4 \|\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z)\|^2 \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K \frac{1 + c_n/v}{v^3} N^{1/2},\end{aligned}\tag{132}$$

where the last step we use $E(|s_1|^4) \leq K$ which is easy to check. Regarding $\mathbf{C}(z)$, using (45), we get

$$\left| \text{tr} \mathbf{C}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right| \leq \frac{|z|}{Nv} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \text{tr} (\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right| \leq \frac{|z|(1 + c_n/v)}{v^3}\tag{133}$$

As for $\mathbf{A}(z)$, we further decompose $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \text{tr} \mathbf{A}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right| &= \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) (\mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* - N^{-1} \Sigma) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j(z) \text{tr} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \Sigma \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)) \Sigma \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^N \text{tr} \tilde{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) (\mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* - N^{-1} \Sigma) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \Sigma \\ &:= A_1(z) + A_2(z) + A_3(z).\end{aligned}$$

Using (45) and (43), we arrive at

$$|A_2(z)| \leq \frac{1 + c_n/v}{v^3},\tag{134}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|A_3(z)| \leq K N^{1/2}.\tag{135}$$

Again utilizing (4.3) of [3] and (43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_j(z) \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{b_n(z)}{N^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \beta_1(z) - b_n(z) \right| \left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \beta_1(z) \right| \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \left| \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \beta_1(z) \right| \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right| \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \right) \\
& \leq K_1 \left(\mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) - b_n(z)|^2 \right)^{1/2} + K_2 \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad + K_3 \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq KN^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

Moreover, using (45), we have

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) - \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \leq KN \tag{137}$$

Together with (136), (137), we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left| A_1(z) + \frac{b_n(z)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \right| \leq KN^{1/2} \tag{138}$$

Utilize (43) again we have for any non-random $n \times n$ \mathbf{M} whose spectral norm is bounded in n ,

$$\mathbb{E} |\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}(z)\mathbf{M})| \leq KN^{1/2}, \tag{139}$$

thus together with a similar argument for (132), (133), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{M}) - \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z)\mathbf{M}) \right| \leq KN^{1/2}. \tag{140}$$

Hence combining (132), (133), (138) and (140), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) &= \frac{b_n^2(z)}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \operatorname{tr} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + A_4(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where $E|A_4(z)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. According to (2.17) in [4], we have

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} \right) - \frac{1}{z} \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} \right) \right| \leq KN^{1/2}. \tag{141}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) &= \frac{(m_n^0(z))^2}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \operatorname{tr} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{z^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right) + A_5(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where $E|A_5(z)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. By (4.2) and (4.6) in [4], there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{z \in \mathbb{C}} \left| 1 - \frac{(m_n^0(z))^2}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right) \right| > \delta \quad (142)$$

for n large enough, which indicates that

$$\operatorname{tr} (\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \Sigma) = \frac{1}{z^2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right) \left(1 - \frac{(m_n^0(z))^2}{N} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \overline{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \right) \right)^{-1} + A_6(z),$$

where $E|A_6(z)| \leq KN^{1/2}$. Then the conclusion follows from (129). \square

G.4. Proof of Lemma D.2

Proof. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y}|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i,j} m_{ij} \overline{X}_i Y_j \right) \left(\sum_{i,j} \bar{m}_{ij} X_i \overline{Y}_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} |m_{ij}|^2 \mathbb{E} |X_i|^2 \mathbb{E} |Y_j|^2 = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to the independence of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , and the assumption $\mathbb{E}(X_1) = \mathbb{E}(Y_1) = 0$. Regarding the latter quantity, we denote the double index $i = (i_1, i_2)$ and $m_i = m_{i_1 i_2} \overline{X}_{i_1} Y_{i_2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{y}|^4 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_i |m_i|^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_i |m_i|^2 \right)^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right)^2 + 2 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_i |m_i|^2 \sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_i |m_i|^4 + \mathbb{E} \sum_{i \neq j} |m_i|^2 |m_j|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (143)$$

where the last equality follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_i |m_i|^2 \sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right) = \sum_{(i_1, i_2) \neq (j_1, j_2), (k_1, k_2)} m_{i_1, i_2} \bar{m}_{j_1, j_2} |m_{k_1, k_2}|^2 \mathbb{E} (\overline{X}_{i_1} X_{j_1} Y_{i_2} \overline{Y}_{j_2} |X_{k_1}|^2 |Y_{k_2}|^2) = 0.$$

Because either $i_1 \neq j_1$ or $i_2 \neq j_2$, in both cases $\mathbb{E} (\overline{X}_{i_1} X_{j_1} Y_{i_2} \overline{Y}_{j_2} |X_{k_1}|^2 |Y_{k_2}|^2) = 0$. For the first term in (143), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_i |m_i|^4 = \sum_{i_1, i_2} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^4 \mathbb{E} |X_{i_1}|^4 \mathbb{E} |Y_{i_2}|^4 = \mathbb{E} |X_1|^4 \mathbb{E} |Y_1|^4 \sum_{i_1, i_2} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^4.$$

Regarding the second term, similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i \neq j} |m_i|^2 |m_j|^2 &= \sum_{(i_1, i_2) \neq (j_1, j_2)} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 |m_{j_1, j_2}|^2 \mathbb{E} (|X_{i_1}|^2 |X_{j_1}|^2 |Y_{i_2}|^2 |Y_{j_2}|^2) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, i_2 \neq j_2} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 |m_{i_1, j_2}|^2 \mathbb{E} |X_{i_1}|^4 \mathbb{E} |Y_{i_2}|^2 \mathbb{E} |Y_{j_2}|^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i_2, i_1 \neq j_1} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 |m_{j_1, i_2}|^2 \mathbb{E} |Y_{i_2}|^4 \mathbb{E} |X_{i_1}|^2 \mathbb{E} |X_{j_1}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{i_2 \neq j_2, i_1 \neq j_1} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 |m_{j_1, j_2}|^2 \mathbb{E}|X_{i_1}|^2 \mathbb{E}|X_{j_1}|^2 \mathbb{E}|Y_{i_2}|^2 \mathbb{E}|Y_{j_2}|^2 \\
& \leq \max(\mathbb{E}|X_1|^4, \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4) \sum_{(i_1, i_2) \neq (j_1, j_2)} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 |m_{j_1, j_2}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have the sum of the first term is less than

$$\mathbb{E}|X_1|^4 \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 \left(\sum_{i_1, i_2} |m_{i_1, i_2}|^2 \right)^2 = \mathbb{E}|X_1|^4 \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^4.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \neq j} m_i \bar{m}_j \right)^2 \leq 2 \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^4.$$

Thus the the desired result is acquired with $K = \mathbb{E}|X_1|^4 \mathbb{E}|Y_1|^4 + 2$. \square

G.5. Proof of Lemma D.3

Proof. Firstly, by Lemma B.4, we have for any matrix $\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2$ independent of \mathbf{s}_1 and bounded in spectral norm,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{y} \right|^p \leq K_p \delta_n^{2p-4} N^{-2}, \quad p \geq 2, \quad (144)$$

thus obviously,

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{s}_1|^p \leq K_p \delta_n^{2p-4} N^{-2}, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (145)$$

Then using martingale decomposition for $\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)$ and (145) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 (\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right|^2 \\
& \leq K \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_j \right|^2 \\
& \leq K N^{-1}
\end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

Again, following the decomposition above (2.5) in [2], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \left(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - (-z\mathbf{I}_n - z\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_n(z)\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \\
& = \frac{N}{z} \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right] \\
& = \frac{N}{z} \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{z} \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{z} \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z) \left[\mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right] \\
& = \delta_1(z) + \delta_2(z) + \delta_3(z).
\end{aligned}$$

By (144), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\delta_1(z)| &\leq \frac{N}{|z|} \left| \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \tilde{b}_1(z) \varepsilon_1(z) \left[\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right] \right| \\
&\leq KN (\mathbb{E} |\varepsilon_1(z)|^2)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq KN^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

By (44) and (145), we get

$$|\delta_2(z)| \leq K \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M}_2 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{x}^* \mathbf{M}_1 \widehat{\Sigma}_n^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq KN^{-1}. \tag{148}$$

Similar to (146), we have

$$|\delta_3(z)| \leq KN^{-1/2}. \tag{149}$$

combining (146)-(149) we get the desired result. \square

G.6. Proof of Lemma E.1

Proof. Before proceeding, let us introduce some notations here. We define $\tilde{X}_{ij} = X_{ij} - \widehat{X}_{ij} = X_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{ij}| > \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} - \mathbb{E} X_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{ij}| > \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j$ be the corresponding random vectors where X_{ij} is replaced by \tilde{X}_{ij} . $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j$ is similarly defined. Now we give some useful quadratic bounds based on Lemma B.5. Let \mathbf{M} be a $n \times n$ matrix of rank s_n ⁴ and independent of \mathbf{s}_1 , then by direct computation, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \mathbf{M} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 - \frac{\mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{11} \tilde{X}_{11}}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{M} \Sigma \right|^2 \leq CN^{-2} \tilde{\sigma}_n^2 s_n \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{M}\|^2, \tag{150}$$

where we define $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{11}|^2$, which owns the following estimates by (90).

$$\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = o(k_n^{-1/2} N^{-1/2}). \tag{151}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \mathbf{M} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 - \frac{\mathbb{E} X_{11} \tilde{X}_{11}}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{M} \Sigma \right|^2 \leq CN^{-2} s_n \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{M}\|^2 \mathbb{E} (|X_{11}|^2 |\tilde{X}_{11}|^2). \tag{152}$$

Moreover, By Lemma B.5, we have for any $p \geq 4$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \mathbf{M} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 - \frac{\mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{11} \tilde{X}_{11}}{N} \text{tr} \mathbf{M} \Sigma \right|^p \leq C_p N^{-p} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{M}\|^p \left(\mathbb{E}^{p/4} |\tilde{X}_{11}|^4 s_n^{p/2} + \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{11}|^p \mathbb{E} |\widehat{X}_{11}|^p s_n \right). \tag{153}$$

Similarly, we have for any $q \geq 2$

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{s}_1 - \frac{\mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{11} X_{11}}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{M} \Sigma \right|^p \leq C_p n^{-p} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{M}\|^p \left(s_n^{p/2} + \delta_n^{2p-4} (k_n N)^{p/2-1} s_n \right). \tag{154}$$

⁴Here the rank s_n may take values 1, k_n or n , for different purpose.

Let $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 = \mathbb{E}|\widehat{X}_{11}|^2$, from (151), it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{N}{k_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) - \check{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{B} \right|^2 &\leq N k_n \frac{(1 - \hat{\sigma}_n^2)^2}{\hat{\sigma}_n^4} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z)\|^2 \|\check{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z)\|^2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_n\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{CN k_n}{\hat{\sigma}_n^4} \left(\mathbb{E} |X_{11}|^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{ij}| > \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} \right)^2 \leq C \delta_n^4 \left(\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} |X_{11}|^4 \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{ij}| > \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} \right)^2 = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, to prove Lemma E.1, we only need to prove the following

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{N}{k_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \right) \mathbf{B} \right|^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (155)$$

From (44), we know that (155) will be verified by the following two assertions

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j(z) \text{tr} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right|^2 = o(k_n N^{-1}) \quad (156)$$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\beta}_j(z) \text{tr} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right|^2 = o(k_n N^{-1}). \quad (157)$$

Due to similarity, we only prove (156), where the expectation will be expanded as

$$\diamond_1 = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_j(z) \text{tr} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j \mathbf{s}_j^* \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \right|^2,$$

and

$$\diamond_2 = \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{s}_{j_1}^* \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{j_1} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{j_2}^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_{j_2}.$$

Therefore, we only need to prove that $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \diamond_1$ and $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \diamond_2$ are both $o(k_n N^{-1})$. From (44), we could control \diamond_1 by

$$\diamond_1 \leq \underbrace{CN \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \right|^2}_{\diamond_{11}(z)} + \underbrace{CN \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_1(z) \hat{\beta}_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \right|^2}_{\diamond_{12}(z)}.$$

By (71), (73) and (152), we have

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \diamond_{11}(z) \leq CN \cdot o(N^{-2} k_n) + o(n^{-\ell}) = o(k_n N^{-1}).$$

Similarly, by (71), (73), (153) and (154), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond_{12}(z) &\leq CN \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \right|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left| \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 - n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \widehat{X}_{11} \tilde{X}_{11} \text{tr} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right|^4 \\ &\quad + CN \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z)\|^2 \left(\mathbb{E} X_{11} \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{11}| > \delta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \right|^2 \\ &\leq CN (k_n^4 N^{-4} + \delta_n^4 k_n^2 N^{-3})^{1/2} \cdot (o(N^{-2}) + o(N^{-3}))^{1/2} + CN \cdot o(N^{-3/2} k_n^{-3/2}) (k_n^2 N^{-2}) \\ &= o(k_n N^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last $o(k_n N^{-1})$ holds uniformly in $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$ and we use the fact deduced from (90) that

$$\mathbb{E} |X_{11}| \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_{11}| > \eta_n k_n^{1/4} n^{1/4}\}} = o(k_n^{-3/4} n^{-3/4}).$$

Now we have proved that $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \diamond_1 = o(k_n N^{-1})$, the remaining part will focus on \diamond_2 , which will be further decomposed by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) &= \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) - \beta_{j_1 j_2}(z) \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_2} \mathbf{s}_{j_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) - \beta_{j_1}(z) \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_1} \mathbf{s}_{j_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \\
&\quad + \beta_{j_1}(z) \beta_{j_1 j_2}(z) \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_2} \mathbf{s}_{j_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_1} \mathbf{s}_{j_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \\
&\quad + \beta_{j_1}(z) \beta_{j_1 j_2}(z) \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_1} \mathbf{s}_{j_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_2} \mathbf{s}_{j_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \\
&\quad + \beta_{j_1}(z) \beta_{j_1 j_2}^2(z) \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_2} \mathbf{s}_{j_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_1} \mathbf{s}_{j_1}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_{j_2} \mathbf{s}_{j_2}^* \mathbf{D}_{j_1 j_2}^{-1}(z).
\end{aligned} \tag{158}$$

As a result, $6^4 = 1296$ extra terms appears. However, since the expansions of \diamond_2 are rather complicated, as an illustration, we only present estimates for some typical terms; other terms can be estimated similarly. We will evaluate the following terms of \diamond_2 :

$$\diamond_{21}(z), \diamond_{22}(z), \diamond_{23}(z), \diamond_{24}(z).$$

Their definitions will be given below, when the corresponding terms are evaluated. To start with, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{21}(z)| &= N(N-1) \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E}_{-12} \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \mathbb{E}_{-12} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \right) \right| \\
&\leq C \left| \mathbb{E} X_{11} \tilde{X}_{11} \right|^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \text{tr} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right| \\
&\leq o(k_n^{-1} N^{-1}) \cdot k_n^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z)\|^2 \|\mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z)\|^2 = o(k_n N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Another significant term is $\diamond_{22}(z)$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\diamond_{22}(z) &= N(N-1) \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \\
&= N(N-1) \mathbb{E} (\beta_1(z) - \beta_{21}(z)) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \\
&\quad + N(N-1) b_{n1}(z) \mathbb{E} \gamma_{21}(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \\
&\quad + (N-1) b_{n1}(z) \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \\
&\quad + N(N-1) b_{n1}(z) \mathbb{E} \beta_{21}(z) \gamma_{21}(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \\
&= \diamond_{22,1}(z) + \diamond_{22,2}(z) + \diamond_{22,3}(z) + \diamond_{22,4}(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $\gamma_{21}(z) = \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 - N^{-1} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z)$. Analogous to $\diamond_{21}(z)$, we know that $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{22,3}(z)| = o(k_n N^{-1})$. By Lemma D.2, (73) and (152), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{22,1}(z)| &\leq CN^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z) \beta_{12}(z) \beta_{21}(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \\
&\quad \times \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2| \\
&\leq CN^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2| + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
&\leq CN^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_{-12} \left| \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbb{E}_{-12} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \right|^2 \right) + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
&\leq CN^2 \cdot N^{-1/2} \cdot N^{-1/2} \cdot o(k_n N^{-2}) + o(n^{-\ell}) = o(k_n N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (71), (73) and (152), we have

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{22,2}(z)| \leq CN^2 \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E}_{-12} \gamma_{21}(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \mathbb{E}_{-12} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq CN^2 \cdot o(k_n^{1/2}N^{-3/2}) \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |\gamma_{21}(z)|^2 \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1|^2 + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
&\leq o(k_n^{1/2}N^{1/2}) \cdot N^{-1/2} \cdot k_n^{1/2}N^{-1} + o(n^{-\ell}) = o(k_n N^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then conclusion holds for $\diamond_{22,2}(z)$ by a similar treatment, which finally yields that $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{22}(z)| = o(k_n N^{-1})$. Regarding $\diamond_{23}(z)$, by Lemma B.4, (73) and (152), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\diamond_{23}(z)| &= N(N-1) \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \mathbb{E}(\beta_{12}(z) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2) \right| \\
&= (N-1) |\mathbb{E}(X_{11}^* \tilde{X}_1)| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \mathbb{E}(\beta_{12}(z) \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2) \right| \\
&\leq o(k_n^{-1/2}N^{1/2}) \cdot \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |\mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \Sigma \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2|^2 \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2|^2 + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
&\leq o(k_n^{-1/2}N^{1/2}) \cdot k_n N^{-1} \cdot k_n^{1/2}N^{-1} + o(n^{-\ell}) = o(k_n N^{-3/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

If there are more quadratic forms appear, the treatment include the following two aspects. One is based on (150) and (154), since we see that $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \mathbf{M} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1$ possesses a better estimates than $\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M} \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1$ or $\mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1$, where \mathbf{M} is independent of \mathbf{s}_1 . The other relies on (73), which reduces redundant quadratic forms to constants. As an illustration, we will end our proof by verify the most complicated term

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{|\diamond_{23}(z)|}{N(N-1)} &= \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) \beta_{12}^2(z) \hat{\beta}_2(z) \hat{\beta}_{21}^2(z) \beta_1(\bar{z}) \beta_{12}^2(\bar{z}) \hat{\beta}_2(\bar{z}) \hat{\beta}_{21}^2(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{s}_2 \right. \\
&\quad \times \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \\
&\quad \times \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_1^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_2 \left. \right| \\
&\leq C \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\mathbf{s}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_1|^4 \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\hat{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{B} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \mathbf{s}_1|^4 \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E}^{1/4} |\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_2^* \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{12}^{-1}(\bar{z}) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2|^4 + o(n^{-\ell}) \\
&\leq C k_n^{1/2} N^{-1} \cdot o(N^{-1/2}) \cdot k_n^{1/2} N^{-1} \cdot o(N^{-1/2}) + o(n^{-\ell}) = o(k_n N^{-3}).
\end{aligned}$$

The verification for the rest terms is similar, which is mainly based on (71)-(73), (150)-(154) and Lemma D.2, together with the techniques utilized to evaluate $\diamond_{21}(z)$, $\diamond_{22}(z)$ and $\diamond_{23}(z)$. We thus omit these steps here. \square

References

- [1] Bai, Z., Jiang, D., Yao, J.F., Zheng, S., 2009. Corrections to LRT on large-dimensional covariance matrix by RMT. *The Annals of Statistics* 37, 3822 – 3840. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS694>, doi:10.1214/09-AOS694.
- [2] Bai, Z.D., Miao, B.Q., Pan, G.M., 2007. On asymptotics of eigenvectors of large sample covariance matrix. *The Annals of Probability* 35, 1532 – 1572. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/009117906000001079>, doi:10.1214/009117906000001079.
- [3] Bai, Z.D., Silverstein, J.W., 1998. No eigenvalues outside the support of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability* 26, 316 – 345. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1022855421>, doi:10.1214/aop/1022855421.
- [4] Bai, Z.D., Silverstein, J.W., 2004. CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance

- matrices. *The Annals of Probability* 32, 553 – 605. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1078415845>, doi:10.1214/aop/1078415845.
- [5] Bai, Z.D., Silverstein, J.W., 2010. *Spectral Analysis of Large Dimensional Random Matrices*. Second Edition. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0661-8>.
- [6] Bai, Z.D., Yin, Y.Q., 1993. Limit of the Smallest Eigenvalue of a Large Dimensional Sample Covariance Matrix. *The Annals of Probability* 21, 1275 – 1294. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176989118>, doi:10.1214/aop/1176989118.
- [7] Baik, J., Silverstein, J.W., 2006. Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *Journal of multivariate analysis* 97, 1382–1408.
- [8] Bao, Z., Ding, X., Wang, J., Wang, K., 2022. Statistical inference for principal components of spiked covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics* 50, 1144 – 1169. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AOS2143>, doi:10.1214/21-AOS2143.
- [9] Billingsley, P., 1968. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, New York.
- [10] Billingsley, P., 1995. *Probability and Measure*, 3rd ed. Wiley, New York.
- [11] Bloemendal, A., Knowles, A., Yau, H.T., Yin, J., 2016. On the principal components of sample covariance matrices. *Probability theory and related fields* 164, 459–552.
- [12] Burkholder, D.L., 1973. Distribution Function Inequalities for Martingales. *The Annals of Probability* 1, 19 – 42. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176997023>, doi:10.1214/aop/1176997023.
- [13] Cai, T.T., Han, X., Pan, G., 2020. Limiting laws for divergent spiked eigenvalues and largest nonspiked eigenvalue of sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics* 48, 1255 – 1280. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1798>, doi:10.1214/18-AOS1798.
- [14] Cipolloni, G., Erdős, L., Schröder, D., 2023. Functional central limit theorems for Wigner matrices. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 33, 447 – 489. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-AAP1820>, doi:10.1214/22-AAP1820.
- [15] Dilworth, S.J., 1993. Some probabilistic inequalities with applications to functional analysis. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16241494>.
- [16] Durrett, R., 2019. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108591034.
- [17] Fan, J., Liao, Y., Mincheva, M., 2011. High-dimensional covariance matrix estimation in approximate factor models. *The Annals of Statistics* 39, 3320 – 3356. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/11-AOS944>, doi:10.1214/11-AOS944.

- [18] Hallin, M., Paindaveine, D., Verdebout, T., 2010. Optimal rank-based testing for principal components. *The Annals of Statistics* 38, 3245 – 3299. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOS810>, doi:10.1214/10-AOS810.
- [19] Han, X., Tong, X., Fan, Y., 2023. Eigen selection in spectral clustering: a theory-guided practice. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118, 109–121.
- [20] Johnstone, I.M., 2001. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of Statistics* 29, 295 – 327. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1009210544>, doi:10.1214/aos/1009210544.
- [21] Johnstone, I.M., Lu, A.Y., 2009. On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 104, 682–693. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2009.0121>, doi:10.1198/jasa.2009.0121.
- [22] Johnstone, I.M., Yang, J., 2018. Notes on asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for spiked covariance models with non-gaussian data. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10427 .
- [23] Karoui, N.E., 2007. Tracy–Widom limit for the largest eigenvalue of a large class of complex sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability* 35, 663 – 714. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/009117906000000917>, doi:10.1214/009117906000000917.
- [24] Koltchinskii, V., Lounici, K., 2016. New asymptotic results in principal component analysis. *Sankhya A* 79, 254 – 297. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:88521780>.
- [25] Ledoit, O., Péché, S., 2009. Eigenvectors of some large sample covariance matrix ensembles. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 151, 233–264. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:40468634>.
- [26] Lee, J., Schnelli, K., 2014. Tracy-widom distribution for the largest eigenvalue of real sample covariance matrices with general population. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 26, 3786–3839. doi:10.1214/16-AAP1193.
- [27] Li, Q., Cheng, G., Fan, J., Wang, Y., 2018. Embracing the blessing of dimensionality in factor models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113, 380–389. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2016.1256815>, doi:10.1080/01621459.2016.1256815.
- [28] Liu, X., Liu, Y., Pan, G., Zhang, L., Zhang, Z., 2023. Asymptotic properties of spiked eigenvalues and eigenvectors of signal-plus-noise matrices with their applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13939 .
- [29] Liu, Z., Hu, J., Bai, Z., Song, H., 2022. A clt for the lss of large dimensional sample covariance matrices with diverging spikes. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:254564642>.

- [30] Mestre, X., 2008. On the asymptotic behavior of the sample estimates of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of covariance matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 56, 5353–5368.
- [31] Najim, J., Yao, J., 2016. Gaussian fluctuations for linear spectral statistics of large random covariance matrices. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 26, 1837 – 1887. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AAP1135>, doi:10.1214/15-AAP1135.
- [32] Naumov, A., Spokoiny, V., Ulyanov, V., 2019. Bootstrap confidence sets for spectral projectors of sample covariance. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 174, 1091 – 1132. doi:10.1007/s00440-018-0877-2.
- [33] Pan, G.M., Zhou, W., 2008. Central limit theorem for signal-to-interference ratio of reduced rank linear receiver. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 18, 1232 – 1270. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/07-AAP477>, doi:10.1214/07-AAP477.
- [34] Paul, D., 2007. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica* , 1617–1642.
- [35] Pearson, K., 1901. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *Philosophical Magazine Series 1* 2, 559–572. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:125037489>.
- [36] Silin, I., Fan, J., 2020. Hypothesis testing for eigenspaces of covariance matrix. [arXiv:2002.09810](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.09810).
- [37] Silin, I., Spokoiny, V., 2018. Bayesian inference for spectral projectors of the covariance matrix. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 12, 1948 – 1987. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJS1451>, doi:10.1214/18-EJS1451.
- [38] Wachter, K.W., 1978. The Strong Limits of Random Matrix Spectra for Sample Matrices of Independent Elements. *The Annals of Probability* 6, 1 – 18. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176995607>, doi:10.1214/aop/1176995607.
- [39] Yao, J., Zheng, S., Bai, Z., 2015. *Large Sample Covariance Matrices and High-Dimensional Data Analysis*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CB09781107588080.
- [40] Yin, Y., Zhou, W., 2023. Limiting behavior of bilinear forms for the resolvent of sample covariance matrices under elliptical distribution with applications. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16373](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.16373) .
- [41] Yin, Y.Q., Bai, Z.D., Krishnaiah, P.R., 1988. On the limit of the largest eigenvalue of the large dimensional sample covariance matrix. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 78, 509–521. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:121098751>.
- [42] Zheng, S., Bai, Z., Yao, J., 2015. Substitution principle for CLT of linear spectral statistics of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices with applications to hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics* 43, 546 – 591. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1292>, doi:10.1214/14-AOS1292.

- [43] Zheng, S., Chen, Z., Cui, H., Li, R., 2019. Hypothesis testing on linear structures of high-dimensional covariance matrix. *The Annals of Statistics* 47, 3300 – 3334. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1779>, doi:10.1214/18-AOS1779.