

A distance theorem for inhomogenous random rectangular matrices

Manuel Fernandez V

August 13, 2024

Abstract

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$ be a random matrix with independent uniformly anti-concentrated entries satisfying $\mathbb{E}\|A\|_{HS}^2 \leq Kn(n-d)$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector with uniformly anti-concentrated entries. We show that when $1 \leq d \leq \lambda n / \log n$ the distance between X and H satisfies the following following small ball probability estimate:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{dist}(X, H) \leq t\sqrt{d}\right) \leq (Ct)^d + e^{-cn},$$

for some constants $\lambda, c, C > 0$. This extends the distance theorems from [11], [5], and [6] by dropping any identical distribution assumptions about the entries of X and A . Furthermore it can be applied to prove numerous results about random matrices in the inhomogenous setting. These include lower tail estimates on the smallest singular value of rectangular matrices and upper tail estimates on the smallest singular value of square matrices.

To obtain a distance theorem for inhomogenous rectangular matrices we introduce a new tool for this new general ensemble of random matrices, *Randomized Logarithmic LCD*, a natural combination of the *Randomized LCD*, used in study of smallest singular values of inhomogenous square matrices [6], and of the *Logarithmic LCD*, used in the study of no-gaps delocalization of eigenvectors [13] and the smallest singular values of Hermitian random matrices [19].

1 Introduction

Given a random matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ one can ask numerous questions about its typical behavior and structure. In non-asymptotic random matrix theory a well-studied problem has been that of determining the behavior of the smallest singular value

$$\sigma_n := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \|Ax\|_2$$

For many years sharp estimates for σ_n in the case of square matrices were limited to that of the standard gaussian matrix, due to Szarek [15] and Edelman [2]. Subsequent work by Tao and Vu [16], Rudelson [9] and finally Rudelson and Vershynin [10],[11] established the correct behavior for square random matrices with subgaussian entries. Beyond the result itself, the tools developed in these works have been used to prove numerous other quantitative statements about random matrices. Two such examples include upper tail estimates on intermediate singular values [20],[8] and delocalization of eigenvectors [13],[12],[7], all results being for i.i.d. subgaussian matrices.

Of course there many situations where random matrix models arise where the matrix is neither i.i.d nor subgaussian. Such situation arise in applied mathematics, such as in the analysis of random networks and in numerical linear algebra. Once a result has been established for the sub-gaussian case it is natural to try to extend the result to a wider class of random matrix models. Since [10] estimates for the smallest singular value have been extended to various random matrix models. We recommend the recent survey of Tikhomirov [18] on quantitative invertibility in the non-Hermitian setting for more information on these types of results.

Alas, it is an ever growing challenge to generalize results about random matrices to these more relaxed settings. One such result is the following: a small ball estimate for the distance between a random vector and a subspace. More precisely, we define the Levy concentration function for a random vector $Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\mathcal{L}(Z, t) := \sup_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{P}(\|Z - v\|_2 \leq t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Given a random vector X and a subspace H we are interested in an upperbound on the quantity $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t)$. Here $P_{H^\perp} X$ is understood to mean the orthogonal projection of X onto the orthogonal complement of H . This type of result, known as a *distance theorem*, is a crucial element in most proofs of optimal lower tail estimates for the smallest singular value [17],[11],[5],[6],[1], upper tail estimates on the smallest singular value [17], upper tail estimates on intermediate singular values [8],[20], and the condition number [4], and the delocalization of eigenvectors [13],[12],[7]. In [10],[11] Rudelson and Vershynin showed that when $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has co-dimension d , $1 \leq d \leq \lambda n$ and X and H is spanned by a random matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$ whose entries are i.i.d. subgaussian, then one has

$$\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d}) \leq (Ct)^d + e^{-cn}. \quad (1)$$

Here $c, C, \lambda > 0$ depend only on the subgaussian moments of the entries. In [5] Livshyts showed that the same estimate could be obtained with the subgaussian entry assumption replaced with all entries satisfying a uniform anti-concentration estimate and A consisting of i.i.d. rows.

In the proofs of previous distance theorems [10],[11],[5], [6] the upperbound on $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t)$ is derived from the lack of ‘arithmetic structure’ of the unit normals of H . In [10],[11] this lack of arithmetic structure was quantified by a vector having large *essential least common denominator* which, for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $L, u > 0$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{LCD}_{L,u}(v) := \inf\{\theta > 0 : \text{dist}(\theta v, \mathbb{Z}^n) < \min(u\|\theta v\|_2, L)\}. \quad (2)$$

As an initial observation one can show that, under all previously mentioned settings, unit normals of H are ‘incompressible’ (see Definition 2.4 and Lemma 2.6) with exponentially small failure probability. A result like Proposition 2.5 then gives an initial lower bound on 2. By exploiting the fact that the unit normals are orthogonal to many independent random vectors, the initial lower bound can be boosted to a much larger quantity.

In [19],[13] the LCD variant *logarithmic least common denominator* was introduced which, for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $L, u > 0$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{LogLCD}_{L,u}(v) := \inf\left\{\theta > 0 : \text{dist}(\theta v, \mathbb{Z}^n) < L\sqrt{\log_+\left(\frac{u\|\theta v\|_2}{L}\right)}\right\}. \quad (3)$$

This variant greatly simplifies the argument for deriving upper bounds on $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t)$ from large LCD in the case where H^\perp is multi-dimensional. However, both 2 and 3 are difficult to work with in the inhomogenous setting when the entries X or the entries of a column of A are not i.i.d.. Consequently in [6] Livshyts, Tikhomirov, and Vershynin introduced the LCD variant *randomized least common denominator* which, for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $L, u > 0$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{RLCD}_{L,u}^X(v) := \inf\{\theta > 0 : \mathbb{E}\text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star v), \mathbb{Z}^n) < \min(u\|\theta v\|_2^2, L^2)\}. \quad (4)$$

Using this variant they proved a distance theorem in the inhomogenous setting where H has co-dimension 1 and proved optimal lower tail estimates for the smallest singular value of square inhomogenous matrices. Given their result a natural continuation would be to prove a distance theorem in the inhomogenous setting when H has co-dimension greater than 1. We manage to prove a distance theorem with the same assumption on X and H as in [6] but with co-dimension of H now being between 1 and $O(n/\log n)$.

Theorem 1.1 (Distance Theorem). *There exists $c = c(b, K), C = C(b, K), \lambda = \lambda(b, K)$ such that the following is true: Let $1 \leq d \leq \lambda n/\log(n)$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector whose entries satisfy Assumption 2.1 and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$ be a random matrix satisfying Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.3. Furthermore assume that X and A are independent. Let H denote the subspace spanned by the columns of A . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d}) \leq (Ct)^d + e^{-cn}.$$

For technical reasons we are unable to extend the result to co-dimension up to $O(n)$. However, for certain applications we have in mind, such as lower tail estimates for the smallest singular values estimates of inhomogenous rectangular matrices, Theorem 1.1 will suffice. Indeed, once d is of order $n/\log n$ comparatively simpler tools can be used to obtain said estimates. Other applications of Theorem 1.1 we have in mind include determining upper tail estimates for the smallest singular value, intermediate singular values, and condition number, all in the inhomogenous setting. Lastly, we note that Rudelson and Vershynin proved a distance theorem in the setting

where H is an arbitrary subspace and the entries of X are merely independent and satisfy $\mathcal{L}(X_i, 1) \leq b$ for some $b \in (0, 1)$, but with a weaker small ball estimate [14].

Because we seek a distance theorem in the inhomogenous setting with H having co-dimension greater than 1 we define the LCD variant *Randomized Logarithmic LCD* 7, which for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $L, u > 0$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v) = \inf \left\{ \theta > 0 : \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star v), \mathbb{Z}^n) < L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|\theta v\|_2}{L} \right) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

In Section 3 we prove a number of facts about Randomized Logarithmic LCD that will be necessary in proving Theorem 1.1. These include the quantity's stability under perturbations of v , a general lower bound on LCD when v is incompressible, and that LCD is decreasing in the parameter L .

Turning to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we follow a two step approach. The first step is to show that that $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d})$ is large when all vectors in $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$ have large LCD. The second step is to show all vectors $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$ indeed have large LCD. To implement the first step using randomized logarithmic LCD we mirror the corresponding argument appearing in [13] for logarithmic LCD. In particular, we first derive a small ball estimate for the product of a matrix and a random vector in terms of the randomized logarithmic LCD of the matrix (see 8 in Definition 3.2) and then deduce a small ball estimate for $P_{H^\perp} X$ in terms of the smallest LCD of any unit normal of H . This is done in Section 4 and only slight modifications to the argument in [13] are required. Implementing the second step is really the crux of the matter. To do so we adopt the proof strategy used in [6] to prove that the unit normals of H , with co-dimension 1, have large randomized LCD. Suppose our goal is to prove that LCD of all vectors in $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$ is at least \bar{D} . Then our strategy is as follows:

1. Prove that the LCD of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \mathcal{H}^\perp$ is at least $m > 0$.
2. Prove that the LCD of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \mathcal{H}^\perp$ is at least \bar{D} or less than m .

Let us first discuss 1. Recall that we may assume that the unit normals are incompressible. Therefore by Proposition 2.5 a large portion (in the ℓ_2 sense) of the entries of a unit normal are close to 0. This means $\text{dist}(\theta v, \mathbb{Z}^n)$ is of order $\|\theta v\|_2$ when θ is not too large which gives a lower bound on the original LCD and the logarithmic LCD. A similar argument provides a lower bound for randomized LCD 4. In the inhomogenous setting this gives a lower bound of order $n/\sqrt{\text{Var}|X|}$. Note, however, that the trivial lowerbound on randomized logarithmic LCD is L/u . Since a non-trivial upper bound on $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t)$ requires that L scale with \sqrt{d} (see Proposition 4.1, Corollary 4.3) the previous lower bound in the inhomogenous setting is not sufficient when $\text{Var}|X|$ is at least order n^2/d , which can be much smaller than what is required in Assumption 2.2. To get around this we use the probabilistic method to show that for every unit normal there exists a choice of L of order \sqrt{d} such that the randomized logarithmic LCD is at least $L/u + cn/\sqrt{\text{Var}|X|}$, for $c > 0$ an absolute constant. Using a rounding argument one can further restrict each vector's choice of L to a small set. Once the LCD of each unit normal, with respect to its choice of L , is shown to be large we can deduce that all unit normals have large LCD with respect to a common choice of L .

In contrast to 1, the proof of 2 is rather involved. Roughly speaking, we first decompose the subset of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$ into level sets according to the quantity $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n-d} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{A_i}(v)$ and use a careful recursive argument to show that the level sets in the range $[m, \bar{D})$ are empty. This information is then used to show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v)$ is at least \bar{D} for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$. Although the guarantee is stronger than necessary, it allows us to exploit the fact that v is in the nullspace of A^\top . To prove that each level set is empty we rely on a special type of 'lattice-like' ε -net over $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$. More concretely, if the level set contains v then some net point y has $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n-d} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{A_i}(y)$ in the same level set as v with $\|A^\top y\|_2$ being small, which is unlikely. We remark that this type of net first appeared in the work of Livshyts [5] and was a key ingredient in the proof of 2 in [6].

Because of the technical nature of the proof of 2 we defer most of the discussion to Section 6. Here, however, we mention the following: It turns out that important properties of our ε -net (see Lemma 5.11 and Theorem 6.5) only hold when $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n-d} \mathbb{E}\|A_i\|_2^2$ is sufficiently small. Unless d is small, assuming that the columns of A satisfy Assumption 2.2 is insufficient. In this case we cannot use the fact that H^\perp is contained in the nullspace of A^\top in our recursive argument. Instead we notice that H contains the span of the submatrix Q , where Q consists of all columns of A_i for which $\mathbb{E}\|A_i\|_2^2$ is of order n^2/d . When d is large the condition is stronger than

Assumption 2.2. By Assumption 2.3 and Markov's inequality it follows that $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n - Cd)}$, for an appropriate $C \geq 1$. Since Q only has $(C - 1)d$ fewer columns than A and H^\perp is contained in the nullspace of Q^\top , we are able to use Q in place of A in the proof of 2. This is in contrast to the corresponding proof in [6], where the fact that H^\perp is contained in the nullspace A^\top is used directly.

We end this section with an outline of the rest of the paper. In Section 2 we discuss some preliminaries and list the assumptions of the inhomogenous setting. In Section 3 we introduce the Randomized Logarithmic LCD and prove the relevant properties of it. In Section 4 we reduce the problem of proving a small ball estimate for $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X)$ to showing that the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of the unit normals of H are large. In Section 5 we state the known discretization results necessary to define the ε -net and prove its various properties. Finally in Section 6 we prove that the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of the unit normals of H are large and deduce Theorem 1.1 as a corollary. We conclude the section with a discussion on the difficulties with extending Theorem 1.1 to larger co-dimension.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper the following parameters are reserved for defining certain assumptions:

$$b \in (0, 1), \quad K \geq 1.$$

These parameters are used to define various assumptions we will consider in the inhomogenous setting.

Assumption 2.1 (uniform anti-concentration). ξ is a random variable satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}(\xi, 1) := \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{P}[|u - \xi| \leq 1] \leq b.$$

Assumption 2.2 (Second moment). $Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a random vector satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}|Z|^2 \leq rn^2, \tag{6}$$

where $r = r(b, K)$ is sufficiently small.

Assumption 2.3 (Hilbert-Schmidt norm). $B \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w}$ is a random matrix satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[\|B\|_{\text{HS}}^2] \leq Khw.$$

These assumptions will only hold for the random variables, vectors and matrices which we declare them to hold for. On the other hand, we will always assume that the entries of a random vector and the entries of a random matrix are independent. We now recall the concept of a decomposition of the sphere into ‘compressible’ and ‘incompressible’ vectors. This notion was introduced by Rudelson and Vershynin in [10], although a similar idea was used in an earlier work by Litvak, Pajor, Rudelson and Tomasz-Jaegerman[4].

Definition 2.4. Let $\delta, \rho \in (0, 1)$. We say that a vector $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is (δ, ρ) -compressible if there there exists a vector $y \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ with at most δn non-zero entries for which

$$\text{dist}(x, y) \leq \rho$$

We write $Comp(\delta, \rho)$ to denote the set of (δ, ρ) -compressible vectors and define $Incomp(\delta, \rho) := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus Comp(\delta, \rho)$.

There are two important properties about the sphere decomposition that we will use. The first property is that incompressible vectors contain a large subset of coordinates that are ‘spread’.

Proposition 2.5. [11] *Let $x \in Incomp(\delta, \rho)$. Then there exists a subset of indices $J \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of size $|J| \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho^2\delta n$ such that*

$$\frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2n}} \leq |x_j| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta n}} \quad \text{for all } j \in J.$$

The second property is that rectangular random matrices usually send compressible vectors to non-small vectors. In particular compressible vectors avoid the matrix's null space.

Lemma 2.6. [5] Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be a random matrix satisfying Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.3 and $N \geq n$. Then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{x \in \text{comp}(\delta, \rho)} |Mx| \leq c\sqrt{N} \right) \leq 2e^{-cn}$$

where $\delta, \rho \in (0, 1), c > 0$ depend only on K, b .

So as to simplify our arguments we will fix the choice of δ and ρ , as guaranteed by Lemma 2.6, for the remaining sections. For notation purposes we say $x \lesssim y$ if $x \leq Cy$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on K and b . We say $x \gtrsim y$ if $y \lesssim x$ and we say $x \approx y$ if $x \lesssim y \lesssim x$. Note that since δ, ρ depend only on K and b Proposition 2.5 implies that $|x_j| \approx 1/\sqrt{n}$ for all $j \in J$. Lastly, when speaking about a certain LCD variant we may simply refer to it as LCD when the variant being discussed is clear from the context.

3 Randomized Logarithmic LCD

We recall the definition of Randomized LCD as introduced in [6].

Definition 3.1. [6] Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector, let $L > 0, u \in (0, 1)$ and let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a deterministic vector. The Randomized LCD is defined as

$$\mathbf{RLCD}_{L,u}^X(v) := \inf \{ \theta > 0 : \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\theta v \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) < \min(L^2, u\|\theta v\|_2^2) \}.$$

Randomized LCD is a variant of the essential LCD 2 first introduced in the seminal work of Rudelson and Vershynin on the smallest singular value of square matrices [10]. Because we seek a distance theorem between a random vector and a random subspace with co-dimension greater than 1 we introduce the Randomized Logarithmic LCD, a variant of the Logarithmic LCD 3, first used in the study of no-gaps delocalization of eigenvectors of random matrices [13] and the invertibility of symmetric random matrices [19].

Definition 3.2 (Randomized Logarithmic LCD). Let $L > 0, u \in (0, 1)$, let $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be a random vector and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be a random matrix.

1. Given a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we defined the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of v as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v) &:= \inf \left\{ \theta > 0 : \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\theta v \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^N) < L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|\theta v\|_2}{L} \right) \right\}, \\ \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^A(v) &:= \min_i \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{A_i}(v). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

2. Given a matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$, we define the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of V as

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(V) := \inf \left\{ \|\theta\| > 0 : \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(V^\top \theta \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) < L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|V^\top \theta\|_2}{L} \right) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

3. Given a subspace $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ we define the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of E as

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(E) := \inf_{v \in E \cap \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v). \quad (9)$$

We will only use vector and subspace versions of the Randomized Logarithmic LCD to show that an upper bound on $\mathcal{L} \left(P_{H^\perp X}, t\sqrt{d} \right)$ can be obtained from a lower bound on $\inf_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v)$. We thus defer relevant lemmas about these quantities to Section 4. For now we will show that the vector version of Randomized Logarithmic LCD satisfies a number of properties. In particular we will show that the LCD of a vector is stable under perturbations, that every incompressible vector has a non-trivial LCD lower bound, and that the LCD is decreasing in the parameter L . We will also show that the Randomized Logarithmic LCD can be lower bounded by the Randomized LCD, for an appropriate choice of parameters.

3.1 Stability of Randomized Logarithmic LCD

Our proof of stability of Randomized Logarithmic LCD is analogous to the the proof of stability of Randomized LCD from [6].

Lemma 3.3 (Stability of Randomized Logarithmic LCD for vectors). *Let $L > 0, u \in (0, 1)$ and let $X \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be a random vector satisfying Assumption 2.1. Let $0 < r_1 < r_2$ be positive parameters and let x, y be points in the annulus $r_2 B_2^n \setminus r_1 B_2^n$. Fix any tolerance level $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying*

$$\varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(X) \leq \frac{1}{8} \frac{L^2}{D^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|}{L} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $D = \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(x)$. Then whenever $\|x - y\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ we have

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2L, 2u(r_2/r_1)^2}^X(y) \leq D \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, (u/2)(r_1/r_2)^2}^X(y). \quad (11)$$

In addition if $D' \leq D$ and

$$\varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(X) \leq \frac{1}{8} \frac{L^2}{(D')^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|D'x\|}{L} \right), \quad (12)$$

then

$$D' \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, (u/2)(r_1/r_2)^2}^X(y). \quad (13)$$

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}|x \star \bar{X} - y \star \bar{X}|^2 = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{X}_i^2 (x_i - y_i)^2 < \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}|\bar{X}|^2 = 2\varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(X).$$

We first prove 11. Since $\mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\theta(v \star \bar{X})) - L^2 \log_+(u \|\theta v\|_2/L)$ is continuous in θ the definition of Randomized Logarithmic LCD implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(Dx \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) = L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|\theta x\|_2}{L} \right).$$

By triangle inequality and the identity $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(Dy \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) &\leq 2 \text{dist}^2(Dx \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) + 2 \text{dist}^2(Dx \star \bar{X}, Dy \star \bar{X}), \\ &\leq 2L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right) + 2D^2 \mathbb{E}|x \star \bar{X} - y \star \bar{X}|, \\ &\leq 2L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right) + 4D^2 \varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(X), \\ &\leq 2L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right) + 4D^2 \frac{1}{8} \frac{L^2}{D^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right), \\ &\leq \frac{5}{2} L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right), \\ &\leq \frac{5}{2} L^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{\frac{u(r_2/r_1)}{(r_2/r_1)} \|Dy\|_2}{L} \right), \\ &\leq (2L)^2 \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{\frac{2u(r_2/r_1)}{(r_2/r_1)} \|Dy\|_2^2}{(2L)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By inspection of Definition 3.2 we conclude that

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2L, 2u(r_2/r_1)^2}^X(y) \leq D.$$

Similarly, by triangle inequality and the identity $(a + b)^2 \geq a^2/2 - 2b^2$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\text{dist}^2(Dy \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}^2(Dx \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) - 2\text{dist}^2(Dx \star \bar{X}, Dy \star \bar{X}), \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right) - 2D^2 \mathbb{E}^2 |x \star \bar{X} - y \star \bar{X}|, \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right) - 2D^2 \frac{1}{8} \frac{L^2}{D^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right), \\
&= \frac{1}{4} L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|Dx\|_2}{L} \right), \\
&\geq \left(\frac{L}{2} \right)^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u(r_1/r_2) \|Dy\|_2}{(L/2)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By inspection of Definition 3.2 we conclude that

$$D \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, (u/2)(r_1/r_2)}^X(y).$$

We now prove 13. By inspection of Definition 3.2 we have, for $0 \leq \theta \leq D' \leq D$, that

$$\mathbb{E}\text{dist}^2(D'x \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) \geq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u \|\theta x\|_2}{L} \right).$$

The proof of 13 is now exactly the same as the proof of the lowerbound for 11. \square

3.2 Lower bounds on Randomized Logarithmic LCD

We will give two types of lower bounds on $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v)$. The first type of lower bound is analogous to the lower bound for Randomized LCD appearing in [6]. This bound is of order $n/\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}$. Although generally worse than the second type of lower bound it does not depend on the parameter L , and the bound is as strong as the second type when $\text{Var}(X)$ is of order n^2/L^2 . The second type of lower bound is of the form $L/u + cn/\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}$, where c is a positive constant. This lower bound is useful for the case where $\text{Var}(X)$ is of order at least n^2/L^2 . That said it requires that L be changed up to a constant multiplicative factor.

Lemma 3.4 (lowerbound). *There exists $n_0 = n_0(b, K), u = u(b, K), c = c(b, K)$ such that the following is true: Let $n \geq n_0, L > 0$, and let $x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho)$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying Assumption 2.1. Then*

1.

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(x) \geq \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}. \quad (14)$$

2. If $L^2 \lesssim n$ then there exists $\tilde{L} \in [L, 2L]$ such that

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}. \quad (15)$$

3. Furthermore, if X satisfies Assumption 2.2 and $L \geq 1$ then \tilde{L} can be chosen to come from

$$\mathcal{N} := \{L, 2L\} \cup \{L + i/10 : 1 \leq i \leq \lfloor 10L \rfloor\}. \quad (16)$$

Proof. We first prove 14. Let S_1 denote the set of indices guaranteed by Proposition 2.5. Since X satisfies Assumption 2.1 and $|S_1| \gtrsim n$, Chernoff's inequality implies that, with exponentially small failure probability, at least $b|S_1|/2$ indices of S_1 satisfy $|\bar{X}_i| \geq 1$. Furthermore a double application of Markov's inequality implies that, with failure probability at most $1/100$, at most $b|S_1|/4$ indices of S_1 satisfy $|X_i|^2 \gtrsim \text{Var}(X)/|S_1|$. Taking n_0 sufficiently large we conclude that, with failure probability at most $2/100$, S_1 contains a subset S_2 such that $|S_2| \gtrsim n$ and

$$i \in S_2 \implies 1 \leq |\bar{X}_i| \lesssim \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)/n}.$$

Since S_2 is a subset of S_1 it follows that

$$i \in S_2 \implies \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \lesssim |\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i| \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}{n}.$$

Furthermore for $0 \leq \theta \lesssim \frac{n}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}$ and $i \in S_2$ one has $|\theta(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)| \leq 1/2$. In particular the closest integer to $\theta(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ is 0. Letting $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ denote the expectation conditioned on the existence of S_2 it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(\text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n)) \geq \frac{98}{100} \bar{\mathbb{E}}(\text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n)) \gtrsim \frac{49}{50} \cdot n \cdot \frac{\theta^2}{n} \gtrsim \theta^2.$$

Since the inequality

$$\theta^2 \gtrsim L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L} \right)$$

automatically holds for $\theta \leq L/u$ and also holds for $\theta > L/u$ and for $u \lesssim 1$, we conclude that 14 holds for some $c > 0, u \in (0, 1)$, depending only on b and K .

We now prove 15. Pick \tilde{L} uniformly from $[L, 2L]$ and independently of X . We first bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X_i \cdot x), \mathbb{Z}).$$

In the remaining part of the proof we adopt the following convention: If S is a subset of \mathbb{R} we will write $|Sz|$ to denote the Lebesgue measure of S scaled by z . Let $I := \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]$. Note that all indices i of S_2 satisfy

$$|I(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)| \leq \left| \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \cdot (\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i) \right| \leq 1/10,$$

by taking c sufficiently small. We now case on $|(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)|$.

1. $|(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)| \leq 4/10$: In this case $|2(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)| \leq 8/10$. Therefore the distance between $I(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ and \mathbb{Z} is achieved by either the left or right endpoint of $I(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$. In particular the distance is at least $\min(1/10, |(\tilde{L}/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)|)$, so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X_i \cdot x), \mathbb{Z}) \geq \min \left(\frac{1}{100}, L^2(\bar{X}_i \cdot x)^2 \right) \geq \min \left(\frac{1}{100}, \frac{L^2 \rho}{2n} \right).$$

2. $|(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)| > 4/10$: Let $J := [(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i), 2(L/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)]$. If $(\tilde{L}/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ is not contained in $\cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k - 2/10, k + 1/10)$ then the distance between $I(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ and \mathbb{Z} is at least $1/10$. Since J is an interval it is easy to see that

$$|J \cap (\cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k - 2/10, k + 1/10))^c| \geq (7/10)(|J| - 3/10).$$

Since $(\tilde{L}/u)(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ is distributed uniformly over J we conclude that with probability at least

$$\frac{(7/10)(|J| - 3/10)}{|J|} \geq \frac{(7/10)(1/10)}{4/10} = \frac{7}{40},$$

the distance between $I(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)$ and \mathbb{Z} is at least $1/10$, so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X_i \cdot x), \mathbb{Z}) \geq \frac{7}{40} \cdot \frac{1}{100} = \frac{7}{4000}.$$

Since the cases constitute all possible values of $|L(\bar{X}_i \cdot x_i)|$ we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\bar{L}}{u}, \frac{\bar{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X_i \cdot x_i), \mathbb{Z}) \geq \min \left(\frac{7}{4000}, \frac{L^2 \rho}{2n} \right).$$

Since $|S_2| \geq \frac{b}{8} \rho^2 \delta n$ an application of linearity of expectation gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\bar{L}}{u}, \frac{\bar{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n) \geq \sum_{i \in S_2} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{L}} \cdot \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\bar{L}}{u}, \frac{\bar{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X_i \cdot x_i), \mathbb{Z}), \quad (17)$$

$$\geq \min \left(\frac{7bn\rho^2\delta}{32000}, \frac{L^2 b \rho^3 \delta}{16} \right), \quad (18)$$

$$\gtrsim \min(n, L^2) \gtrsim L^2, \quad (19)$$

Tonelli's theorem then gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{L}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\bar{L}}{u}, \frac{\bar{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n) = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{L}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\bar{L}}{u}, \frac{\bar{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n) \gtrsim L^2.$$

Therefore, by the Probabilistic Method, there exists a deterministic choice of $\tilde{L} \in [L, 2L]$ for which

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n) \geq CL^2,$$

where C depends only on b and K . Observe note that

$$\max_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\tilde{L}}{u}, \frac{\tilde{L}e^c}{u} \right]} \tilde{L}^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{\tilde{L}} \right) \leq c\tilde{L}^2 \leq 4cL^2.$$

Taking when $c = C/4$ we have that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\tilde{L}, u}^X(x) \geq \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \min \left(\frac{cn}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}, \frac{\tilde{L}(e^c - 1)}{u} \right) \geq \frac{\tilde{L}}{u} + \frac{c'n}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}$, where $0 < c' \leq c$. We thus conclude 15.

We now prove 16. Take ℓ to be the smallest element in \mathcal{N} such that $\tilde{L} \leq \ell$. Since $2L \in \mathcal{N}$, ℓ is well defined. Since X satisfies Assumption 2.2 r can be taken sufficiently small so that $c'n/(2\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}) \geq 1/(10u) \geq (\ell - L)/u$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{X}} \min_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\ell}{u}, \frac{\ell}{u} + \frac{c'n}{2\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}} \right]} \text{dist}^2(\theta(X \star x), \mathbb{Z}^n) \geq C\ell^2, \quad \max_{\theta \in \left[\frac{\ell}{u}, \frac{\ell e^c}{u} \right]} \ell^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{\ell} \right) \leq c\ell^2 \leq 4cL^2.$$

Therefore $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L', u}^X(x) \geq \frac{\ell}{u} + \frac{c''n}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}$ where $0 < c'' \leq c'$. We thus conclude 16. \square

3.3 Randomized Logarithmic LCD decreases with L

For a certain technical argument that we will use later on (see Proposition 6.2) we will need to lower bound $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{1, u}^X(v)$ by $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^X(v)$ when $L \geq 1$. We show that such a lower bound holds so long as $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^X(v)$ is sufficiently large.

Lemma 3.5 (Comparing RLCDs with different parameters). *Let $L_1, L_2 > 0$ with $L_1 \geq L_2$ and $u \in (0, 1)$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector and let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If*

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2, u}^X(x) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{L_1}{u}, \frac{1}{u} \cdot \frac{L_1^{L_1^2/(L_1^2 - L_2^2)}}{L_2^{L_2^2/(L_1^2 - L_2^2)}} \right\},$$

then

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_1, u}^X(x) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2, u}^X(x).$$

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_1,u}^X(x) = \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2,u}^X(x)$ whenever $L_1 = L_2$. Therefore we restrict to the case of $L_1 > L_2$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_1,u}^X(x) > \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2,u}^X(x)$. By the definition of Randomized Logarithmic LCD it follows that there exists $\theta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2,u}^X(x) \leq \theta < \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_1,u}^X(x)$ and

$$L_1^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\theta(x \star X), \mathbb{Z}^n) < L_2^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right).$$

In particular

$$L_1^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right) < L_2^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right).$$

By assumption $\theta \geq L_1/u$ and so

$$L_1^2 \log \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right) < L_2^2 \log \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right).$$

Observe now that

$$\theta \geq \frac{1}{u} \cdot \frac{L_1^{L_1^2/(L_1^2-L_2^2)}}{L_2^{L_2^2/(L_1^2-L_2^2)}} \quad (20)$$

$$\implies (\theta u)^{L_1^2-L_2^2} \geq \frac{L_1^{L_1^2}}{L_2^{L_2^2}}, \quad (21)$$

$$\implies \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right)^{L_1^2} \geq \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right)^{L_2^2}, \quad (22)$$

$$\implies L_1^2 \log \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right) \geq L_2^2 \log \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right). \quad (23)$$

Therefore

$$L_1^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right) < L_2^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_2} \right) \leq L_1^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L_1} \right),$$

which is a contradiction. Thus no such θ exists and we conclude that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_1,u}^X(x) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L_2,u}^X(x)$. \square

Remark 3.6. Note that Lemma 3.5 implies that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(x) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{1,u}^X(x)$ whenever $L > 1$ and $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{1,u}^X(x) \geq \frac{1}{u} \cdot L^{L^2/(L^2-1)}$.

3.4 Randomized LCD lowerbounds Randomized Logarithmic LCD

Finally, we show that Randomized LCD is a lower bound on Randomized Logarithmic LCD for an appropriate choice of LCD parameters and range of θ . This allows us to deduce certain facts about Randomized Logarithmic LCD that were originally prove in [6] for Randomized LCD (see for instance Theorem 5.9 and Corollary 5.10).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector, let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be deterministic, let $a, L > 0$ and let $u, t \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $u^2 \leq 2t$. Then*

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v) \geq \min \left(\mathbf{RLCD}_{a\sqrt{n},t}^X(v), \frac{L}{u\|v\|} e^{n(a/L)^2} \right)$$

Proof. By inspection of Definition 3.1 and Definition 3.2 it suffices to show that

$$\min(a^2n, t\|\theta v\|^2) \geq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|\theta v\|}{L} \right),$$

for $0 < \|\theta v\| \leq (L/u)e^{an/L^2}$. For ease of notation we will write θ in place of $\|\theta v\|$ for the remainder of the proof. Since the right hand side is 0 for $0 < \theta \leq L/u$ we may further assume that $\theta > L/u$. We now case on θ :

- $\theta \geq a\sqrt{n/t}$: In this case $\min(a^2n, t\theta^2) = a^2n$. Note now that

$$\theta \leq (L/u)e^{n(a/L)^2} \implies e^{n(a/L)^2} \geq \frac{\theta u}{L} \implies a^2n \geq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{L} \right).$$

- $\theta < a\sqrt{n/t}$: In this case $\min(a^2n, t\theta^2) = t\theta^2$. Consider now the function $f(\theta) := t\theta^2 - L^2 \log_+(\theta u/L)$. Clearly $f(L/u) = bL^2/u^2 > 0$ and $f'(\theta) = 2t\theta - L^2/\theta$ on $(L/u, \infty)$. Since f' is increasing on this interval its infimum over the interval is

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow L/u^+} f'(\theta) = \frac{2tL}{u} - uL = \frac{L}{u} (2t - u^2) \geq 0.$$

Therefore $f(\theta) > 0$ on $(L/u, \infty)$ and we conclude that $t\theta^2 \geq L^2 \log_+(\theta u/L)$. □

4 Distance to general subspaces

The distance theorem gives an upper bound on the small ball probability for the distance between a random vector X and a subspace H . Recall that to prove the distance theorem our first objective is to show that an upper bound on $\mathcal{L}\left(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d}\right)$ follows from a lower bound on $\inf_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(v)$. To do this we will mirror the arguments appearing in Section 7 of [13]. The starting point is the observation that, conditioned on the matrix A , $P_{H^\perp} X$ is the product of a deterministic matrix P_{H^\perp} with a random vector X . Write $P_{H^\perp} = M^\top M$. Using a well-known anti-concentration tool, Esseen's inequality [3], we will upper bound $\mathcal{L}\left(MX, t\sqrt{d}\right)$ via a lower bound on $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(M)$.

Proposition 4.1 (Small ball probabilities via Randomized Logarithmic LCD). *Consider a random vector $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ that satisfies Assumption 2.1. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$. Take $t_0 := \sqrt{d}/D(M)$ where $D(M) := \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^\xi(M)$. Then whenever $4L^2 \geq d + 2$ we have*

$$\mathcal{L}(M\xi, t\sqrt{d}) \leq \frac{(CL/u)^d}{\det(MM^\top)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\max\{t, t_0\}}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^d,$$

where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant.

We now discuss the proof strategy.

Proof. We recall the d -dimensional version of Esseen's inequality [3]. For random vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and parameter $t > 0$ the small ball probability $\mathcal{L}(Y, \sqrt{d})$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(Y, \sqrt{d}) \leq C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} |\phi_Y(\theta)| d\theta, \tag{24}$$

where $\phi_Y(\theta) := \mathbb{E} \exp(2\pi i \langle \theta, Y \rangle)$ and $C_1 > 0$ is some absolute constant. Taking $Y = t^{-1}M\xi$, by linearity of expectation we may write

$$\langle \theta, Y \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^n t^{-1} \langle \theta, M_k \rangle \xi_k.$$

Since ξ has independent coordinates we may further write

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(2\pi i \langle \theta, Y \rangle)] = \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(2\pi i t^{-1} \langle \theta, M_k \rangle \xi_k)] = \prod_{k=1}^n \phi_k(t^{-1} \langle M_k, \theta \rangle),$$

where $\phi_k(s) := \mathbb{E} \exp(2\pi i s \xi_k)$. Note that we may write $|\phi_k(\tau)|^2 = \mathbb{E} \cos(2\pi \tau \overline{\xi_k})$ where $\overline{\xi_k}$ denotes the symmetrization of ξ_k . This follows from the fact that

$$|\phi_k(\tau)|^2 = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\cos(2\pi i \tau \xi_k)]^2 + \mathbb{E}[\sin(2\pi i \tau \xi_k)]^2} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \cos(2\pi i (\xi_k - \tilde{\xi}_k))} = \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \cos(2\pi i \tilde{\xi}_k)},$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_k$ is an independent copy of ξ_k . Since $x \leq \exp(-(1-x^2)/2)$ on $[0, \infty)$ and $|\phi_k(\tau)|$ is non-negative we may write

$$|\phi_k(\tau)| \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(1 - |\phi_k(\tau)|^2)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathbb{E} \cos(2\pi\tau\bar{\xi}_k))\right).$$

Furthermore

$$\mathbb{E}[1 - \cos(2\pi\tau\bar{\xi}_k)] \geq 8 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(\tau\bar{\xi}_k, \mathbb{Z})^2],$$

which itself follows from the fact that $1 - \cos(2\pi x) \geq 8 \min_{q \in \mathbb{Z}} |x - q|^2$ on all of \mathbb{R} . Plugging in this upper bound on $|\phi_Y(\theta)|$ to 24 yields

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} |\phi_Y(\theta)| \, d\theta &\leq C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp\left(-4 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(t^{-1}\langle M_k, \theta \rangle \bar{\xi}_k, \mathbb{Z})^2]\right) \, d\theta, \\ &= C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp(-4 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(t^{-1}(M^\top \theta) \star \bar{\xi}, \mathbb{Z}^n)^2]) \, d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Assume $t \geq \sqrt{d}/D(M)$. Then $D(M) \geq t^{-1}\sqrt{d}$. Since the integral is taken over $B(0, \sqrt{d})$ and $t^{-1}(M^\top \theta) = M^\top(\theta/t)$, 8 of 3.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp(-4 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(t^{-1}(M^\top \theta) \star \bar{\xi}, \mathbb{Z}^n)^2]) \, d\theta &= C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp(-4 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{dist}((M^\top \theta/t) \star \bar{\xi}, \mathbb{Z}^n)^2]) \, d\theta, \\ &\leq C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp\left(-4L^2 \cdot \log_+\left(\frac{u\|M^\top \theta\|_2}{tL}\right)\right) \, d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

We now estimate the integral. Let $M = U\Sigma V^\top$ be a singular value decomposition of M . Then $M^\top \theta = V\Sigma U^\top \theta$. Since the integral is over $B(0, \sqrt{d})$ by taking an appropriate change of basis we may replace $U^\top \theta$ with θ . Furthermore $\|V\Sigma\theta\|_2 = \|\Sigma\theta\|_2$ so we may drop V all together. Applying the u -substitution $z := u\Sigma\theta/Lt$ and writing $\det \Sigma = \det(MM^\top)^{1/2}$ and extending the domain to all of \mathbb{R}^d we may further simplify the integral,

$$C_1^d \int_{B(0, \sqrt{d})} \exp\left(-4L^2 \cdot \log_+\left(\frac{u\|M^\top \theta\|_2}{tL}\right)\right) \leq \frac{(C_1 L t / u)^d}{\det(VV^\top)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(-4L^2 \log_+\|z\|_2) \, dz.$$

We now split the integral,

$$\int_{B(0, \sqrt{m})} \exp(-4L^2 \log_+\|z\|_2) \leq \int_{B(0,1)} 1 \, dz + \int_{B(0,1)^c} \|z\|_2^{-4L^2} \, dz.$$

To deal with the second term we will use polar coordinates. Take $q := 4L^2$. By assumption $q \geq m + 2$. Writing z in polar coordinates with $dz = r^{d-1} dr d\phi$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B(0,1)^c} \|z\|_2^{-q} \, dz &= \int_1^\infty \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} r^{-q} r^{d-1} \, dr d\phi, \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_1^\infty r^{-q} r^{d-1} \, dr d\phi, \\ &= \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} \int_1^\infty r^{d-q-1} \, dr, \\ &= \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)} \cdot \frac{1}{q-d-1} \leq \left(\frac{C_2}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^d, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is some absolute constant. Since the volume of the unit ball is at most $\left(\frac{C_3}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^d$, for some absolute constant C_3 , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}(M\xi, t\sqrt{d}) \leq \frac{(C_1 L t / u)^d}{\det(VV^\top)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{C_2 + C_3}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^m = \frac{(CL/u)^d}{\det(VV^\top)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{d}}\right)^d,$$

Where $C := C_1(C_2 + C_3)$. Since $\mathcal{L}(M\xi, t\sqrt{d})$ is a decreasing function of t we conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}(M\xi, t\sqrt{d}) \leq \frac{(CL/u)^d}{\det(MM^\top)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\max\{t, t_0\}}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^d.$$

□

The next step is to show the upper bound on $\mathcal{L}(MX, t\sqrt{d})$ can be derived from $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ instead of $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(M)$. We do this by showing that The Randomized Logarithmic LCD of a subspace and of its projection matrix are the same.

Proposition 4.2 (Randomized Logarithmic LCD of matrices vs subspaces). *Let $L > 0, u \in (0, 1)$ and let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector. Let E be a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . Let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ satisfy $UU^\top = I_d$ and $\text{Im}(U^\top) = E$. Then*

1.

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(E) = \inf \left\{ \|v\|_2 \in E : \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(v \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) \leq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|v\|_2}{L} \right) \right\} \quad (27)$$

2.

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(E) = \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(U). \quad (28)$$

Proof. We first prove 27. Note that $v \in E \iff v/\|v\| \in E$ and that for any $v \in \mathbb{E}$ one has

$$\mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(v \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) \leq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|v\|}{L} \right) \iff \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(\|v\| \cdot \frac{v}{\|v\|} \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) \leq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|v\| \frac{\|v\|}{\|v\|}}{L} \right). \quad (29)$$

The result then follows by inspection of the definitions of 9 and 7 and observing that both sides of 27 are equivalent by 29. We now prove 28. Note that for every $v \in E$ there is a choice of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $U^\top x = v$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2(v \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) < L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|v\|}{L} \right) \iff \mathbb{E} \text{dist}^2((U^\top x) \star \bar{X}, \mathbb{Z}^n) < L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{u\|U^\top x\|}{L} \right). \quad (30)$$

Since $\|U^\top x\| = \|x\|$ we have that $\|v\| = \|x\|$. The result then follows by inspection of the definitions of 9 and 8 and observing that both sides of 28 are equivalent by 27 and 30. □

To conclude, we simply need to show that the upper bound obtained for $\mathcal{L}(MX, t\sqrt{d})$ can be used to upper bound $\mathcal{L}(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d})$.

Corollary 4.3 (Small ball probabilities for projections). *Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying Assumption 2.1 and let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a d dimensional subspace. Let P_E denote the orthogonal projection matrix of E . Write $t_0 := \sqrt{d}/D(E)$ where $D(E) := \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(E)$. Let $C > 0$ be the absolute constant from Proposition 4.1 and let L, u satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 4.1. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}(P_E \xi, t\sqrt{d}) \leq (CL/u)^d \left(\frac{\max\{t, t_0\}}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^d. \quad (31)$$

Proof. Since P_E is the orthogonal projection matrix onto E there exists $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ satisfying $UU^\top = I_d, U^\top U = P_E$. Since U^\top is an isometry from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^n it preserves the small ball probability of an m -dimensional random vector. Therefore

$$\mathcal{L}(P_E \xi, t\sqrt{d}) = \mathcal{L}(U^\top U \xi, t\sqrt{d}) = \mathcal{L}(U^\top \xi, t\sqrt{d})$$

By 28 of Proposition 4.2 we have that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(U) = \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(E)$. The result then follows from Proposition 4.1 by taking $M := U^\top$. □

5 Discretization

Recall that to prove the distance theorem our second objective is to show that the LCD of H^\perp is large. This is typically done by using a special type of ε -net over the level sets, in terms of LCD, of H^\perp . This net should approximate H^\perp in terms of distance and be sufficiently small. It can then be shown that the existence of such a net implies that the LCD of H^\perp is large. In [11] the ε net only approximated distance in terms of operator norm (i.e. $\|A(x-y)\|_2 \leq \|A\| \|x-y\|_2$). This sufficed since A being made up of independent sub-gaussian entries meant that $\|A\|$ was, with exponentially small failure probability, of order \sqrt{n} . In this case for every $x \in H^\perp$ and its closest net point y the quantity $\|A(x-y)\|_2$ is of order $\varepsilon\sqrt{n}$, which is sufficient to achieve the implication. In the case where the entries of A are heavy-tailed the operator norm can be prohibitively large, making net-approximations in terms of the operator norm inapplicable. In the work of Livshyts [5], a ‘lattice-like’ net was introduced that could control $\|A(x-y)\|_2$ in terms of the regularized Hilbert Schmidt norm (see 34 and Lemma 5.6). Since regularized Hilbert Schmidt norm is typically of the same order as Hilbert Schmidt norm (see Lemma 5.7), Assumption 2.3 makes it again possible to assume that $\|A(x-y)\|_2$ is of order $\varepsilon\sqrt{n}$. This same type net was again used in [6]. We will essentially be using the same net as in [6] but with properties now being proven in terms of Randomized Logarithmic LCD. We now recall the relevant discretization results from [6] that we will use.

Definition 5.1. [Lattice] Given a weight vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a resolution parameter ε we consider the set of approximately unit vectors whose entries are quantized at scale $\alpha_i\varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$. In particular

$$\Lambda_\alpha(\varepsilon) := \left(\frac{3}{2}B_2^n \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_2^n \right) \cap \left(\frac{\alpha_1\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \frac{\alpha_n\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{Z} \right). \quad (32)$$

Lemma 5.2. [Rounding][6] Fix any given accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, weight vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be a (deterministic) matrix. Then for every unit vector $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ there exists a lattice point $y \in \Lambda_\varepsilon(\alpha)$ for which

$$\|x-y\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad \|M(x-y)\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \|M_i\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (33)$$

Next, given $\kappa > \varepsilon$ we define

$$\Omega_\kappa := \{ \alpha \in [0, 1]^n : \prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \geq \kappa^{-n} \}.$$

Lemma 5.3. [6] For any $\kappa > e$ there exists $C > 0$ and a set $\mathcal{F} \subset \Omega_{e\kappa}$ of size $(C \log \kappa)^n$ such that the following is true: For every $\beta \in \Omega_\kappa$ there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ for which $\alpha \leq \beta$ coordinate wise.

Definition 5.4. [6] Assuming the dimension n fixed, for the parameters $\kappa > e$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we shall use the notation

$$\Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{F}} \Lambda_\alpha(\varepsilon),$$

where \mathcal{F} is the set guaranteed by Lemma 5.3

Remark 5.5. [6] For every $\kappa > e$ there exists $C_\kappa > 0$ for which $|\Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon)| \leq (C_\kappa/\varepsilon)^n$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

Next we recall the regularized Hilbert-Schmidt norm, introduced in [5].

$$\mathcal{B}_\kappa(M) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \|M_i\|_2^2 : \alpha \in \Omega_\kappa \right\} \quad (34)$$

Lemma 5.6. [6] Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$, $\kappa > e$ and A an $N \times n$ matrix. then for every unit vector $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ there exists $y \in \Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon)$ for which

$$\|x-y\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad \|M(x-y)\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\mathcal{B}_\kappa(M)} \quad (35)$$

Lemma 5.7. [6] *Let A be a random matrix with independent columns. Then for any $\kappa > e$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa(M) \geq 2\mathbb{E}\|M\|_{HS}^2) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{-2n}$$

So far the results stated show how the net may be a good approximation of H^\perp in terms of distance. We now address how the net size scales with the level set of H^\perp it approximates. Given a random matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$, and parameters $L, D > 0, u \in (0, 1)$ we write

$$\begin{aligned} S_{L,u,D}^M &:= \left\{ x \in \frac{3}{2}B_2^n \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_2^n : \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^M(x) \in [D, 2D] \right\}, \\ \tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M &:= \left\{ x \in \frac{3}{2}B_2^n \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_2^n : \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2L,72u}^M(x) \leq 2D, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2,u/72}^M(x) \geq D \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The definitions of $S_{L,u,D}^M$ and $\tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M$ are chosen so as to coincide with Lemma 3.3 with $r_1 = 1/2, r_2 = 3$. For our purposes one should imagine that a point $v \in H^\perp$ in the level set $S_{L,u,D}^M$ is being approximated by some net point contained in $\tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M$.

Lemma 5.8. *Fix any $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.1), \kappa > e, L > 0, u \in (0, 1)$. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be a random random matrix with independent columns, and whose rows M^i satisfy*

$$\varepsilon^2 \text{Var}(M^i) \leq \frac{n}{8} \frac{L^2}{D^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right).$$

Then with probability at least $1 - (\kappa/\sqrt{2})^{-2n}$ for every $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap S_{L,u,D}^M$ there exists $y \in \Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon) \cap \tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M$ such that

$$\|x - y\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad \|M(x - y)\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbb{E}\|M\|_{HS}^2)^{1/2} \quad (37)$$

Proof. We follow the proof strategy from [6]. By Lemma 5.7 the event

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\mathcal{B}_\kappa(M) < 2\mathbb{E}\|M\|_{HS}^2\}$$

occurs with probability at least $1 - \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{-2n}$. Conditioned on \mathcal{E} , by Lemma 5.6 for every $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap S_{L,u,D}^M$ there exists $y \in \Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon)$ satisfying 35 with $\sqrt{\mathcal{B}_\kappa(M)} \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|M\|_{HS}^2}$. In addition, by our assumption on the rows M and the fact that $\|x\| = 1$ we may apply Lemma 3.3 with $r = \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}, r_1 = 3, r_2 = 1/2$ to get

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2L,72u}^M(y) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^M(x) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2,u/72}^M(y)$$

Since $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^M(x) \in [D, 2D]$ we conclude that $y \in \tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M$. \square

Lemma 5.8 implies that an ε -net made from sets of the form $\Lambda^\kappa(\varepsilon)$ can approximate level sets of H^\perp in terms of distance and LCD. We now want a way to control the cardinality of the ε -net. To that end consider the following set of lattice points:

$$\Lambda := \left(\frac{3}{2}B_2^n \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \#\{i : |x_i| \geq \frac{\rho}{8\sqrt{n}}\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho^2\delta n\} \right) \cap \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{Z} \right) \quad (38)$$

In [6] the following theorem was proven regarding the randomized LCD of a typical lattice point of 38.

Theorem 5.9 (Most lattice points are unstructured). *There exist $n_0 = n_0(b, k)$ and $u = u(b, K) \in (0, 1/4)$ such that the following holds. Let $n \geq n_0$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying Assumption 2.1 and the constraint*

$$\mathbb{E}|X|^2 \leq \frac{1}{8}(1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2.$$

Fix numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ satisfying $6^{-n} \leq \lambda_i \leq 0.01$ and let W be a vector uniformly distributed on the set Λ defined in 38. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_W \left\{ \mathbf{RLCD}_{\gamma\sqrt{n},u}^X(W) < \min_i 1/\lambda_i \right\} \leq (C\gamma)^{cn},$$

where $C, c > 0$ are constants depending only on b and K . In particular given $U \geq 1$ there exists $\gamma = \gamma(b, K)$ such that $(C\gamma)^{cn}$ may be replaced with U^{-n} .

Combining Lemma 3.7 and Theorem 5.9 we obtain a version of Theorem 5.9 in terms of Randomized Logarithmic LCD.

Corollary 5.10. *There exist $n_0 = n_0(b, k)$ and $u = u(b, K) \in (0, 1/4)$ such that the following holds. Let $n \geq n_0$ and $L > 0$. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying Assumption 2.1 and the constraint*

$$\mathbb{E}|X|^2 \leq \frac{1}{8}(1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2.$$

Fix numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ satisfying $6^{-n} \leq \lambda_i \leq 0.01$ and let W be a vector uniformly distributed on the set Λ defined in 38. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_W \left\{ \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(W) < \min \left(\frac{2L}{u} e^{n(\gamma/L)^2}, \min_i 1/\lambda_i \right) \right\} \leq (C\gamma)^{cn},$$

where $C, c > 0$ are constants depending only on b and K . In particular given $U \geq 1$ there exists $\gamma = \gamma(b, K)$ such that $(C\gamma)^{cn}$ may be replaced with U^{-n} .

Recall that $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp$ likely contains no compressible vectors (see Proposition 2.5). Therefore using Lemma 5.8 and Corollary 5.10 we can prove the existence of the desired ε -net over a given level set $S_{L,u,D}^M \cap (\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap H^\perp)$.

Lemma 5.11. *Given $U \geq 1$ there exist $n_0 = n_0(b, K), u = u(b, K), \gamma = \gamma(U, b, K)$ such that the following holds: Let $L \geq 1, 0 < D < \bar{D} \leq (2L/u)e^{n(\gamma/L)^2}$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/\bar{D}$. Let $n \geq n_0$ and let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be a random matrix satisfying Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.3 and whose rows M^i satisfy the constraint*

$$\mathbb{E}|M^i|^2 \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{8}(1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2, \frac{nL^2 \bar{D}^2}{8 D^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right), \frac{nL^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{L} \right) \right\}$$

Then there exists constants $C, c > 0$ and a non-random set $\Lambda \subseteq \frac{3}{2}B_2^n \setminus \frac{1}{2}B_2^n$ having the following properties:

1. $\Lambda \subset \tilde{S}_{L,u,D}^M$
2. With probability at least $1 - e^{-n}$, for every point x in $S_{L,u,D}^M \cap \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho)$ there exists a point y in Λ such that $\|x - y\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$ and $\|M(x - y)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{N}$.
3. If $x \in S_{L,u,D}^M \cap \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho)$ and $\|x - y\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$ then

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{M^i}(x) \geq \bar{D} \implies \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^i}(y) \geq \bar{D}$$

for every matrix row M^i .

4. The number of points in Λ is at most $(U\varepsilon)^{-n}$

The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.1 in [6].

Proof. Redefine ε as $\varepsilon := \min(\varepsilon, \rho/2)$. Let $\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ be the set defined in Definition 5.4 with $\kappa = 5$. Recall that by Remark 5.5 $|\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)| \leq (C/\varepsilon)^n$, where C is an absolute constant. Take u from Theorem 5.9. By assumption

$$\mathbb{E}|M^i|^2 \leq \frac{nL^2 \bar{D}^2}{8 D^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right) \implies \varepsilon^2 \text{Var}|M^i|^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \frac{nL^2}{D^2} \cdot \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right).$$

Thus the rows of M satisfy 10. It follows from 11 of Lemma 5.8 that with probability at least $1 - (5/\sqrt{2})^{-2n} \geq 1 - e^{-n}$ that $\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ is a set satisfying the first two properties. By assumption

$$E|M^i|^2 \leq \frac{nL^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{L} \right) \implies \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \text{Var}|M^i|^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} \frac{L^2}{\bar{D}^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{L} \right).$$

Therefore the rows of M satisfy 12. It follows by 13 of Lemma 3.3 that $\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ is a set satisfying the third property. Finally take $\Lambda \subset \Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ to be the set of all points in $\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ that approximate some point $S_{L,u,D}^M \cap \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho)$

in terms of distance. Since $\rho/\sqrt{2n} - \rho/(2\sqrt{n}) \geq \rho/(8\sqrt{n})$, Proposition 2.5 implies that Λ is contained in a set of the form 38. By assumption

$$\mathbb{E}|M^i|^2 \leq \frac{1}{8}(1-b)\delta\gamma^2n^2.$$

Since all elements in Λ satisfy $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2L,72u}^M(y) \leq 2D \leq (2L/u)e^{(\gamma/L^2)n}$ and come from a set of the form defined in 38, by Theorem 5.9 at most $(U')^{-n}$ fraction of elements in $\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)$ are in Λ , where U goes to infinity as γ goes to 0. Thus by Remark 5.5 we have

$$|\Lambda| \leq |\Lambda^5(\varepsilon)|U'^{-n} \leq (C_5/(U'\varepsilon))^n,$$

Taking $U' = C_5U$ with an appropriate choice of γ we conclude that Λ satisfies the fourth property. \square

6 The Distance Theorem

6.1 $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large

With Lemma 5.11 in hand we are ready to prove that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large (see Theorem 6.5). Much of this section is analogous to Section 5 of [6]. To begin we recall the following ‘tensorization’ lemma.

Lemma 6.1. [11] *Let $t \in (0, 1)$ and $C \geq 1$. Let Y_1, \dots, Y_d be a collection of independent random variables such that for every random variable and $t \geq t_0$ one has $\mathbb{P}(|Y_i| \leq t) \leq pt$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^d |Y_i|^2 \leq t^2d\right) \leq (Cpt)^m,$$

where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant.

We now discuss the proof strategy for Theorem 6.5. In order to show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large we would first like to show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^A(H^\perp)$ is large and then use this information to show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large. This will follow from a proof by contradiction. Assuming $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^A(H^\perp)$ is large, if $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is small then there must exist $x \in H^\perp$ for which $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{A|X}(x)$ is small (say in some level set $[D, 2D]$). Here $A|X$ denotes the matrix obtained by appending X to A as its top row. Using the net from Definition 5.11 and the fact that $A^\top x = 0$ it will then follow that there exists a net point $y \in \Lambda$ such that $\|A^\top y\|_2 \leq \|(A|X)^\top(x - y)\|_2$, where the latter quantity is known to be not too large. On the other hand because $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^A(H^\perp)$ is large the properties of Λ and Proposition 4.1 and will imply a lower bound on $\|A_i^\top y\|_2$ for every column A_i of A . Lemma 6.1 will then imply that $\|A^\top y\|_2$ is likely large, giving a contradiction. The proof that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^A(H^\perp)$ is large will follow in a similar way using a recursive argument on the rows of A^\top .

There are, however, a few problems with this particular argument. Firstly, in order to guarantee $\|A^i y\|_2$ is likely not too small it is necessary to use Proposition 4.1 with $L = 1$. Since L will be chosen to be of order \sqrt{d} we will have to appeal to Remark 3.6, which requires a sufficiently large lower bound on $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{A_i}(y)$. The lower bound obtainable through Lemma 3.4 would then require that the variance of A_i be of order at most n^2/d , which does not necessarily hold for all rows of A . Therefore we will have to restrict our attention to rows of A with sufficiently small variance. The corresponding matrix Q will thus need enough columns so as to guarantee that $\|Q^\top y\|_2$ is likely large. Luckily, because we assume that A satisfies Assumption 2.3, this will turn out to be so. The second issue is more subtle. Since X only satisfies Assumption 2.2, 15 of Lemma 3.4 will only give a non-trivial lower bound on $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\tilde{L},u}^X(x)$, where \tilde{L} belongs to \mathcal{N} from 16 and depends on x . In particular the contradiction argument will not directly show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large. Instead, we will partition H^\perp as $H^\perp = \cup_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} H_\ell^\perp$, with H_ℓ^\perp consisting of all vectors with a non-trivial lower bound for parameter ℓ . We will then show that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^X(H_\ell^\perp)$ is large for every $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ and then use the fact that $\mathcal{N} \subseteq [L, 2L]$ to deduce that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^X(H^\perp)$ is large.

Proposition 6.2. *There exists $n_0 = n_0(b, K), u = u(b, K), \gamma = \gamma(b, K)$ such that the following holds: Let $\lambda > 0, n \geq n_0$ and let $d \leq \lambda n / \log n$. Pick $L \in [2\sqrt{d}, 4\sqrt{d}]$. Let $0 < D \leq \bar{D} \leq \frac{2L}{u} e^{(\gamma/L)^2 n}$. Let $M = \mathbb{R}^{(n-d+1) \times n}$ be a random matrix whose rows satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}|M^i|^2 \leq \min \left\{ (1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2/8, \frac{nL^2 \bar{D}^2}{8 D^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right), \frac{nL^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{L} \right) \right\},$$

Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.3. Furthermore suppose all rows of $M^{(1)}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^i}(x) \geq \frac{72}{u} \cdot (L/2)^{(L/2)^2 / ((L/2)^2 - 1)},$$

when x is incompressible. Then

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \cap S_{L, u, D}^M \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \bar{D}] \leq 2e^{-n}, \quad (39)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Take n_0, u, γ, U from Lemma 5.11 with γ and U to be determined later. Observe the following: Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a deterministic incompressible vector satisfying $|z| \geq 0.5$. By assumption all rows M^i of $M^{(1)}$ satisfy $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^i}(z) \geq \frac{72}{u} \cdot (L/2)^{(L/2)^2 / ((L/2)^2 - 1)}$. By Lemma 3.5 it follows that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^i}(z) \leq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{1, u/72}^{M^i}(z)$. Therefore $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{1, u/72}^{M^{(1)}}(z) \geq \bar{D}$. Applying Proposition 4.1 with $d = 1, M = z, \xi = Y$ gives

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\langle M^i, z \rangle \leq \frac{1}{D} \right] \leq \frac{72C/u}{D|z|} \lesssim \frac{1}{D}.$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 over the rows of $M^{(1)}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| M^{(1)} z \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-d}}{D} \right] \leq \left(\frac{R}{D} \right)^{n-d}, \quad (40)$$

where $R > 0$ depends only on b and K . Let Λ be the lattice subset guaranteed by Lemma 5.11 with respect to M with $\varepsilon = 1/\bar{D}$. Define the event

$$\mathcal{E}_D := \{ \exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \cap S_{L, u, D}^M \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \bar{D} \}$$

Note that if \mathcal{E}_D occurs then there exists $y \in \Lambda$ for which

$$\|x - y\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{D\sqrt{n}}, \quad |M(x - y)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-d}}{D}.$$

Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.5 and the fact that $Mx = 0$ then imply that

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^{(1)}}(y) \geq \bar{D}, \quad |M^{(1)}y| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n-d}}{D}.$$

Since Λ is deterministic and all vectors z in Λ satisfy $|z| \geq 0.5$ we may apply 40 to a union bound over all vectors in Λ approximating x to conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_D] \leq e^{-n} + |\Lambda| \cdot (R/\bar{D})^{n-d} \leq e^{-n} + U^{-n} \cdot \bar{D}^n \cdot (R/\bar{D})^{n-d} \leq e^{-n} + \bar{D}^d (R/U)^n,$$

From the upper bound on d and the definition of \bar{D} we have that $\bar{D}^d \leq (8\sqrt{d}/u)^d e^{(\gamma^2/4)n} \leq e^{\gamma^2 n/4 + C\lambda n}$, for some absolute constant $C > 1$. Since U goes to infinity as γ goes to 0 we may take γ sufficiently small so that $(R/U)^n < e^{-\gamma^2 n/4 - C\lambda n}$, in which case the result follows. \square

Note that Lemma 5.11 bounds the probability that the Randomized Logarithmic LCD of a vector lies in the interval $[D, 2D]$. By taking a suitable dyadic decomposition of a range $[\underline{D}, \bar{D}]$ and applying Proposition 6.2 to each interval, the result can be extended to a range.

Corollary 6.3. *There exists $n_0 = n_0(b, K), u = u(b, K), \gamma = \gamma(b, K)$ such that the following holds: Let $\lambda > 0, n \geq n_0$ and let $0 \leq d \leq \lambda n / \log n$. Pick $L \in [2\sqrt{d}, 4\sqrt{d}]$. Let $0 < \underline{D} \leq \overline{D} \leq \frac{2L}{u} e^{(\gamma/L)^2 n}$. Let $M = \mathbb{R}^{(n-d+1) \times n}$ be a random matrix whose rows satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}|M^i|^2 \leq \min \left\{ (1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2/8, \frac{nL^2 \overline{D}^2}{8 \underline{D}^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right), \frac{nL^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\overline{D}u}{L} \right) \right\},$$

Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.3. Furthermore suppose all rows of $M^{(1)}$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L/2, u/72}^{M^i}(x) \geq \frac{72}{u} \cdot (L/2)^{(L/2)^2 / ((L/2)^2 - 1)},$$

when x is incompressible. Then

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^M(x) \in [\underline{D}, 2\overline{D}], \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \overline{D}] \leq e^{-cn}, \quad (41)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Take n_0, u, γ from Proposition 6.2. Note that for every $p > 0$ the function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{x^2} \log(px)$ is unimodal on the interval $(1/p, \infty)$. In particular over any interval in $(1/p, \infty)$ the function is minimized at an endpoint. Hence

$$\min_{D \in [\underline{D}, \overline{D}]} \frac{nL^2 \overline{D}^2}{8 D^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right) = \min \left\{ \frac{nL^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\overline{D}u}{L} \right), \frac{nL^2 \overline{D}^2}{8 \underline{D}^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{L} \right) \right\}.$$

Since $|\overline{D} - \underline{D}| \leq \frac{L}{u} e^{(\gamma/L)^2 n} \leq e^{cn}$ for a sufficiently small constant c one can construct a dyadic decomposition of the range as $[\underline{D}, \overline{D}] = \cup_{i=1}^{\tau} [T_i, T_{i+1}]$ where $\tau \leq n$ and $T_{i+1}/T_i \leq 2$ for each interval. By Proposition 6.2

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \cap S_{L, u, T_i}^M \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \overline{D}] \leq 2e^{-n},$$

for all i . Since $T_{i+1}/T_i \leq 2$ the event

$$\{\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^M(x) \in [\underline{D}, 2\overline{D}], Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \overline{D}\}$$

is contained in the event

$$\cup_{i=1}^{\tau} \{\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \cap S_{L, u, T_i}^M \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \overline{D}\}.$$

Taking a union bound we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^M(x) \in [\underline{D}, \overline{D}], Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^{M^{(1)}}(x) \geq \overline{D}] \leq 2ne^{-n}. \quad \square$$

Remark 6.4. Note that the same assumptions of Corollary 6.3 imply that

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^M(x) \in [\underline{D}, 2\overline{D}], Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u}^M(x) \geq \overline{D}] \leq e^{-cn}.$$

Theorem 6.5. *There exists $n_0 = n_0(b, K), \gamma = \gamma(b, K), u = u(b, K), \eta = \eta(b, K), \lambda = \lambda(b, K)$ such that the following holds: Let $n \geq n_0$ and $1 \leq d \leq \lambda n / \log n$. Take $L = 2\sqrt{d}$. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$ be a random matrix satisfying Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.3. Finally let $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector independent of A that satisfies Assumption 2.1, Assumption 2.2. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ and } A^\top x = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L, u/2}^X(x) \leq (L/u)e^{\gamma n/L^2}] \leq e^{-\eta n}$$

Proof. We pick u and n_0 as guaranteed by Corollary 6.3 and Remark 6.4. Take $C, c > 0$ from Corollary 5.10. We will take $\gamma, \eta \in (0, 1)$ to be sufficiently small constants, depending only on b and K . For convenience, given a matrix B and a row vector Y we write $B|Y$ to denote the matrix obtained by appending Y to the top of B . We will also take $\inf_x(\cdot)$ to mean an infimum taken over all (δ, ρ) incompressible vectors x satisfying $A^\top x = 0$. We begin by recording the following parameters:

$$\overline{D} := (L/u)e^{(\gamma/(2L))^{2n}} \quad (42)$$

$$\underline{D} := L/\eta \quad (43)$$

$$\underline{D}_\ell := \ell/u + 1/\eta \quad (44)$$

$$\tau_\ell := \min\{i \geq 0 : \overline{D} \cdot 2^{-i} \leq \underline{D}_\ell\} \quad (45)$$

$$D_{i,\ell} := \begin{cases} \overline{D} \cdot 2^{-i} & \text{for } 0 \leq i < \tau \\ \underline{D}_\ell & \text{for } i = \tau \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

$$q_{i,\ell} := \min\left(\frac{Kn^2\eta^4}{\ell^2}, \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \log_+\left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell}\right)\right) \quad (47)$$

$$Q_{i,\ell} := \text{sub matrix of } A^\top \text{ consisting of all rows with variance at most } q_{i,\ell} \quad (48)$$

$$\mathcal{N} := \{L, 2L\} \cup \{L + i/10 : 1 \leq i \leq \lfloor 10/L \rfloor\} \quad (49)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_\ell := \{x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^X(x) \geq \underline{D}_\ell\} \quad (50)$$

We claim that the following inequalities hold for all $0 \leq i \leq \tau$ and $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$:

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell/2,u/\tau_2}^{Q_{0,\ell}}(x) \geq \min\left(\underline{D}, \frac{1}{u}(\ell/2)^{(\ell/2)^2/((\ell/2)^2-1)}\right) \quad (51)$$

$$\#Q_{i,\ell} \geq n - n/\log(D_{i,\ell}) \quad (52)$$

$$\ell^2 \log_+\left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell}\right) \leq (1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2/8 \quad (53)$$

$$(1/D_{i,\ell})^2 \log_+\left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell}\right) \leq (1/\overline{D})^2 \log_+\left(\frac{\overline{D}u}{\ell}\right) \quad (54)$$

$$(1/\overline{D})^2 \log_+\left(\frac{\overline{D}u}{\ell}\right) \leq (1/\underline{D}_\ell)^2 \log_+\left(\frac{\underline{D}_\ell u}{L}\right) \quad (55)$$

Assuming such choice exists we proceed as follows: Our first step is to upper bound the probability that $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^Q(x) < \overline{D}$ for some $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$. To that end consider the following events:

$$\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} := \{\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^Q(x) \in [\underline{D}, D_{i,\ell}]\}, \quad (56)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell} := \{\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) \in [\underline{D}, D_{i,\ell}] \text{ and } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) \geq D_{i+1,\ell}\}, \quad (57)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,\ell} := \bigcup_{Y \in Q_{i,\ell} \setminus Q_{i+1,\ell}} \{\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } Mx = 0, \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}|Y}(x) \in [\underline{D}, D_{i,\ell}] \text{ and } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) \geq D_{i+1,\ell}\}. \quad (58)$$

We claim that $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} \subset \mathcal{E}_{i,\ell} \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,\ell} \cup \mathcal{H}_{i+1,\ell}$. To see this we case on whether or not $Q_{i,\ell} = Q_{i+1,\ell}$

1. $Q_{i,\ell} = Q_{i+1,\ell}$. If $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} \not\subset \mathcal{E}_{i,\ell}$ then either there exists incompressible x with $Mx = 0$ such that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) < D_{i+1,\ell}$ or all such x satisfy $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) > D_{i,\ell}$. Since the last case is disjoint from $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell}$ we conclude that $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} \subset \mathcal{H}_{i+1,\ell}$.
2. $Q_{i,\ell} \neq Q_{i+1,\ell}$. If $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} \not\subset \mathcal{F}_{i,\ell}$ then either there exists incompressible x with $Mx = 0$ such that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}}(x) < D_{i+1,\ell}$ or all such x satisfy $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i+1,\ell}|Y}(x) > D_{i,\ell}$ for any $Y \in Q_{i,\ell} \setminus Q_{i+1,\ell}$. However, this last case implies that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^Y(x) > D_{i,\ell}$ for all $Y \in Q_{i,\ell}$. Therefore 7 from Definition 3.2 would imply that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{i,\ell}}(x) > D_{i,\ell}$. Since the last case is disjoint from $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell}$ we conclude that $\mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} \subset \mathcal{H}_{i+1,\ell}$.

Since 51 implies that $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q_{0,\ell}}(x) \geq \underline{D}$ we have that $\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell}, \mathcal{F}_{i,\ell}, \mathcal{H}_{i,\ell} = \emptyset$ for $i > \tau$. Therefore $\mathcal{H}_0 \subset \cup_{0 \leq i \leq \tau} (\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell} \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,\ell})$ and so $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^Q(x) \geq \bar{D}$ whenever $\mathcal{H}_0 \subset \cup_{0 \leq i \leq \tau} (\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell} \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,\ell})$ is empty. By union bound, the probability that $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^X(x) < \bar{D}$ for any $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ is at most $\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} (\sum_{i=0}^{\tau} (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{F}_{i,\ell}]))$. To bound $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell}]$ and $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{F}_{i,\ell}]$ we will appeal to Corollary 6.3 and Remark 6.4. Note that 54 and 53 imply

$$\min \left\{ (1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2, \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \frac{D_{i,\ell}^2}{\underline{D}^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{Du}{\ell} \right), \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell} \right) \right\} = \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell} \right).$$

48,51 and 52 then imply that Corollary 6.3 holds when the matrix is $Q_{i+1,\ell}|Y$ (for any $Y \in Q_{i,\ell} \setminus Q_{i+1,\ell}$), the upper and lower limits on the Randomized Logarithmic LCD range are \underline{D} and $D_{i,\ell}$, and with the additional choice of parameters γ, u, n_0 . Similarly, 48,51,53, 52 and 54 imply that Corollary 6.4 holds when the matrix is $Q_{i,\ell}$, the upper and lower limits on the Randomized Logarithmic LCD range are \underline{D} and $D_{i,\ell}$, and with the additional choice of parameters γ, u, n_0 . Therefore

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\tau} (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{i,\ell}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{F}_{i,\ell}]) \right) \leq (20\sqrt{m} + 1) \cdot 2 \cdot 10ne^{-cn} \leq e^{-2\eta n}.$$

Our next step is to upper bound the probability that $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{P}_\ell, Mx=0} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q|X}(x)$ is at most \bar{D} for some $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$. As previously argued we may assume, with failure probability at most $e^{-2\eta n}$, that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^Q(x) > \bar{D}$ for every $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that 55 implies that

$$\min \left\{ (1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2, \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \frac{\bar{D}^2}{\underline{D}^2} \log_+ \left(\frac{D_\ell u}{\ell} \right), \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{\ell} \right) \right\} = \frac{n\ell^2}{8} \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{\ell} \right).$$

48,51,52 then imply that Corollary 6.3 holds with the matrix $Q|X$, the upper and lower limits on the Randomized Logarithmic LCD range are \underline{D}_ℓ and \bar{D} , and with condition $x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho)$ replaced with $x \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$. In particular the probability that $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{P}_\ell, Mx=0} \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^{Q|X}(x) < \bar{D}$ for some $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ is at most

$$e^{-2\eta n} + (20\sqrt{d} + 1)e^{-cn} \leq e^{-\eta n}.$$

The last step is to upper bound the probability that $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u/2}^X(x)$ is at most $(L/u)e^{\gamma n/d}$. Observe that for every $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ one has $\ell^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{\ell} \right) \geq L^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\theta u}{2L} \right)$ whenever $\theta \geq 2L/u$. In particular $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u/2}^X(x) \geq \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^X(x)$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$ and $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell,u}^X(x) \geq 2L/u$. Since 16 of Lemma 3.4 implies that $\text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \in \cup_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{P}_\ell$ and $\bar{D} \geq 2L/u$ for every $\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ we conclude that with failure probability $e^{-\eta n}$ one has $\inf_x \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{L,u}^Q(x) \geq (L/u)e^{\gamma n/(4d)}$.

We are now left with verifying 51, 52, 53, 54 and 55. By Lemma 3.4,47 and the 48 every row Y in $Q_{0,\ell}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{\ell/2,u/72}^Y(x) \geq \frac{c\ell}{\eta^2 \sqrt{K}}$$

Since $L \leq \ell \leq 2L$ we may take η sufficiently small so that 51 is satisfied. Next, since M satisfies Assumption 2.3 Markov's inequality implies that

$$\#Q_{i,\ell} \geq n - d - \frac{Kn(n-d)}{q_{i,\ell}} \geq n - d - \max \left(\frac{\ell^2}{\eta^4}, \frac{8Kn}{\ell^2 \log(D_{i,\ell}u/\ell)} \right).$$

Since $\log(D_{i,\ell}) = \log(\ell/u) + \gamma n/(4\ell^2)$ and $4d \leq \ell^2 \leq 8d$ we may take γ sufficiently small so that $n/\log(D_{i,\ell}) \geq d + \ell^2/\eta^4$. One may also take γ sufficiently small so that $\log(D_{i,\ell})/\log(D_{i,\ell}u/\ell) \leq \ell^2/16K$, in which case $n/\log(D_{i,\ell}) \geq d + 8Kn/(\ell^2 \log(D_{i,\ell}u/\ell))$. Therefore 52 is satisfied. Next note that

$$\ell^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{D_{i,\ell}u}{\ell} \right) \leq \ell^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\bar{D}u}{\ell} \right) \lesssim n \lesssim (1/8)(1-b)\delta\gamma^2 n^2.$$

Therefore 53 is satisfied by taking λ sufficiently small. Next note that the map $t \mapsto \frac{\log_+(t)}{t^2}$ is decreasing when $t \geq e$. Taking η sufficiently small so that $\underline{D} \geq eL/u$ we conclude that

$$\frac{(\overline{D}u/L)^2}{\log_+(\overline{D}u/L)} \leq \frac{(D_{i,\ell}u/L)^2}{\log_+(D_{i,\ell}u/L)}.$$

Rearranging the inequality, we conclude that 54 is satisfied. Finally, since $d \leq \lambda n / \log(n)$ we have that $\overline{D} \geq n^{\gamma/(8\lambda)}$. Since $\log(1+x) > \min(1, x/2)$ whenever $x > 0$ we we have that

$$\overline{D}^2 \log_+(D_{i,\ell}u/\ell) \geq n^{\gamma/(4\lambda)} \cdot \min\left(1, \frac{u\eta}{2\ell}\right) \geq \frac{n^{\gamma/(4\lambda)}u\eta}{2\ell}.$$

Since $\underline{D}_\ell^2 \log_+(\overline{D}u/\ell)$ is abounded above by a polynomial in n and ℓ we may take λ sufficiently small so $(n^{\gamma/(4\lambda)}u\eta)/(2\ell) \geq \underline{D}_\ell^2 \log_+(\overline{D}u/\ell)$ and rearranging the resulting inequality, we conclude that 55 is satisfied. \square

6.2 Proving the distance theorem

We now prove the distance theorem as a quick application of Corollary 4.3 and Theorem 6.5

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since H^\perp lies in the nullspace of A^\top by Lemma 2.6, with failure probability at most e^{-cn} , all unit vectors in H^\perp are incompressible. By Theorem 6.5 there exists choices of u, η, γ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists x \in \text{Incomp}(\delta, \rho) \text{ s.t. } A^\top x = 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2\sqrt{d}, u}^X(x) \leq (2\sqrt{d}/u)e^{\gamma n/d}] \leq e^{-\eta n}$$

In particular every vector $x \in H^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ satisfies $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2\sqrt{d}, u}^X(x) > (2\sqrt{d}/u)e^{\gamma n/d}$. By inspection of 9 from Definition 3.2 it follows that $\mathbf{RLogLCD}_{2\sqrt{d}, u}^X(H^\perp) > (2\sqrt{d}/u)e^{\gamma n/d}$. Since $4(2\sqrt{d})^2 = 16d \geq d + 2$ by Corollary 4.3 it follows that

$$\mathcal{L}\left(P_{H^\perp} X, t\sqrt{d}\right) \leq e^{-cn} + e^{-\eta n} + (2C\sqrt{d}/u)^d \left(\max\{\varepsilon/\sqrt{d}, (u/(2\sqrt{d}))e^{-\gamma n/d}\}\right)^d \quad (59)$$

$$\leq e^{-cn} + e^{-\eta n} + (2C\varepsilon/u)^d + C^d e^{-\gamma n} \quad (60)$$

$$= (\tilde{C}\varepsilon)^d + e^{\tilde{c}n} \quad (61)$$

where \tilde{C}, \tilde{c} depend only on K and b . \square

As a remark we note that the assumption

Remark 6.6. In the distance theorem for rectangular matrices that appears in [5] one can take $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$ such that $d = O(n)$. Recall that Theorem 1.1 requires that $d = O(n/\log n)$. The stronger restriction on d is used for the union bound argument in the proof of Proposition 6.2 and used to prove 55 in the proof of Theorem 6.5. The restriction in the proof of Theorem 6.5 can be overcome if one assumes a stronger variance constraint ($\text{Var}|X| \leq rn^{3/2}$) or if one can prove a lower bound on randomized logarithmic LCD stronger than 15 (the lower bound should be $c\tilde{L}/u$ where c is a positive constant greater than 1). The more serious bottleneck is from Proposition 6.2. The issue is that the bound on the size of the net in Proposition 6.2, $(\overline{D}/U)^n$, will not be sufficiently small. To see this note that in order to prove Proposition 6.2 using the net bound it is necessary that $\overline{D}^d U^{-n}$ be exponentially small (say at most c^{-n}). Therefore $d \leq n \log(cU) / \log(\overline{D})$. Since $\overline{D} = (2\sqrt{d}/u) \exp(\gamma n/d)$ this condition is weaker than $d \leq n \log(U) / \log(d) \implies d \log(d) \leq n \log(U)$, which fails to be true once d is much larger than $n/\log(n)$. It seems that one would require a stronger result than Theorem 5.9 or an alternative way to bound the net size. We note that in [11] the net used for their LCD variant 2 has size of order $(\overline{D}/\sqrt{n})^n$. Such a bound for our net would be sufficient.

As mentioned earlier, even without the distance theorem beyond this range one can recover smallest singular value estimates for inhomogenous matrices when $\lambda n / \log(n) \leq d \leq cn$. This fact will appear in a follow up work and the proof strategy is similar in spirit to the one employed in [4] for bounding the smallest singular value of rectangular subgaussian matrices of the same aspect ratio. In this way the distance theorem proven here is sufficient to recover smallest singular value estimates for inhomogenous rectangular matrices of all aspect ratio no smaller than 1.

References

- [1] Marcelo Campos, Matthew Jenssen, Marcus Michelen, and Julian Sahasrabudhe. The least singular value of a random symmetric matrix. In *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, volume 12, page e3. Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- [2] Alan Edelman. Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 9(4):543–560, 1988.
- [3] Carl gustav Esseen. On the kolmogorov-rogozin inequality for the concentration function. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 5:210–216, 1966.
- [4] Alexander E. Litvak, Alalin Pajor, Mark Rudelson, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann. Smallest singular value of random matrices and geometry of random polytopes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 195:491–523, 2005.
- [5] Galyna V Livshyts. The smallest singular value of heavy-tailed not necessarily iid random matrices via random rounding. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 145(1):257–306, 2021.
- [6] Galyna V. Livshyts, Konstantin Tikhomirov, and Roman Vershynin. The smallest singular value of inhomogeneous square random matrices, 2019.
- [7] Anna Lytova and Konstantin Tikhomirov. On delocalization of eigenvectors of random non-hermitian matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 177(1):465–524, 2020.
- [8] Hoi H Nguyen. Random matrices: Overcrowding estimates for the spectrum. *Journal of functional analysis*, 275(8):2197–2224, 2018.
- [9] Mark Rudelson. Invertibility of random matrices: norm of the inverse. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 575–600, 2008.
- [10] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. The littlewood-offord problem and invertibility of random matrices. *Advances in Mathematics*, 218:600–633, 06 2008.
- [11] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. The smallest singular value of a random rectangular matrix. 2008.
- [12] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Delocalization of eigenvectors of random matrices with independent entries. 2015.
- [13] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. No-gaps delocalization for general random matrices. 2015.
- [14] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Small ball probabilities for linear images of high-dimensional distributions. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(19):9594–9617, 2015.
- [15] Stanislaw J Szarek. Condition numbers of random matrices. *Journal of Complexity*, 7(2):131–149, 1991.
- [16] Terence Tao and Van H Vu. Inverse littlewood-offord theorems and the condition number of random discrete matrices. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 595–632, 2009.
- [17] Kateryna Tatarko. An upper bound on the smallest singular value of a square random matrix. *J. Complexity*, 48:119–128, 2018.
- [18] Konstantin Tikhomirov. Quantitative invertibility of non-hermitian random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.00601*, 2022.
- [19] Roman Vershynin. Invertibility of symmetric random matrices. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 44, 03 2014.
- [20] Feng Wei. Upper bound for intermediate singular values of random matrices. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 445(2):1530–1547, 2017.