# Optimal Transfer Learning for Missing Not-at-Random Matrix Completion

Akhil Jalan\* UT Austin akhiljalan@utexas.edu Yassir Jedra<sup>†</sup> MIT jedra@mit.edu

Arya Mazumdar<sup>‡</sup> UC San Diego arya@ucsd.edu

Soumendu Sundar Mukherjee<sup>§</sup> Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata ssmukherjee@isical.ac.in Purnamrita Sarkar¶
UT Austin
purna.sarkar@austin.utexas.edu

#### Abstract

We study transfer learning for matrix completion in a Missing Not-at-Random (MNAR) setting that is motivated by biological problems. The target matrix Q has entire rows and columns missing, making estimation impossible without side information. To address this, we use a noisy and incomplete source matrix P, which relates to Q via a feature shift in latent space. We consider both the *active* and passive sampling of rows and columns. We establish minimax lower bounds for entrywise estimation error in each setting. Our computationally efficient estimation framework achieves this lower bound for the active setting, which leverages the source data to query the most informative rows and columns of Q. This avoids the need for *incoherence* assumptions required for rate optimality in the passive sampling setting. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach through comparisons with existing algorithms on real-world biological datasets.

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Computer Science.

<sup>†</sup>LIDS.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Halıcıoğlu Data Science Institute & Department of Computer Science and Engineering.

<sup>§</sup>Statistics and Mathematics Unit (SMU).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>¶</sup>Department of Statistics and Data Sciences.

### 1 Introduction

We study transfer learning in the context of matrix completion, a fundamental problem motivated by theory [CR09, CT10] and practice [FVFW21, EC22, GYY<sup>+</sup>22].

A major body of work studies matrix completion in the Missing Completely-at-Random (MCAR) setting [JNS13, Cha15, CCF<sup>+</sup>20], where each entry is observed i.i.d. with probability p. A more general missingness pattern, known as Missing Not-at-Random (MNAR), considers an underlying propensity matrix  $p_{ij}$  so that the  $(i,j)^{th}$  entry is observed independently with probability  $p_{ij}$  [MC19, BC22]. Various MNAR models have been formulated based on missingness structures in panel data [ADSS23], recommender systems [JMPS23], and electronic health records [ZCL23].

Motivated by biological problems, we consider a challenging MNAR structure where most rows and columns of  $\widetilde{Q}$  (a noisy version of Q) are entirely missing. Specifically, we consider both the *active sampling* and *passive sampling* settings for  $\widetilde{Q}$ . In active sampling, a practitioner can choose rows R and columns C so that entries in  $R \times C$  are observed. This follows experimental design constraints in metabolite balancing experiments [CN00], marker selection for single-cell RNA sequencing [VG20], patient selection for companion diagnostics [HFSB22], and gene expression microarrays [HCMD21].

In the passive sampling setting, the practitioner cannot choose the experiments. We model this by sampling each row (column) with probability  $p_{\text{Row}}$  ( $p_{\text{Col}}$ ). For example, microarray analysis detects RNA segments corresponding to known genes by using chemical hybridization. However, rows may be missing because of a patient sample failing to hybridize, and columns may be missing because of gene probe failure [HCMD21]. For an illustration, see Figure 1.

This setting is inherently difficult because there are many entries (i,j) for which row i and column j are both missing in  $\widetilde{Q}$ . Clearly, even when Q is low-rank and incoherent, estimation is impossible without side information (Proposition 2.1). Transfer learning is necessary to achieve vanishing estimation error since no information about  $Q_{ij}$  is known. Hence, we consider transfer learning in a setting where one has a noisy and masked  $\widetilde{P}$  corresponding to a source matrix P. P and Q are related by a distribution shift in their latent singular subspaces (Definition 1.2), which is a common model in e.g. Genome-Wide Association Studies [MZGD24] and Electronic Health Records [ZCL23].

**Contributions.** Below, we list our contributions:

- (i) We obtain **minimax lower bounds** for entrywise estimation error for both the active (Theorem 2.2) and passive sampling settings (Theorem 2.12).
- (ii) We give a **computationally efficient** estimation framework for both sampling settings. Our procedure is **minimax optimal** for the active setting (Theorem 2.6). We also establish minimax optimality for the passive setting under *incoherence* assumptions (Theorem 2.9).
- (iii) We compare the performance of our algorithm with existing algorithms on **real-world datasets** for gene expression microarrays and metabolic modeling (Section 3).

**Setup.**  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  are the underlying source and target matrices, related by a distributional shift in their latent singular subspaces (Definition 1.2). We observe a noisy and possibly masked  $\widetilde{P}$ . The observation model of  $\widetilde{Q}$  depends on which setting below we consider:

(i) Active Sampling Setting. We have a budget of  $T_{\text{row}}$  rows and  $T_{\text{col}}$  columns. We select rows  $i_1, ..., i_{T_{\text{row}}}$  and columns  $j_1, ..., j_{T_{\text{col}}}$ , possibly at random, and with repeats allowed. Let  $n_{ij} \ge 0$  be the number of times both row i and column j are chosen. Then, we have  $n_{ij}$  independent noisy observations




Figure 1: The missingness matrix for gene expression levels on Day 2 of a sepsis study [PTN+13] shows entire rows (patients) and columns (genes) as missing, due to e.g. probe-target hybridization failure of the Illumina HT-12 gene expression microarray [HCMD21]. We mark missing entries as 0 (white) and present entries as 1 (blue). This motivates our missingness model (Eq. (1) and Eq. (2)).

 $\widetilde{Q}_{i,j}^{(1)},...,\widetilde{Q}_{i,j}^{(n_{ij})}$  such that:

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,j}^{(t)} = \begin{cases}
Q_{ij} + \zeta_{i,j}^{(t)} & \text{if } n_{ij} > 0, \\
\star & \text{otherwise,} 
\end{cases}$$
(1)

For  $\zeta_{i,j}^{(t)i.i.d} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_Q^2)$ .

(ii) Passive Sampling Setting. Instead of row and column budgets, there are probabilities  $p_{\text{Row}}, p_{\text{Col}} \in [0,1]$  corresponding to the random row mask  $\eta_1, ..., \eta_m \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Ber}(p_{\text{row}})$  and column mask  $\nu_1, ..., \nu_n \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Ber}(p_{\text{col}})$ . Entry (i,j) of Q is noisily observed if  $\eta_i = \nu_j = 1$ , and missing otherwise.

$$\tilde{Q}_{ij} = \begin{cases}
Q_{ij} + \zeta_{i,j} & \text{if } \eta_i = \nu_j = 1, \\
\star & \text{otherwise,} 
\end{cases}$$
(2)

where  $\zeta_{i,j} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_Q^2)$ .

## 1.1 Organization of the Paper

We give our main theoretical findings, including lower and upper bounds for the active and passive sampling settings, in Section 2. Next, we compare our methods against existing algorithms on real-world and synthetic datasets in Section 3. Finally, we discuss related work in Section 4 and conclusions in Section 5.

### 1.2 Notation and Problem Setup

We use lowercase letters a,b,c to denote (real) scalars, boldface x,y,z to denote vectors, and uppercase A,B,C to denote matrices. For  $n \ge 1$ , let  $[n] := \{1,...,n\}$ ,  $I_n$  be the identity matrix and  $(e_i)_{i=1}^n$  the

canonical basis vectors. Let  $a \lor b := \max\{a,b\}$  and  $a \land b := \min\{a,b\}$ . For multisets S,T and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , let  $A[S,T] \in \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times |T|}$  be the submatrix with row and column indices in S,T respectively, possibly with repeated entries from A. Let  $\otimes$  denote the tensor (Kronecker) product: for  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times t}$ ,  $(A \otimes B) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with  $(A \otimes B)_{i(r-1)+v,j(s-1)+w} = A_{ij}B_{vw}$ . We denote the Frobenius norm as  $||A||_{F}$ , max norm as  $||A||_{\max} := \max_{i,j} |A_{ij}|$ , and  $2 \to \infty$  norm as  $||A||_{2\to\infty} := \max_i ||A^T e_i||_2$ . Asymptotics  $O(\cdot), o(\cdot), \Omega(\cdot), \omega(\cdot)$  are with respect to  $m \land n$  unless specified otherwise. Recall that, for integer n,d such that  $d \le n$ , the Stiefel manifold  $\mathcal{O}^{n \times d}$  [Hat02] consists of all  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  such that  $U^T U = I_d$ .

We now define matrix incoherence, which measures how concentrated the entries of the singular vectors are.

**Definition 1.1** (Incoherence). Let M be an  $m \times n$  matrix of rank d, and write its SVD as  $M = U\Sigma V^{\top}$ . The left (resp. right) incoherence parameter of M is defined as  $\mu_U = m \|U\|_{2\to\infty}^2 / d$  (resp.  $\mu_V = n \|V\|_{2\to\infty}^2 / d$ ). The incoherence parameter of M is defined as  $\mu(M) := \max\{\mu_U, \mu_V\}$ .

We now formally define the distribution shift from P to Q, which generalizes the latent space rotation model [XJZ13, MZGD24].

**Definition 1.2** (Matrix Transfer Model). In the matrix transfer model, we have source and target matrices  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  such that:

- (i) (Low-Rank) Let  $P = U_P \Sigma_P V_P^{\top}$  for some  $d \leq m \wedge n$  where  $U_P \in \mathcal{O}^{m \times d}$ ,  $V_P \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times d}$ , and  $V_P \succeq 0$  is diagonal  $d \times d$ .
- (ii) (Distribution shift) There exist  $T_1, T_2, R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that  $Q = U_P T_1 R T_2^T V_P^T$ , and  $||T_i||_2 = O(1)$  for i = 1, 2.

We will define the parameter space as:

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,n,d} = \left\{ (P,Q) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : P = U \Sigma_P V^T, \\ Q = U T_1 R T_2^T V^T, U \in \mathcal{O}^{m \times d}, V \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times d}, \\ T_1, T_2, R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \Sigma_P \succeq 0 \right\}$$
(3)

Definition 1.2 requires that the d-dimensional features of rows and columns lie in a shared subspace for P,Q. Consider the matrix of associations between m genetic variants (e.g. the MC1R gene) and n phenotypes (e.g. dark hair) for different populations P,Q (e.g. England and Spain) [MZGD24]. The above model ensures that the latent feature vector for a genotype (resp. phenotype) in Q is a linear combination of those in P.

Note that  $T_1, T_2$  are not necessarily rotations and can even be singular. We set  $||T_i||_2 = O(1)$  to simplify theorem statements, but it is not required.

# 2 Main Findings

We first show that without transfer – side information from the source data P – completing the target matrix Q is impossible. To this end, we present a minimax lower bound on the expected prediction error. First, we define the parameter space of matrices with bounded incoherence:

$$\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(d)} = \left\{ Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \operatorname{rank}(Q) \le d, \\ \mu(Q) \le O\left(\log(m \vee n)\right) \right\}. \tag{4}$$

**Proposition 2.1** (Minimax Error of MNAR Matrix Completion Without Transfer). Let  $m,n \ge 1$  and  $d \le m \land n$ . Let  $\Psi = (Q,\sigma,p_{\text{Row}},p_{\text{Col}})$  where  $Q \in \mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(d)}$ ,  $\sigma^2 > 0$ , and  $p_{\text{Row}},p_{\text{Col}} \in [0,1]$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_{\Psi}$  denote the law of the random matrix  $\widetilde{Q}$  defined as in Eq. (2) with  $\sigma_Q = \sigma$ , and denote the expectation under this law as  $\mathbb{E}_{\Psi}$ . The minimax rate of estimation is:

$$\inf_{\hat{Q}} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(d)}} \inf_{\substack{P \text{Row} \leq .99\Psi \\ P \in \mathbb{N}^2 \leq .99}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{mn} \| Q - \hat{Q} \|_F^2 \right] \geq \Omega(d\sigma^2).$$

An immediate consequence of the above proposition is that the minimax rate for max squared error  $\|\hat{Q}-Q\|_{\max}^2$  is also  $\Omega(d\sigma^2)$ . We see that in both error metrics, vanishing estimation error is impossible without transfer learning.

## 2.1 Lower Bound for Active Sampling Setting

We now give a minimax lower bound for Q estimation in the active sampling setting.

**Theorem 2.2** (Minimax Lower Bound for Q-estimation with Active Sampling). Fix m,n and  $2 \le d \le m \land n$ . Fix  $\sigma^2 > 0$  and let  $|\Omega| = T_{\text{row}} \cdot T_{\text{col}}$ .

Let  $\mathbb{P}_{P,Q,\sigma^2}$  be the distribution of  $(\widetilde{P},\widetilde{Q})$  where  $\widetilde{P}:=P$  and  $\widetilde{Q}:=Q+G$  where  $G_{ij}\overset{i.i.d}{\sim}N(0,\sigma^2)$ .

Let Q be the class of estimators which observe  $\widetilde{P}$ , and choose row and column samples according to the budgets  $T_{\text{row}}, T_{\text{col}}$  as in Eq. (1), and then return some estimator  $\hat{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ . Then, there exists absolute constant C > 0 such that minimax rate of estimation is:

$$\inf_{\hat{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}(P,Q) \in \mathcal{F}_{m,n,d}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{P,Q,\sigma^2}}[\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{\max}^2] \! \geq \! \frac{Cd^2\sigma^2}{|\Omega|}.$$

We prove Theorem 2.2 using a generalization of Fano's method [V<sup>+</sup>94]. We construct a family of distributions indexed by  $d^2$  source/target pairs  $(P^{(s)},Q^{(s)})_{s=1}^{d^2}$ . The source P is the same for all s, while each pair of target matrices  $Q^{(s)},Q^{(s')}$  differs in at most 2 entries. For example, say entries (5,6) and (8,7) are different between  $Q^{(1)}$  and  $Q^{(2)}$ . Regardless of the choice of row/column samples, the average KL divergence of a pair of targets is small. If e.g. the entries (5,6),(8,7) are heavily sampled, then the estimator can distinguish  $Q^{(1)},Q^{(2)}$  well, but cannot distinguish  $Q^{(t)},Q^{(t')}$  for all t,t' pairs that are equal on (5,6) and (8,7).

## 2.2 Estimation Framework

Next, we describe our estimation framework. Given  $\widetilde{P}$  and  $\widetilde{Q}[R,C]$ , where R,C can come from either the active (Eq. (1)) or passive sampling (Eq. (2)) setting, we estimate  $\widehat{Q}$  via the least-squares estimator.

### Least Squares Estimator.

- 1. Extract features via SVD from  $\tilde{P} = \hat{U}_P \hat{\Sigma}_P \hat{V}_P^T$ .
- 2. Let  $\Omega$  be the multiset of observed entries. Then solve

$$\hat{\Theta}_{Q} := \arg\min_{\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \Omega} |\widetilde{Q}_{ij} - \hat{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i}^{\top} \Theta \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{j}|^{2}, \tag{5}$$

where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}_i := \hat{U}_P^T \boldsymbol{e}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_j := \hat{V}_P^T \boldsymbol{e}_j$ .

## 3. Estimate $\hat{Q}$ :

$$\hat{Q}_{ij} = \hat{\boldsymbol{u}}_i^{\top} \hat{\Theta}_Q \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_j. \tag{6}$$

This fully specifies  $\hat{Q}$  in the passive sampling setting (Eq. (2)). For the active sampling setting, we must also specify how rows and columns are chosen.

Active sampling poses two main challenges. First, it is not clear how to leverage  $\widetilde{P}$  for sampling  $\widetilde{Q}$  because samples are chosen *before* observing  $\widetilde{Q}$ , so the distribution shift from P to Q is unknown. Second, the best design depends on the choice of estimator and vice versa.

Surprisingly, we show that for the right choice of experimental design, the optimal estimator is precisely the least-squares estimator  $\hat{Q}$  as in Eq. (6). We use the classical G-optimal design [Puk06], which has been used in reinforcement learning to achieve minimax optimal exploration [LS20a] and optimal policies for linear Markov Decision Processes [TJP23].

**Definition 2.3** ( $\epsilon$ -approximate G-optimal design). Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a finite set. For a distribution  $\pi: \mathcal{A} \to [0,1]$ , its G-value is defined as

$$g(\pi) := \max_{\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathcal{A}} \left[ \boldsymbol{a}^T \left( \sum_{\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(\boldsymbol{a}) \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{a}^T \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{a} \right].$$

For  $\epsilon > 0$ , we say  $\hat{\pi}$  is  $\epsilon$ -approximately G-optimal if

$$g(\hat{\pi}) \leq (1+\epsilon) \inf_{\pi} g(\pi).$$

If  $\epsilon = 0$ , we say  $\hat{\pi}$  is simply G-optimal.

Notice that in Eq. (5), the covariates are tensor products  $(\hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{u}_i)$  of column and row features. The G-optimal design is useful because it respects the tensor structure of the least-squares estimator. We prove this via the Kiefer-Wolfowitz Theorem [LS20a].

**Proposition 2.4** (Tensorization of *G*-optimal design). Let  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d_1}$ ,  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_2}$ . Let  $\rho$  be a *G*-optimal design for  $\{U^T \mathbf{e}_i : i \in [m]\}$  and  $\zeta$  be a *G*-optimal design for  $\{V^T \mathbf{e}_j : j \in [n]\}$ . Let  $\pi(i,j) = \rho(i)\zeta(j)$  be a distribution on  $[m] \times [n]$ . Then  $\pi$  is a *G*-optimal design on  $\{V^T \mathbf{e}_j \otimes U^T \mathbf{e}_i : i \in [m], j \in [n]\}$ .

Consider a maximally coherent P that is nonzero at entry (3,5) and zero elsewhere. Then Q is also zero outside (3,5). By the Kiefer-Wolfowitz Theorem, the G-optimal design for rows (resp. columns) samples row 3 (resp. column 5) with probability 1. So, if  $\widetilde{P}$  is not too noisy, then the G-optimal design samples precisely the useful rows/columns.

In light of Proposition 2.4, we leverage the tensorization property to sample rows and columns as follows.

Active Sampling. Given  $\hat{U}, \hat{V}$ , and budget  $T_{\text{row}}, T_{\text{col}}$ ,

- 1. Compute  $\epsilon$ -approximate G-optimal designs  $\hat{\rho}, \hat{\zeta}$  for  $\{\hat{U}_P^T \mathbf{e}_i : i \in [m]\}$  and  $\{\hat{V}_P^T \mathbf{e}_j : j \in [n]\}$  respectively, with the Frank-Wolfe algorithm [LS20a].
- 2. Sample  $i_1,...i_{T_{\text{row}}} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \hat{\rho}$  and  $j_1,...j_{T_{\text{col}}} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \hat{\zeta}$ .

Finally, we specify the assumption we need on the source data  $\widetilde{P}$ , called Singular Subspace Recovery (SSR).

**Assumption 2.5** ( $\epsilon$ -SSR). Given  $\widetilde{P} \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \{\star\})^{m \times n}$ , we have access to a method that outputs estimates  $\widehat{U}_P \in \mathcal{O}^{m \times d}$  and  $\widehat{V}_P \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times d}$ , such that:

$$\inf_{W_U \in \mathcal{O}^{d \times d}} \|\hat{U} - UW_U\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \epsilon_{\text{SSR}},$$
and
$$\inf_{W_V \in \mathcal{O}^{d \times d}} \|\hat{V} - VW_V\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \epsilon_{\text{SSR}}$$
(7)

for some  $\epsilon_{SSR} > 0$ .

This assumption holds for a number of models. For instance, recent works in both MCAR [CCF<sup>+</sup>20] and MNAR [ADSS23, JMPS23] settings give estimation methods for  $\hat{P}$  with entry-wise error bounds. In Appendix A.2, we prove that these entry-wise guarantees, combined with standard theoretical assumptions such as incoherence, imply Assumption 2.5.

We now give our main upper bound.

**Theorem 2.6** (Generic error bound for active sampling). Let  $\hat{Q}$  be the active sampling estimator with  $T_{\text{row}}, T_{\text{col}} \ge 20d\log(m+n)$ . Then, for absolute constants C, C' > 0, and all  $\epsilon < \frac{1}{10}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{P},\tilde{Q}} \left[ \|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{\max}^2 \le C(1+\epsilon) \left( \frac{d^2 \sigma_Q^2 \log(m+n)}{|T_{\text{col}}| |T_{\text{row}}|} \right) \right] d^2 \epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 \|Q\|_2^2 \right] \\
\ge 1 - C'(m+n)^{-2}.$$

We will discuss implications of Theorem 2.6 in Remark 2.7. First, we give some intuition. Notice that Theorem 2.6 (and Theorem 2.9) gives an error bound as a sum of two terms, which depend on the sample size and  $\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}$  respectively. To see why, let  $\Omega$  be the set of observed entries, either in a passive or active sampling setting. Let  $\hat{\boldsymbol{u}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{v}}_j$  be the covariates as in Eq. (5). The observation  $\widetilde{Q}_{ij}$  can be decomposed:

$$\widetilde{Q}_{ij} = Q_{ij} + (\widetilde{Q}_{ij} - Q_{ij}) 
= \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i}^{\top} \Theta_{Q} \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}_{j} + \underbrace{\epsilon_{ij}}_{\text{misspecification } \widetilde{P}} + \underbrace{(\widetilde{Q}_{ij} - Q_{ij})}_{\text{noise}} \tag{8}$$

The population estimand  $\Theta_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , which is estimated in Eq. (5), is:

$$\Theta_Q := W_U^T T_1 R T_2^T W_V,$$

where  $T_1, T_2$  are the distribution shift matrices as in Definition 1.2, and  $W_U, W_V \in \mathcal{O}^{d \times d}$  are some rotations. The misspecification error is due to the estimation error of the singular subspaces of P and depends on  $\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}$  as follows:

$$\epsilon_{ij} := \mathbf{e}_{i}^{T} (\hat{U} - UW_{U}) \Theta_{Q} \hat{V} \mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$+ \mathbf{e}_{i}^{T} \hat{U} \Theta_{Q} (\hat{V} - VW_{V}) \mathbf{e}_{j}$$

$$+ \mathbf{e}_{i}^{T} (\hat{U} - UW_{U}) \Theta_{Q} (\hat{V} - VW_{V}) \mathbf{e}_{j}$$

Therefore  $\epsilon_{ij}^2 = O(\epsilon_{\rm SSR}^2 \|Q\|_2^2)$  for all  $i,j.^1$  Notice the misspecification error is independent of the estimator  $\hat{\Theta}_Q$ , so it will not depend on sample size. This explains the appearance of the two summands in our upper bounds. The first term depends on estimation error  $\Theta_Q - \hat{\Theta}_Q$ , which is unique to the sampling method. The second depends on misspecification, which is common to both.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In fact  $\epsilon_{ij}^2 = O(\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 ||R||_2^2)$ , but we report bounds with the weaker  $O(\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 ||Q||_2^2)$  for ease of reading.

Remark 2.7 (Minimax Optimality for MNAR and MCAR Source Data). The rate of Theorem 2.6 is minimax-optimal in the usual transfer learning regime when target data is noisy ( $\sigma_Q$  large) and limited ( $|\Omega| := |T_{\text{row}}| |T_{\text{col}}|$  small).

Suppose P is rank d,  $\mu$ -incoherent, with singular values  $\sigma_1 \ge \cdots \ge \sigma_d$ , condition number  $\kappa$  and m = n. For the MNAR  $\widetilde{P}$  setting, suppose each  $\widetilde{P}_{ij}$  has i.i.d. additive noise  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_P^2)$  with sampling sparsity factor  $n^{-\beta}$  for  $\beta \in [0,1]$  and  $\sigma_P = O(1)$ . By [JMPS23],  $\widehat{Q}$  is minimax-optimal if

$$\frac{4\mu^{3}d^{3}\kappa^{2}\|Q\|_{2}^{2}}{n^{1+\frac{2-\beta}{d}}} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_{Q}^{2}}{|\Omega|},$$

where  $\lesssim$  ignores  $\log(m+n)^{O(1)}$  factors. For the MCAR  $\widetilde{P}$  setting, suppose  $\widetilde{P}$  has additive noise  $\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_P^2)$  and observed entries i.i.d. with probability  $p \gtrsim \frac{\kappa^4 \mu^2 d^2}{n}$ , with  $\sigma_P \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_d(P)}{\sqrt{\kappa^4 \mu d}}$ . Letting  $|\Omega| = n^2 p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}$ , by [CCF<sup>+</sup>20],  $\hat{Q}$  is minimax-optimal if

$$\frac{\mu^6 d^4 \|Q\|_2^2}{n^2} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_Q^2}{|\Omega|}.$$

While the results of [JMPS23, CCF<sup>+</sup>20] used in Remark 2.7 require incoherence, recent work also gives guarantees on  $\epsilon_{\rm SSR}$  without incoherence assumptions, although in limited settings.

**Remark 2.8** (Incoherence-free minimax optimality). Let  $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be rank-1 and Hermitian, and  $\tilde{P} = P + W$  where W is Hermitian with i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_P^2)$  noise on the upper triangle. Under the assumptions of [YL24], for constant C > 0,  $\hat{Q}$  is minimax optimal if

$$\frac{C\sigma_P^2(\log n)^{O(1)}\|Q\|_2^2}{\|P\|_2^2} \le \frac{\sigma_Q^2}{|\Omega|}.$$

Taking  $|\Omega| = O(\log n)$  since d = 1, and  $||Q||_2 = O(||P||_2)$ , we require

$$C\sigma_P^2(\log n)^{O(1)} \le \sigma_Q^2.$$

## 2.3 Passive Sampling

We next give the estimation error for the passive sampling setting. The rate almost exactly matches Theorem 2.6, but we pay an extra factor due to incoherence. This is because unlike the active sampling setting, if  $\ell_2$  mass of the features is highly concentrated in a few rows and columns, then the passive sample will simply miss these with constant probability. To give a high probability guarantee, we require that features cannot be too highly concentrated.

**Theorem 2.9** (Generic Error Bound for  $\hat{Q}$ ). Let  $\hat{Q}$  be as in Eq. (6) and C > 0 an absolute constant. Suppose P has left/right incoherence  $\mu_U, \mu_V$  respectively, and  $p_{\text{Row}}, p_{\text{Col}}$  are such that  $\frac{p_{\text{Row}}m}{Cd\log m} \ge \mu_U + \frac{\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 m}{d}$ ,  $\frac{p_{\text{Col}}n}{Cd\log n} \ge \mu_V + \frac{\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 n}{d}$ .

Let  $\mu = \mu_U \mu_V$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg[\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_{\max}^2 \le C\mu \bigg(\frac{d^2\sigma_Q^2 \log(m+n)}{p_{\text{Row}}p_{\text{Col}}mn} + d^2\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}^2 \|Q\|_2^2\bigg)\bigg]$$
$$\ge 1 - O((m \land n)^{-2}).$$

If P is coherent, the sample complexity  $|\Omega| \approx p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} mn$  needed to achieve vanishing estimation error in Theorem 2.9 may be large. By contrast, our active sampling with G-optimal design requires only  $|\Omega| \gtrsim d^2 \sigma_Q^2$  (Theorem 2.6). This shows the advantage of active sampling, which can query the most informative rows/columns when P is coherent.

## 2.4 Lower Bound for Passive Sampling

We give a lower bound for the passive sampling setting in terms of a fixed, arbitrary mask. To exclude degenerate cases such as all entries being observed, we require the following definition.

**Definition 2.10** (Nondegeneracy). Let p > 0 and  $\eta_1, ..., \eta_m \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \operatorname{Ber}(p)$ . Let  $D \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$  be diagonal with  $D_{ii} = \eta_i$ . We say  $(\eta_i)_{i=1}^m$  is p-nondegenerate for  $U \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times d}$  if  $\left| \|DU\|_2 - \sqrt{p} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{p}}{10}$ .

The Matrix Bernstein inequality [CCF<sup>+</sup>21] implies that masks are nondegenerate with high probability.

**Proposition 2.11.** Under the conditions of Theorem 2.9, the event that both  $(\eta_i)_{i=1}^m$  is  $p_{\text{Row}}$ -nondegenerate for  $\hat{U}_P$  and that  $(\nu_j)_{j=1}^n$  is  $p_{\text{Col}}$ -nondegenerate for  $\hat{V}_P$  holds with probability  $\geq 1-2(m \wedge n)^{-10}$ .

We can now state our lower bound, proved via Fano's method.

**Theorem 2.12** (Minimax Lower Bound for Passive Sampling). Let  $\mathcal{F}_{m,n,d}$  be the parameter space of Theorem 2.2. Let

 $\mathcal{G}_{m,n,d} := \left\{ (P,Q) \in \mathcal{F}_{m,n,d} : P,Q \text{ are } O(1) - incoherent \right\}$ 

Suppose  $(\eta_i)_{i=1}^m, (\nu_j)_{j=1}^n$  are nondegenerate with respect to U,V respectively. Let  $\mathbb{P}_{Q,\sigma^2,p_{\text{Row}},p_{\text{Col}}}$  be the law of the random matrix  $\widetilde{Q}$  generated as in Eq. (2) with  $\sigma = \sigma_Q$ .

There exists absolute constant C > 0 such that minimax rate of estimation is:

$$\inf_{\hat{Q}} \sup_{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}_{m,n,d} \mathbb{P}_{(Q,\sigma^2,p_{\text{Row}},p_{\text{Col}})}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{mn} \| \hat{Q} - Q \|_F^2 \middle| (\eta_i)_{i=1}^m, \right]$$

$$(\nu_j)_{j=1}^n \ge \frac{Cd^2 \sigma_Q^2}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} mn}$$

We immediately obtain the same lower bound for max squared error.

We see that our error rate for passive sampling in Theorem 2.9 is minimax-optimal when  $\mu = O(1)$ , modulo bounds on  $\epsilon_{\text{SSR}}$  as in Remark 2.7.

Unlike the lower bound for max squared error in active sampling (Theorem 2.2), Theorem 2.12 gives a lower bound for the mean-squared error, which is strictly stronger. An interesting question is whether Theorem 2.12 can be generalized to incoherence greater than a constant. We leave this for future work.

## 3 Experiments

In this section, we compare both our active and passive sampling estimators against existing methods on real-world and simulated datasets.

**Experimental setup.** We compare against two baselines from the matrix completion literature. First, we use the MNAR matrix completion method of [BC22]. We tune the method by passing in the true rank of Q as well as the rank of the mask matrix. Second, we use the transfer learning method of [LLL22]. This method is designed for matrix completion, but in a missingness structure different from our MNAR

Table 1: Summary of real-world datasets. The  $2 \to \infty$  norms are for  $U_P, V_P, U_Q, V_Q$  respectively. Notice these are within [0,1] always, and  $2 \to \infty$  norm of 1 implies maximal coherence.

Dataset	Shape	Rank	$2 \rightarrow \infty$ Norms
GENE EXPR.	$31 \times 300$ $251 \times 251$	4	0.55, 0.30, 0.64, 0.38
METABOLIC		8	0.99, 0.99, 0.99, 0.99

setting. For shorthand, we will refer to these as BC22 and LLL22 respectively. See Appendix B for precise details of our implementations.

The input to each of these, as well as our passive sampling method, is the pair  $\widetilde{P},\widetilde{Q}$ . The method of [BC22] requires input matrices to have entries in [-1,1] so we normalize all  $\widetilde{P},\widetilde{Q}$  by their maximum entry in absolute value, for all methods. We also compute the active sampling estimator by fixing the budgets  $T_{\text{row}} = m \cdot p_{\text{Row}}, T_{\text{col}} = n \cdot p_{\text{Col}}$  throughout.

### 3.1 Real World Experiments

In this section we study real-world datasets on gene expression microarrays in a whole-blood sepsis study [PTN<sup>+</sup>13], and weighted metabolic networks of gram-negative bacteria [KLD<sup>+</sup>16]. Table 1 summarizes the datasets, and Appendix B gives more details on our data preparation.

**Patient Gene Expression Matrices.** The matrices P,Q represent the gene expression for patients in a sepsis study [PTN<sup>+</sup>13]. Here  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{31 \times 300}$  where  $P_{ij}$  measures the expression level of gene j in patient i on day 1 of the study, and Q corresponds to day 2 of the study.

Figure 2 displays the maximum squared error for a range of masking probabilities on  $\widetilde{Q}$ . We see that both active and passive sampling perform well even at small sample sizes, while the transfer baseline method [LLL22] achieves a worse but nontrivial maximum error.

Notably, active sampling is no better than passive sampling here. This makes sense because P,Q are relatively incoherent (Table 1), so our theoretical guarantees are the same.

In fact, active sampling displays higher variation in error, due to the variability in random sampling from the G-optimal design. It is known that the G-optimal design for any  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  has support size  $O(d^2)$  [LS20b], so the sampled set of rows and columns will vary somewhat from one experiment to the next.

Weighted Metabolic Network Adjacency Matrices. We collect weighted metabolic networks from the BiGG Genome Scale Metabolic Models repository [KLD<sup>+</sup>16], consistent with recent work on transfer learning for network estimation [JMMS24]. Specifically,  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{251 \times 251}$  where  $P_{ij} \geq 0$  counts the number of co-occurrences of metabolites i and j in a reaction for organism P.  $Q_{ij}$  represents the same quantity in a different organism Q. We use the gram-negative bacteria E.  $coli\ W$  and P. putida for P,Q respectively. Unlike [JMMS24], we do not need to truncate the adjacency matrices to  $\{0,1\}$ , allowing us to handle edge weights. This makes a difference, because without truncation the edge weights distribution is highly skewed for both P,Q (see Appendix B).

Figure 3 shows max squared error for a range of masking probabilities on  $\widetilde{Q}$ . We see that active sampling does well, while passive sampling is very poor (note however, that passive sampling does relatively well for mean-squared error - Figure 12). This is because P,Q are almost maximally coherent (Table 1), so the assumptions of our guarantee for passive sampling (Theorem 2.9) do not hold. By contrast, active sampling performs well even in this highly coherent setting.



Figure 2: Max-squared error of  $\hat{Q}-Q$ . Here,  $\widetilde{Q}$  has  $p_{\text{Row}}=p_{\text{Col}}$  varying along the x-axis, which displays  $p_{\text{Row}}^2$ . We set  $\sigma_Q=0.1$ , and P is fully observed. For each method, we show the median of the errors across 50 independent runs, as well as the [10,90] percentile.




Figure 3: Max-squared error of  $\hat{Q}-Q$ , with the same experimental parameters as Figure 2.

### 3.2 Simulations

In this section, we further probe the effects of incoherence by testing on two highly coherent synthetic datasets (described below). Table 2 displays our results, with  $p_{\text{Row}} = p_{\text{Col}} = 0.1, \sigma_Q = 0.1$ , and P fully observed. Note that  $0.1 \approx \frac{2d \log n}{n}$  here, so  $p_{\text{Row}}, p_{\text{Col}}$  are near the theoretical limit of our guarantees even for incoherent matrices.

Each table entry shows  $\hat{\mu} \pm 2\hat{\sigma}$  for mean-squared error across 50 independent trials. We find that for a stylized example of maximally coherent P,Q, active sampling is much better than all other methods. However, for less stylized P,Q that are still not incoherent, active and passive sampling are comparable, and outperform both baselines.

**Stylized Coherent Model.** For n=200, d=5 we generate  $U_P, V_P \in \{0,1\}^{n \times d}$  via  $(U_P)_{ii}=1$ ,  $(V_P)_{(n-i),i}=1.0$  and the other entries zero. We sample the diagonal entries of  $\Sigma_P, \Sigma_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  iid uniformly at random from [0.5,1]. Then  $P=U_P\Sigma_PV_P^T$  and  $Q=U_P\Sigma_QV_P^T$ . We call this class "Coherent."

Matrix Partition Model. For a less stylized class, let m = 300, n = 200, d = 5, a = 0.1, b = 0.8. We

generate partitions  $U_P \in \{0,1\}^{m \times d}$ ,  $V_P \in \{0,1\}^{n \times d}$  where each row is uniformly at random from  $\{e_1,...,e_d\}$ . Then,  $B_P \in [0,1]^{d \times d}$  is generated by sampling  $C \in [0,1]^{d \times d}$  with  $C_{ij} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Unif}([0,b])$  and  $(B_P)_{ij} = C_{ij} + \mathbf{1}_{i=j}a$ . Finally, we sample permutations  $\Pi_1, \Pi_2 \in \{0,1\}^{d \times d}$  uniformly at random from all such permutations. Then,  $P = U_P B_P V_P^T$  and  $Q = U_P \Pi_1 B_P \Pi_2^T V_P^T$ . We call this class "Matrix Partition Model" in analogy with the Planted Partition Model [Abb17]. Spectral arguments show that such matrices are somewhat coherent [LGT14], although not maximally so.

Table 2: Comparison of the errors of different approaches on synthetic data.

	Coherent	Partition
Passive (Ours)	$0.084 \pm 0.039 \times 10^{-3}$	$\textbf{0.040} \pm \textbf{0.090}$
ACTIVE (OURS)	$0.009 \pm 0.015  imes 10^{-3}$	$0.046 \pm 0.074$
LLL22	$0.061 \pm 0.037 \times 10^{-3}$	$0.134 \pm 0.011$
BC22	$0.789 \pm 0.644 \times 10^{-3}$	$0.305 \pm 0.002$




Figure 4: Ablation study for the effect of additive target noise in the Matrix Partition Model. For each method, we display the median max-squared error across 10 independent runs, as well as the [10,90] percentile.

### 3.3 Ablation Studies

Our main focus is to understand how sample budgets  $T_{\rm row}, T_{\rm col}$ , or probabilities  $p_{\rm Row}, p_{\rm Col}$  affects the estimation error for transfer learning. We also perform ablation studies to test the effect of other model parameters, such as rank, dimension, noise variance, etc. Figure 4 shows the effect of target noise variance on maximum error in the Matrix Partition Model with  $m=300, n=200, d=5, a=0.1, b=0.8, p_{\rm Row}=0.5, p_{\rm Col}=0.5$ . Due to space constraints, we defer our additional ablation studies to Appendix B.

### 4 Related Work

We review the most relevant literature here. For additional discussion, we refer to the surveys [DHGS21, Jaf22] for matrix completion and [ZQD+19, KCLSea22] for transfer learning.

Matrix Completion. Most matrix completion algorithms require a Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) assumption [CR09, Cha15, DPVDBW14, ZSJD19], where each  $Q_{ij}$  is observed with probability

p independently of all others. The Missing Not-at-Random setting allows the masking probability of  $Q_{ij}$  to depend on the value of  $Q_{ij}$  itself [MC19, BC22, JMPS23], but still assumes that entries are masked independently of one another. If masking variables are dependent, then authors assume identifiability of the matrix conditioned on the masking [ADSS23], or that entries in every row and column are observed [SGZ23]. By contrast, we study one of the simplest possible MNAR models in which entries of  $\widetilde{Q}$  are not independent and entire rows and columns can be missing. This MNAR model is motivated by biological problems [CN00, HCMD21, EC22].

Transfer learning. Transfer learning has been well-studied in learning theory [BDBCP06, CMRR08, CKW08]. Recent works address various supervised learning [RCS21, CW21a, MPW23, CP24] and unsupervised learning settings [GLW24, DM24]. Statistical works consider minimax rates of estimation, and computationally efficient estimators to achieve such rates [TJJ20, ASS<sup>+</sup>23, CW21b, MPW23, CB23, CP24]. In applications, transfer learning from data-rich to data-poor domains has applications in biostatistics [Ksh15, DFAZ21], epidemiology [AB20], computer vision [THSD17, NSZ20], language models [HPW21], and other areas.

Transfer learning for matrix completion typically assumes the source P and target Q are observed in an MCAR fashion, and are related through a rotation in latent space [XJZ13, MZGD24, HLL<sup>+</sup>24]. Rotational shift is a special case of our distribution shift model (Definition 1.2), which allows for any linear shift in latent space. On the other hand, works that study transfer learning for specific classes of matrices typically assume distributional shifts that are unique to those structures, such as in latent variable networks [JMMS24] or the log-linear word production model [ZCL23].

Optimal experimental design. Choosing a set of maximally informative experiments is a classical problem in statistics [Smi18, Puk06] with connections to active learning [Das11], bandits [AYPS11], and reinforcement learning [LSW20]. Optimal designs have been studied for domain adaptation [RSDIV10, XYL+22], misspecified regression [LSW20], and linear Markov Decision Processes [JMPS23]. In our active sampling setting, we *jointly* query rows and columns to observe the corresponding submatrix of  $\widetilde{Q}$ , rather than one entry at a time [CZB+13, RCT15, BGN17]. But, the optimal row queries depend on column queries (and vice versa) – so we use the tensorization property of G-optimal designs (Proposition 2.4) to prove global optimality with respect to joint row/column samplers.

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

We study transfer learning for a challenging MNAR model of matrix completion. We obtain minimax lower bounds for entrywise estimation of Q in both the active (Theorem 2.2) and passive sampling settings (Theorem 2.12). We give a computationally efficient minimax-optimal estimator that uses tensorization of G-optimal designs in the active setting (Theorem 2.6). Further, in the passive setting, we give a rate-optimal estimator under incoherence assumptions (Theorem 2.9). Finally, we experimentally validate our findings on data from gene expression micoarrays and metabolic modeling.

Future work could consider even more difficult missingness structures, such as when the masks  $(\eta_i)_{i=1}^m, (\nu_j)_{j=1}^n$  are dependent. If the mask can be partitioned into subsets whose mutual dependencies are small, an Efron-Stein argument [PMT16] may work. Is bounded dependence necessary? Moreover, one can consider other kinds of side information, such as gene-level features in Genome-Wide Association Studies [MZGD24]. Finally, there can be other interesting nonlinear models for transfer between source and target matrices.

## 6 Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

## 7 Acknowledgments

AJ and PS gratefully acknowledge NSF grants 2217069, 2019844, and DMS 2109155. YJ is supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation Postdoctoral Scholarship Program under grant KAW 2022.0366. AM was supported by NSF awards 2217058 and 2133484. SSM was partially supported by an INSPIRE research grant (DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/002193) from the Dept. of Science and Technology, Govt. of India and a Start-Up Grant from Indian Statistical Institute.

### References

- [AB20] Ioannis D. Apostolopoulos and Tzani Bessiana. Covid-19: automatic detection from x-ray images utilizing transfer learning with convolutional neural networks. *Physical and Engineering Sciences in Medicine*, 43:635 640, 2020. (Cited on page 13.)
- [Abb17] Emmanuel Abbe. Community detection and stochastic block models. arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.10146, 2017. (Cited on page 12.)
- [ADSS23] Anish Agarwal, Munther Dahleh, Devavrat Shah, and Dennis Shen. Causal matrix completion. In *The thirty sixth annual conference on learning theory*, pages 3821–3826. PMLR, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 7, and 13.)
- [ASS<sup>+</sup>23] Alekh Agarwal, Yuda Song, Wen Sun, Kaiwen Wang, Mengdi Wang, and Xuezhou Zhang. Provable benefits of representational transfer in reinforcement learning. In Gergely Neu and Lorenzo Rosasco, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Sixth Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 195 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2114–2187. PMLR, 12–15 Jul 2023. (Cited on page 13.)
- [AYPS11] Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Dávid Pál, and Csaba Szepesvári. Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [BC22] Sohom Bhattacharya and Sourav Chatterjee. Matrix completion with data-dependent missingness probabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(10):6762–6773, 2022. (Cited on pages 2, 9, 10, 13, and 34.)
- [BDBCP06] Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, and Fernando Pereira. Analysis of representations for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19, 2006. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [BGN17] Aniruddha Bhargava, Ravi Ganti, and Rob Nowak. Active positive semidefinite matrix completion: Algorithms, theory and applications. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1349–1357. PMLR, 2017. (Cited on page 13.)
    - [CB23] Tyler Cody and Peter A. Beling. A systems theory of transfer learning. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 17(1):26–37, 2023. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [CCF<sup>+</sup>20] Yuxin Chen, Yuejie Chi, Jianqing Fan, Cong Ma, and Yuling Yan. Noisy matrix completion: Understanding statistical guarantees for convex relaxation via nonconvex optimization. SIAM journal on optimization, 30(4):3098–3121, 2020. (Cited on pages 2, 7, 8, and 34.)
  - [CCF<sup>+</sup>21] Yuxin Chen, Yuejie Chi, Jianqing Fan, Cong Ma, et al. Spectral methods for data science: A statistical perspective. Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning, 14(5):566–806, 2021. (Cited on pages 9, 20, and 30.)

- [Cha15] Sourav Chatterjee. Matrix estimation by universal singular value thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 177–214, 2015. (Cited on pages 2 and 12.)
- [CKW08] Koby Crammer, Michael Kearns, and Jennifer Wortman. Learning from multiple sources. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 9(8), 2008. (Cited on page 13.)
- [CMRR08] Corinna Cortes, Mehryar Mohri, Michael Riley, and Afshin Rostamizadeh. Sample selection bias correction theory. In *International conference on algorithmic learning theory*, pages 38–53. Springer, 2008. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [CN00] Bjarke Christensen and Jens Nielsen. *Metabolic Network Analysis*, pages 209–231. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000. (Cited on pages 2 and 13.)
  - [CP24] T Tony Cai and Hongming Pu. Transfer learning for nonparametric regression: Non-asymptotic minimax analysis and adaptive procedure. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12272, 2024. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [CR09] Emmanuel J Candès and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. Found Comput Math, 9:717–772, 2009. (Cited on pages 2 and 12.)
  - [CT10] Emmanuel J Candès and Terence Tao. The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(5):2053–2080, 2010. (Cited on page 2.)
  - [CW21a] T Tony Cai and Hongji Wei. Transfer learning for nonparametric classification: Minimax rate and adaptive classifier. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1), 2021. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [CW21b] T Tony Cai and Hongji Wei. Transfer learning for nonparametric classification: Minimax rate and adaptive classifier. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1), 2021. (Cited on page 13.)
- [CZB<sup>+</sup>13] Shayok Chakraborty, Jiayu Zhou, Vineeth Balasubramanian, Sethuraman Panchanathan, Ian Davidson, and Jieping Ye. Active matrix completion. In 2013 IEEE 13th international conference on data mining, pages 81–90. IEEE, 2013. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [Das11] Sanjoy Dasgupta. Two faces of active learning. Theoretical computer science, 412(19):1767–1781, 2011. (Cited on page 13.)
- [DFAZ21] Abhirup Datta, Jacob Fiksel, Agbessi Amouzou, and Scott L Zeger. Regularized bayesian transfer learning for population-level etiological distributions. *Biostatistics*, 22(4):836–857, 2021. (Cited on page 13.)
- [DHGS21] Pierre De Handschutter, Nicolas Gillis, and Xavier Siebert. A survey on deep matrix factorizations. *Computer Science Review*, 42:100423, 2021. (Cited on page 12.)
  - [DM24] Xiucai Ding and Rong Ma. Kernel spectral joint embeddings for high-dimensional noisy datasets using duo-landmark integral operators. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12317, 2024. (Cited on page 13.)
- [DPVDBW14] Mark A Davenport, Yaniv Plan, Ewout Van Den Berg, and Mary Wootters. 1-bit matrix completion. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 3(3):189–223, 2014. (Cited on page 12.)
  - [EC22] Tal Einav and Brian Cleary. Extrapolating missing antibody-virus measurements across serological studies. *Cell Systems*, 13(7):561–573, 2022. (Cited on pages 2 and 13.)
  - [FVFW21] Iván Fernández-Val, Hugo Freeman, and Martin Weidner. Low-rank approximations of nonseparable panel models. *The Econometrics Journal*, 24(2):C40–C77, 2021. (Cited on page 2.)

- [GLW24] Yuqi Gu, Zhongyuan Lyu, and Kaizheng Wang. Adaptive transfer clustering: A unified framework. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21263, 2024. (Cited on page 13.)
- [GRS19] Venkatesan Guruswami, Atri Rudra, and Madhu Sudan. Essential coding theory. 2019. (Cited on page 31.)
- [GYY<sup>+</sup>22] Yuan Gao, Laurence T Yang, Jing Yang, Dehua Zheng, and Yaliang Zhao. Jointly low-rank tensor completion for estimating missing spatiotemporal values in logistics systems. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 19(2):1814–1822, 2022. (Cited on page 2.)
  - [Hat02] Allen Hatcher. Algebraic Topology. Cambridge University Press, 2002. (Cited on page 4.)
- [HCMD21] Taishan Hu, Nilesh Chitnis, Dimitri Monos, and Anh Dinh. Next-generation sequencing technologies: An overview. *Human Immunology*, 82(11):801–811, 2021. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 13.)
- [HFSB22] Cynthia Huber, Tim Friede, Julia Stingl, and Norbert Benda. Classification of companion diagnostics: a new framework for biomarker-driven patient selection. *Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science*, pages 1–11, 2022. (Cited on page 2.)
  - [HJ12] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012. (Cited on page 20.)
- [HLL<sup>+</sup>24] Yong He, Zeyu Li, Dong Liu, Kangxiang Qin, and Jiahui Xie. Representational transfer learning for matrix completion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06233, 2024. (Cited on page 13.)
- [HPW21] Wenjuan Han, Bo Pang, and Ying Nian Wu. Robust transfer learning with pretrained language models through adapters. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 854–861, 2021. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [Jaf22] Jafar Jafarov. Survey of matrix completion algorithms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01532, 2022. (Cited on page 12.)
- [JMMS24] Akhil Jalan, Arya Mazumdar, Soumendu Sundar Mukherjee, and Purnamrita Sarkar. Transfer learning for latent variable network models. In *The Thirty-Eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on pages 10, 13, 32, and 33.)
- [JMPS23] Yassir Jedra, Sean Mann, Charlotte Park, and Devavrat Shah. Exploiting observation bias to improve matrix completion. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04775, 2023. (Cited on pages 2, 7, 8, and 13.)
  - [JNS13] Prateek Jain, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Sujay Sanghavi. Low-rank matrix completion using alternating minimization. In *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 665–674, 2013. (Cited on page 2.)
- [KCLSea22] H.E. Kim, A. Cosa-Linan, N. Santhanam, and et al. Transfer learning for medical image classification: a literature review. *BMC Medical Imaging*, 22(1):69, 2022. (Cited on page 12.)
  - [KLD+16] Zachary A King, Justin Lu, Andreas Dräger, Philip Miller, Stephen Federowicz, Joshua A Lerman, Ali Ebrahim, Bernhard O Palsson, and Nathan E Lewis. Bigg models: A platform for integrating, standardizing and sharing genome-scale models. Nucleic acids research, 44(D1):D515-D522, 2016. (Cited on pages 10 and 33.)
    - [Ksh15] Meghana Kshirsagar. Combine and conquer: methods for multitask learning in biology and language. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2015. (Cited on page 13.)

- [KW60] Jack Kiefer and Jacob Wolfowitz. The equivalence of two extremum problems. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 12:363–366, 1960. (Cited on page 25.)
- [LGT14] James R Lee, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Luca Trevisan. Multiway spectral partitioning and higher-order cheeger inequalities. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 61(6):1–30, 2014. (Cited on pages 12 and 34.)
- [LLL22] Keith Levin, Asad Lodhia, and Elizaveta Levina. Recovering shared structure from multiple networks with unknown edge distributions. *Journal of machine learning research*, 23(3):1–48, 2022. (Cited on pages 9, 10, and 34.)
- [LS20a] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020. (Cited on page 6.)
- [LS20b] Tor Lattimore and Csaba Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020. (Cited on page 10.)
- [LSW20] Tor Lattimore, Csaba Szepesvari, and Gellert Weisz. Learning with good feature representations in bandits and in rl with a generative model. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5662–5670. PMLR, 2020. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [MC19] Wei Ma and George H Chen. Missing not at random in matrix completion: The effectiveness of estimating missingness probabilities under a low nuclear norm assumption. Advances in neural information processing systems, 32, 2019. (Cited on pages 2 and 13.)
- [MPW23] Cong Ma, Reese Pathak, and Martin J Wainwright. Optimally tackling covariate shift in rkhs-based nonparametric regression. The Annals of Statistics, 51(2):738-761, 2023. (Cited on page 13.)
- [MZGD24] Sean McGrath, Cenhao Zhu, Min Guo, and Rui Duan. Learner: A transfer learning method for low-rank matrix estimation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20605, 2024. (Cited on pages 2, 4, and 13.)
  - [NSZ20] Behnam Neyshabur, Hanie Sedghi, and Chiyuan Zhang. What is being transferred in transfer learning? In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 512–523. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [PMT16] Daniel Paulin, Lester Mackey, and Joel A Tropp. Efron—stein inequalities for random matrices. 2016. (Cited on page 13.)
- [PTN<sup>+</sup>13] Grant P Parnell, Benjamin M Tang, Marek Nalos, Nicola J Armstrong, Stephen J Huang, David R Booth, and Anthony S McLean. Identifying key regulatory genes in the whole blood of septic patients to monitor underlying immune dysfunctions. *Shock*, 40(3):166–174, 2013. (Cited on pages 3, 10, and 33.)
  - [Puk06] Friedrich Pukelsheim. Optimal design of experiments. SIAM, 2006. (Cited on pages 6 and 13.)
  - [PW24] Yury Polyanskiy and Yihong Wu. Information theory: From coding to learning. Cambridge university press, 2024. (Cited on page 24.)
  - [RCS21] Henry WJ Reeve, Timothy I Cannings, and Richard J Samworth. Adaptive transfer learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(6):3618–3649, 2021. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [RCT15] Natali Ruchansky, Mark Crovella, and Evimaria Terzi. Matrix completion with queries. In Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, pages 1025–1034, 2015. (Cited on page 13.)

- [RSDIV10] Piyush Rai, Avishek Saha, Hal Daumé III, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. Domain adaptation meets active learning. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 Workshop on Active Learning for Natural Language Processing*, pages 27–32, 2010. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [RV13] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18(none):1 9, 2013. (Cited on page 22.)
  - [SGZ23] Max Simchowitz, Abhishek Gupta, and Kaiqing Zhang. Tackling combinatorial distribution shift: A matrix completion perspective. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3356–3468. PMLR, 2023. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [Smi18] Kirstine Smith. On the standard deviations of adjusted and interpolated values of an observed polynomial function and its constants and the guidance they give towards a proper choice of the distribution of observations. *Biometrika*, 12(1/2):1–85, 1918. (Cited on page 13.)
- [THSD17] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation. 2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), pages 2962–2971, 2017. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [TJJ20] Nilesh Tripuraneni, Michael I. Jordan, and Chi Jin. On the theory of transfer learning: the importance of task diversity. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS '20, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [TJP23] Jerome Taupin, Yassir Jedra, and Alexandre Proutiere. Best policy identification in linear mdps. In 2023 59th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), pages 1–8. IEEE, 2023. (Cited on pages 6 and 26.)
  - [V<sup>+</sup>94] Sergio Verdú et al. Generalizing the fano inequality. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 40(4):1247–1251, 1994. (Cited on pages 5 and 23.)
  - [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018. (Cited on page 26.)
  - [VG20] Alexander HS Vargo and Anna C Gilbert. A rank-based marker selection method for high throughput scrna-seq data. *BMC bioinformatics*, 21:1–51, 2020. (Cited on page 2.)
  - [XJZ13] Miao Xu, Rong Jin, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Speedup matrix completion with side information: Application to multi-label learning. Advances in neural information processing systems, 26, 2013. (Cited on pages 4 and 13.)
- [XYL<sup>+</sup>22] Binhui Xie, Longhui Yuan, Shuang Li, Chi Harold Liu, Xinjing Cheng, and Guoren Wang. Active learning for domain adaptation: An energy-based approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 36, pages 8708–8716, 2022. (Cited on page 13.)
  - [YL24] Hao Yan and Keith Levin. Coherence-free entrywise estimation of eigenvectors in low-rank signal-plus-noise matrix models. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. (Cited on page 8.)
  - [Yu97] Bin Yu. Assouad, fano, and le cam. In Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam: research papers in probability and statistics, pages 423–435. Springer, 1997. (Cited on page 31.)
  - [ZCL23] Doudou Zhou, Tianxi Cai, and Junwei Lu. Multi-source learning via completion of block-wise overlapping noisy matrices. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(221):1–43, 2023. (Cited on pages 2 and 13.)

- [ZQD+19] Fuzhen Zhuang, Zhiyuan Qi, Keyu Duan, Dongbo Xi, Yongchun Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Hui Xiong, and Qing He. A comprehensive survey on transfer learning. Proceedings of the IEEE, 109:43-76, 2019. (Cited on page 12.)
- [ZSJD19] Kai Zhong, Zhao Song, Prateek Jain, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Provable non-linear inductive matrix completion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. (Cited on page 12.)

## A Proofs and Additional Results

#### A.1 Preliminaries

We will repeatedly make use of the vectorization operator.

**Definition A.1** (Vectorization). For  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ , the vectorization  $\text{vec}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$  is the vector whose first n entries correspond to the first column of X, and next n entries correspond to the second column of X, and so on.

We can vectorize matrix products as follows.

**Lemma A.2** ([HJ12]). Let A,B,X be matrices of shapes such that AXB is well-defined. Then:

$$vec(AXB) = (B^T \otimes A)vec(X).$$

## A.2 From Entrywise Guarantees to SSR

We prove that Assumption 2.5 follows from entrywise estimation guarantees on the source.

**Proposition A.3.** Let P an  $m \times n$  matrix of rank r. Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $\widehat{P}$  be a rank-r estimate of P, satisfying

$$\|\widehat{P} - P\|_{\text{max}} \le \epsilon \|P\|_{\text{max}}.\tag{9}$$

Consider the SVDs  $P = U\Sigma V^{\top}$ , and  $\widehat{P} = \widehat{U}\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{V}^{\top}$ . Then, it holds that

$$\begin{split} \min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} & \|U - \widehat{U}R\|_{2 \to \infty} \\ & \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{n} + (2 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{mn}\|UU^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty})\|P - \widehat{P}\|_{\max}}{\sigma_r(P)} \\ & \min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} & \|V - \widehat{V}W\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq \\ & \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{m} + (2 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{mn}\|VV^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty})\|P - \widehat{P}\|_{\max}}{\sigma_r(P)} \end{split}$$

provided that  $\sqrt{mn}\epsilon ||P||_{\max} \leq \frac{\sigma_r(P)}{2}$ .

Below, we give a result showing that entry-wise guarantees imply subspace recovery in the two-to-infinity guarantee.

*Proof.* We will only prove the result concerning the left subspaces U and  $\widehat{U}$ . Our first step is to relate the errors  $\widehat{U}R-U$  and  $UU^{\top}\widehat{U}-U$ . We will introduce in our computations the sign matrix<sup>2</sup> of  $U^{\top}\widehat{U}$ , namely  $\operatorname{sgn}(U^{\top}\widehat{U})$  which is a rotation matrix. We have

$$\begin{split} \min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} & \|UW - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \|U \operatorname{sgn}(U^{\top} \widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \\ & \le \|U(U^{\top} \widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}U\|_{2 \to \infty} + \|U\|_{2 \to \infty} \|U^{\top} \widehat{U} - \operatorname{sgn}(U^{\top} \widehat{U})\|_{\operatorname{op}}. \end{split}$$

Moreover, we also know (e.g., see Lemma 4.15 [CCF<sup>+</sup>21]) that

$$\|\widehat{U}^{\mathsf{T}}U - \operatorname{sgn}(\widehat{U}^{\mathsf{T}}U)\|_{\operatorname{op}} \leq \|\sin(\Theta)\|_{\operatorname{op}},$$

The sign matrix of an  $n \times n$  matrix Z with SVD  $U_Z \Sigma_Z V_Z^{\top}$  is given by  $\operatorname{sgn}(Z) = U_Z V_Z^{\top} \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times n}$ .

and using the Theorem Davis-Kahan we obtain

$$\|\widehat{U}^{\top}U - \operatorname{sgn}(\widehat{U}^{\top}U)\|_{\operatorname{op}} \leq \|\sin(\Theta)\|_{\operatorname{op}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\operatorname{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} \|UW - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}U\|_{2 \to \infty} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\|U\|_{2 \to \infty}\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)}.$$
(10)

Next, we show that  $\min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} \|UW - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty}$  can be well controlled by the error  $M - \widehat{M}$ . On the one hand, we have triangular inequality, and noting that  $UU^{\top}M = M$  and  $\widehat{U}\widehat{U}^{\top}\widehat{M} = \widehat{M}$  that

$$\begin{split} \|(UU^\top - \widehat{U}\widehat{U}^\top)\widehat{M}\|_{2\to\infty} &\leq \|UU^\top M - \widehat{U}\widehat{U}^\top \widehat{M}\|_{2\to\infty} + \|UU^\top (M - \widehat{M})\|_{2\to\infty} \\ &\leq \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{2\to\infty} + \|UU^\top\|_{2\to\infty} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \end{split}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{split} \|(UU^{\top} - \widehat{U}\widehat{U}^{\top})\widehat{M}\|_{2 \to \infty} &= \|(U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U})\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{V}^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty} \\ &= \|(U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U})\widehat{\Sigma}\|_{2 \to \infty} \\ &\geq \|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \sigma_r(\widehat{M}) \\ &\geq \|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \sigma_r(M) - \|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}, \end{split}$$

where in the last inequality we used Weyl's inequality:  $|\sigma_r(M) - \sigma_r(\widehat{M})| \le ||M - \widehat{M}||_{\text{op}}$ . We combine the above inequalities to obtain

$$\|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq \frac{\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{2 \to \infty} + \|UU^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\mathrm{op}} + \|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \|\widehat{M} - M\|_{\mathrm{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)}$$

If the following condition holds

$$||M - \widehat{M}||_{\text{op}} \le \sqrt{mn} ||M - \widehat{M}||_{\text{max}} \le \frac{\sigma_r(M)}{2},$$

then

$$\|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \leq \frac{\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{2 \to \infty} + \|UU^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)} + \frac{1}{2}\|U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty}$$

which in turn gives

$$||U(U^{\top}\widehat{U}) - \widehat{U}||_{2 \to \infty} \le \frac{2||M - \widehat{M}||_{2 \to \infty} + 2||UU^{\top}||_{2 \to \infty}||M - \widehat{M}||_{\text{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)}$$
(11)

In summary we conclude that

$$\min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} \|UW - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \frac{2\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{2 \to \infty} + (2 + \sqrt{2})\|UU^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty}\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}}}{\sigma_r(M)} \tag{12}$$

Using the inequalities

$$\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \sqrt{n} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\max}$$
 and  $\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\text{op}} \le \sqrt{mn} \|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\max}$ ,

we can express our bounds as

$$\min_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{r \times r}} \|UW - \widehat{U}\|_{2 \to \infty} \le \frac{(2\sqrt{n} + (2 + \sqrt{2})\sqrt{mn}\|UU^{\top}\|_{2 \to \infty})\|M - \widehat{M}\|_{\max}}{\sigma_r(M)}.$$
 (13)

A simple calculation also gives the following.

**Proposition A.4.** Suppose  $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{O}^{m \times r}$  satisfies Assumption 2.5 with bound  $\epsilon_{\rm SSR}$ , and the population incoherence is  $\mu_U := \frac{m\|U\|_{2\to\infty}^2}{d}$ . Then  $\hat{U}$  is  $\gamma$ -incoherent for  $\gamma \leq 2\mu_U + \frac{2\epsilon_{\rm SSR}^2 m}{d}$ .

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 2.1

We require the following special case of Hoeffding's inequality.

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $X_1,...,X_n \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} Bernoulli(p)$ . Then:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i}X_{i}-p\right| \geq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right] \leq 2n^{-2}$$

The following concentration is standard.

Lemma A.6. Let  $\mathbf{x} \sim S^{n-1}$ . Then:

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{\infty} \ge C\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}] \le 1 - O(n^{-1/2})$$

*Proof.* By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\sum_{i} X_{i} - np\right| \ge t\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{2t^{2}}{n}\right)$$

Let  $t = \sqrt{n \log n}$ . The conclusion follows.

Finally, we require the following version of the Hanson-Wright inequality.

**Theorem A.7** ([RV13] Theorem 2.1). Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be fixed and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  a random vector with i.i.d. mean zero entries with variance 1 and  $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$  for all i. Then there exists constant c > 0 such that for any t > 0,

$$\mathbb{P}\!\left[|\|A\boldsymbol{x}\|_2\!-\!\|A\|_F|\!>\!t\right]\!\leq\!2\!\exp\!\left(-\frac{ct^2}{K^4\|A\|^2}\right)$$

We are ready to state our lower bound.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let  $u_1,...,u_d \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be generated with iid  $N(0,\frac{1}{m})$  entries and  $v_1,...,v_d \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be generated with iid  $N(0,\frac{1}{n})$  entries. Let  $Q = \sum_{i=1}^d u_i v_i^T$ .

We first analyze the incoherence of Q. We analyze the left-incoherence. Fix  $i \in [m]$  and let  $\mathbf{y} = (U^T \mathbf{e}_i)$ . Then we apply Theorem A.7 with  $\mathbf{x} = \sqrt{m}\mathbf{y}$  and A = V, to obtain that  $||A\mathbf{x}|| = ||\sqrt{m}VU^T \mathbf{e}_i|| \le ||V||_F + C'K^2||V||_2\sqrt{\log n}$  with probability  $\ge 1 - n^{-10}$  for absolute constant C' > 0. Since  $\mathbf{x}$  has iid N(0,1) entries, the Orlicz norm constant is at most  $K \le 2$ . Taking a union bound over all i, it follows that:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \| \sqrt{m} V U^T \|_{2 \to \infty} \le \| V \|_F + 4C' \| V \|_2 \sqrt{\log n} \right] \ge 1 - O(n^{-9})$$

It follows that the left incoherence is at most  $O(\log n)$  with high probability. An identical application of Theorem A.7 with A = U implies that the right-incoherence is at most  $O(\log m)$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}'$  be the event that Q is  $O(\log(n \vee m))$  incoherent. Let Q be the random matrix generated as above, conditioned on  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Note that  $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}'] \geq 1 - o(1)$ .

Next, let  $I \subset [m], J \subset [n]$  be the rows and columns of Q that are seen in  $\widetilde{Q}$ . Then by Lemma A.5,  $|I| \le 0.99m + \sqrt{m \log m}$  and  $|J| \le 0.99m + \sqrt{n \log n}$  with probability  $\ge 1 - 2n^{-2} - 2m^{-2}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the event that the bounds on I and J both hold.

Consider  $k \in [m] \setminus I, \ell \in [n] \setminus J$ . None of the entries of Q in the  $k^{th}$  row or  $\ell^{th}$  column are seen. Therefore, since  $m - |I| \ge \Omega(m)$  and  $n - |J| \ge \Omega(n)$ , and since  $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}'] \ge 1 - o(1)$ , there exists a constant C such that for all  $i \in [d]$ ,  $Var(\boldsymbol{u}_{i;k}\boldsymbol{v}_{i;\ell}|\widetilde{Q}) \ge C$ . Therefore, since  $\boldsymbol{u}_1,...,\boldsymbol{u}_d,\boldsymbol{v}_1,...,\boldsymbol{v}_d$  are independent, for any  $\hat{Q}$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{Q}_{k\ell} - Q_{k\ell})^2 | \widetilde{Q}] \ge Var(Q_{k\ell} | \widetilde{Q})$$

$$\ge \sum_{i=1}^d Var(\boldsymbol{u}_{i;k} \boldsymbol{v}_{i;\ell} | \widetilde{Q})$$

$$\ge Cd$$

Therefore, if we condition on  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $|[m]\backslash I| \geq \Omega(m)$  and  $|[n]\backslash J| \geq \Omega(n)$ , so  $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{mn}\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_F^2|\widetilde{Q}] \geq cd$  for a constant c > 0. Since  $1 - 2n^{-2} - 2m^{-2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , we conclude that:

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{mn}\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_F^2|\widetilde{Q}] &\geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{mn}\|\hat{Q} - Q\|_F^2|\widetilde{Q}, \mathcal{E}] \\ &\geq \frac{cd}{2} \end{split}$$

### A.4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

We require a version of Fano's theorem given in Theorem 7 of  $[V^+94]$ .

**Theorem A.8** (Generalized Fano). Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of probability measures,  $(\mathcal{D},d)$  a metric space, and  $\theta:\mathcal{P}\to\mathcal{D}$  a map that extracts the parameters of interest. Let  $\mathcal{H}\subset\mathcal{P}$  be a finite subset of size M. Suppose  $\alpha>0$  is such that for any distinct  $H_i,H_j\in\mathcal{H}$ ,

$$d(\theta(H_i), \theta(H_i)) \ge \alpha$$
.

And, suppose that  $\beta > 0$  is such that:

$$\log 2 + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} KL(H_i, H_j) \le \beta \log M.$$

Then,

$$\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[d(\theta(P), \hat{\theta})] \ge \alpha(1 - \beta).$$

We also require a standard expression for the KL divergence of a pair of multivariate Gaussians.

**Lemma A.9.** Let  $\mu, \mu' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be distinct and  $\Sigma \succ 0$ . The KL divergence of two multivariate Gaussians sharing the same covariance is given as:

We now prove our lower bound.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ ,  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be such that  $U_{ii} = 1$  and  $V_{ii} = 1$  for  $i \in [d]$ , and all other entries are zero. Let  $P = UV^T$ . We construct a hypothesis space  $\mathcal{H} = \{(P^{(ij)}, Q^{(ij)} : i, j \in [d]\}$  of size  $d^2$  where  $P^{(ij)}, Q^{(ij)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  as follows. For all members ij, we set  $P^{(ij)} = P$ . Next, let  $R^{(ij)} = \gamma e_i e_j^T$  for  $\gamma > 0$  to be specified later. We set  $Q^{(ij)} = UR^{(ij)}V^T$ .

First, notice for any  $(r,s) \neq (i,j)$  that:

$$||Q^{(ij)} - Q^{(rs)}||_{\max}^2 = \gamma^2$$

Next, consider the KL divergences between a pair of hypotheses. Let  $(\tilde{P}^{(ij)}, \tilde{Q}^{(ij)})$  be the distribution of the data under hypothesis  $(P^{(ij)}, Q^{(ij)})$ . Since  $\tilde{P}^{(ij)} = P^{(ij)} = P$  for all (i,j), we must simply bound  $KL(\tilde{Q}^{(ij)}, \tilde{Q}^{(rs)})$  for each pair (ij,rs). Now, let  $\pi_R^{(ij)}, \pi_C^{(ij)}$  be the row and column sampling distributions (possibly deterministic) respectively, based on the source data  $\tilde{P}^{(ij)}$ . Since  $\tilde{P}^{(ij)} = P^{(ij)} = P$  for all (i,j) we know that there is a pair of distributions  $\pi_R, \pi_C$  such that  $\pi_R^{(ij)} = \pi_R, \pi_C^{(ij)} = \pi_C$  for all (i,j). In other words the sampling cannot depend on the hypothesis index (i,j).

Next, we analyze  $KL(\widetilde{Q}^{(ij)}, \widetilde{Q}^{(rs)})$ . Each distribution depends on the randomness of  $\pi_R, \pi_C$  as well as the Gaussian noise. Let R, C be the random multisets of rows and columns generated by  $\pi_R, \pi_C$  according to the prescribed row/column budgets. By the chain rule for KL divergences (Theorem 2.15 of [PW24]), we have:

$$KL(\widetilde{Q}^{(ij)},\!\widetilde{Q}^{(rs)}) \!=\! \underset{R,C}{\mathbb{E}} \! \left[ KL \bigg( \big(\widetilde{Q}^{(ij)}|R,\!C), \big(\widetilde{Q}^{(rs)}|R,\!C) \bigg) \right]$$

Note that the marginal term involving  $\pi_R^{(ij)}, \pi_C^{(ij)}$  versus  $\pi_R^{(rs)}, \pi_C^{(rs)}$  is zero, because the distributions are equal for all ij,rs.

Next, for  $u \in [m], v \in [n]$ , let  $n_{uv}(R,C)$  be the number of times that (u,v) is sampled in R,C. Notice that  $\mathbb{E}_{R,C}[n_{uv}(R,C)] = |\Omega| \pi_R(u) \pi_C(v)$ . So, by Lemma A.9,

$$\mathbb{E}_{R,C}\left[KL\left(\left(\widetilde{Q}^{(ij)}|R,C\right),\left(\widetilde{Q}^{(rs)}|R,C\right)\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{R,C}\left[\sum_{u\in[m],v\in[n]} \frac{n_{uv}(R,C)}{\sigma_Q^2} (Q_{uv}^{(ij)} - Q_{uv}^{(rs)})^2\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{R,C}\left[\frac{\gamma^2}{\sigma_Q^2} (n_{ij}(R,C) + n_{rs}(R,C))\right]$$

$$= \frac{\gamma^2 |\Omega|}{\sigma_Q^2} (\pi_R(i)\pi_C(j) + \pi_R(r)\pi_C(s))$$

Hence, the average KL divergence for all pairs is:

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{d^4} \sum_{(i,j) \in [d]^2(r,s) \in [d]^2} & KL(\widetilde{Q}^{(ij)}, \widetilde{Q}^{(rs)}) = \frac{\gamma^2 |\Omega|}{\sigma_Q^2 d^4} \sum_{(i,j) \in [d]^2(r,s) \in [d]^2} \sum_{(\pi_R(i)\pi_C(j) + \pi_R(r)\pi_C(s))} \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma^2 |\Omega|}{\sigma_Q^2 d^4} \sum_{(i,j) \in [d]^2} (1 + d^2 \pi_R(i) \pi_C(j)) \\ & \leq \frac{\gamma^2 |\Omega|}{\sigma_Q^2 d^4} \cdot 2d^2 \\ & = \frac{2\gamma^2 |\Omega|}{\sigma_Q^2 d^2} \end{split}$$

Let  $\gamma^2 = \frac{1}{10} \frac{\sigma_Q^2 d^2}{|\Omega|}$ . By Theorem A.8, we conclude that for  $d \ge 2$ , the minimax rate of estimation is at least  $\frac{1}{10} \gamma^2 = \frac{1}{100} \frac{\sigma_Q^2 d^2}{|\Omega|}$ 

## A.5 Proof of Proposition 2.4

We use the classical characterization of G-optimal designs due to Kiefer and Wolfowitz.

**Theorem A.10** ([KW60]). Let  $\pi$  be a distribution on a finite space  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . The following are equivalent:

- $\pi$  is G-optimal.
- $g(\pi) = d$ .
- For  $V(\pi) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a) a a^T$ ,  $\pi$  maximizes logdet  $V(\pi)$ .

We now prove the tensorization of G-optimal designs.

**Proposition A.11** (Restatement of Proposition 2.4). Let  $\rho$  be a G-optimal design for  $\{\hat{U}_P^T e_i : i \in [m]\}$  and  $\zeta$  be a G-optimal design for  $\{\hat{V}_P^T e_j : j \in [n]\}$ . Let  $\pi(i,j) = \rho(i)\zeta(j)$  be a distribution on  $[m] \times [n]$ . Then  $\pi$  is a G-optimal design on  $\{\hat{V}_P^T e_j : j \in [m]\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i \in [m], j \in [n]$ . Then by the Kiefer-Wolfowitz theorem,

$$\begin{split} g(\pi) &= \max_{i,j} \left[ (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \left( \sum_{i,j} \pi(i,j) (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}) (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \right)^{-1} (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}) \right] \\ &= \max_{i,j} \left[ (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \left( \left( \sum_{j} \zeta(j) \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \boldsymbol{e}_{j}^{T} \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \right) \otimes \left( \sum_{i} \rho(i) \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}^{T} \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \right) \right)^{-1} (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}) \right] \\ &= \max_{i,j} \left[ (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \left[ \left( \sum_{j} \zeta(j) \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \boldsymbol{e}_{j}^{T} \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \right)^{-1} \otimes \left( \sum_{i} \rho(i) \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}^{T} \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \right)^{-1} \right] (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \right] \\ &= \max_{i,j} \left[ (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j})^{T} \left( \sum_{j} \zeta(j) \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j} \boldsymbol{e}_{j}^{T} \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \right)^{-1} (\hat{V}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{j}) (\hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i})^{T} \left( \sum_{i} \rho(i) \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}^{T} \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \right)^{-1} (\hat{U}_{P}^{T} \boldsymbol{e}_{i}) \right] \\ &= g(\rho) g(\zeta) \\ &= d^{2} \end{split}$$

Where the last step follows from G-optimality of  $\rho$  and  $\zeta$ . By Theorem A.10,  $\pi$  is G-optimal.

### A.6 Proof of Theorem 2.6

We first prove a useful error decomposition.

**Proposition A.12** (Decomposition). Let  $\hat{U}_P \in \mathcal{O}^{m \times d}$ ,  $\hat{V}_P \mathcal{O}^{n \times d}$  be the estimates of the left/right singular vectors of P. Then there exist matrices  $W_U, W_V \in O(d, \mathbb{R})$  such that if  $T_1, T_2$  are the distribution shift matrices as in Definition 1.2, and if  $M = (W_U^T T_1) R(T_2^T W_V)$ , then:

$$Q = \hat{U}_{P}(W_{U}^{T}T_{1})R(T_{2}^{T}W_{V})\hat{V}_{P}^{T} + E$$

Where the E-error depends on the estimator error of  $\hat{P}$ .

$$E := (\hat{U}_P - U_P W_U) M \hat{V}_P^T + \hat{U}_P M (\hat{V}_P - V_P W_V)^T + (\hat{U}_P - U_P W_U) M (\hat{V}_P - V_P W_V)^T$$

*Proof.* Let  $T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be the distributional shift matrices from Definition 1.2 such that  $U_Q = U_P T_1, V_Q = V_P T_2$ .

Let  $W_U$  be the solution to the Procrustes problem:

$$W_U := \arg \inf_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{d \times d}} ||U_P W - \hat{U}_P||_{2 \to \infty}$$

And similarly,

$$W_V := \arg\inf_{W \in \mathcal{O}^{d \times d}} ||V_P W - \hat{V}_P||_{2 \to \infty}$$

Next, let  $Z = T_1 R T_2^T$  and  $M = W_U^T Z W_V$ . Further, let  $\Delta_U = \hat{U}_P - \hat{U}_P W_U$  and  $\Delta_V = \hat{V}_P - \hat{V}_P W_V$ . Then, we can write Q as:

$$Q = U_P T_1 R (V_P T_2)^T$$

$$= U_P Z V_P^T$$

$$= U_P W_U W_U^T Z W_V W_V^T V_P^T$$

$$= (\hat{U}_P + \Delta_U) W_U^T Z W_V (\hat{V}_P + \Delta_V)^T$$

$$= \hat{U}_P M \hat{V}_P^T + E$$

Where E contains the cross-terms:

$$E = \Delta_U M \hat{V}_P^T + \hat{U}_P M \Delta_V^T + \Delta_U M \Delta_V^T$$

So we are done.  $\Box$ 

We require a strong form of matrix concentration due to [TJP23].

**Lemma A.13** (Design Matrix Concentration). Let  $\hat{\pi}$  be an  $\epsilon$ -approximate G-optimal design on a finite set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\rho, \delta > 0$  and  $t \geq 2(1+\epsilon)(\frac{1}{\rho^2} + \frac{1}{3\rho})d\log(\frac{2d}{\delta})$ . Suppose  $\Omega = \{\boldsymbol{a}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{a}_t\}$  is the multiset of t samples drawn i.i.d. from  $\hat{\pi}$ , and let  $W_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \boldsymbol{a}_i \boldsymbol{a}_i^T$ . Then:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[(1-\rho)\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in A}\hat{\pi}(\boldsymbol{a})\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^T \preceq W_t \preceq (1+\rho)\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in A}\hat{\pi}(\boldsymbol{a})\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^T\right] \geq 1-\delta$$

In particular, since  $\hat{\pi}$  is  $\epsilon$ -approximately G-optimal,

$$\mathbb{P}\!\left[\frac{d}{(1\!+\!\rho)}\!\leq\!\max_{\boldsymbol{a}\in A}\!\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_{W_t^{-1}}^2\!\leq\!\frac{(1\!+\!\epsilon)d}{(1\!-\!\rho)}\right]\!\geq\!1\!-\!\delta$$

We also require the following standard bound on the maximum of Gaussians.

**Lemma A.14** ([Ver18] 2.5.10). Let  $X_1,...,X_n \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} N(0,\sigma^2)$ . Then for all u > 0,

$$\mathbb{P}[\max_{i} X_{i}^{2} \ge 4\sigma^{2}\log(n) + 2u^{2}] \le \exp(-\frac{u^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}).$$

Proof of Theorem 2.6. We first introduce some notation. Let  $S_r, S_c$  be the multisets of rows/columns sampled and  $\Omega = S_r \times S_c$ .

Let  $\psi_j = \hat{V}_P^T e_j$  and  $\varphi_i = \hat{U}_P^T e_i$ . Then, let  $\hat{\phi}_{ij} = \hat{V}_P^T e_j \otimes \hat{U}_P^T e_i = \psi_j \otimes \varphi_k$ , and  $W = \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T$ . Notice that:

$$W = \left(\sum_{j \in S_c} \psi_j \psi_j^T\right) \otimes \left(\sum_{i \in S_r} \varphi_i \varphi_i^T\right)$$

Therefore, let  $W_1 = \sum_{j \in S_c} \psi_i \psi_j^T$  and  $W_2 = \sum_{i \in S_r} \varphi_i \varphi_i^T$  for shorthand. Then  $W^{-1}$  exists iff  $W_1^{-1}, W_2^{-1}$  exist. By Lemma A.13, both  $W_1^{-1}, W_2^{-1}$  exist with probability at least  $1 - (m+n)^{-2}$ , since  $S_r, S_c$  are both large enough by assumption.

Therefore, conditioning on the inverses existing, if we solve the least-squares system, we obtain  $\hat{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that:

$$\operatorname{vec}(\hat{M}) = \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \widetilde{Q}_{ij}$$

Recall from Proposition A.12 that  $Q = \hat{U}_P M \hat{V}_P^T + E$ , where  $E_{ij} = \epsilon_{ij}$  is the misspecification error. Therefore, we can bound the error of  $\hat{Q} = \hat{U}_P M \hat{V}_P^T$  as:

$$\hat{Q}_{ij} - Q_{ij} = \mathbf{e}_i^T \hat{U}_P(\hat{M} - M) \hat{V}_P^T \mathbf{e}_j - \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$= \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T \text{vec}(\hat{M} - M) + \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$= : E_{1;ij} + E_{2;ij}$$

$$E_{1;ij} := \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T \text{vec}(\hat{M} - M)$$

$$E_{2:ij} := \epsilon_{ij}$$

Let  $G_{ij} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} N(0,\sigma_Q^2)$  be the additive noise for  $\widetilde{Q}_{ij}$ . Then,  $\widetilde{Q}_{ij} = \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T \text{vec}(M) + \epsilon_{ij} + G_{ij}$ . Hence we can write  $E_1$  as:

$$\begin{split} E_{1;k\ell} &= \left( \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T (\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \widetilde{Q}_{ij} \right) - \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \text{vec}(M) \\ &= \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \bigg( (\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \left( \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T \text{vec}(M) + \epsilon_{ij} + G_{ij} \right) \bigg) - \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \text{vec}(M) \\ &= \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \bigg( (\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \left( \epsilon_{ij} + G_{ij} \right) \bigg) \\ &= \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \bigg( (\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \epsilon_{ij} \bigg) + \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \bigg( (\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T)^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} G_{ij} \bigg) \\ &= : E_{3;k\ell} + E_{4;k\ell} \end{split}$$

We analyze  $E_4$  first. Let  $\boldsymbol{x} = W^{-1} \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} G_{ij}$ . For any  $k, \ell$ , we wish to bound  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{k\ell}^T \boldsymbol{x}$ . Notice that  $\boldsymbol{x}$  is a multivariate Gaussian with mean  $\boldsymbol{0}$ . Its covariance is therefore:

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}^{T}] = \sum_{ij \in \Omega} \sum_{i'j' \in \Omega} W^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{i'j'}^{T} W^{-1} \mathbb{E}[G_{ij}G_{i'j'}] = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} = \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in \Omega} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ij}^{T}\right) W^{-1} + \sigma_{Q}^{2} W^{-1} \left(\sum_{ij \in$$

Hence  $\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T x$  is a scalar Gaussian with mean zero and variance  $\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T \sigma_Q^2 W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}$ . We next bound this quadratic form. Notice that we can tensorize the quadratic form as:

$$\phi_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \phi_{k\ell} = (\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell} \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k)^T (W_1 \otimes W_2)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell} \otimes \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k)$$
$$= (\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell} W_1^{-1} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell}) (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_k W_2^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k)$$

We apply Lemma A.13 to each term in the product. With probability  $1-2(m+n)^{-2}$ , for  $S_r, S_c$  both of size at least  $20d\log(\frac{2d}{m+n})$ ,

$$\|\psi_{\ell}\|_{W_1^{-1}}^2 \|\varphi_k\|_{W_2^{-1}}^2 \le \frac{(2+2\epsilon)d^2}{|S_r||S_c|}$$

Conditioning on this event, the variance of  $\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T x$  is at most  $\frac{(1+\epsilon)d^2\sigma_Q^2}{|\Omega|(1-\rho)}$ , for  $|\Omega| = |S_r||S_c|$ . Therefore, by Lemma A.14,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{k \in [m], \ell \in [n]} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{k\ell}^T \boldsymbol{x} \right|^2 \leq 20 \log(mn) \frac{(2 + 2\epsilon)\sigma_Q^2 d^2}{|\Omega|} \right] \leq \delta + (mn)^{-2}$$

Finally, we analyze the error term  $E_{3;k\ell}$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|E_{3;k\ell}| \le \left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} a_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} \epsilon_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2}$$

First,

$$\begin{split} \sum_{ij\in\Omega} a_{ij}^2 &= \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \operatorname{tr} \left( \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} \left( \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} \left( \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \right) \\ &= \left| \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{(2+2\epsilon)d^2}{|\Omega|} \end{split}$$

For the other term,

$$\left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} \epsilon_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} \leq |\Omega|^{1/2} \max_{ij\in\Omega} |\epsilon_{ij}|$$

It follows that  $\max_{k,\ell} |E_{3;k\ell}| \leq \sqrt{2+2\epsilon} \cdot d\max_{i,j\in\Omega} |\epsilon_{ij}|$ . The conclusion follows.

## A.7 Proof of Theorem 2.9

We require the following concentration result to control the sizes of masks.

**Lemma A.15** (Bernoulli Concentration). Let  $X_1,...,X_n \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} Bernoulli(p)$  for  $p \in (0,1)$ . Then if  $p \ge 10 \log n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\sum_{i}(X_{i}-p)\right| \geq \frac{np}{2}\right] \leq n^{-\omega(1)}$$

*Proof.* By the scalar Bernstein inequality (Lemma A.16), we have for B=1 and  $\zeta=np$  that:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\sum_{i} (X_i - p)\right| \ge \tau\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{\tau^2/2}{\zeta + (B\tau/3)}\right)$$

Let  $\tau = np/2$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\sum_{i} (X_{i} - p)\right| \ge \tau\right] \le 2\exp\left(\frac{-10}{8}\log n\right)$$

$$\le 2n^{-(\log n)^{1/4}}$$

We are ready to prove the estimation error for passive sampling.

Proof of Theorem 2.9. Following the notation of the proof of Theorem 2.6, we want to bound  $E_{3;k\ell}$  and  $E_{4;k\ell}$ . However, rather than using G-optimality to bound quadratic forms of the type  $\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}W^{-1}\hat{\phi}_{ij}$ , we will apply spectral concentration via Proposition A.17.

To this end, we condition on the events that  $\hat{V}_P^T \Pi_R \hat{V}_P \succeq \frac{p_{\text{Row}}}{2}$  and  $\hat{U}_P^T \Pi_C \hat{U}_P \succeq \frac{p_{\text{Col}}}{2}$ . By Proposition A.4 and Proposition A.17, the two events occur simultaneously with probability  $\geq 1 - 2(m \wedge n)^{-10}$ . Then  $W^{-1}$  exists and  $W^{-1} \preceq \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}}p_{\text{Col}}}I$ . Therefore, for all  $i,j,k,\ell$ , by incoherence,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{k\ell}^{T} W^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \right| &\leq \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}} \| \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{k\ell} \| \| \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{ij} \| \\ &= \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}} \| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{k} \| \| \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{i} \| \| \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell} \| \| \boldsymbol{\psi}_{j} \| \\ &\leq \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\mu_{U}^{2} \mu_{V}^{2} d^{4}}{m^{2} n^{2}}} \right) \\ &= \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}} \frac{\mu d^{2}}{m n} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma A.14,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{k \in [m], \ell \in [n]} |E_{4;k\ell}|^2 \le 20 \log(mn) \sigma_Q^2 \frac{4}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}}} \frac{\mu d^2}{mn}\right] \le 2(m \wedge n)^{-10} + (mn)^{-2}.$$

Next, we analyze  $E_3$ . Let  $a_{ij} = \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{ij}$ . Let p = q = 2. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|E_{3;k\ell}| \le \left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} a_{ij}^p\right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} \epsilon_{ij}^q\right)^{1/q}$$

First, we have:

$$\begin{split} \sum_{ij\in\Omega} a_{ij}^2 &= \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \mathrm{tr} \bigg( \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \bigg) \\ &= \mathrm{tr} \bigg( \sum_{ij\in\Omega} \hat{\phi}_{ij} \hat{\phi}_{ij}^T W^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell} \hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^T W^{-1} \bigg) \end{split}$$

$$=\operatorname{tr}\left(\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^TW^{-1}\right)$$
$$=\left|\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}^TW^{-1}\hat{\phi}_{k\ell}\right|$$
$$\leq \frac{4\mu d^2}{p_{\mathrm{Bow}}p_{\mathrm{Col}}mn}$$

On the other hand,

$$\left(\sum_{ij\in\Omega} \epsilon_{ij}^q\right)^{1/2} \le |\Omega|^{1/2} \max_{ij\in\Omega} |\epsilon_{ij}|$$

Notice  $\mathbb{E}[|\Omega|] = mnp_{\text{Row}}p_{\text{Col}}$ . By Lemma A.15, with probability  $\geq 1 - 4(m \wedge n)^{-\omega(1)}$ ,

$$|\Omega| \le \frac{9}{4} p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} mn$$

Therefore, with probability  $\geq 1 - 4(m \wedge n)^{-2}$ ,

$$\frac{\sqrt{|\Omega|}}{p_{\mathrm{Row}}p_{\mathrm{Col}}mn} \leq \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\mathrm{Row}}p_{\mathrm{Col}}mn}}$$

The conclusion follows.

## A.8 Proof of Proposition 2.11

We require the following version of the Matrix Bernstein Inequality [CCF<sup>+</sup>21].

**Lemma A.16** (Matrix Bernstein Inequality). Suppose that  $\{Y_i : i = 1,...,n\}$  are independent mean-zero random matrices of size  $d_1 \times d_2$ , such that  $||Y_i||_2 \le B$  almost surely for all i, and  $\zeta \ge \max\{||\mathbb{E}[\sum_i Y_i Y_i^T]||_2, ||\mathbb{E}[\sum_i Y_i^T Y_i]||_2\}$  Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i}\right\|_{2} \geq \tau\right] \leq (d_{1} + d_{2}) \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^{2}/2}{\zeta + B\tau/3}\right)$$

We now prove nondegeneracy of masks with high probability.

**Proposition A.17** (Spectral Concentration). Suppose that  $\hat{V}_P$  and  $\hat{U}_P$  are  $\mu_V, \mu_U$ -incoherent respectively. Let  $\Pi_C \in \{0,1\}^{n \times n}$  be the random matrix with diagonal entries  $\nu_1, ..., \nu_n$  and similarly let  $\Pi_R \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$  have diagonal entries  $\eta_1, ..., \eta_m$ . Then, assuming that  $\mu_V \leq \frac{p_{\text{Col}} n}{400 \text{dlog} n}$  and  $\mu_U \leq \frac{p_{\text{Row}} n}{400 \text{dlog} n}$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{U}_P^T \Pi_R \hat{U}_P \succeq p_{\text{Row}}/2] \ge 1 - m^{-10}$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{V}_P^T \Pi_C \hat{V}_P \succeq p_{\text{Col}}/2] \ge 1 - n^{-10}$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\hat{V}_P$  has rows  $y_1,...,y_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then,

$$\hat{V}_P^T \Pi_C \hat{V}_P = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \boldsymbol{y}_i \boldsymbol{y}_i^T.$$

Let  $\boldsymbol{v}_i = \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{y}_i$ . Let  $p_{\text{Col}} = \mathbb{E}[\nu_i]$ . We use  $p = p_{\text{Col}}$  for shorthand. Notice  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_P^T \Pi_C \hat{V}_P] = \sum_i p \boldsymbol{y}_i \boldsymbol{y}_i^T = p I_d$ , since  $\hat{V}_P^T \hat{V}_P = I_d$ . Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{i} \nu_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{T} - p n I_{d} \right\|_{2} = \left\| \sum_{i} (\nu_{i} - p) \boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{T} \right\|_{2}$$

Let  $Y_i = (\nu_i - p) \boldsymbol{v}_i \boldsymbol{v}_i^T$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = 0$ . Next, let  $\mu := \mu_V$ . By incoherence,  $||Y_i||_2 \le ||\boldsymbol{v}_i||_2^2 \le \mu d$  for all i. Further,

$$\begin{split} \max\{\|\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i}Y_{i}Y_{i}^{T}]\|_{2}, &\|\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i}Y_{i}^{T}Y_{i}]\|_{2}\} = \|\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i}Y_{i}^{2}]\|_{2} \\ &= p(1-p)\|\sum_{i}\|\boldsymbol{v}_{i}\|_{2}^{2}\boldsymbol{v}_{i}\boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{T}\|_{2} \\ &\leq p(1-p)n\mu d\|\sum_{i}\boldsymbol{y}_{i}\boldsymbol{y}_{i}^{T}\|_{2} \\ &= p(1-p)n\mu d \end{split}$$

Thus, by Lemma A.16, for  $B = \mu d$  and  $\zeta = p(1-p)n\mu d$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i}\right\|_{2} \geq \tau\right] \leq 2n \exp\left(-\frac{\tau^{2}/2}{\zeta + B\tau/3}\right)$$

Setting  $\tau = 10\sqrt{p(1-p)n\mu d \log n} \vee 10\mu d\sqrt{\log n}$  implies that:

$$\mathbb{P}\!\left[\sum_{i}\!\nu_{i}\boldsymbol{v}_{i}\boldsymbol{v}_{i}^{T}\!\succeq\!pn\!-\!\tau\right]\!\geq\!1\!-\!n^{-10}$$

If  $\mu \leq \frac{pn}{400d\log n}$ , then  $\tau \leq pn/2 = p_{\text{Col}} \cdot n/2$ . We conclude that  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{V}_P^T \Pi_C \hat{V}_P \succeq p_{\text{Col}}/2] \geq 1 - n^{-10}$ . An identical argument gives  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{U}_P^T \Pi_R \hat{U}_P \succeq p_{\text{Row}}/2] \geq 1 - m^{-10}$ .

**Corollary A.18.** Under the assumptions of Proposition A.17, the design matrix for passive sampling has rank  $d^2$  with probability at least  $1-2(m \wedge n)^{-10}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega \subset [m] \times [n]$  be the set of indices corresponding to the observed entries of  $\widetilde{Q}$ . Let  $P_{\Omega} \in \{0,1\}^{|\Omega| \times mn}$  be the coordinate projection. The design matrix is precisely  $P_{\Omega}(\hat{V}_P \otimes \hat{U}_P)$ . Then, notice that:

$$(P_{\Omega}(\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}))^{T} (P_{\Omega}(\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P})) = (\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P})^{T} P_{\Omega}^{T} P_{\Omega}(\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P})$$

$$= (\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P})^{T} (\Pi_{C} \otimes \Pi_{R}) (\hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P})$$

$$= \hat{V}_{P}^{T} \Pi_{C} \hat{V}_{P} \otimes \hat{U}_{P}^{T} \Pi_{R} \hat{U}_{P}$$

By Proposition A.17, this matrix has rank at least  $d^2$  with probability  $\geq 1 - 2(m \wedge n)^{-10}$ .

### A.9 Proof of Theorem 2.12

We require the Gilbert-Varshamov code [GRS19].

**Theorem A.19** (Gilbert-Varshamov). Let  $q \ge 2$  be a prime power. For  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{q-1}{q}$  there exists an  $\epsilon$ -balanced code  $C \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$  with rate  $\Omega(\epsilon^2 n)$ .

We will use the following version of Fano's inequality.

**Theorem A.20** (Generalized Fano Method, [Yu97]). Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of probability measures,  $(\mathcal{D},d)$  a pseudo-metric space, and  $\theta: \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{D}$  a map that extracts the parameters of interest. For a distinguished  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , let  $X \sim P$  be the data and  $\hat{\theta}:=\hat{\theta}(X)$  be an estimator for  $\theta(P)$ .

Let  $r \ge 2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_r \subset \mathcal{P}$  be a finite hypothesis class of size r. Let  $\alpha_r, \beta_r > 0$  be such that for all  $i \ne j$ , and all  $P_i, P_j \in \mathcal{P}_r$ ,

$$d(\theta(P_i), \theta(P_i)) \ge \alpha_r;$$

$$KL(P_i,P_i) \leq \beta_r$$
.

Then

$$\max_{j \in [r]} \! \mathbb{E}_{P_j}[d(\hat{\theta}(X),\! \theta(P_j))] \! \geq \! \frac{\alpha_r}{2} \bigg( 1 \! - \! \frac{\beta_r \! + \! \log 2}{\log r} \bigg).$$

We can now prove Theorem 2.12.

Proof of Theorem 2.12. Let  $C \subset \{0,1\}^{d^2}$  be the 0.1-balanced Gilbert-Varshmaov code as in Theorem A.19. Let  $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  be Stiefel matrices with incoherence parameter  $\mu = O(1)$ . Let  $P = U \Sigma_P V^T$  for a diagonal  $\Sigma_P \succ 0$  to be specified later. Let  $\delta_Q > 0$  be a positive real to be specified later.

We will construct a family of source/target pairs indexed by C similar to [JMMS24]. For  $w \in C$ , let  $B_w \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be defined as:

$$B_{w;ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{mn}}{2d} & w_{ij} = 0\\ \frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d} (\frac{1}{2} + \delta_Q) & w_{ij} = 1 \end{cases}$$

Then define  $(P_w,Q_w) = (P,UB_wV^T)$ .

For a fixed  $w \in C$ , the distribution of the data  $(A_P, \widetilde{Q})$  depends on the random noise and masking of both  $A_P, \widetilde{Q}$ . Let  $D_R \in \{0,1\}^{m \times m}$  and  $D_C \in \{0,1\}^{n \times n}$  be the diagonal matrices corresponding to the row/column masks for Q, and let  $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  have iid  $N(0, \sigma_Q^2)$  entries. Then  $\widetilde{Q} = D_R(Q+G)D_C$ .

Now, we will apply Theorem A.20 to lower bound  $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{mn}\|\hat{Q}-Q_w\|_F^2\middle|D_R,D_C\right]$ . Fix any  $D_R\in\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{E}_1),D_C\in\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ . Let  $\widetilde{P}_w,\widetilde{Q}_w$  denote the distribution of the data when the population matrices are  $P_w,Q_w$  and we condition on the Q-mask matrices  $D_R,D_C$ .

By Theorem A.19, the hypothesis space indexed by C is such that  $\log(|C|) \ge C_1 d^2$  for absolute constant  $C_1 > 0$ . Next, for distinct  $w, w' \in C$ ,

$$\begin{split} KL((\widetilde{P}_{w}, \widetilde{Q}_{w}), &(\widetilde{P}_{w'}, \widetilde{Q}_{w'})) = KL(\widetilde{P}_{w'}, \widetilde{P}_{w}) + KL(\widetilde{Q}_{w}, \widetilde{Q}_{w'}) \\ &\leq KL(\widetilde{Q}_{w}, \widetilde{Q}_{w'}) \\ &= KL((D_{C} \otimes D_{R}) \text{vec}(Q_{w} + G), (D_{C} \otimes D_{R}) \text{vec}(Q_{w'} + G)) \end{split}$$

Notice that we do not use any properties of  $\widetilde{P}_w, \widetilde{P}_{w'}$ , and in particular allow for deterministic  $\widetilde{P}_w = P_w = P$ . Since  $D_C, D_R$  are fixed, this is simply the KL divergence of two multiariate Gaussians with the same covariance but different means. Therefore, by Lemma A.9, we have that:

$$\begin{split} KL((\widetilde{P}_{w}, \widetilde{Q}_{w}), &(\widetilde{P}_{w'}, \widetilde{Q}_{w'})) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{Q}^{2}} \operatorname{vec}(Q_{w} - Q_{w'})^{T} (D_{C} \otimes D_{R})^{T} (D_{C} \otimes D_{R})^{-1} (D_{C} \otimes D_{R}) \operatorname{vec}(Q_{w} - Q_{w'}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{Q}^{2}} \|D_{R} (Q_{w} - Q_{w'}) D_{C}\|_{F}^{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{Q}^{2}} \|D_{R} U (B_{w} - B_{w'}) V^{T} D_{C}\|_{F}^{2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{Q}^{2}} \|D_{R} U\|_{2}^{2} \|D_{C} V\|_{2}^{2} \|B_{w} - B_{w'}\|_{F}^{2} \\ &\leq \frac{5p_{\operatorname{Row}} p_{\operatorname{Col}}}{\sigma_{Q}^{2}} \left(\delta_{Q}^{2} \frac{mn}{d^{2}}\right) d^{2} \end{split}$$

$$= \frac{5p_{\rm Row}p_{\rm Col}mn\delta_Q^2}{\sigma_Q^2}.$$

In the penultimate step, we used the fact that  $D_R \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}_1), D_C \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}_2)$ .

Next, for any distinct  $w, w' \in C$ , by Theorem A.19 we have that  $\mathbb{P}_{i,j \in [d]}[w_{ij} \neq w'_{ij}] \geq 0.1$ . Therefore,

$$||Q_{w} - Q_{w'}||_{F} = ||U(B_{w} - B_{w'})V^{T}||_{F}$$

$$= ||(B_{w} - B_{w'})||_{F}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i,j \in [d]: w_{ij} \neq w'_{ij}} \delta_{Q}^{2} \frac{mn}{d^{2}}\right)^{1/2}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{10} \delta_{Q} \sqrt{mn}$$

In the notation of Theorem A.20, we have:

$$\alpha_r := \frac{1}{10} \delta_Q \sqrt{mn}$$
 
$$\beta_r = \frac{5p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} m n \delta_Q^2}{\sigma_Q^2}$$

Since  $\log(|C|) \ge C_1 d^2$ , we set  $\delta_Q = \sqrt{\frac{C_1 d^2 \sigma_Q^2}{10 p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} m n}}$  so that that  $\beta_r = \frac{C_1 d^2}{2}$ . Therefore, by Theorem A.20, for absolute constants  $C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{D_R \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}_1), D_C \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{E}_2)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{mn} \| \hat{Q} - Q_w \|_F^2 \middle| D_R, D_C \right] &\geq \frac{C_2 \alpha_r^2}{mn} \\ &\geq C_3 \delta_Q^2 \\ &\geq \frac{C_4 d^2 \sigma_Q^2}{p_{\text{Row}} p_{\text{Col}} mn} \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows.

# **B** Additional Experiments and Details

Compute environment. We run all experiments on a Linux machine with 378GB of CPU/RAM. The total compute time across all results in the paper was less than 4 hours.

**Dataset details.** For the gene expression experiments, we gather whole-blood sepsis gene expression data sampled by [PTN<sup>+</sup>13], available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=gse54514. We take the intersection of rows and columns present on days 1 and 2 of the study, and then filter by the 300 most expressed columns (genes) on day 1, to obtain  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{31\times300}$ . Here  $P_{ij}$  is the expression level of gene j for patient i on day 1, and  $Q_{ij}$  is the same on day 2.

For the metabolic networks experiments, we access the BiGG genome-scale metabolic models datasets [KLD<sup>+</sup>16] at http://bigg.ucsd.edu. We use the same set of shared metabolites for iWFL1372 (the source species P) and IJN1463 (the target species Q) as [JMMS24]. The resulting networks are weighted undirected graphs with adjacency matrices  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{251 \times 251}$  where  $P_{ij}$  counts the number of co-occurrences of metabolites i,j in iWFL1372, and  $Q_{ij}$  does the same for IJN1463.

**Details of the baselines.** For the method of [BC22], we use the estimator from their Section 2.2, but modify step (3) to truncate to the true rank d, and in step (6) truncate to the true rank of the propensity matrix whose (i,j) entry is  $\eta_i \nu_j$ . The propensity rank is always 1 in our case. This is the estimator  $\hat{Q}_{\text{BC22}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ .

For the method of [LLL22], we use the estimator from their Section 3.3, with weights  $w_P, w_Q$  based on estimated sub-gamma parameters of the noise for  $\widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q}$ . Then, let  $Q' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be:

$$Q'_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{w_P}{w_P + w_Q} \widetilde{P}_{ij} + \frac{w_Q}{w_P + w_Q} \widetilde{Q}_{ij} & \widetilde{Q}_{ij} \neq \star \\ \widetilde{P}_{ij} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We return the rank-d SVD truncation of Q' as  $\hat{Q}_{\text{LLL22}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ .

We will discuss additional ablation experiments in Section B.1, and experiments on the real-world data in Section B.2.

#### **B.1** Ablation Studies

Throughout this section we use the Partitioned Matrix Model with a=0.1,b=0.8 from Section 3. For each setting, we hold all parameters fixed and vary one parameter pto observe the effect of all algorithms on both Max Squared Error and Mean Squared Error. The default settings are:

- Matrices  $P,Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with m = 300, n = 200.
- The parameters a = 0.8, b = 0.1 in the Partitioned Matrix Model.
- Additive noise for  $\widetilde{Q}$  is iid  $\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_Q^2)$  with  $\sigma_Q = 0.1$ .
- The rank is d=5.
- $p_{\text{Row}} = p_{\text{Col}} = 0.5$ , so the probability of seeing any entry of Q is 0.25.

For all experiments, we test for 10 independent trials at each parameter setting and display the median error of each method, along with the [10,90] percentile.

Figure 9 shows that all methods do poorly in max errow when P is masked. Our methods are best in mean-squared error. This is because the Matrix Partition Model is highly coherent, as can be shown from spectral partitioning arguments [LGT14]. Therefore, the max-squared error is high, as we would expect from Remark 2.7 and the results of [CCF $^+$ 20].




Figure 5: We test the effect of growing the target additive noise parameter  $\sigma_Q$ .




Figure 6: We test the effect of growing the target additive noise parameter  $\sigma_P$ . Each entry of P is observed with i.i.d. additive noise  $\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma_P^2)$ .




Figure 7: We test the effect of growing n for  $P,\!Q\!\in\!\mathbb{R}^{300\times n}.$ 




Figure 8: We test the effect of rank.




Figure 9: We test the effect of masking entries of P in a Missing Completely-at-Random setup with probability p. Note that the errors for active and passive sampling are almost identical, so we use different markers (circle and triangle resp.) to distinguish them. We see that our methods do better in mean-squared error (left) while max error is poor for all methods (right).

## **B.2** Additional Real-World Experiments

We first display the weighted adjacency matrices for P,Q for the metabolic networks setting of Section 3 as Figure 10 and Figure 11. It is evident that the edge weights show significant skew. Note that the colorbar for both visualizations is logarithmically scaled.

Next, we report mean-squared error for the same experimental settings discussed in Section 3. Figure 13 shows the results for gene expression. Figure 12 shows the results for metabolic data; notably, despite poor performance in max-squared error, the passive sampling estimator is reasonably good in mean-squared error, although not as good as the active sampling estimator.




Figure 10: The source matrix P in the setting of Figure 3.




Figure 11: The target matrix Q in the setting of Figure 3.



# Metabolic Network Transfer




Figure 12: The mean-squared error of each  $\hat{Q}-Q$  in the setting of Figure 3.






Figure 13: The mean-squared error of each  $\hat{Q}-Q$  in the setting of Figure 2.