

Learning multivariate Gaussians with imperfect advice

Arnab Bhattacharyya
National University of Singapore
arnabb@nus.edu.sg

Davin Choo
National University of Singapore
davin@u.nus.edu

Philips George John
CNRS-CREATE & National University of Singapore
philips.george.john@u.nus.edu

Themis Gouleakis
Nanyang Technological University
themis.gouleakis@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract

We revisit the problem of distribution learning within the framework of learning-augmented algorithms. In this setting, we explore the scenario where a probability distribution is provided as potentially inaccurate advice on the true, unknown distribution. Our objective is to develop learning algorithms whose sample complexity decreases as the quality of the advice improves, thereby surpassing standard learning lower bounds when the advice is sufficiently accurate.

Specifically, we demonstrate that this outcome is achievable for the problem of learning a multivariate Gaussian distribution $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ in the PAC learning setting. Classically, in the advice-free setting, $\tilde{\Theta}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ samples are sufficient and worst case necessary to learn d -dimensional Gaussians up to TV distance ε with constant probability. When we are additionally given a parameter $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ as advice, we show that $\tilde{O}(d^{2-\beta}/\varepsilon^2)$ samples suffices whenever $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon d^{1-\beta}$ (where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the entrywise ℓ_1 norm) for any $\beta > 0$, yielding a polynomial improvement over the advice-free setting.

1 Introduction

The problem of approximating an underlying distribution from its observed samples is a fundamental scientific problem. The *distribution learning* problem has been studied for more than a century in statistics, and it is the underlying engine for much of applied machine learning. The emphasis in modern applications is on high-dimensional distributions, with the goal being to understand when one can escape the curse of dimensionality. The survey by [Dia16] gives an excellent overview of classical and modern techniques for distribution learning, especially when there is some underlying structure to be exploited.

In this work, we investigate how to go beyond worst case sample complexities for learning distributions. We consider the situation where the algorithm is also given the aid of possibly imperfect advice regarding the input distribution. We position our study in the context of *algorithms with predictions*, where the usual problem input is supplemented by “predictions” or “advice” (potentially drawn from modern machine learning models) and the algorithm’s goal is to incorporate the advice in a way that improves performance if the advice is of high quality, but if the advice is inaccurate, there should not be degradation below the performance in the no-advice setting. Most previous work in this setting are in the context of online algorithms, e.g. for the ski-rental problem [GP19, WLW20, ADJ+20], non-clairvoyant scheduling [PSK18], scheduling [LLMV20, BMRS20, AJS22], augmenting classical data structures with predictions (e.g. indexing [KBC+18] and Bloom filters [Mit18]), online selection and matching problems [AGKK20, DLPLV21, CGLB24], online TSP [BLMS+22, GLS23], and a more general framework of online primal-dual algorithms [BMS20]. However, there have been some recent applications to other areas, e.g. graph algorithms [CSVZ22, DIL+21] and causal learning [CGB23].

We apply the algorithms with predictions perspective to the classical problem of learning high-dimensional Gaussian distributions. It is known (e.g. see Appendix C of [ABDH+20]) that:

- Given $\tilde{\Theta}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ i.i.d. samples from a d -dimensional Gaussian $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ with unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and identity covariance, one can learn $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$

- Given $\tilde{\Theta}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ i.i.d. samples from a d -dimensional Gaussian $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ with unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and unknown covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, one can learn $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})) \leq \varepsilon$

Here, d_{TV} denotes the *total variation distance*, and the algorithm for both cases is the most obvious one: compute the empirical mean and empirical covariance. Meanwhile, note that if one is given as advice the correct mean $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, then using distribution testing, one can certify that $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ using only $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon^2)$ samples [DKS17, Appendix C], quadratically better than without advice. This observation motivates the object of our study.

Gaussian Learning with Advice: Given samples from a Gaussian $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, as well as advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$, how many samples are required to recover $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})) \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$? The sample complexity should be a function of the dimension, ε, δ , as well as a measure of how close $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ are to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ respectively.

1.1 Our main results

We give the first known results in distribution learning with imperfect advice. Our techniques are piecewise elementary and easy to follow. Furthermore, we provide polynomial algorithms for producing the estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ based on LASSO and SDP formulations.

Given a mean $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as advice, we present two algorithms TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN and TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE that provably improve on the sample complexities of $\tilde{\Theta}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ and $\tilde{\Theta}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ for identity and general covariances respectively when given high quality advice.

Theorem 1. *For any given $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN algorithm uses*

$$n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min \left\{ 1, d^{-\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-1}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1^2 \right\} \right)$$

i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ for some unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and identity covariance \mathbf{I}_d , and can produce $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d)$ time such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Theorem 2. *For any given $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE algorithm uses*

$$n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min \left\{ 1, d^{-2\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-2}}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \|\text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2 \right\} \right)$$

i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for some unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and unknown covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, and can produce $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon))$ time such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

In particular, the TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN algorithm uses only $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{d^{1-\beta}}{\varepsilon^2})$ samples when $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 < \varepsilon d^{\frac{1-3\beta}{2}} = \varepsilon \sqrt{d} \cdot d^{-\frac{3\beta}{2}}$ and the TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE algorithm uses only $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{d^{2-\beta}}{\varepsilon^2})$ samples when $\|\text{vec}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 < \varepsilon d^{1-\beta} = \varepsilon d \cdot d^{-\beta}$. Moreover, both our algorithms have runtime which is polynomial in d .

The choice of representing the quality of the advice in terms of the ℓ_1 -norm is well-motivated. It is known, e.g. see Theorem 2.5 of [FR13], that if a vector \boldsymbol{x} satisfies $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \leq \tau$, then for any positive integer s , $\sigma_s(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \tau/(2\sqrt{s})$, where $\sigma_s(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the ℓ_2 -error of the best s -sparse approximation to \boldsymbol{x} . Thus, if $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon d^{(1-\eta)/2}$, then $\sigma_{d^{1-\eta}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon$. The latter may be very reasonable, as one may have good predictions for most of the coordinates of the mean with the error in the advice concentrated on a sublinear $d^{1-\eta}$ coordinates.

We supplement our algorithmic upper bounds with information-theoretic lower bounds. Here, we say that an algorithm $(\varepsilon, 1 - \delta)$ -PAC learns a distribution \mathcal{P} if it can produce another distribution $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{P}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$. Our lower bounds tell us that $\tilde{\Omega}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ and $\tilde{\Omega}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ samples are unavoidable for PAC-learning $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ respectively when given low quality advice.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{400}$ and we are given advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with only the guarantee that $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{d}$. Then, any algorithm that $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC learns $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ requires $\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ samples in the worst case.*

Theorem 4. Suppose $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{12}$ and we are given advice $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with only the guarantee that $\|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_1 \leq \varepsilon d$. Then, any algorithm that $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC learns $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ requires $\Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2 \log 1/\varepsilon}\right)$ samples in the worst case.

Both of our lower bounds are tight in the following sense. Our algorithm TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN gives a polynomially-smaller sample complexity compared to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ when the advice quality (measured in terms of the ℓ_1 -norm) is polynomially smaller compared to $\varepsilon\sqrt{d}$. Theorem 3 shows that this is the best we can do; there is a hard instance where the advice quality is $\leq \varepsilon\sqrt{d}$ and we need $\tilde{\Omega}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples. Similarly, our algorithm TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE gives a polynomially-smaller sample complexity compared to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ when the advice quality (measured in terms of the entry-wise ℓ_1 -norm) is polynomially smaller compared to εd . Theorem 4 shows that there is a hard instance where the advice quality is $\leq \varepsilon d$ and we need $\tilde{\Omega}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples.

1.2 Technical overview

To obtain our upper bounds, we first show that the existing test statistics for non-tolerant testing can actually be used for tolerant testing with the same asymptotic sample complexity bounds and then use these new tolerant testers to test the advice quality. The tolerance is with respect to the ℓ_2 -norm for mean testing and with respect to the Frobenius norm for covariance testing. These results are folklore, but we did not manage to find formal proofs for them. As these may be of independent interest, we present their proofs in Appendix A.1 for completeness.

Lemma 5 (Tolerant mean tester). Given $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $d \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2$, there is a tolerant tester that uses $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and satisfies the following two conditions:

1. If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$, then the tester outputs **Accept** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.
2. If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$, then the tester outputs **Reject** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Lemma 6 (Tolerant covariance tester). Given $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $d \geq \varepsilon_2^2$, there is a tolerant tester that uses $\mathcal{O}\left(d \cdot \max\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2\right\} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and satisfies the following two conditions:

1. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq \varepsilon_1$, then the tester outputs **Accept** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.
2. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \geq \varepsilon_2$, then the tester outputs **Reject** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We will first explain how to obtain our result for TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN before explaining how a similar approach works for TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE.

1.2.1 Approach for TestAndOptimizeMean

Without loss of generality, we may assume henceforth that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{0}$ since one can always pre-process samples by subtracting $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and then add $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ back to the estimated $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. Our overall approach is quite natural: (i) use the tolerant testing algorithm in Lemma 5 to get an upper bound on the “advice quality”, and (ii) enforce the constraint on the “advice quality” when learning $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$.

The most immediate notion of advice quality one may posit is $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{0}\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2$. Let us see what issues arise. Using an exponential search process, we can invoke Lemma 5 directly to find some $r > 0$, such that $r/2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq r$. To argue about the sample complexity for learning $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, and ignoring computational efficiency, one can invoke the Scheffé tournament approach for density estimation. Let \mathcal{N} be an ε -cover in ℓ_2 of the the ℓ_2 -ball of radius r around $\mathbf{0}$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is ε -close in ℓ_2 to one of the points in \mathcal{N} . It is known (e.g. see Chapter 4 of [DL01]) that the sample complexity of the Scheffé tournament algorithm scales as $\log |\mathcal{N}|$. However, we have that $\log |\mathcal{N}| = \Omega(d)$; e.g. see Proposition 4.2.13 of [Ver18]. Indeed, one can get a formal lower bound showing that the sample complexity cannot be made sublinear in d for non-trivial values of r . To get around this barrier, we will instead take the notion of advice quality to be $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1$ instead of $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2$. It is known that $d^{\frac{c r^2}{\varepsilon^2}}$ ℓ_2 balls of radius ε suffice to cover an ℓ_1 -ball of radius r , for some absolute constant $c > 0$;

e.g. see Chapter 4, Example 2.8 of [Ver12]. Using this modified approach, the Scheffé tournament only requires $\mathcal{O}(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log d)$ samples which could be $o(d/\varepsilon^2)$ for a wide range of values of r .

There are still two issues to address: (i) how to obtain an ℓ_1 estimate r of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, i.e., $r/2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq r$, and (ii) how to get a computationally efficient learning algorithm.

- (i) We can apply the standard inequality $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d}\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2$ bound to transform our ℓ_2 estimate from [Lemma 5](#) into an ℓ_1 one. However, since the number of samples has a quadratic relation with r , we need a better approximation than \sqrt{d} to achieve sample complexity that is sublinear in d . To achieve this, we partition the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ vector into blocks of size at most $k \leq d$ and approximate the ℓ_1 norm of each smaller dimension vector separately and then add them up to obtain an ℓ_1 estimate of the overall $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Doing so improves the resulting multiplicative error to $\approx \sqrt{d/k}$ instead of \sqrt{d} .
- (ii) The Scheffé tournament approach requires time at least linear in the size of the ε -cover. In order to do better, we observe that we can formulate our task as an optimization problem with an ℓ_1 -constraint. Specifically, given samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$, we solve the following program:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2$$

The error $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2$ can be analyzed by similar techniques as those used for analyzing ℓ_1 -regularization in the context of LASSO or compressive sensing; e.g. see [Tib96, Tib97, HTW15].

1.2.2 Approach for TestAndOptimizeCovariance

As before, we may assume without loss of generality that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ by pre-processing the samples appropriately. Furthermore, we can invest $\Omega(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples up-front to ensure that the empirical mean $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ will be an ε -good estimate of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Then, it will suffice to obtain an estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ suffices. At a high level, the approach for TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE is the same as TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN after three adjustments to adapt the approach from vectors to matrices.

The first adjustment is that we perform a suitable preconditioning process using an additional $\mathcal{O}(d)$ samples so that we can subsequently argue that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\|_2 \leq 1$. This will then allow us to argue that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\|_2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F \in \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. Our preconditioning technique is inspired by [KLSU19]; while they use $\mathcal{O}(d)$ samples to construct a preconditioner to control the maximum eigenvalue, we use a similar approach to control the minimum eigenvalue.

The second adjustment pertains to the partitioning idea used for multiplicatively approximating $\|\operatorname{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1$. Observe that the covariance matrix of a marginal of a multivariate Gaussian is precisely the principal submatrix of the original covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ on the corresponding projected coordinates. For example, if one focuses on coordinates $\{i, j\} \subseteq [d]$ of each sample, then the corresponding covariance matrix is $\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i,i} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i,j} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j,i} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j,j} \end{bmatrix}$, for $i < j$. To this end, we generalize the partitioning scheme described for TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN to higher ordered objects.

Definition 7 (Partitioning scheme). Fix $q \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, and a q -ordered d -dimensional tensor $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^{\otimes q}}$. Let $\mathbf{B} \subseteq [d]$ be a subset of indices and define $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{B}}$ as the principal subtensor of \mathcal{T} indexed by \mathbf{B} . A collection of subsets $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w \subseteq [d]$ is called an (q, d, k, a, b) -partitioning of the tensor \mathcal{T} if the following three properties hold:

- $|\mathbf{B}_1| \leq k, \dots, |\mathbf{B}_w| \leq k$
- For every cell of \mathcal{T} appears in *at least* a of the w principal subtensors $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{B}_w}$.
- For every cell of \mathcal{T} appears in *at most* b of the w principal subtensors $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{B}_w}$.

For example, when $q = 2$, $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is just a $d \times d$ matrix. Observe one can always obtain a partitioning with $k \leq d^q$ by letting the index sets $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w$ encode every possible index, but this results in a large $w = \binom{d}{q}$ which can be undesirable for downstream analysis. The partitioning used in TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN is a special case of [Definition 7](#) with $q = a = b = 1$, $k = \lceil d/w \rceil$. For TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE, we are interested in the case where $q = 2$ and $a = 1$. Ideally, we want to minimize k and b as well. [Fig. 1](#) illustrates an example of a $(q = 2, d = 5, k = 3, a = 1, b = 3)$ -partitioning.




Figure 1: Consider partitioning a $d \times d$ matrix (i.e., $d = 5$ and $q = 2$) with $w = 4$ blocks $\{(1, 2, 3), (1, 4, 5), (2, 4, 5), (3, 4, 5)\}$, each of size $k = 3$. We see that every cell in the original 5×5 matrix appears in at least $a = 1$ and at most $b = 3$ times across all the induced submatrices.

The last change is to the optimization program for learning $\widehat{\Sigma}$. Given samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, we define:

$$\widehat{\Sigma} = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is p.s.d.} \\ \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r \\ \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_2 \leq 1}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2$$

Observe that Σ is a feasible solution to the above program. The optimization problem can be solved efficiently since it can be written as an SDP with convex constraints; see [Appendix C.3](#). We finally bound $\|\Sigma - \widehat{\Sigma}\|_F$ using an analysis that mirrors that for `TESTANDOPTIMIZE`MEAN but is in terms of matrix algebra.

1.2.3 Lower bound

To prove our lower bound results ([Theorem 3](#) and [Theorem 4](#)), we make use of a lemma in [\[ABDH⁺20\]](#) that informally says the following: If we can construct a cover f_1, \dots, f_M of distributions such that the pairwise KL divergence is at most κ and the pairwise TV distance is $> 2\varepsilon$, then, given sample access to an unknown f_i , the sample complexity of learning a distribution which is ε -close to f_i in total variation with probability $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ over the samples (which is referred to as $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC learning in total variation) is $\geq \widetilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\log M}{\kappa}\right)$. This lemma gives an information-theoretic lower bound and is a consequence of the generalized Fano's inequality.

To apply this lemma in the context of learning with advice, we need to fix an advice \mathbf{a} (mean or covariance, in the case of our problem) and find a large cover of distributions f_1, \dots, f_M that satisfy the conditions of the lemma (pairwise KL $\leq \kappa$ and pairwise TV $> 2\varepsilon$), while also satisfying a guarantee on the advice quality with respect to *all* f_1, \dots, f_M (say, the quality of \mathbf{a} is Q). Then, applying the lemma will show a sample complexity lower bound for learning a distribution given advice with quality Q , since an adversary can choose an f_i in the cover set and give \mathbf{a} (fixed) as the advice in each case while still satisfying the advice quality requirement. Since, in this context, we know that the underlying ground truth is one of f_1, \dots, f_M , the advice \mathbf{a} is immaterial. The lemma asserts that we still need $\widetilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\log M}{\kappa}\right)$ samples to learn a distribution close to the given f_i (where the pairwise TV separation of $> 2\varepsilon$ is crucial in ensuring that the learning algorithm would need to identify the correct f_i to succeed, since no distribution f will be ε -close in TV to f_i and f_j for $i \neq j$ due to the triangle inequality).

In the context of learning a Gaussian with unknown mean given the covariance (where we propose the `TESTANDOPTIMIZE`MEAN algorithm), the advice quality that we consider is $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1$, where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is the advice and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the ground truth. For proving the lower bound in [Theorem 3](#), we construct a cover of M distributions $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \mathbf{I}_d)$ (with identity covariance) such that $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|_1$ is precisely the same for all $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$'s. In the identity covariance case, we can ensure that the pairwise TV and KL requirements are satisfied by controlling the ℓ_2 distance $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2$ for each pair $i \neq j$. This enables us to use a construction where we set the first k coordinates of each $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ based on the codewords of an error correcting code with distance $\geq \Omega(k)$, and we can show the existence of such a code with $2^{\Omega(k)}$ codewords using the Gilbert-Varshamov bound.

In the context of learning Gaussians with unknown covariance given advice (for which we propose the `TESTANDOPTIMIZE`COVARIANCE algorithm), we consider the advice quality $\|\widetilde{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma \widetilde{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_1$ where Σ is the ground truth and $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ is the advice. To prove a lower bound on the sample complexity of learning given good advice, we follow a similar strategy where again, we want to construct a cover of M distributions $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_i)$

which all satisfy a bound on the advice quality and also satisfy the pairwise TV and KL requirements. Here, the construction of the cover is more complicated since we must control the spectrum (eigenvalues) of each Σ_i precisely because the KL divergence $\text{KL}(\Sigma_i, \Sigma_j)$ depends on $\log \frac{\det(\Sigma_i)}{\det(\Sigma_j)}$. Hence, a coding theoretic construction as in the unknown mean case is difficult. However, we can adapt to our setting the construction used in Theorem 6.3 of [ABDH⁺20] to prove the lower bound for learning a single Gaussian without advice.

Outline of the paper We begin with preliminary materials and related work in Section 2. Then, we present TESTANDOPTIMIZE MEAN and TESTANDOPTIMIZE COVARIANCE in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively. Finally, we give our hardness results in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Notation We use *lowercase letters* for scalars, set elements, random variable instantiations, *uppercase letters* for random variables, *bolded lowercase letters* for vectors and sets, *bolded uppercase letters* for set of random variables and matrices, *calligraphic letters* for probability distributions and sets of sets, and *small caps* for algorithm names. Intuitively, we use non-bolded versions for singletons, bolded versions for collections of items, and calligraphic for more complicated objects. The context should be clear enough to distinguish between various representations.

For any integer $d \geq 1$, we write $[d]$ to mean the set of integers $\{1, \dots, d\}$. We will write $\mathbf{v} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ to mean drawing a multivariate Gaussian sample and $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{|\mathcal{M}|}\}$ to mean a collection of $|\mathcal{M}|$ independently drawn such vectors.

In the rest of this section, we will state some basic facts and lemmas that would be useful for our work. Most of them are folklore results and we supplement proofs in Appendix A.2 for them when we could not nail down a direct reference.

2.1 Matrix facts

Fact 8 (e.g. see Exercise 5.4.P3 of [HJ12]). *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be an arbitrary d -dimensional real vector. Then, the ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 norms of \mathbf{x} are defined as $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d |\mathbf{x}_i|$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}_i^2}$ respectively. They satisfy the inequality: $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|_2$.*

For a real matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we define its vectorized form $\text{vec}(\mathbf{M}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ by $\text{vec}(\mathbf{M}) = (\mathbf{M}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{M}_{d,d})$ and we see that $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2 = \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{M})\|_2^2$. We recover a matrix given its vectorized form via $\mathbf{M} = \text{mat}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{M}))$. For any matrix \mathbf{A} , we use $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ to denote its smallest eigenvalue. Note that for any full rank matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{A}\|_2} \leq \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_2$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_2$ (e.g. see Exercise 5.6.P23 of [HJ12]), and $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_2 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d} \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_2$. For any two matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} of the same dimension, we also know that $\|\mathbf{AB}\|_F \leq \min\{\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 \|\mathbf{B}\|_F, \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \|\mathbf{B}\|_2\}$.

Lemma 9 (Chapter 5.6 of [HJ12]). *Let \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} be two square real matrices where \mathbf{A} is an invertible matrix. Then, $\|\mathbf{AB}\| = \|\mathbf{BA}\|$.*

Lemma 10. *Let \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} be two square $d \times d$ matrices where \mathbf{A} is an invertible matrix with a square root. Then, $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^{-1/2} - I\| = \|\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} - I_d\|$*

Definition 11 (Projected vector). Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a d -dimensional vector and $\mathbf{B} = \{i_1, \dots, i_w\} \subseteq [d]$ be a subset of $1 \leq w \leq d$ indices, where $i_1 < \dots < i_w$. Then, we define $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{B}} = (\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_w}) \in \mathbb{R}^w$ as the projection of the vector \mathbf{x} to the coordinates indicated by \mathbf{B} .

Lemma 12 (Trace inequality). *For any three matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{ABC}) \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2$.*

Lemma 13. *For any two matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$ and $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{AB})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$.*

2.2 Distance measures between distributions

Definition 14 (Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence).

For two continuous distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} over \mathbf{X} ,

$$d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x})}{\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x})} \right) d\mathbf{x}$$

Note that KL divergence is not symmetric in general.

Lemma 15 (Known fact about KL divergence). *Given two d -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{P} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $\mathcal{Q} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ are invertible, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. In particular, $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}\|_2^2$ when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ and $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2$ when $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Definition 16 (Total variation (TV) distance). For two continuous distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} over domain \mathbf{X} , with density functions f and g respectively, $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} |f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x})| d\mathbf{x}$.

Theorem 17 (Pinsker's inequality). *If \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are two probability distributions on the same measurable space, then $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \sqrt{d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q})/2}$.*

2.3 Properties of Gaussians

The following are standard results about empirical statistics of Gaussian samples.

Lemma 18 (Lemma C.4 in [ABDH⁺20]; Corollary 5.50 in [Ver10]). *Let $\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and let $0 < \varepsilon < 1 < t$. If $n \geq c_0 \cdot \frac{t^2 d}{\varepsilon^2}$, for some absolute constant c_0 , then*

$$\Pr \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top - \mathbf{I}_d \right\|_2 > \varepsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2 d)$$

Lemma 19 (Folklore; e.g. see Appendix C of [ABDH⁺20]). *Fix $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. Given $2n$ i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2n} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for some unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and unknown covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, define empirical mean and covariance as*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \mathbf{x}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_{2i} - \mathbf{x}_{2i-1})(\mathbf{x}_{2i} - \mathbf{x}_{2i-1})^\top$$

Then,

- When $n \in \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{d^2 + d \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2} \right)$, we have $\Pr \left(d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})) \leq \varepsilon \right) \geq 1 - \delta$
- When $n \in \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{d + \sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon^2} \right)$, we have $\Pr \left((\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon^2 \right) \geq 1 - \delta$

Lemma 20 (Properties of empirical covariance). *Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the empirical covariance constructed from n i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for some unknown covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Then,*

- When $n = d$, with probability 1, we have that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ share the same eigenspace.
- Let $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d$ and $\hat{\lambda}_1 \leq \dots \leq \hat{\lambda}_d$ be the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ respectively. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\frac{\hat{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_1} \leq 1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right)$.

Lemma 21. Fix $n \geq 1$ and $d \geq 1$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a hidden mean vector and we draw n samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Define $\mathbf{z}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i$ and $y_n = \|\mathbf{z}_n\|_2^2$. Then,

1. y_n follows the non-central chi-squared distribution $\chi_d^2(\lambda)$ for $\lambda = n\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2$. This also implies that $\mathbb{E}[y_n] = d + \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(y_n) = 2d + 4\lambda$.

2. For any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(y_n > d + \lambda + t) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{t}{d + 2\lambda} - \log\left(1 + \frac{t}{d + 2\lambda}\right)\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d + 2\lambda)(d + 2\lambda + t)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

3. For any $t \in (0, d + \lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(y_n < d + \lambda - t) &\leq \exp\left(\frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{t}{d + 2\lambda} + \log\left(1 - \frac{t}{d + 2\lambda}\right)\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d + 2\lambda)^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 22. Suppose $\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Then,

$$\Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i\right\|_{\infty} \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) \leq \delta$$

3 Identity covariance setting

We begin by defining a parameterized sample count $m(d, \varepsilon, \delta)$. Then, we will state our APPROXL1 algorithm and show how to use it according to the strategy outlined in [Section 1.2.1](#).

Definition 23. Fix any $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We define $m(d, \varepsilon, \delta) = n_{d, \varepsilon} \cdot r_{\delta}$, where

$$n_{d, \varepsilon} = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{3\varepsilon^2} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\delta} = 1 + \left\lceil \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right) \right\rceil$$

Given samples from a d -dimensional isotropic Gaussian $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ with unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and identity covariance, the APPROXL1 algorithm partitions the d coordinates into $w = \lceil d/k \rceil$ buckets each of length at most $k \in [d]$ and separately perform an exponential search to find the 2-approximation of the ℓ_2 norm of each bucket by repeatedly invoking the tolerant tester from [Lemma 5](#). In the terminology of [Definition 7](#), this is a partitioning scheme with $q = 1$, $a = 1$, and $b = 1$. Crucially, projecting the samples in \mathbb{R}^d of $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ into the subcoordinates of $\mathbf{B} \subseteq [d]$ yields samples in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{B}|}$ from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{I}_{|\mathbf{B}|})$ so we can obtain valid estimates using each of these marginals. After obtaining the ℓ_2 estimate of each bucket, we use [Fact 8](#) to obtain bounds on the ℓ_1 and then combine them by summing up these estimates: if we have an ε -multiplicative approximation of each bucket's ℓ_1 , then their sum will be an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ -multiplicative approximation of the entire $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ vector whenever the partition overlap parameters a and b of [Definition 7](#) are constants.

In [Appendix B.1](#), we show that the APPROXL1 algorithm has the following guarantees.

Let ε , δ , k , α , and ζ be the input parameters to the APPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)). Given $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, the APPROXL1 algorithm succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ and has the following properties:

- If APPROXL1 outputs Fail, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 > \zeta/2$.
- If APPROXL1 outputs OK, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \alpha$.
- If APPROXL1 outputs $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1)$.

Now, suppose APPROXL1 tells us that $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq r$. We can then perform a constrained version of LASSO to search for a candidate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{d}{\delta}\right)$ samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$.

Algorithm 1 The APPROXL1 algorithm.

Input: Error rate $\varepsilon > 0$, failure rate $\delta \in (0, 1)$, block size $k \in [d]$, lower bound $\alpha > 0$, upper bound $\zeta > 2\alpha$, and i.i.d. samples \mathcal{S} from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$

Output: Fail, OK, or $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

- 1: Define $w = \lceil d/k \rceil$ and $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$
- 2: Partition the index set $[d]$ into w blocks:

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \{1, \dots, k\}, \mathbf{B}_2 = \{k+1, \dots, 2k\}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w = \{k(w-1)+1, \dots, d\}$$

- 3: **for** $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$ **do**
 - 4: Define $\mathcal{S}_j = \{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{B}_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{B}_j|} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\}$ as the samples projected to \mathbf{B}_j ▷ See [Definition 11](#)
 - 5: Initialize $o_j = \text{Fail}$
 - 6: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil$ **do**
 - 7: Define $l_i = 2^{i-1} \cdot \alpha$
 - 8: Let **Outcome** be the output of the tolerant tester of [Lemma 5](#) using sample set \mathcal{S}_j with parameters $\varepsilon_1 = l_i$, $\varepsilon_2 = 2l_i$, and $\delta = \delta'$
 - 9: **if** **Outcome** is **Accept** **then**
 - 10: Set $o_j = l_i$ and **break** ▷ Escape inner loop for block j
 - 11: **if** there exists a **Fail** amongst $\{o_1, \dots, o_w\}$ **then**
 - 12: **return** **Fail**
 - 13: **else if** $4 \sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 \leq \alpha^2$ **then**
 - 14: **return** **OK** ▷ Note: o_j is an estimate for $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2$
 - 15: **else**
 - 16: **return** $\lambda = 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j$ ▷ λ is an estimate for $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1$
-

Lemma 24. Fix $d \geq 1$, $r \geq 0$, and $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Given $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{d}{\delta} \right)$ samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ for some unknown $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq r$, one can produce an estimate in $\text{poly}(n, d)$ time $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Suppose we get n samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. For $i \in [n]$, we can re-express each \mathbf{y}_i as $\mathbf{y}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{g}_i$ for some $\mathbf{g}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Let us define $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \underset{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \leq r}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 \quad (1)$$

By optimality of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in [Eq. \(1\)](#), we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \quad (2)$$

By expanding and rearranging [Eq. \(2\)](#), one can show (see [Appendix B.2](#))

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} \right\rangle \quad (3)$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} \right\rangle \quad (\text{From [Eq. \(3\)](#)})$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{n} \cdot \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \right\|_{\infty} \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \quad (\text{H\"older's inequality})$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{n} \cdot \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \right\|_{\infty} \cdot (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1) \quad (\text{Triangle inequality})$$

$$\leq 4r \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}{n}} \quad (\text{From Lemma 22, } \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 \leq r, \text{ and } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq r)$$

When $n = \frac{2r^2 \log \frac{2d}{\delta}}{\varepsilon^4} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{d}{\delta}\right)$, we have $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \leq 4r \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}{n}} = 4\varepsilon^2$. So, by Theorem 17 and Lemma 15, we see that

$$d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} d_{\text{KL}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d))} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\varepsilon^2}{4}} = \varepsilon$$

Finally, it is well-known that LASSO runs in in $\text{poly}(n, d)$ time. \square

Algorithm 2 The TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN algorithm.

Input: Error rate $\varepsilon > 0$, failure rate $\delta \in (0, 1)$, parameter $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and sample access to $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$

Output: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

- 1: Define $k = \lceil d^{2\beta} \rceil$, $\alpha = \varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{\frac{k}{d}}$, $\zeta = 4\varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{d}$, and $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$ ▷ Note: $\zeta > 2\alpha$
 - 2: Draw $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and store it into a set \mathcal{S} ▷ See Definition 23
 - 3: Let **Outcome** be the output of the APPROXL1 algorithm given ε , δ , k , α , ζ , and \mathbf{S} as inputs
 - 4: **if Outcome is OK then**
 - 5: **return** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{0}$
 - 6: **else if Outcome is** $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ **and** $\lambda < \varepsilon\sqrt{d}$ **then**
 - 7: Draw $n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda^2/\varepsilon^4)$ i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$
 - 8: **return** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \text{argmin}_{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \leq \lambda} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2$ ▷ See Eq. (1)
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Draw $n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$
 - 11: **return** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i$ ▷ Empirical mean
-

Theorem 1. For any given $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN algorithm uses

$$n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, d^{-\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-1}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1^2\right\}\right)$$

i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ for some unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and identity covariance \mathbf{I}_d , and can produce $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d)$ time such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{0}$. This is because we can pre-process all samples by subtracting $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ to yield i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{I}_d)$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}' = \boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. Suppose we solved this problem to produce $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}'$ where $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}', \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq 10\varepsilon$, we can then output $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}' + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and see from data processing inequality that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) = d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}', \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq 10\varepsilon$; see the coupling characterization of TV in [DMR18].

Correctness of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ output. Consider the TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN algorithm given in Algorithm 2. There are three possible outputs for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$:

1. $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{0}$, which can only happen when **Outcome** is OK
2. $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \text{argmin}_{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \leq \lambda} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2$, which can only happen when **Outcome** is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$
3. $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i$

Conditioned on VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 succeeding, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we will show that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ and failure probability at most δ in each of these cases, which implies the theorem statement.

Case 1: When **Outcome** is OK, Section 3 tells us that $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \alpha \leq \varepsilon$, with failure probability at most δ . So, by Theorem 17 and Lemma 15, we see that

$$d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \cdot d_{\text{KL}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d))} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{0}\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}} \leq \varepsilon$$

Case 2: Using $r = \lambda$ as the upper bound, [Lemma 24](#) tells us that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ with failure probability at most δ when $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda^2/\varepsilon^4)$ i.i.d. samples are used.

Case 3: With $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples, [Lemma 19](#) tells us that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \varepsilon$ with failure probability at most δ .

Sample complexity used. By [Definition 23](#), APPROXL1 uses $|\mathbf{S}| = m(k, \alpha, \delta') \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{k}/\alpha^2)$ samples to produce Outcome. Then, APPROXL1 further uses $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda^2/\varepsilon^4)$ samples or $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples depending on whether $\lambda < \varepsilon\sqrt{d}$. So, TESTANDOPTIMIZE MEAN has a total sample complexity of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\alpha^2} + \min\left\{\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4}, \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right) \quad (4)$$

Meanwhile, [Section 3](#) states that $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1)$ whenever Outcome is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ for any two real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we see that

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon^4} \cdot \left(\frac{d^2\alpha^2}{k^2} + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1^2\right)\right) \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \left(\frac{d\alpha^2}{\varepsilon^2 k} + \frac{k \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1^2}{d\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \quad (5)$$

Putting together [Eq. \(4\)](#) and [Eq. \(5\)](#), we see that the total sample complexity is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, \frac{d\alpha^2}{\varepsilon^2 k} + \frac{k \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1^2}{d\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right)$$

Recalling that TESTANDOPTIMIZE MEAN sets $k = \lceil d^{2\beta} \rceil$ and $\alpha = \varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{\frac{k}{d}}$, this simplifies to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{d^{1-\beta}}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, d^{-\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-1}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1^2\right\}\right) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, d^{-\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-1}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1^2\right\}\right)$$

To conclude, recall that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in the analysis above actually refers to the pre-processed $\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. □

Remark on setting upper bound ζ . As ζ only affects the sample complexity logarithmically, one may be tempted to use a larger value than $\zeta = 4\varepsilon\sqrt{d}$. However, observe that running APPROXL1 with a larger upper bound than $\zeta = 4\varepsilon\sqrt{d}$ would not be helpful since $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 > \zeta/4$ whenever APPROXL1 currently returns Fail and we have $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \lambda$ whenever APPROXL1 returns $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. So, $\varepsilon\sqrt{d} = \zeta/4 < \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \lambda$ and TESTANDOPTIMIZE MEAN would have resorted to using the empirical mean anyway.

4 General covariance setting

We will later define analogs of $m(d, \alpha, \delta)$ and APPROXL1 from [Section 3](#) to the unknown covariance setting: $m'(d, \alpha, \delta)$ and VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 respectively. Then, after stating the guarantees of VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1, we show how to use them according to the strategy outlined in [Section 1.2.2](#). For the rest of this section, we assume that we get i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and also that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is full rank. These are without loss of generality for the following reasons:

- Instead of a single sample from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, we will draw two samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and consider $\mathbf{x}' = \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2}{\sqrt{2}}$. One can check that \mathbf{x}' is distributed according to $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and we only use a multiplicative factor of 2 additional samples, which is subsumed in the big-O.
- By [Lemma 20](#), the empirical covariance constructed from d i.i.d. samples of $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ will have the same rank as $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ itself, with probability at least $1 - \delta$. So, we can simply project and solve the problem on the full rank subspace of the empirical covariance matrix.

4.1 The adjustments

To begin, we elaborate on the adjustments mentioned in [Section 1.2.2](#) to adapt the approach from the identity covariance setting to the unknown covariance setting. The formal proofs of the following two adjustment lemmas are deferred to [Appendix C.1](#).

The first adjustment relates to performing a suitable preconditioning process using an additional d samples so that we can subsequently argue that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \geq 1$. The idea is as follows: we will compute a preconditioning matrix \mathbf{A} using d i.i.d. samples such that $\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}$ has eigenvalues at least 1, i.e. $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$. That is, $\|(\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A})^{-1}\|_2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A})} \leq 1$. Then, we solve the problem treating $\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}$ as our new Σ . This adjustment succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and is possible because, with probability 1, the empirical covariance $\widehat{\Sigma}$ formed by using d i.i.d. samples would have the same eigenspace as Σ , and so we would have a bound on the ratios between the minimum eigenvalues between $\widehat{\Sigma}$ and Σ ; see [Lemma 20](#).

Lemma 25. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there is an explicit preconditioning process that uses d i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ in constructing a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$. Furthermore, for any full rank PSD matrix $\widetilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\|(\mathbf{A}\widetilde{\Sigma}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\widetilde{\Sigma}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\| = \|\widetilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Sigma\widetilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\|$.*

The matrix \mathbf{A} in [Lemma 25](#) is essentially constructed by combining the eigenspace corresponding to “large eigenvalues” with a suitably upscaled eigenspace corresponding to “small eigenvalues” in the empirical covariance matrix obtained by d i.i.d. samples and relying on [Lemma 20](#) for correctness arguments.

The second adjustment relates to showing that the partitioning idea also works for obtaining sample efficient ℓ_1 estimates of $\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)$. While an existence result suffices, we show that a simple probabilistic construction will in fact succeed with high probability.

Lemma 26. *Fix dimension $d \geq 2$ and group size $k \leq d$. Consider the $q = 2$ setting where $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix. Define $w = \frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)}$. Pick sets $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w$ each of size k uniformly at random (with replacement) from all the possible $\binom{d}{k}$ sets. With high probability in d , this is a $(q = 2, d, k, a = 1, b = \frac{30(d-1)\log d}{(k-1)})$ -partitioning scheme.*

We can obtain a $(q = 2, d, k, a = 1, b = \mathcal{O}(\frac{d \log d}{k}))$ -partitioning scheme by repeating the construction of [Lemma 26](#) until it satisfies required conditions. Since it succeeds with high probability in d , we should not need many tries. The key idea behind utilizing partitioning schemes is that the marginal over a subset of indices $\mathbf{B} \subseteq [d]$ of a d -dimensional Gaussian with covariance matrix Σ has covariance matrix that is the principal submatrix $\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}}$ of Σ . So, if we can obtain a multiplicative α -approximation of a collection of principal submatrices $\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_w}$ such that all cells of Σ are present, then we can obtain a multiplicative α -approximation of Σ just like in [Section 3](#). Meanwhile, the b parameter allows us to upper bound the overestimation factor due to repeated occurrences of any cell of Σ .

4.2 Following the approach from the identity covariance setting

We begin by defining a parameterized sample count $m'(d, \varepsilon, \delta)$, similar to [Definition 23](#).

Definition 27. Fix any $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We define $m'(d, \varepsilon, \delta) = n'_{d, \varepsilon} \cdot r_{\delta}$, where

$$n'_{d, \varepsilon} = 3200d \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, 1 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\delta} = 1 + \left\lceil \log \left(\frac{12}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil$$

The VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm corresponds to APPROXL1 in [Section 3](#): it performs an exponential search to find the 2-approximation of the $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2$ by repeatedly invoking the tolerant tester from [Lemma 6](#) and then utilize a suitable partitioning scheme to bound $\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1$; see [Lemma 26](#) and the discussions below it.

In [Appendix C.2](#), we show that the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm has the following guarantees.

Lemma 28. *Let ε , δ , k , α , and ζ be the input parameters to the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#)). Given $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ and has the following properties:*

- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs Fail, then $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 > \zeta/2$.

Algorithm 3 The VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm.

Input: Error rate $\varepsilon > 0$, failure rate $\delta \in (0, 1)$, block size $k \in [d]$, lower bound $\alpha > 0$, upper bound $\zeta > 2\alpha$, and i.i.d. samples \mathcal{S} from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$

Output: Fail, OK, or $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

```

1: Define  $w = \frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)}$ ,  $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$ , and let  $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w \subseteq [d]^2$  be a  $(q = 2, d, k, a = 1, b = \mathcal{O}(\frac{d \log d}{k}))$ -partitioning scheme as per Lemma 26
2: for  $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$  do
3:   Define  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{B}_j} = \{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{B}_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{B}_j|} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\}$  as the projected samples ▷ See Definition 11
4:   Initialize  $o_j = \text{Fail}$ 
5:   for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil$  do
6:     Define  $l_i = 2^{i-1} \cdot \alpha$ 
7:     Let Outcome be the output of the tolerant tester of Lemma 6 using sample set  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{B}_j}$  with  $\varepsilon_1 = l_i$ ,  $\varepsilon_2 = 2l_i$ , and  $\delta = \delta'$ 
8:     if Outcome is Accept then
9:       Set  $o_j = l_i$  and break ▷ Escape inner loop for block  $j$ 
10: if there exists a Fail amongst  $\{o_1, \dots, o_w\}$  then
11:   return Fail
12: else if  $4b \sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 \leq \alpha^2$  then
13:   return OK
14: else
15:   return  $\lambda = 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j$  ▷  $\lambda$  is an estimate for  $\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1$ 

```

- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs OK, then $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \alpha^2$.
- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)} \cdot \alpha + 2\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \right)$$

Now, suppose VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 tells us that $\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r$. We can then construct a SDP to search for a candidate $\widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$.

Lemma 29. Fix $d \geq 1$, $r \geq 0$, and $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Given $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{d + \sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ for some unknown $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r$, one can produce estimates $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon))$ time such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\mu, \Sigma), N(\widehat{\mu}, \widehat{\Sigma})) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Suppose we get n samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$. For $i \in [n]$, we can re-express each \mathbf{y}_i as $\mathbf{y}_i = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{g}_i$, for some $\mathbf{g}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Let us define $\mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top$ and $\mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top = \Sigma^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \right) \Sigma^{1/2} = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{T} \Sigma^{1/2}$.

Let us define $\widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ as follows:

$$\widehat{\Sigma} = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is p.s.d.} \\ \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r \\ \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2 \quad (6)$$

Observe that Σ is a feasible solution to [Eq. \(6\)](#). We show in [Appendix C.3](#) that [Eq. \(6\)](#) is a semidefinite program (SDP) that is polynomial time solvable.

Since Σ and $\widehat{\Sigma}$ are symmetric p.s.d. matrices, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^{1/2}\|_F^2 && \text{(Since } \mathbf{y}_i = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{g}_i\text{)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\left(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^{1/2} \right)^\top \left(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^{1/2} \right) \right) \\ &&& \text{(Since } \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) \text{ for any matrix } \mathbf{A}\text{)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{\Sigma}^2 - 2\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2} + \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \right)$$

(Expanding and applying cyclic property of trace)

Similarly, by replacing $\widehat{\Sigma}$ with Σ , we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|\Sigma - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\Sigma^2 - 2\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^2 + \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \right)$$

By standard SDP results (e.g. see [VB96, Fre04, GM12]), Eq. (6) can be solved optimally up to up to additive ε in the objective function. We show explicitly in Appendix C.3 that our problem can be transformed into a SDP and be solved in $\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon))$ time. Since we solve up to additive ε in the objective function, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \|\Sigma - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2 \quad (7)$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{\Sigma}^2 - 2\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2} + \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \right) \leq \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\Sigma^2 - 2\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma^2 + \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \right)$$

Cancelling the common $\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \Sigma$ term and rearranging, we get

$$\text{Tr} \left(\widehat{\Sigma}^2 - \Sigma^2 \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2} - \Sigma^2 \right) \right) \quad (8)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr} \left(\left(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right)^\top \left(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\widehat{\Sigma}^2 - 2\widehat{\Sigma}\Sigma + \Sigma^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2} - \Sigma^2 \right) - \widehat{\Sigma}\Sigma + \Sigma^2 \right) \\ &\hspace{15em} \text{(Add } 2\Sigma^2 - 2\widehat{\Sigma}\Sigma \text{ to both sides of Eq. (8))} \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\left(\mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top - \mathbf{I}_d \right) \cdot \left(\Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2} - \Sigma^2 \right) \right) \quad \text{(Since } \text{Tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}\Sigma) = \text{Tr}(\Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{1/2}) \text{)} \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + 2 \cdot \text{Tr} \left(\left(\Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma \right) \cdot \Sigma^{1/2} \cdot \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \right) - \mathbf{I}_d \right) \right) \\ &\hspace{15em} \text{(Rearranging with cyclic property of trace)} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + 2 \cdot \left\| \text{vec} \left(\Sigma \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^2 \right) \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \right) - \mathbf{I}_d \right\|_2 \\ &\hspace{15em} \text{(By Lemma 12 with } \mathbf{A} = \Sigma^{1/2} \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma, \mathbf{B} = \Sigma^{1/2}, \text{ and } \mathbf{C} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top \right) - \mathbf{I}_d \text{)} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathbf{T} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top$ and Lemma 18 tells us that $\Pr(\|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 > \varepsilon) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2 d)$ when the number of samples $n = \frac{c_0}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{2}{\delta}$, for some absolute constant c_0 . So, to complete the proof, it suffices to upper bound $\left\| \text{vec} \left(\Sigma \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^2 \right) \right\|_1$. Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \text{vec} \left(\Sigma \widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma^2 \right) \right\|_1 &= \left\| \text{vec} \left((\mathbf{I}_d - \Sigma)(\Sigma - \widehat{\Sigma}) - \Sigma + \widehat{\Sigma} \right) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \left\| \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d - \Sigma) \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \text{vec}(\Sigma - \widehat{\Sigma}) \right\|_1 + \left\| \text{vec}(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \right\|_1 \quad \text{(By Lemma 13)} \\ &= (\left\| \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d - \Sigma) \right\|_1 + 1) \cdot \left\| \text{vec}(\widehat{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d + \mathbf{I}_d - \Sigma) \right\|_1 \quad \text{(Rearranging and adding 0)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d - \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|_1 + 1) \cdot \left(\|\text{vec}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d - \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|_1 \right) && \text{(By Lemma 13)} \\
&\leq (r+1) \cdot 2r && \text{(Since } \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_d - \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\|_1 \leq r \text{ and } \|\text{vec}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r)
\end{aligned}$$

When $\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \leq n$ and $n \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\varepsilon^4} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + 2 \cdot \left\| \text{vec} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2 \right) \right\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + 4r(r+1) \cdot \|\mathbf{T} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \leq \varepsilon^2$$

Now, Lemma 19 tells us that the empirical mean $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ formed using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d + \sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ samples satisfies $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon^2$, with failure probability at most δ . So,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{d}_{\text{KL}}(N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\det \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(By Lemma 15)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(By Lemma 9)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^2 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(Since } (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon, \text{ with probability at least } 1 - \delta) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\|_2^2 \cdot \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(Submultiplicativity of Frobenius norm)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^2 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(Since } \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\|_2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \leq 1) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2) && \text{(From above, with probability at least } 1 - \delta) \\
&= \varepsilon^2
\end{aligned}$$

By union bound, the above events jointly hold with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$. Thus, by symmetry of TV distance and Theorem 17, we see that

$$\text{d}_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)) = \text{d}_{\text{TV}}(N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \text{d}_{\text{KL}}(N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d))} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon^2} = \varepsilon$$

The claim holds by repeating the same argument after scaling δ by an appropriate constant. \square

Algorithm 4 The TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE algorithm.

Input: Error rate $\varepsilon > 0$, failure rate $\delta \in (0, 1)$, parameter $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, and sample access to $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$

Output: $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

- 1: Define $k = \lceil d^{2\beta} \rceil$, $\alpha = \frac{\varepsilon k}{d}$, $\zeta = 4\varepsilon d$, and $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$ ▷ Note: $\zeta > 2\alpha$
 - 2: Draw $m'(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and store it into a set \mathcal{S} ▷ See Definition 27
 - 3: Let Outcome be the output of the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm given ε , δ , k , α , ζ , and \mathcal{S} as inputs
 - 4: **if** Outcome is OK **then**
 - 5: **return** $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{I}_d$
 - 6: **else if** Outcome is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda < \varepsilon d$ **then**
 - 7: Draw $n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda^2 / \varepsilon^4)$ i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$
 - 8: **return** $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is p.s.d.} \\ \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda \\ \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2$ ▷ See Eq. (6)
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Draw $2n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^2 / \varepsilon^2)$ i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{2n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$
 - 11: **return** $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} (\mathbf{y}_{2i} - \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})(\mathbf{y}_{2i} - \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})^\top$ ▷ Empirical covariance
-

Theorem 2. For any given $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, the TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE algorithm uses

$$n \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min \left\{ 1, d^{-2\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-2}}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \|\text{vec}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2 \right\} \right)$$

i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ for some unknown mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and unknown covariance Σ , and can produce $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon))$ time such that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \varepsilon$ with success probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_d$. This is because we can pre-process all samples by pre-multiplying $\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2}$ each of them to yield i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \Sigma \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2})$ and then post-process the estimated $\hat{\Sigma}$ by outputting $\hat{\Sigma}^{1/2} \tilde{\Sigma} \hat{\Sigma}^{1/2}$ instead.

Correctness of $\hat{\Sigma}$ output. Consider the TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE algorithm given in [Algorithm 4](#).

Using the empirical mean $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i$ formed by $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{d + \sqrt{d \log(1/\delta)}}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d/\varepsilon^2)$ samples, [Lemma 19](#) tells us that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. There are three possible outputs for $\hat{\Sigma}$:

1. $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{I}_d$, which can only happen when Outcome is OK
2. $\hat{\Sigma} = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is p.s.d.} \\ \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r \\ \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2$, which can only happen when Outcome is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$
3. $\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} (\mathbf{y}_{2i} - \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})(\mathbf{y}_{2i} - \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})^\top$

Conditioned on VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 succeeding, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we will now show that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \varepsilon$ and failure probability at most 2δ in each of these cases, which implies the theorem statement as we can repeat the argument by scaling ε and δ by appropriate constants.

Case 1: When Outcome is OK, [Lemma 28](#) tells us that $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \alpha^2$, with failure probability at most δ . Meanwhile, [Lemma 19](#) tells us that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon^2$, with failure probability at most δ . By union bound, both of these jointly hold with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$. Now, by setting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{I}_d$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\text{KL}}(N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma}), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\Sigma^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \Sigma}{\det \hat{\Sigma}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \|\Sigma^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(By Lemma 15)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \right) && \text{(Since } \hat{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_d) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\varepsilon^2 + \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2) && \text{(Since } (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq \varepsilon, \text{ with probability at least } 1 - \delta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\varepsilon^2 + \alpha^2) && \text{(Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \alpha^2, \text{ with probability at least } 1 - \delta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2) && \text{(since } \alpha = \frac{\varepsilon k}{d} \leq \varepsilon \text{ as } k \leq d) \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by symmetry of TV distance and [Theorem 17](#), we see that

$$d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})) = d_{\text{TV}}(N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma}), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} d_{\text{KL}}(N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma}), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma))} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon^2} = \varepsilon$$

Case 2: Using $r = \lambda$ as the upper bound, [Lemma 29](#) tells us that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \varepsilon$ with failure probability at most δ when $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2})$ i.i.d. samples are used.

Case 3: With $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ samples, [Lemma 19](#) tells us that $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma), N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})) \leq \varepsilon$ with failure probability at most δ .

Sample complexity used. By [Definition 27](#), `VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1` uses $|\mathbf{S}| = m'(k, \alpha, \delta') \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k/\alpha^2)$ samples to produce `Outcome`. Then, `VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1` further uses $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda^2/\varepsilon^4)$ samples or $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ samples depending on whether $\lambda < \varepsilon d$. So, `TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE` has a total sample complexity of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} + \min\left\{\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}, \frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} + \min\left\{\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4}, \frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right) \quad (9)$$

Meanwhile, [Lemma 28](#) states that

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)} \cdot \alpha + 2\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1\right)$$

whenever `Outcome` is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ for any two real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we see that

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon^4} \cdot \left(\frac{d^4\alpha^2}{k^4} + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2\right)\right) \subseteq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \left(\frac{d^2\alpha^2}{\varepsilon^2 k^3} + \frac{k \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2}{d^2\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \quad (10)$$

Putting together [Eq. \(9\)](#) and [Eq. \(10\)](#), we see that the total sample complexity is

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{k}{\alpha^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, \frac{d^2\alpha^2}{\varepsilon^2 k^3} + \frac{k \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2}{d^2\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right)$$

Recalling that `TESTANDOPTIMIZECOVARIANCE` sets $k = \lceil d^{2\beta} \rceil$ and $\alpha = \frac{\varepsilon k}{d}$, this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{d^{2-2\beta}}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, d^{-2\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-2}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2\right\}\right) \\ \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{1, d^{-2\beta} + \frac{d^{2\beta-2}}{\varepsilon^2} \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2\right\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, recall that $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in the analysis above actually refers to the pre-processed $\tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{-1/2}\mathbf{\Sigma}\tilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{-1/2}$. \square

Remark on setting upper bound ζ . As ζ only affects the sample complexity logarithmically, one may be tempted to use a larger value than $\zeta = 4\varepsilon d$. However, observe that running `VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1` with a larger upper bound than $\zeta = 4\varepsilon\sqrt{d}$ would not be helpful since $\|\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 > \zeta/2$ whenever `VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1` currently returns `Fail` and we have $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda$ whenever `VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1` returns $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. So, $\varepsilon d = \zeta/4 < \|\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2^2 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda$ and `TESTANDOPTIMIZEMEAN` would have resorted to using the empirical mean anyway.

5 Lower Bounds

5.1 Learning the mean given advice

[Theorem 3](#) and [Theorem 4](#) are implied by [Lemma 31](#) and [Lemma 32](#) respectively. For the proofs of both our lower bounds, we use the following corollary of Fano's inequality.

Lemma 30 (Lemma 6.1 of [\[ABDH⁺20\]](#)). *Let $\kappa : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and let \mathcal{F} be a class of distributions such that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist distributions $f_1, \dots, f_M \in \mathcal{F}$ such that*

$$d_{\text{KL}}(f_i, f_j) \leq \kappa(\varepsilon) \text{ and } d_{\text{TV}}(f_i, f_j) > 2\varepsilon \quad \forall i \neq j \in [M]$$

Then any method that learns \mathcal{F} to within total variation distance ε with probability $\geq 2/3$ has sample complexity $\Omega\left(\frac{\log M}{\kappa(\varepsilon) \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$.

Lemma 31. *Fix $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{400}$. Suppose we are given sample access to $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ for some unknown $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and an advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, any algorithm that $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC learns $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ requires $\tilde{\Omega}\left(\max\left\{\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1^2}{\varepsilon^4}, \frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right)$ samples. In particular, when $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 \geq \varepsilon\sqrt{d}$, then $\tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ samples are necessary.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can consider $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mathbf{0}$ since we can easily sample from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ by sampling from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and subtracting $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ from each sample. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ denote the mean-estimate produced by the learning algorithm. Note that the TV distance between $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{I}_d)$ is $\Theta(\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\|_2)$, specifically in $\left[\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\|_2}{200}, \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\|_2}{2}\right]$, by Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 2.1 of [DMR18], as long as $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\|_2 \leq 1$. Also, we have $\text{d}_{\text{KL}}(N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d), N(\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{I}_d)) = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu}'\|_2^2$.

Now, for an arbitrary ε sufficiently small, we want to choose a large M such that we can show the existence of M vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_M \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 = \lambda \text{ and } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2 \in [\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon] \text{ for each } i \neq j \in [M]. \quad (11)$$

As long as $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, Eq. (11) would imply that (i) the pairwise total variation distance is at least $\frac{\varepsilon}{200}$, and (ii) the KL divergence is at most $2\varepsilon^2$ (in both directions). Suppose we take $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{400}$, so that the pairwise total variation is at least $2\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{200}$ and the pairwise KL divergence is at most $\kappa(\varepsilon') = 2\varepsilon^2$ for $\kappa(x) = 2 \cdot 400^2 \cdot x^2$. Then, Lemma 30 will give a sample complexity lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{\log M}{\kappa(\varepsilon') \log(1/\varepsilon')}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\log M}{\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ for learning in total variation up to ε' given advice.

Our randomized construction of the covering set is as follows: Choose a $0 < k < d$ to be fixed later. The first k coordinates of each $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ are set to $\frac{\lambda}{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ for some $\mathbf{v}_i \in \{\pm 1\}^k$ and the remaining $d - k$ coordinates are set identically to 0. Then, by construction, $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|_1 = k \left(\frac{\lambda}{k}\right) = \lambda$ for each $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2 = \left(\frac{2\lambda}{k}\right) \sqrt{\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j\|_0}$.

By the Gilbert-Varshamov bound, for any $k > 4$, there exists a code $C \subseteq \{0, 1\}^k$ with pairwise Hamming distance $\in [k/4, k]$ such that $|C| \geq \frac{2^{k-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{k/4-1} \binom{k}{i}} \geq \frac{2^{k-1}}{\left(\frac{4ek}{k}\right)^{k/4}} \geq 2^{\Omega(k)}$ (the second inequality via Stirling's approximation). We can thus show the existence of our $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M\} \subseteq \{\pm 1\}^k$ by taking $M = 2^{\Omega(k)}$ to get the code C as above and applying the transformation $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \mapsto ((-1)^{x_1}, \dots, (-1)^{x_k})$ to each binary codeword in C .

Thus, from the above construction, we will have $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2 \in \left[\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{k}}, \frac{2\lambda}{\sqrt{k}}\right]$ for each $i \neq j \in [M]$. To satisfy Eq. (11), we can choose $k = \left\lceil \frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil$. By the above discussion, this gives us a sample complexity lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{\varepsilon^4 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ for learning Gaussian means given advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\mu} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_1 = \lambda$. \square

Lemma 32. *Suppose we are given advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ which is symmetric and positive-definite, and sample access to $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for some unknown symmetric positive-definite $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, with only the constraint that $\|\text{vec}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{I}_d\right)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon d)$, where $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{800}$. Then, any algorithm that $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC learns $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ in total variation requires $\Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ samples.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ since, we can transform the input samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ as $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{x}$ to get samples from $N\left(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$, so that the advice quality in the transformed space (with advice taken to be \mathbf{I}_d) would be $\|\text{vec}\left(\mathbf{I}_d \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \mathbf{I}_d - \mathbf{I}_d\right)\|_1$, which is equal to the original advice quality $\|\text{vec}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{I}_d\right)\|_1$.

To use Lemma 30, we need to construct a set of M distributions (for sufficiently large M) f_1, \dots, f_M with $f_i \triangleq N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$ such that (i) $\|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \cdot d \cdot \lambda$ where λ is a constant > 800 (which satisfies our constraint on the advice quality, taking $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ — the choice of $\lambda = 800$ as the constant will be clear later), (ii) the pairwise KL divergence is $\leq \kappa(\varepsilon)$ and (iii) the pairwise TV distance is $> 2\varepsilon$. We follow the construction in Theorem 6.3 of [ABDH⁺20], changing a few parameters as necessary.

Take $r = 9$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \mathbf{I}_d + \mu \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{U}_i^\top$, where $\mathbf{U}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d/r}$ consists of the first d/r columns of a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix. By construction, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i - \mathbf{I}_d = \mu \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{U}_i^\top$ has d/r eigenvalues which are equal to μ and remaining $d - d/r$ eigenvalues equal to 0. Thus, the Frobenius norm $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F = \sqrt{\frac{d}{r} \mu^2} = \frac{\mu d^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}}$ (using the fact that Frobenius norm is equal to Schatten 2-norm), which implies $\frac{\mu d^{0.5}}{r^{0.5}} \leq \|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \frac{\mu d^{1.5}}{r^{0.5}}$ (by Cauchy-Schwarz). So, taking $\mu = \varepsilon \lambda \sqrt{\frac{r}{d}}$ (this is the only useable choice, up to constants, because of the TV distance bound, which needs to be $\Omega(\varepsilon)$) gives $\varepsilon \cdot \lambda \leq \|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon \cdot d \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon d)$ for each $i \in [M]$. Since we take $r = 9$, $\lambda \in \Theta(1)$ and $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{800}$ by assumption, we have $\mu \leq \frac{800 \sqrt{9\lambda}}{d^{0.5}} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ for sufficiently large d .

We have $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_d - \frac{\mu}{1+\mu} \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{U}_i^\top$. By a similar calculation as in Theorem 6.3 of [ABDH⁺20], we have $\text{d}_{\text{KL}}(f_i, f_j) \leq \frac{\mu^2 d}{r} = \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2$. Thus, we can take $\kappa(x) = \lambda^2 \cdot x^2 \in \mathcal{O}(x^2)$ for applying Lemma 30.

To bound the pairwise TV distance, we can use the following argument: By Lemma 6.5 of [ABDH⁺20], by taking each \mathbf{U}_i to be the first d/r columns of a uniformly random orthogonal matrix (w.r.t. the Haar measure on the group of orthogonal matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$), for $9 \leq r \leq d$ there exists $M = 2^{\Omega(\frac{d^2}{r^2})}$ matrices $\mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d/r}$ such that and $\|\mathbf{U}_i^\top \mathbf{U}_j\|_F^2 \leq \frac{d}{2r}$ for each $i \neq j \in [M]$. By Lemma 6.6 of [ABDH⁺20], since $\mu \leq \frac{1}{4}$, we have $d_{\text{TV}}(N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i), N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j)) \geq \Omega\left(\min\{1, \frac{4}{5}\mu\sqrt{d/r}\}\right) \geq C \min\{1, \varepsilon\lambda\}$ for some constant $C \geq \frac{1}{400}$ (using the lower bound from Theorem 1.1 of [DMR18]), which is $> 2\varepsilon$ as long as $\lambda > 800$ and $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}$.

Applying Lemma 30 to the set of distributions constructed as above (with $M = 2^{\Omega(d^2)}$ and $\kappa(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^2 \lambda^2 = \Theta(\varepsilon^2)$), we get that $(\varepsilon, \frac{2}{3})$ -PAC-learning a zero-mean Gaussian $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ given advice $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ with just the constraint that $\|\text{vec}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{I}_d\right)\|_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon d)$ requires $\Omega\left(\frac{d^2}{\varepsilon^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ samples in the worst case. \square

Acknowledgements

- AB: This research was supported by the National Research Foundation (NRF), Prime Minister’s Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme, by the NRF-AI Fellowship R-252-100-B13-281, Amazon Faculty Research Award, and Google South & Southeast Asia Research Award.
- DC: This research/project is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore under its AI Singapore Programme (AISG Award No: AISG-PhD/2021-08-013).
- TG: This research was partially supported by MoE AcRF Tier 1 A-8000980-00-00 while at NUS and by an NTU startup grant while at NTU.

References

- [ABDH⁺20] Hassan Ashtiani, Shai Ben-David, Nicholas J. A. Harvey, Christopher Liaw, Abbas Mehrabian, and Yaniv Plan. Near-optimal sample complexity bounds for robust learning of gaussian mixtures via compression schemes. *J. ACM*, 67(6), oct 2020.
- [ADJ⁺20] Spyros Angelopoulos, Christoph Dürr, Shendan Jin, Shahin Kamali, and Marc Renault. Online Computation with Untrusted Advice. In *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [AGKK20] Antonios Antoniadis, Themis Gouleakis, Pieter Kleer, and Pavel Kolev. Secretary and online matching problems with machine learned advice. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:7933–7944, 2020.
- [AJS22] Antonios Antoniadis, Peyman Jabbarzade, and Golnoosh Shahkarami. A Novel Prediction Setup for Online Speed-Scaling. In *18th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT 2022)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [BLMS⁺22] Giulia Bernardini, Alexander Lindermayr, Alberto Marchetti-Spaccamela, Nicole Megow, Leen Stougie, and Michelle Sweering. A Universal Error Measure for Input Predictions Applied to Online Graph Problems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [BMRS20] Étienne Bamas, Andreas Maggiori, Lars Rohwedder, and Ola Svensson. Learning Augmented Energy Minimization via Speed Scaling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15350–15359, 2020.
- [BMS20] Etienne Bamas, Andreas Maggiori, and Ola Svensson. The Primal-Dual method for Learning Augmented Algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20083–20094, 2020.
- [BV04] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [CGB23] Davin Choo, Themistoklis Gouleakis, and Arnab Bhattacharyya. Active causal structure learning with advice. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5838–5867. PMLR, 2023.

- [CGLB24] Davin Choo, Themistoklis Gouleakis, Chun Kai Ling, and Arnab Bhattacharyya. Online bipartite matching with imperfect advice. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2024.
- [CM13] T Tony Cai and Zongming Ma. Optimal hypothesis testing for high dimensional covariance matrices. *Bernoulli*, 19(5B):2359–2388, 2013.
- [CSVZ22] Justin Chen, Sandeep Silwal, Ali Vakilian, and Fred Zhang. Faster fundamental graph algorithms via learned predictions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3583–3602. PMLR, 2022.
- [Dia16] Ilias Diakonikolas. Learning structured distributions. *Handbook of Big Data*, 267:10–1201, 2016.
- [DIL⁺21] Michael Dinitz, Sungjin Im, Thomas Lavastida, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Faster matchings via learned duals. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:10393–10406, 2021.
- [DKS17] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, and Alistair Stewart. Statistical query lower bounds for robust estimation of high-dimensional gaussians and gaussian mixtures. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 73–84, 2017.
- [DL01] Luc Devroye and Gábor Lugosi. *Combinatorial methods in density estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [DLPLV21] Paul Dütting, Silvio Lattanzi, Renato Paes Leme, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Secretaries with Advice. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 409–429, 2021.
- [DMR18] Luc Devroye, Abbas Mehrabian, and Tommy Reddad. The total variation distance between high-dimensional gaussians with the same mean. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08693*, 2018.
- [FR13] Simon Foucart and Holger Rauhut. *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing*. Birkhäuser Basel, 2013.
- [Fre04] Robert M. Freund. Introduction to Semidefinite Programming (SDP), 2004. MIT OpenCourseWare.
- [Gho21] Malay Ghosh. Exponential tail bounds for chisquared random variables. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, 15, 2021.
- [GLS23] Themis Gouleakis, Konstantinos Lakis, and Golnoosh Shahkarami. Learning-Augmented Algorithms for Online TSP on the Line. In *37th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. AAAI, 2023.
- [GM12] Bernd Gärtner and Jiri Matousek. *Approximation Algorithms and Semidefinite Programming*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [GP19] Sreenivas Gollapudi and Debmalya Panigrahi. Online Algorithms for Rent-or-Buy with Expert Advice. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2319–2327. PMLR, 2019.
- [HJ12] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [HJS⁺22] Baihe Huang, Shunhua Jiang, Zhao Song, Runzhou Tao, and Ruizhe Zhang. Solving sdp faster: A robust ipm framework and efficient implementation. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 233–244. IEEE, 2022.
- [HTW15] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Martin Wainwright. Statistical learning with sparsity. *Monographs on statistics and applied probability*, 143(143):8, 2015.
- [KBC⁺18] Tim Kraska, Alex Beutel, Ed H. Chi, Jeffrey Dean, and Neoklis Polyzotis. The Case for Learned Index Structures. In *Proceedings of the 2018 international conference on management of data*, pages 489–504, 2018.
- [KLSU19] Gautam Kamath, Jerry Li, Vikrant Singhal, and Jonathan Ullman. Privately learning high-dimensional distributions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1853–1902. PMLR, 2019.

- [LLMV20] Silvio Lattanzi, Thomas Lavastida, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Online Scheduling via Learned Weights. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1859–1877. SIAM, 2020.
- [Mit18] Michael Mitzenmacher. A Model for Learned Bloom Filters, and Optimizing by Sandwiching. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [PSK18] Manish Purohit, Zoya Svitkina, and Ravi Kumar. Improving Online Algorithms via ML Predictions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
- [Tib97] Robert Tibshirani. The lasso method for variable selection in the cox model. *Statistics in medicine*, 16(4):385–395, 1997.
- [VB96] Lieven Vandenberghe and Stephen Boyd. Semidefinite Programming. *SIAM Review*, 38(1):49–95, 1996.
- [Ver10] Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.
- [Ver12] Roman Vershynin. Lectures in geometric functional analysis, 2012.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [WLW20] Shufan Wang, Jian Li, and Shiqiang Wang. Online Algorithms for Multi-shop Ski Rental with Machine Learned Advice. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:8150–8160, 2020.
- [Zha05] Fuzhen Zhang. *The Schur Complement and Its Applications*. Springer, 2005.

A Additional results

A.1 Tolerant testing

In this section, we present an algorithm for testing whether an unknown distribution is close to a standard normal distribution. More specifically, we first describe a tolerant tester for the property that the mean of an isotropic Gaussian distribution equals zero. Subsequently, we present a tolerant tester for the property that the covariance matrix equals the identity matrix.

A.1.1 Tolerant testing for mean

The definition of a tolerant tester for the mean of an isotropic Gaussian distribution is given below.

Definition 33 (Tolerant testing of isotropic Gaussian mean). Fix $m \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a hidden mean vector and we draw m samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. An algorithm ALG is said to be a $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta)$ -tolerant isotropic Gaussian mean tester if it satisfies the following two conditions:

1. If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$, then ALG should *Accept* with probability at least $1 - \delta$
2. If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$, then ALG should *Reject* with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

ALG is allowed to decide arbitrarily when $\varepsilon_1 < \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 < \varepsilon_2$.

It is known that the test statistic $y_n = \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right\|_2^2$ can be used for *non-tolerant* isotropic Gaussian mean testing with an appropriate threshold; see [DKS17, Appendix C]. With the following lemma we show that y_n can also be used for *tolerant* isotropic Gaussian mean testing.

Algorithm 5 The TOLERANTIGMT algorithm.

Input: $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, m i.i.d. samples of $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

Output: Fail (too little samples), *Accept* ($\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$), or *Reject* ($\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$).

- 1: Define testing threshold $\tau = d + \frac{n(\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2)}{2}$
 - 2: Define sample batch size $n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}$
 - 3: Define number of rounds $r = \lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$ if $\lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$ is odd, otherwise define $r = 1 + \lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$
 - 4: **if** $m < nr$ **then**
 - 5: **return** Fail
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ **do**
 - 8: Use an unused batch of n i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{(i)} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$
 - 9: Compute test statistic $y_n^{(i)} = \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i^{(i)} \right\|_2^2$ for the i^{th} test
 - 10: Define i^{th} outcome $\mathbf{R}^{(i)}$ as *Accept* if $y_n^{(i)} \leq \tau$, and *Reject* otherwise
 - 11: **return** majority($\mathbf{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{R}^{(r)}$)
-

Lemma 34. Fix $m \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a hidden mean vector and we draw m i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. When $d \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2$ and $m \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$, TOLERANTIGMT (Algorithm 5) is a $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta)$ -tolerant isotropic Gaussian mean tester.

Proof. The total number of samples m required is $nr \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ since TOLERANTIGMT uses $n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}$ i.i.d. samples in each of the $r \in \mathcal{O}(\log(\frac{1}{\delta}))$ rounds.

For correctness, we will prove that each round $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ succeeds with probability at least $2/3$. Then, by Chernoff bound, the majority outcome out of $r \geq \log(\frac{12}{\delta})$ independent tests will be correct with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Now, fix an arbitrary round $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. TOLERANTIGMT uses $n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \geq 1$ i.i.d. samples to form a statistic $y_n^{(i)}$ and tests against the threshold $\tau = d + \frac{n(\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2)}{2}$. From Lemma 21 (first item), we know that $y_n^{(i)} \sim$

$\chi_d^2(\lambda)$ is a non-central chi-square random variable with $\lambda = n\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2$. Let us define $t = \frac{n(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)}{2} > 0$. Observe that we can rewrite the testing threshold τ in two different ways: $\tau = d + \frac{n(\varepsilon_1^2 + \varepsilon_2^2)}{2} = d + n\varepsilon_1^2 + t = d + n\varepsilon_2^2 - t$.

Case 1: $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$

In this case, we have $\lambda = n\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \leq n\varepsilon_1^2$ and $\tau = d + n\varepsilon_1^2 + t$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(y_n^{(i)} > \tau) &= \Pr(y_n^{(i)} > d + n\varepsilon_1^2 + t) && \text{(since } \tau = d + n\varepsilon_1^2 + t\text{)} \\
&\leq \Pr(y_n^{(i)} > d + \lambda + t) && \text{(since } \lambda \leq n\varepsilon_1^2\text{)} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d+2\lambda)(d+2\lambda+t)}\right) && \text{(apply Lemma 21 (second item) with } t > 0\text{)} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d+2n\varepsilon_1^2)(d+2n\varepsilon_1^2+t)}\right) && \text{(since } \lambda \leq n\varepsilon_1^2\text{)} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dn^2(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)^2}{16(d+2n\varepsilon_1^2)(d+2n\varepsilon_2^2)}\right) && \text{(since } t = \frac{n(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)}{2} \leq 2n(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16^2 d^2}{16(d+2n\varepsilon_1^2)(d+2n\varepsilon_2^2)}\right) && \text{(since } n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{\left(1 + \frac{2n\varepsilon_1^2}{d}\right)\left(1 + \frac{2n\varepsilon_2^2}{d}\right)}\right) && \text{(dividing both numerator and denominator by } 16d^2\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{\left(1 + \frac{32\varepsilon_1^2}{\sqrt{d}(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)}\right)\left(1 + \frac{32\varepsilon_2^2}{\sqrt{d}(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)}\right)}\right) && \text{(since } n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{(1+2)(1+2)}\right) && \text{(since } d \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{9}\right) < \frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$, we have $\Pr(y_n^{(i)} \leq \tau) \geq 2/3$ and the i^{th} test outcome will be correctly an Accept with probability at least $2/3$.

Case 2: $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$

In this case, we have $\lambda = n\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \geq n\varepsilon_2^2 > n\varepsilon_1^2$ and $\tau = d + n\varepsilon_2^2 - t$. We first observe the following inequalities:

- Since $n \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, $\lambda \geq n\varepsilon_2^2$, and $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, we see that

$$\left(2 - \frac{n\varepsilon_1^2}{\lambda} - \frac{n\varepsilon_2^2}{\lambda}\right)^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2}\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{d}{\lambda} + 2\right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon_2^2} + 2\right)^2 \quad (12)$$

- Since $n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \geq 1$ and $d \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \geq 1$, we see that

$$\left(1 + \frac{2n\varepsilon_2^2}{d}\right)^2 \leq 3^2 \quad (13)$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(y_n^{(i)} < \tau) &= \Pr(y_n^{(i)} < d + n\varepsilon_2^2 - t) && \text{(since } \tau = d + n\varepsilon_2^2 - t\text{)} \\
&= \Pr(y_n^{(i)} < d + \lambda - (\lambda + t - n\varepsilon_2^2)) && \text{(Rewriting)} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{d(\lambda + t - n\varepsilon_2^2)^2}{4(d+2\lambda)^2}\right) && \text{(apply Lemma 21 (third item) with } 0 < \lambda + t - n\varepsilon_2^2 < d + \lambda\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{d\left(\lambda - \frac{n}{2}\varepsilon_1^2 - \frac{n}{2}\varepsilon_2^2\right)^2}{4(d+2\lambda)^2}\right) && \text{(since } t = \frac{n(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)}{2}\text{)} \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{d\left(2 - \frac{n\varepsilon_1^2}{\lambda} - \frac{n\varepsilon_2^2}{\lambda}\right)^2}{16\left(\frac{d}{\lambda} + 2\right)^2}\right) && \text{(Pulling out the factor of } \frac{\lambda}{2}\text{ from numerator)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{d\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2}\right)^2}{16\left(\frac{d}{n\varepsilon_2^2}+2\right)^2}\right) && \text{(by Eq. (12))} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{n^2(\varepsilon_2^2-\varepsilon_1^2)^2}{16d\left(1+\frac{n\varepsilon_2^2}{d}\right)^2}\right) && \text{(Pulling out factors of } n, d, \text{ and } \varepsilon_2^2) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{\left(1+\frac{n\varepsilon_2^2}{d}\right)^2}\right) && \text{(since } n = \frac{16\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2-\varepsilon_1^2}) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{16}{3^2}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{16}{9}\right) < \frac{1}{3} && \text{(by Eq. (13))}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$, we have $\Pr(y_n^{(i)} \geq \tau) \geq 2/3$ and the i^{th} test outcome will be correctly a **Reject** with probability at least $2/3$. \square

We are now ready to state the main theorem below.

Lemma 5 (Tolerant mean tester). *Given $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $d \geq \left(\frac{16\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2-\varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2$, there is a tolerant tester that uses $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon_2^2-\varepsilon_1^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. *If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon_1$, then the tester outputs **Accept** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.*
2. *If $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_2$, then the tester outputs **Reject** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.*

Proof. Use the guarantee of **Lemma 34** on TOLERANTIGMT (**Algorithm 5**) with parameters $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 2\varepsilon$. \square

A.1.2 Tolerant testing for covariance matrix

We now give the definition of a tolerant tester for the unknown covariance matrix being equal to identity.

Definition 35 (Tolerant testing of zero-mean Gaussian covariance matrix). Fix $m \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a hidden full rank covariance matrix and we draw m samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. An algorithm ALG is said to be a $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta)$ -tolerant zero-mean Gaussian covariance tester if it satisfies the following two conditions:

1. If $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq \varepsilon_1$, then ALG should *Accept* with probability at least $1 - \delta$
2. If $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \geq \varepsilon_2$, then ALG should *Reject* with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

ALG is allowed to decide arbitrarily when $\varepsilon_1 < \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 < \varepsilon_2$.

Definition 36 (Test statistic T_n). Let x_1, \dots, x_n be n i.i.d. samples from $\sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for an unknown $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. For $i \neq j$, we define $h(x_i, x_j) = (x_i^\top x_j)^2 - (x_i^\top x_i + x_j^\top x_j) + d$. Then, we define T_n as

$$T_n = \frac{2}{k(k-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} h(x_i, x_j)$$

It is known that the test statistic T_n (**Definition 36**) can be used for *non-tolerant* zero-mean Gaussian covariance testing with an appropriate threshold; see [CM13]. With the following lemma, we show that T_n can also be used for *tolerant* zero-mean Gaussian covariance testing.

Lemma 37. *Fix $m \geq 1$, $d \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, and $\delta > 0$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a hidden full rank covariance matrix and we draw m i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. When $d \geq \varepsilon_2^2$ and*

$$m \geq \mathcal{O}\left(d \cdot \max\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2\right\} \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

TOLERANTZMGCT (**Algorithm 6**) is a $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta)$ -tolerant zero-mean Gaussian covariance tester.

Algorithm 6 TOLERANTZMGCT.

Input: $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, m i.i.d. samples of $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

Output: Fail (too little samples), Accept ($\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2$), or Reject ($\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \geq \varepsilon_2^2$)

- 1: Define testing threshold $\tau = \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 + \varepsilon_1^2}{2}$
 - 2: Define sample batch size $n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \right)^2, 2 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2} \right)^2 \right\}$
 - 3: Define number of rounds $r = \lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$ if $\lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$ is odd, otherwise define $r = 1 + \lceil \log(\frac{12}{\delta}) \rceil$
 - 4: **if** $m < nr$ **then**
 - 5: **return** Fail
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ **do**
 - 8: Use an unused batch of n i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{x}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{(i)} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$
 - 9: Compute test statistic $T_n^{(i)}$ according to **Definition 36** for the i^{th} test
 - 10: Define i^{th} outcome $R^{(i)}$ as **Accept** if $T_n^{(i)} \leq \tau$, and **Reject** otherwise
 - 11: **return** majority($R^{(1)}, \dots, R^{(r)}$)
-

To prove **Lemma 37**, we first state the expectation and variance of T_n known from [**CM13**], and give an upper bound on the variance that will be useful for subsequent analysis.

Lemma 38 ([**CM13**]). *For the test statistic T_n defined in **Definition 36**, we have $\mathbb{E}(T_n) = \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2$ and $\sigma^2(T_n) = \frac{4}{n(n-1)} [\text{Tr}^2(\Sigma^2) + \text{Tr}(\Sigma^4)] + \frac{8}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma^2(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)$.*

Lemma 39. *Fix $d, n \geq 1$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and $b \geq 0$. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}$, then $\|\Sigma\|_F^2 \leq d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2$.*

Proof. Since the matrices can be treated as vectors in \mathbb{R}^{d^2} and then the Frobenius norm corresponds to the ℓ_2 norm, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma\|_F &\leq \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F + \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_F && \text{(Triangle inequality)} \\ &= b \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \sqrt{d} && \text{(Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n} \text{ and } \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = d) \\ &= \sqrt{d} \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\Sigma\|_F^2 \leq d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2$ as desired. \square

Lemma 40. *Fix $d \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and $b \geq 0$. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}$, then for the test statistic T_n defined in **Definition 36**, we have*

$$\sigma^2(T_n) \leq \frac{64d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n} + b^2\right)$$

Proof. We begin by observing two simple upper bounds for $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^4)$ and $\text{Tr}(\Sigma^2(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)$.

$$\text{Tr}(\Sigma^4) = \|\Sigma^2\|_F^2 \leq \|\Sigma\|_F^2 \cdot \|\Sigma\|_F^2 = \|\Sigma\|_F^4 = \text{Tr}^2(\Sigma^2) \quad (14)$$

Since $\Sigma(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d) = \Sigma^2 - \Sigma = (\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\Sigma$, i.e. Σ and $\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d$ commute, we have

$$\text{Tr}(\Sigma^2(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)^2) = \text{Tr}((\Sigma(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d))^2) = \|\Sigma(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_F^2 \leq \|\Sigma\|_F^2 \cdot \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \text{Tr}(\Sigma^2) \cdot \text{Tr}((\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)^2) \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Sigma^2(T_n) \\ &= \frac{4}{n(n-1)} [\text{Tr}^2(\Sigma^2) + \text{Tr}(\Sigma^4)] + \frac{8}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma^2(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)^2) \end{aligned} \quad \text{(By **Lemma 38**)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{8}{n(n-1)} [\text{Tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) + (n-1) \cdot \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)] && \text{(By Eq. (14))} \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n(n-1)} [\text{Tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) + (n-1) \cdot \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) \cdot \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)] && \text{(By Eq. (15))} \\
&= \frac{8}{n(n-1)} \cdot \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) \cdot [\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) + (n-1) \cdot \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)] \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n(n-1)} \cdot \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) \cdot [\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) + n \cdot \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)] && \text{(Since } \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2) \geq 0) \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n(n-1)} \cdot d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 \cdot \left(d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 + n \cdot \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2)\right) \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(Since } \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2) = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_F^2 \text{ and by Lemma 39)} \\
&= \frac{8}{n(n-1)} \cdot d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 \cdot \left(d \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 + b^2 \cdot d\right) && \text{(Since } \text{Tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)^2) = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}) \\
&= \frac{8d^2}{n(n-1)} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 + b^2\right) \\
&\leq \frac{16d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 \cdot \left(\left(1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^2 + b^2\right) && \text{(Since } n \geq 2) \\
&\leq \frac{64d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n} + b^2\right) && \text{(Since } (a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 37. Let us define $\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2, 2 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \right\} > 0$ and suppose $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}$ for some $b \geq 0$.

The total number of samples m required is $nr \in \mathcal{O}\left(d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ since TOLERANTZMGCT uses $n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$ i.i.d. samples in each of the $r \in \mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ rounds.

For correctness, we will prove that each round $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ succeeds with probability at least $2/3$. Then, by Chernoff bound, the majority outcome out of $r \geq \log\left(\frac{12}{\delta}\right)$ independent tests will be correct with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Now, fix an arbitrary round $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. TOLERANTZMGCT uses $n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$ i.i.d. samples to form a statistic $T_n^{(i)}$ (Definition 36) and tests against the threshold $\tau = \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 + \varepsilon_1^2}{4}$.

Case 1: $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
b^2 &= \frac{n}{d} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 && \text{(Since } \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}) \\
&= 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 && \text{(Since } n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}) \\
&\leq 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_1^2 && \text{(Since } \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \frac{b^2}{n} &= 1 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2}{d} && \text{(Since } \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n}) \\
&\leq 1 + \frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{d} && \text{(Since } \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2) \\
&\leq 2 && \text{(Since } d \geq \varepsilon_2^2 > \varepsilon_1^2)
\end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2(\mathbb{T}_n) &\leq \frac{64d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n} + b^2\right) && \text{(By Lemma 40)} \\
&\leq \frac{64d^2}{n^2} \cdot 2 \cdot (2 + 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_1^2) && \text{(From above)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{64 \cdot 2}{3200^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}^2} \cdot (2 + 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_1^2) && \text{(Since } n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \text{)} \\
&\leq \frac{64 \cdot 2}{3200^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}^2} \cdot 3202 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_1^2 && \text{(Since } \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \varepsilon_1^2 \geq 1 \text{)} \\
&\leq \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 3202}{3200^2} \cdot (\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)^2 && \text{(Since } \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \leq \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Chebyshev's inequality then tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\mathbb{T}_n > \tau) &= \Pr\left(\mathbb{T}_n > \varepsilon_1^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2}\right) && \text{(Since } \tau = \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 + \varepsilon_1^2}{2} = \varepsilon_1^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2} \text{)} \\
&\leq \Pr\left(\mathbb{T}_n > \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2}\right) && \text{(Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2 \text{)} \\
&= \Pr\left(\mathbb{T}_n > \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{T}_n] + \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2}\right) && \text{(By Lemma 38)} \\
&\leq \Pr\left(|\mathbb{T}_n - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{T}_n]| > \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2}\right) && \text{(Adding absolute sign)} \\
&\leq \sigma^2(\mathbb{T}_n) \cdot \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 && \text{(Chebyshev's inequality)} \\
&\leq \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 3202}{3200^2} \cdot (\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)^2 \cdot \frac{4}{(\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2)^2} && \text{(From above)} \\
&< \frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon_1^2$, we have $\Pr(\mathbb{T}_n < \tau) \geq 2/3$ and the i^{th} test outcome will be correctly an Accept with probability at least $2/3$.

Case 2: $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \geq \varepsilon_2^2$

We can lower bound b^2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
b^2 &= \frac{n}{d} \cdot \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 && \text{(Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n} \text{)} \\
&= 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 && \text{(Since } n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \text{)} \\
&\geq 3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 && \text{(Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \geq \varepsilon_2^2 \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we can lower bound n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
n &= 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} && \text{(Since } n = 3200 \cdot d \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \text{)} \\
&\geq 3200 \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} && \text{(Since } d \geq \varepsilon_2^2 \text{)} \\
&\geq \frac{3200 \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}}{\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 - 1} && \text{(Since } \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \geq 2 \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Using these lower bounds on b^2 and n (which we color for convenience), we can conclude that $1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \leq \frac{b^2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2$ via the following two equivalences:

$$1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \leq \frac{b^2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 \iff b^2 \geq \frac{n}{\frac{n}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 - 1}$$

and

$$3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 \geq \frac{n}{\frac{n}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 - 1} \iff n \geq \frac{3200 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_2^2}{\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 - 1} = \frac{3200 \cdot \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}}{\Delta_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2}\right)^2 - 1}$$

So,

$$\sigma^2(\mathbb{T}_n) \leq \frac{64d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{b^2}{n} + b^2\right) \quad \text{(By Lemma 40)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 64 \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{d^2}{n^2} \cdot \left(\frac{b^2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2 \right) \cdot \left(\frac{b^2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2 + b^2 \right) \quad (\text{Since } 1 + \frac{b^2}{n} \leq \frac{b^2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2) \\
&= \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{d^2}{n^2} \cdot b^4 \quad (\text{Since } \frac{1}{3200} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2 \leq 1) \\
&= \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2} \right)^2 \cdot \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^4 \quad (\text{Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \frac{b^2 d}{n})
\end{aligned}$$

Chebyshev's inequality then tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\mathbf{T}_n < \tau) &= \Pr\left(\mathbf{T}_n < \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right)\right) \quad (\text{Since } \tau = \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 + \varepsilon_1^2}{2} = \varepsilon_2^2 - \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2} = \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right)) \\
&\leq \Pr\left(\mathbf{T}_n < \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right)\right) \quad (\text{Since } \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \geq \varepsilon_2^2) \\
&= \Pr\left(\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 - \mathbf{T}_n > \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right) \quad (\text{Rearranging}) \\
&= \Pr\left(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}_n] - \mathbf{T}_n > \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right) \quad (\text{By Lemma 38}) \\
&\leq \Pr\left(|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}_n] - \mathbf{T}_n| > \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{2\varepsilon_2^2}\right) \quad (\text{Adding absolute sign}) \\
&\leq \sigma^2(\mathbf{T}_n) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2} \cdot \frac{2\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \quad (\text{Chebyshev's inequality}) \\
&\leq \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 2}{3200} \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}{\varepsilon_2^2}\right)^2 \cdot \|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^4 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2} \cdot \frac{2\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2 \quad (\text{From above}) \\
&= \frac{64 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 4}{3200} \\
&< \frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \geq \varepsilon_2^2$, we have $\Pr(\mathbf{T}_n > \tau) \geq 2/3$ and the i^{th} test outcome will be correctly an Reject with probability at least $2/3$. \square

Lemma 6 (Tolerant covariance tester). *Given $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $d \geq \varepsilon_2^2$, there is a tolerant tester that uses $\mathcal{O}\left(d \cdot \max\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2^2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_2^2 - \varepsilon_1^2}\right)^2\right\} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq \varepsilon_1$, then the tester outputs Accept with probability at least $1 - \delta$.
2. If $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \geq \varepsilon_2$, then the tester outputs Reject with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof. Use the guarantee of Lemma 37 on TOLERANTZMGCT (Algorithm 6) with parameters $\varepsilon_1^2 = \varepsilon^2$ and $\varepsilon_2^2 = 2\varepsilon^2$. \square

A.2 Basic results from Section 2

Lemma 9 (Chapter 5.6 of [HJ12]). *Let \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} be two square real matrices where \mathbf{A} is an invertible matrix. Then, $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\| = \|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\|$.*

Proof. Exercise 5.6.P58(b) of [HJ12] tells us that $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\| = \|\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\|$ when \mathbf{A} normal and \mathbf{B} is Hermitian. Since normal matrices are invertible and every real matrix is Hermitian, the claim follows. \square

Lemma 10. *Let \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} be two square $d \times d$ matrices where \mathbf{A} is an invertible matrix with a square root. Then, $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}\| = \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{I}_d\|$*

Proof. $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\| = \|(\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}^{-1/2})\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\| = \|\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}^{-1/2}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}^{-1/2})\| = \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{I}_d\|$. \square

Lemma 12 (Trace inequality). *For any three matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{ABC}) \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda_1(\mathbf{M}), \dots, \lambda_d(\mathbf{M})$ denote the eigenvalues of a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr}(\mathbf{ABC}) &\leq \sum_i \lambda_i(\mathbf{AB}) \cdot \lambda_i(\mathbf{C}) && \text{(by von Neumann trace inequality)} \\
&= \sum_i \lambda_i(\mathbf{BA}) \cdot \lambda_i(\mathbf{C}) && \text{(e.g. see Theorem 1.3.22 of [HJ12])} \\
&\leq \sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA}) \cdot \lambda_i(\mathbf{C})| \\
&\leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1(\mathbf{BA}) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_d(\mathbf{BA}) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1(\mathbf{C}) \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_d(\mathbf{C}) \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty && \text{(Hölder's inequality)} \\
&= \sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA})| \cdot \max_i \lambda_i(\mathbf{C}) && \text{(Definitions of vector } \ell_1 \text{ and } \ell_\infty \text{ norms)} \\
&\leq \sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA})| \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2 && \text{(Definition of matrix spectral norm)}
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to argue that $\sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA})| \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1$. To this end, consider the singular value decomposition (SVD) of $\mathbf{BA} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$ with unitary matrices \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} and diagonal matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d)$. Let us denote the eigenvalues of \mathbf{BA} by $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d$ and the columns of \mathbf{BA} by $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA})| &\leq \sum_i \sigma_i && \text{(e.g. see Equation (7.3.17) in [HJ12])} \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) && \text{(By definition of } \mathbf{\Sigma} \text{)} \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma}) && \text{(Since } \mathbf{U} \text{ and } \mathbf{V} \text{ are unitary matrices)} \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^\top) && \text{(By cyclic property of trace)} \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{BA}) && \text{(By SVD of } \mathbf{BA} \text{)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{z}_i)_i && \text{(By definition of trace)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{z}_i\|_2 && \text{(Since } (\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{z}_i)_i^2 \text{ is just one term in summation of } \|\mathbf{V} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{z}_i\|_2^2 \text{)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{z}_i\|_2 && \text{(Since } \mathbf{U} \text{ and } \mathbf{V} \text{ are unitary matrices)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{z}_i\|_1 && \text{(Since } \ell_2 \leq \ell_1 \text{)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |(\mathbf{BA})_{i,j}| && \text{(By definition of vector } \ell_1 \text{ norm)} \\
&= \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1 && \text{(By definition of } \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1 \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

Putting together, we get $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{ABC}) \leq \sum_i |\lambda_i(\mathbf{BA})| \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{BA})\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2$ as desired. \square

Lemma 13. *For any two matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$ and $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{AB})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$.*

Proof. To see $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$, observe that

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B})\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{ij} + \mathbf{B}_{ij}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{ij}| + \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |\mathbf{B}_{ij}| = \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 + \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$$

To see $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{AB})\|_1 \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$, observe that

$$\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{AB})\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{ij} \mathbf{B}_{jk}| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d |\mathbf{A}_{ij}| \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d |\mathbf{B}_{jk}| \right) = \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})\|_1 \cdot \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})\|_1$$

□

Lemma 15 (Known fact about KL divergence). *Given two d -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{P} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $\mathcal{Q} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ are invertible, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. In particular, $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}\|_2^2$ when $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathbf{I}_d$ and $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2$ when $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $\mathcal{Q} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be two d -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distributions where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ are full rank invertible covariance matrices.

By definition, the KL divergence between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} is

$$d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) \right) \quad (16)$$

Let us define the matrix $\mathbf{X} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. Note that \mathbf{X} is invertible because $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ are invertible, so $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d > 0$. Then, Eq. (16) can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) - d + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}) + \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \right) \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

This is because $\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1/2}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I}_d) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}) + d$ and

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}}{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}} \right) &= \ln \det (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \ln \det (\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I}_d) = \ln \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + \lambda_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \ln(1 + \lambda_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i - \lambda_i^2) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}) - \|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds due to $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d > 0$.

When $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathbf{I}_d$, Eq. (16) reduces to $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}}\|_2^2$. Meanwhile, when $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{P}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, Eq. (17) reduces to $d_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|\mathbf{X}\|_F^2)$. □

Lemma 20 (Properties of empirical covariance). *Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the empirical covariance constructed from n i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ for some unknown covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Then,*

- When $n = d$, with probability 1, we have that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ share the same eigenspace.
- Let $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_1 \leq \dots \leq \widehat{\lambda}_d$ be the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ respectively. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\frac{\widehat{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_1} \leq 1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}} \right)$.

Proof. For item 1, let $1 \leq r \leq d$ be the rank of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. We consider the case of the d -dimensional Gaussian with zero mean and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_r = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, where \mathbf{I}_r denotes the r -dimensional identity matrix and the zero-padding is added when $r < d$. Note that there is an invertible transformation between samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_r)$ and

$N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ with samples from $N(0, \Gamma_r)$ having the $r + 1, \dots, d$ coordinates be fixed to 0. Now, let us denote the i -th standard basis vector by \mathbf{e}_i and apply an induction argument on r from 1 to d . The base case ($r = 1$) is obviously true since a single sample \mathbf{x}_1 will span $\{\mathbf{e}_1\}$ unless $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}$, which will happen with probability 0. When $r > 1$, by strong induction, r samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r$ will not span $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_r\}$ only if the r -th sample \mathbf{x}_r lies in the subspace spanned by $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{r-1}$. This is a measure 0 event under the $N(\mathbf{0}, \Gamma_r)$ measure.

For item 2, see Fact 3.4 of [KLSU19]. \square

Lemma 21. Fix $n \geq 1$ and $d \geq 1$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a hidden mean vector and we draw n samples $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Define $\mathbf{z}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i$ and $y_n = \|\mathbf{z}_n\|_2^2$. Then,

1. y_n follows the non-central chi-squared distribution $\chi_d^2(\lambda)$ for $\lambda = n\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2$. This also implies that $\mathbb{E}[y_n] = d + \lambda$ and $\text{Var}(y_n) = 2d + 4\lambda$.

2. For any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(y_n > d + \lambda + t) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{t}{d + 2\lambda} - \log\left(1 + \frac{t}{d + 2\lambda}\right)\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d + 2\lambda)(d + 2\lambda + t)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

3. For any $t \in (0, d + \lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(y_n < d + \lambda - t) &\leq \exp\left(\frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{t}{d + 2\lambda} + \log\left(1 - \frac{t}{d + 2\lambda}\right)\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{dt^2}{4(d + 2\lambda)^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first item follows from the definition of the non-central chi-squared distribution, noting that the random vector \mathbf{z}_n is distributed as $N(\sqrt{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. The second and third items follow from Theorems 3 and 4 of [Gho21] respectively. \square

Lemma 22. Suppose $\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Then,

$$\Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i\right\|_{\infty} \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) \leq \delta$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_n \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_d)$, we see that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{g}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{g}_n \sim N(0, n\mathbf{I}_d)$. Furthermore, each coordinate $i \in [d]$ of $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ is distributed according to $N(0, n)$. By standard Gaussian tail bounds, we know that $\Pr(|y_i| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2n}\right)$ for any $i \in [d]$ and $t > 0$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i\right\|_{\infty} \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) &= \Pr\left(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\infty} \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\max_{i \in [d]} \|y_i\| \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \Pr\left(\|y_i\| \geq \sqrt{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}\right) \quad (\text{Union bound over all } d \text{ coordinates}) \\ &\leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}{2n}\right) \quad (\text{Setting } t = 2n \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)) \\ &= \delta \end{aligned}$$

\square

B Identity covariance setting

B.1 Guarantees of APPROXL1

Here, we show that the guarantees of the APPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)).

Let $\varepsilon, \delta, k, \alpha$, and ζ be the input parameters to the APPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)). Given $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, the APPROXL1 algorithm succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ and has the following properties:

- If APPROXL1 outputs Fail, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 > \zeta/2$.
- If APPROXL1 outputs OK, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \alpha$.
- If APPROXL1 outputs $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1)$.

Proof. We begin by stating some properties of o_1, \dots, o_w . Fix an arbitrary index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$ and suppose o_j is *not* a Fail, i.e. the tolerant tester of [Lemma 5](#) outputs Accept for some $i^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$. Note that APPROXL1 sets $o_j = \ell_{i^*}$ and the tester outputs Reject for all smaller indices $i \in \{1, \dots, i^* - 1\}$. Since the tester outputs Accept for i^* , we have that $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\ell_{i^*} = 2o_j$. Meanwhile, if $i^* > 1$, then $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > \ell_{i^*-1} = \ell_{i^*}/2 = o_j/2$ since the tester outputs Reject for $i^* - 1$. Thus, we see that

- When o_j is not Fail, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2o_j$.
- When $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha$, we have $i^* = 1$ and $o_j = \ell_1 = \alpha$.
- When $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha = 2\ell_1$, we have $i^* > 1$ and so $o_j < 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2$.

Success probability. Fix an arbitrary index $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$ with $\ell_i = 2^{i-1}\alpha$, where $\ell_i \leq \ell_1 = \alpha$ for any i . We invoke the tolerant tester with $\varepsilon_2 = 2\ell_i = 2\varepsilon_1$, so the i^{th} invocation uses at most $n_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot r_\delta$ i.i.d. samples to succeed with probability at least $1 - \delta$; see [Definition 23](#) and [Algorithm 5](#). So, with $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ samples, *any* call to the tolerant tester succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, where $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$. By construction, there will be at most $w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil$ calls to the tolerant tester. Therefore, by union bound, *all* calls to the tolerant tester jointly succeed with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Property 1. When APPROXL1 outputs Fail, there exists a Fail amongst $\{o_1, \dots, o_w\}$. For any fixed index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$, this can only happen when all calls to the tolerant tester outputs Reject. This means that $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > \varepsilon_1 = \ell_i = 2^{i-1} \cdot \alpha$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$. In particular, this means that $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > \zeta/2$.

Property 2. When APPROXL1 outputs OK, we have $4\sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 \leq \alpha^2$. Then, since $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2o_j$ for each index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$, we see that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^w (2o_j)^2 = 4 \sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 \leq \alpha^2$$

That is, $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \leq \alpha$ as desired.

Property 3. When APPROXL1 outputs $\lambda = 2\sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $4\sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 > \varepsilon^2$. We can lower bound λ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2}{2} && \text{(since } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2o_j) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 && \text{(since } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2) \\ &= \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1 && \text{(since } \sum_{j=1}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1) \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \geq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1$. Meanwhile, we can also upper bound λ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \sum_{j=1}^w o_j && \text{(since } |\mathbf{B}_j| \leq k \text{)} \\
&= 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha}^w o_j + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w o_j \right) && \text{(partitioning the blocks based on } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \text{ versus } 2\alpha \text{)} \\
&= 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha}^w \alpha + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w o_j \right) && \text{(since } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha \text{ implies } o_j = \alpha \text{)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha}^w \alpha + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \right) && \text{(since } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha \text{ implies } o_j \leq 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \text{)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha}^w \alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 \right) && \text{(since } \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 \text{)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 \right) && \text{(since } |\{j \in [w] : \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 \leq 2\alpha\}| \leq w \text{)} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1) && \text{(since } \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_2 > 2\alpha}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^w \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}_j}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{B}}\|_1 \text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (\lceil d/k \rceil \cdot \alpha + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_1)$. The property follows by putting together both bounds. \square

B.2 Deferred derivation

Here, we show how to derive Eq. (3) from Eq. (2).

For any two vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, observe that $\|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 = \langle \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b} \rangle = (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b})^\top (\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{a} - 2\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{b}$, since $\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{a}$ is just a number. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{y}_i - 2\mathbf{y}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \\
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - X\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{y}_i - 2\mathbf{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (2\mathbf{y}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - 2\mathbf{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
&\quad \text{(Since Eq. (3) tells us that } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2) \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{g}_i)^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} \right) \quad \text{(Since } \mathbf{y}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{g}_i) \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{g}_i^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})) \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \mathbf{g}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{g}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \boldsymbol{\mu} \right\rangle \quad \text{(Linearity of inner product)}
\end{aligned}$$

establishing Eq. (3) as desired.

C General covariance setting

C.1 The adjustments

Here, we provide the deferred proofs of Lemma 25 and Lemma 26 from Section 4.1.

Lemma 25. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there is an explicit preconditioning process that uses d i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ in constructing a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$. Furthermore, for any full rank PSD matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have $\|(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\| = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\|$.*

Proof. Suppose $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be the empirical covariance constructed from $n = d$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. Let $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d$ and $\hat{\lambda}_1 \leq \dots \leq \hat{\lambda}_d$ be the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ respectively. By Lemma 20, we know that:

- With probability 1, we have that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ share the same eigenspace.
- With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have $\frac{\hat{\lambda}_1}{\lambda_1} \leq 1 + c_0 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{d}}$ for some absolute constant c_0 .

Let $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_d$ be the eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_d$. Define the following terms:

- $\mathbf{V}_{\text{small}} = \{i \in [d] : \hat{\lambda}_i < 1\}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{\text{big}} = [d] \setminus \mathbf{V}_{\text{small}}$
- $\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{small}}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{V}_{\text{big}}} \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i \hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top$
- $\mathbf{A} = \sqrt{k} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} + \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}}$, where $k = \left(1 + c_0 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_1}$

We first argue that the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}$ is at least 1, i.e. $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$. To show this, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} \geq 1$ for any unit vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By definition,

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = k \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u}$$

since the cross terms are zero because $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u} = 0$.

Now, observe that $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u} \geq \lambda_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2$ and $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u} \geq \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2$. Meanwhile, by Pythagoras theorem, we know that $\|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 = 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} &= k \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u} \\
&\geq k \lambda_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \\
&\geq (\|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{small}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{\text{big}} \mathbf{u}\|_2^2) \\
&= 1
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is because $k = \left(1 + c_0 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_1}$.

To complete the proof, note that for any full rank PSD matrix $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\Sigma}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\Sigma}\mathbf{A})^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\| &= \|(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\Sigma}\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d\| \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}\Sigma\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d\| \\ &= \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}\Sigma\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_d\| \\ &= \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\| \\ &= \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Sigma\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{I}_d\| \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 26. Fix dimension $d \geq 2$ and group size $k \leq d$. Consider the $q = 2$ setting where $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix. Define $w = \frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)}$. Pick sets $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_w$ each of size k uniformly at random (with replacement) from all the possible $\binom{d}{k}$ sets. With high probability in d , this is a $(q = 2, d, k, a = 1, b = \frac{30(d-1)\log d}{(k-1)})$ -partitioning scheme.

Proof. By definition, we have $|\mathbf{B}_1|, \dots, |\mathbf{B}_w| = k$. Let us define $\mathcal{E}_{1,i,j}$ as the event that the cell (i, j) of \mathbf{T} never appears in any of the submatrices $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{B}_w}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{2,i,j}$ as the event that the cell (i, j) of \mathbf{T} appears in strictly more than b submatrices. In the rest of this proof, our goal is to show that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_1]$ and $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2]$ are small, where $\mathcal{E}_1 = \cup_{(i,j) \in [d] \times [d]} \mathcal{E}_{1,i,j}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \cup_{(i,j) \in [d] \times [d]} \mathcal{E}_{2,i,j}$.

Fix any two distinct $i, j \in [d]$. For $\ell \in [w]$, let us define $X_\ell^{i,j}$ as the indicator event that the cell (i, j) in \mathbf{T} appears in the ℓ^{th} principal submatrix $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{B}_\ell}$ when $i, j \in \mathbf{B}_\ell$. By construction,

$$\Pr[X_\ell^{i,j} = 1] = \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{d-2}{k-2}}{\binom{d}{k}} = \frac{k(k-1)}{d(d-1)} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \frac{\binom{d-1}{k-1}}{\binom{d}{k}} = \frac{k}{d} & \text{if } i = j \end{cases}$$

To analyze \mathcal{E}_1 , we first consider $i, j \in [d]$ where $i \neq j$. We see that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{1,i,j}] = \prod_{\ell=1}^w \Pr[X_\ell^{i,j} = 0] = \left(1 - \frac{k(k-1)}{d(d-1)}\right)^w \leq \exp\left(-\frac{wk(k-1)}{d(d-1)}\right) = \exp(-10 \log d) = \frac{1}{d^{10}}$$

Meanwhile, when $i = j$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{1,i,i}] = \prod_{\ell=1}^w \Pr[X_\ell^{i,i} = 0] = \left(1 - \frac{k}{d}\right)^w \leq \exp\left(-\frac{wk}{d}\right) \leq \exp(-10 \log d) = \frac{1}{d^{10}}$$

Taking union bound over $(i, j) \in [d] \times [d]$, we get

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_1] \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in [d] \times [d]} \Pr[\mathcal{E}_{1,i,j}] \leq \frac{d^2}{d^{10}} = \frac{1}{d^8}$$

To analyze \mathcal{E}_2 , let us first define $Z^{i,j} = \sum_{\ell=1}^w X_\ell^{i,j}$ for any $i, j \in [d]$. Since the $X_\ell^{i,j}$ variables are indicators, linearity of expectations tells us that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}] = \sum_{\ell=1}^w \mathbb{E}[X_\ell^{i,j}] = \begin{cases} \sum_{\ell=1}^w \frac{k(k-1)}{d(d-1)} = \frac{wk(k-1)}{d(d-1)} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^w \frac{k}{d} = \frac{wk}{d} & \text{if } i = j \end{cases}$$

For $i \neq j$, applying Chernoff bound yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Z^{i,j} > (1+2) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}]] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}] \cdot 2^2}{2+2}\right) \leq \exp(-\mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}]) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{wk(k-1)}{d(d-1)}\right) = \exp(-10 \log d) = \frac{1}{d^{10}} \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, when $i = j$,

$$\Pr[Z^{i,i} > (1+2) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z^{i,i}]] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z^{i,i}] \cdot 2^2}{2+2}\right) \leq \exp(-\mathbb{E}[Z^{i,i}]) = \exp\left(-\frac{wk}{d}\right) \leq \exp(-10 \log d) = \frac{1}{d^{10}}$$

By defining

$$b = 3 \cdot \max_{i,j \in [d]} \mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}] = \frac{3wk}{d} = \frac{30(d-1) \log d}{(k-1)},$$

we see that $\Pr[E_{2,i,j}] = \Pr[Z^{i,j} > b] \leq \Pr[Z^{i,j} > (1+2) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z^{i,j}]] \leq \frac{1}{d^{10}}$ and $\Pr[E_{2,i,i}] = \Pr[Z^{i,i} > b] \leq \Pr[Z^{i,i} > (1+2) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z^{i,i}]] \leq \frac{1}{d^{10}}$. Therefore, taking union bound over $(i, j) \in [d] \times [d]$, we get

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2] \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in [d] \times [d]} \Pr[\mathcal{E}_{2,i,j}] \leq \frac{d^2}{d^{10}} = \frac{1}{d^8}$$

In conclusion, this construction satisfy all 3 conditions of [Definition 7](#) with high probability in d . \square

C.2 Guarantees of VectorizedApproxL1

Here, we show that the guarantees of the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#)).

Lemma 28. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta, k, \alpha$, and ζ be the input parameters to the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm ([Algorithm 3](#)). Given $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ i.i.d. samples from $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, the VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 algorithm succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ and has the following properties:*

- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs Fail, then $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 > \zeta/2$.
- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs OK, then $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \alpha^2$.
- If VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\frac{10d(d-1) \log d}{k(k-1)} \cdot \alpha + 2\|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \right)$$

Proof. We begin by stating some properties of o_1, \dots, o_w . Fix an arbitrary index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$ and suppose o_j is not a Fail, i.e. the tolerant tester of [Lemma 6](#) outputs Accept for some $i^* \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$. Note that VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 sets $o_j = \ell_{i^*}$ and the tester outputs Reject for all smaller indices $i \in \{1, \dots, i^* - 1\}$. Since the tester outputs Accept for i^* , we have that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\ell_{i^*} = 2o_j$. Meanwhile, if $i^* > 1$, then $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > \ell_{i^*-1} = \ell_{i^*}/2 = o_j/2$ since the tester outputs Reject for $i^* - 1$. Thus, we see that

- When o_j is not Fail, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2o_j$.
- When $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha$, we have $i^* = 1$ and $o_j = \ell_1 = \alpha$.
- When $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha = 2\ell_1$, we have $i^* > 1$ and so $o_j < 2\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F$.

Success probability. Fix an arbitrary index $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$ with $\ell_i = 2^{i-1}\alpha$, where $\ell_i \leq \ell_1 = \alpha$ for any i . We invoke the tolerant tester with $\varepsilon_2 = 2\ell_i = 2\varepsilon_1$, so the i^{th} invocation uses at most $n'_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot r_\delta$ i.i.d. samples to succeed with probability at least $1 - \delta$; see [Definition 27](#) and [Algorithm 6](#). So, with $m(k, \alpha, \delta')$ samples, any call to the tolerant tester succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, where $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil}$. By construction, there will be at most $w \cdot \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil$ calls to the tolerant tester. Therefore, by union bound, all calls to the tolerant tester jointly succeed with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Property 1. When VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs Fail, there exists a Fail amongst $\{o_1, \dots, o_w\}$. For any fixed index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$, this can only happen when all calls to the tolerant tester outputs Reject. This means that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > \varepsilon_1 = \ell_i = 2^{i-1} \cdot \alpha$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \log_2 \zeta / \alpha \rceil\}$. In particular, this means that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > \zeta/2$.

Property 2. When VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs OK, we have $4b \sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 \leq \alpha^2$. Then, since $\|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2o_j$ for each index $j \in \{1, \dots, w\}$ and since each cell in Σ appears at most b times across all submatrices $\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_w}$, we see that

$$\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq b \cdot \sum_{j=1}^w \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq b \cdot \sum_{j=1}^w (2o_j)^2 \leq \alpha^2$$

That is, $\|\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq \alpha^2$ as desired.

Property 3. When VECTORIZEDAPPROXL1 outputs $\lambda = 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $4b \sum_{j=1}^w o_j^2 > \alpha^2$. We can lower bound λ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot \frac{\|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F}{2} && \text{(since } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2o_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j| \cdot \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2^2} && \text{(since } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2^2) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 && \text{(since } \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1^2 \leq |\mathbf{B}_j| \cdot \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2^2) \\ &\geq \|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \\ &\quad \text{(Since each cell in } \Sigma \text{ appears at least } a = 1 \text{ times across all submatrices } \Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \dots, \Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_w}) \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \geq \|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1$. Meanwhile, we can also upper bound λ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^w \sqrt{|\mathbf{B}_j|} \cdot o_j \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^w o_j && \text{(since } |\mathbf{B}_j| \leq k) \\ &= 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w o_j + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha}}^w o_j \right) && \text{(partitioning based on } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \text{ versus } 2\alpha) \\ &= 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \alpha + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha}}^w o_j \right) && \text{(since } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha \text{ implies } o_j = \alpha) \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha}}^w \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \right) && \text{(since } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha \text{ implies } o_j \leq 2\|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F) \\ &= 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F > 2\alpha}}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2 \right) && \text{(since } \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 = \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \right) \\
&\hspace{15em} (\text{since } \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2 \leq \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1) \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot \left(w\alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F^2 \leq 2\alpha}}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \right) \hspace{2em} (\text{since } |\{j \in [w] : \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha\}| \leq w) \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (w\alpha + 2\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1) \\
&\hspace{10em} (\text{since } \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \|\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F \leq 2\alpha}}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^w \|\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{B}_j} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 = \|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1)
\end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lambda \leq 2\sqrt{k} \cdot (w\alpha + 2\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1)$, where $w = \frac{10d(d-1)\log d}{k(k-1)}$. The property follows by putting together both bounds. \square

C.3 Polynomial running time of Eq. (6)

In this section, we show that Eq. (6) in Lemma 29 can be reformulated as a semidefinite program (SDP) that is polynomial time solvable. Recall that we are given n samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ under the assumption that $\|\text{vec}(\Sigma - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r$ for some $r > 0$, and Eq. (6) was defined as follows:

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \underset{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is p.s.d.} \\ \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r \\ \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{y}_i^\top\|_F^2$$

To convert our optimization problem to the standard SDP form, we “blow up” the problem dimension into some integer $n' \in \text{poly}(d)$. Let m be the number of constraints and n' be the problem dimension. For symmetric matrices $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}_1, \dots, \mathbf{D}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ and values $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{R}$, the standard form of a SDP is written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}} && \langle \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{X} \rangle \\
&\text{subject to} && \langle \mathbf{D}_1, \mathbf{X} \rangle = b_1 \\
&&& \vdots \\
&&& \langle \mathbf{D}_m, \mathbf{X} \rangle = b_m \\
&&& \mathbf{X} \succeq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the inner product between two matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ is written as

$$\langle \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \sum_{j=1}^{n'} \mathbf{A}_{i,j} \mathbf{B}_{i,j}$$

For further expositions about SDPs, we refer readers to [VB96, BV04, Fre04, GM12]. In this section, we simply rely on the following known result to argue that our optimization problem will be polynomial time (in terms of n, d , and r) after showing how to frame Eq. (6) in the standard SDP form.

Theorem 41 (Implied by [HJS⁺22]). *Consider an SDP instance of the form Eq. (18). Suppose it has an optimal solution $\mathbf{X}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ and any feasible solution $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \leq R$ for some $R > 0$. Then, there is an algorithm that produces $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ in $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon)))$ time such that $\langle \mathbf{C}, \hat{\mathbf{X}} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{X}^* \rangle + \varepsilon R \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2$.*

Remark 42. Apart from notational changes, Theorem 8.1 of [HJS⁺22] actually deals with the maximization problem but here we transform it to our minimization setting. They also guarantee additional bounds on the constraints with respect to $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$, which we do not use.

In the following formulation, for any indices i and j , we define $\delta_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ as the indicator indicating whether $i = j$. This will be useful for representation of the identity matrix.

C.3.6 Positive semidefinite constraints

By known properties of the (generalized) Schur complement [Zha05, Section 1.4 and Section 1.6], it is known that $\mathbf{X} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ if and only if the following properties hold simultaneously:

1. $\mathbf{M} \succeq \mathbf{0}$
2. $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d \succeq \mathbf{0} \iff \mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{I}_d \iff \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) \geq 1$, which also implies that \mathbf{A} is psd
3. $\mathbf{U} \succeq \mathbf{0} \iff u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, \dots, u_{1,d}, \dots, u_{d,1}, \dots, u_{d,d} \geq 0$
4. $\mathbf{S} \succeq \mathbf{0} \iff s_{1,1}, s_{1,2}, \dots, s_{1,d}, \dots, s_{d,1}, \dots, s_{d,d} \geq 0$
5. $s_{\mathbf{U}} \geq 0$
6. $s_{\mathbf{B}} \geq 0$

For the first property, since $\mathbf{I}_d \succ \mathbf{0}$, Schur complement tells us that $\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{A}^\top \\ \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{I}_d \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{B} \succeq \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$. Observe that $\mathbf{B} \succeq \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ implies $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \geq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$, which aligns with our intention of modeling $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ by \mathbf{B} . Note that the objective function is $n\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) - 2\text{Tr}(\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{A})$ and we have that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \geq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$ for all feasible matrices \mathbf{B} . Thus, for any pair $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*)$ that minimizes of the objective function, it has to be that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^*) = \text{Tr}((\mathbf{A}^*)^\top \mathbf{A}^*)$, since otherwise, the pair $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^{**} = (\mathbf{A}^*)^\top \mathbf{A}^*)$ would have a smaller value.

C.3.7 Enforcing an upper bound on $\|\mathbf{B}\|_2$

To apply [Theorem 41](#), we need to argue that the feasible region of our SDP is bounded and non-empty, so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2$ is upper bounded. To do so, we need to enforce an upper bound on $\|\mathbf{B}\|_2$.

Since $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r$, by triangle inequality and standard norm inequalities, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 + \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F + \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_2 \\ &= \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2 + d \leq \|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 + d \leq r + d \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

As \mathbf{B} is supposed to model $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ and is constrained only by $\mathbf{B} \succeq \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$, it is feasible to enforce $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 \leq d \cdot (r + d)^4$ because

$$\|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 \leq d \cdot \|\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}\|_2^2 = d \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_2^4 \leq d \cdot (r + d)^4$$

To this end, let us define a symmetric constraint matrix $\mathbf{D}_{i,j}^{\mathbf{B}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ such that

$$\mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{B}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & & \\ & \mathbf{0}_{(2d^2+2d+1) \times (2d^2+2d+1)} & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$$

and $b^{\mathbf{B}} = d \cdot (r + d)^4$. Then, $\langle \mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{X} \rangle = b^{\mathbf{B}}$ resolves to $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) + s_{\mathbf{B}} = \langle \mathbf{D}^{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{X} \rangle = b^{\mathbf{B}} = d \cdot (r + d)^4$. In other words, since the slack variable $s_{\mathbf{B}}$ is non-negative, i.e. $s_{\mathbf{B}} \geq 0$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 \leq d \cdot (r + d)^4 \quad (23)$$

C.3.8 Bounding $\|\mathbf{C}\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2$

Recalling the definition of \mathbf{C} in [Eq. \(21\)](#), we see that

$$\|\mathbf{C}\|_2 \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(n, \dots, n) & -\mathbf{Y} \\ -\mathbf{Y} & \mathbf{0}_{d \times d} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq n + \|\mathbf{Y}\|_2$$

Meanwhile, we know from [Lemma 20](#) that

$$\|\mathbf{Y}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}} \right) \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Recall from [Algorithm 4](#) that when we solve the optimization problem of [Eq. \(6\)](#), we have that $\|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I})\|_1 \leq r$. So, by a similar chain of arguments as [Eq. \(22\)](#), we see that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2 + \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_F + \|\mathbf{I}_d\|_2 = \|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_2 + d \leq \|\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 + d = r + d$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{C}\|_2 \leq n + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_2 \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}}\right)\right) \leq n + (r + d) \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log 1/\delta}{n}}\right)\right) \in \text{poly}(n, d, r)$$

Meanwhile, recalling definition of \mathbf{X} from [Eq. \(20\)](#), we see that for *any* feasible solution \mathbf{X} ,

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \leq \max\{\|\mathbf{M}\|_2, \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d\|_2, \|\mathbf{U}\|_2, \|\mathbf{S}\|_2, s_{\mathbf{U}}, s_{\mathbf{B}}\}$$

By [Eq. \(23\)](#), we have that $\|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d} \cdot (r + d)^2$. So,

$$\|\mathbf{M}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{A}\|_2 + 1 \leq d \cdot (r + d)^4 + r + d + 1 \in \text{poly}(d, r)$$

Also, all the remaining terms are in $\text{poly}(r, d)$ since $\|\text{vec}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_d)\|_1 \leq r$. Therefore, $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \in \text{poly}(d, r)$ with probability $1 - \delta$. So, $\|\mathbf{X}\|_2 \leq R$ for some $R \in \text{poly}(d, r)$.

C.3.9 Putting together

Suppose we aim for an additive error of $\varepsilon' > 0$ in [Eq. \(7\)](#) when we solve [Eq. \(6\)](#). From above, we have that $\|\mathbf{C}\|_2, R \in \text{poly}(n, d, r)$. Let us define $\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon'}{R \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2}$ in [Theorem 41](#). Then, the algorithm of [Theorem 41](#) produces $\widehat{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ in $\text{poly}(n, d, \log(1/\varepsilon)) \subseteq \text{poly}(n, d, \log(\frac{R \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2}{\varepsilon})) \subseteq \text{poly}(n, d, r, \log(1/\varepsilon'))$ time such that $\langle \mathbf{C}, \widehat{\mathbf{X}} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{X}^* \rangle + \varepsilon R \cdot \|\mathbf{C}\|_2 = \langle \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{X}^* \rangle + \varepsilon'$ as desired.