

# OPTIMAL ESTIMATION OF SHARED SINGULAR SUBSPACES ACROSS MULTIPLE NOISY MATRICES

BY ZHENGCHI MA <sup>1,a</sup> AND RONG MA <sup>2,3,b</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Statistics and Data Science, Nankai University, [zhengchima@mail.nankai.edu.cn](mailto:zhengchima@mail.nankai.edu.cn)*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Biostatistics, Harvard University, [rongma@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:rongma@hsph.harvard.edu)*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Data Science, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute*

Estimating singular subspaces from noisy matrices is a fundamental problem with wide-ranging applications across various fields. Driven by the challenges of data integration and multi-view analysis, this study focuses on estimating shared (left) singular subspaces across multiple matrices within a low-rank matrix denoising framework. A common approach for this task is to perform singular value decomposition on the stacked matrix (Stack-SVD), which is formed by concatenating all the individual matrices. We establish that Stack-SVD achieves minimax rate-optimality when the true (left) singular subspaces of the signal matrices are identical. Our analysis reveals some phase transition phenomena in the estimation problem as a function of the underlying signal-to-noise ratio, highlighting how the interplay among multiple matrices collectively determines the fundamental limits of estimation. We then tackle the more complex scenario where the true singular subspaces are only partially shared across matrices. For various cases of partial sharing, we rigorously characterize the conditions under which Stack-SVD remains effective, achieves minimax optimality, or fails to deliver consistent estimates, offering theoretical insights into its practical applicability. To overcome Stack-SVD's limitations in partial sharing scenarios, we propose novel estimators and an efficient algorithm to identify shared and unshared singular vectors, and prove their minimax rate-optimality. Extensive simulation studies and real-world data applications demonstrate the numerous advantages of our proposed approaches.

**1. Introduction.** Spectral methods, commonly referred to as a collection of algorithms built upon the singular value decomposition (SVD) of some properly designed matrices constructed from data, are widely utilized across various disciplines such as statistics, probability theory, and statistical machine learning [17]. As an important theoretical framework that guarantees the performance of spectral methods, the perturbation theory of matrix singular subspaces has been extensively studied [19, 56, 57, 61, 62, 66]. For example, [61] provided a uniform perturbation bound for both left and right singular subspaces, and [11] offered separate rate-optimal perturbation bounds for these subspaces under the same perturbation. Subsequent research has extended the estimation and perturbation analysis of singular subspaces to more complex scenarios, including settings with geometric or computational constraints [10, 16, 41], challenging distance measures [1, 14, 40], non-Gaussian or heteroskedastic noise [2, 45, 58, 69], missing data [9, 64, 71], and tensor data [33, 67, 68].

Closely related to singular subspace estimation, low-rank matrix denoising is a fundamental task in applications such as image processing [26, 59, 63], recommendation systems [35, 60], and statistical genetics [3, 24, 38]. The objective is to recover the underlying signal

---

*MSC2020 subject classifications:* Primary 62H12, 62C20; secondary 62H25.

*Keywords and phrases:* Low-Rank Matrices, Subspace Estimation, Minimax Rates, Data Integration, Spectral Method.

matrix from its noisy observation by leveraging the intrinsic low-rank structure of data matrices. Given its critical role in many applications, SVD-based methods have been extensively studied from the theoretical perspective. For instance, under the low-rank matrix denoising model, [6, 7, 15, 53] explore the high-dimensional asymptotic behavior of singular values and vectors; meanwhile, [13, 23, 31] focus on singular-value thresholding algorithms for recovering the noiseless matrix.

Recently, the problem of identifying shared and distinct patterns of variability across multiple data matrices has garnered significant attention across various research domains. For example, [52] employs rotational bootstrap methods and random matrix theory to decompose the observed spectrum into joint, individual, and noise subspaces. [55] investigates the uncorrelatedness between distinct latent factors derived from different data views. [39] introduces the Joint and Individual Variation Explained (JIVE) framework, to quantify the amount of joint variation between multiple data types. Extensions of JIVE, such as the angle-based JIVE (AJIVE) [28], the robust angle-based JIVE (RaJIVE) [48] and the Interpretive JIVE [44], further enhance its applicability. Supervised extension of JIVE methods include Supervised Joint and Individual Variation Explained (SJIVE) [47] and sparse exponential family sJIVE (sesJIVE) [46]. In cases where the data exhibits partially shared patterns across matrices, a number of methodologies have been proposed. Notable approaches include the partially-joint structure identification [18], Structural Learning and Integrative DEcomposition of multi-view data (SLIDE) [32], hierarchical nuclear norm penalization [65], and Data Integration Via Analysis of Subspaces (DIVAS) [49]. Some asymptotic results for shared subspace estimation based on averages are obtained in [70] and [25]. Other related topics include partial least square [30] or canonical correlation analysis [5, 8, 37, 42], which seeks associations between two matrices by maximizing their correlation, and high-dimensional hypothesis testing across multiple matrices [22, 27, 36]. Despite these exciting achievements, most existing research focuses on a specific estimation algorithm and its theoretical properties, while the fundamental limits of the estimation problem—such as the optimal rates of estimation under complete or partial information sharing—remain largely unexplored.

In this article, we examine the estimation of shared singular subspaces across multiple matrices, focusing on a class of methods, hereafter referred to as the Stack-SVD method and exploring its properties in various scenarios. Stack-SVD estimates the shared singular subspace by concatenating noisy individual matrices and computing the top singular subspace of the resulting stacked matrix. For example, consider two rank- $r$  noiseless matrices,  $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_1}$  and  $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_2}$ , that share some left singular subspaces. Suppose we observe the noisy matrices  $Y_1 = X_1 + Z_1$  and  $Y_2 = X_2 + Z_2$ , where  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are additive noises. By stacking these noisy matrices to form  $(Y_1 \ Y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p_1 + p_2)}$ , Stack-SVD estimates the shared left singular subspace of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  using the top  $r$  left singular vectors of the stacked noisy matrix, sorted by descending singular values.

Stack-SVD is widely employed in applications, particularly in scenarios where two or more matrices are expected to share singular subspaces. For example, in multi-modal single-cell clustering, multiple matrices are often combined by stacking, followed by applying SVD or PCA to the resulting stacked matrix for joint dimensionality reduction [54]. Similarly, in Multi-Omics Factor Analysis (MOFA+) [4], spectral factor analysis is performed on stacked data matrices from different modalities to identify cellular characteristics shared across modalities. Scanorama [34], an algorithm for integrating multiple heterogeneous single-cell datasets, also assumes shared singular subspaces by applying SVD to the stacked data matrix, to align datasets across different conditions. In the field of electronic health record (EHR) data analysis, multiple clinical concepts are frequently stacked into a single matrix, facilitating the identification of patterns and relationships across diverse clinical variables such as diagnoses, medications, and laboratory results. Techniques from natural

language processing, such as the Positive Pointwise Mutual Information (PPMI) matrix, are commonly used in this context. Applying SVD to the PPMI matrix, a widely adopted approach, is conceptually analogous to performing SVD on a stacked matrix and inherently assumes a shared singular subspace across matrices [29, 51].

We show that the convergence rate of Stack-SVD is minimax optimal when the noiseless matrices have exactly identical singular subspaces. In particular, our analysis indicates the advantage of Stack-SVD over several alternative methods, including the principal angle estimators that are also widely used [25, 28]; see Sections 5 and 6. In cases where individual unshared singular vectors are present, we show that some modified Stack-SVD estimators achieve the optimal rates. Furthermore, we propose an efficient algorithm to distinguish between shared and unshared singular vectors within the stacked noisy matrix, enabling practical implementation of these estimators. Our findings deepen the understanding of singular subspace estimation under noise, particularly in settings involving both shared and unshared singular vectors across data matrices, and provide insights for applications in various fields.

We consider the following two specific settings. For the case of identical singular subspace, we consider  $k$  noiseless low-rank matrices  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ) sharing the same left singular subspace, whose SVD can be written as

$$X_1 = U \Sigma_1 V_1^T, \quad X_2 = U \Sigma_2 V_2^T, \quad \dots \quad X_k = U \Sigma_k V_k^T,$$

where  $U$  is the shared left singular subspace while  $\Sigma_i$  and  $V_i$  are the respective singular values and right singular subspaces for  $X_i$ . The observations are noisy versions of these matrices, given by the matrix denoising model [10, 23]:

$$(1) \quad Y_1 = X_1 + Z_1, \quad Y_2 = X_2 + Z_2, \quad \dots \quad Y_k = X_k + Z_k,$$

where  $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ) are additive noise matrices with zero-mean independent sub-Gaussian entries.

For the case of partially shared singular subspace, where each noiseless matrix  $X_i$  may contain some unique singular vectors, we consider a two-matrix case for brevity, although the results can also be generalized into  $k$  matrices. Specifically, we assume

$$(2) \quad X_1 = (U_r \ U_{1*}) \Sigma_1 V_1^T, \quad X_2 = (U_r \ U_{2*}) \Sigma_2 V_2^T$$

where  $U_r \in \mathbb{O}(n, r)$  contains the shared  $r$  left singular vectors, whereas  $U_{1*}$  and  $U_{2*}$  are individual unshared subspaces.  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are diagonal matrices with non-zero positive entries. Note that the singular values in  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are not necessarily in the decreasing order, which means the shared and unshared vectors might be shuffled after sorting the singular values decreasingly. Again, we only observe the noisy version of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  as in (1). The above model is closely related to the AJIVE framework [28, 48]:

$$(3) \quad X_i = J_i + A_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

where  $J_i$  contains the joint structure and  $A_i$  is the individual structure. Here  $J_i$  and  $A_j$  are required to be orthogonal for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ . Indeed, by rewriting  $\Sigma_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \\ & \Sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix}$  and

$V_i^T = \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}^T \\ V_{12}^T \end{pmatrix}$ , the signal matrices in (2) can be expressed as

$$(4) \quad X_i = (U_r \ U_{i*}) \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \\ & \Sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}^T \\ V_{12}^T \end{pmatrix} = U_r \Sigma_{11} V_{11}^T + U_{i*} \Sigma_{12} V_{12}^T := J_i + A_i$$

which reduces to (3). However, existing work [28, 48] focuses on estimating the component matrices  $\{J_i\}$  and  $\{A_i\}$  from  $\{Y_i\}$ , whereas in this study, our goal is to estimate the

shared singular subspace  $U_r$ . We will focus on elucidating the fundamental limits of subspace estimation across diverse scenarios, analyzing the statistical properties of the widely used Stack-SVD procedure, and enhancing its performance in challenging regimes.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We establish the minimax optimal rates for the singular subspace estimation problem when the true singular subspaces of different matrices are completely shared. We show that stack-SVD is minimax rate-optimal in this case, and demonstrate the minimax optimality of individual SVD estimators under unbalanced signals and dimensions. Our analysis reveals several phase transition phenomena in the estimation problem as a function of the underlying signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), highlighting how the interplay among multiple matrices collectively determines the fundamental limits of estimation.
- We establish the minimax optimal rates and identify the optimal estimators for the shared singular subspace when multiple matrices have partially shared singular subspaces. Focusing on two important scenarios of partial sharing where the unshared singular subspaces are mutually orthogonal, we provide theoretical insights on the performance of the Stack-SVD procedure, including its advantages in capturing individually non-identifiable singular vectors, and its limitations in excluding unshared singular vectors. We also extend our analyses to the case when the unshared singular subspaces are not mutually orthogonal.
- To address the limitation of Stack-SVD in the presence of unknown, possibly unshared singular vectors, we propose an efficient algorithm for detecting and discriminating the shared and unshared singular vectors between two matrices. We also provide theoretical guarantees for the proposed method, justifying its practical advantages.
- Numerical results based on extensive simulations are obtained to verify our theoretical findings. Applying our proposed methods to multiple single-cell omics datasets, we demonstrate the advantages of our methods in integrating and representing the shared latent cell-type structures captured by different sequencing technologies.

We finish this part by introducing some mathematical notations. Section 2 concerns the optimal estimation of the fully shared singular subspaces across multiple matrices, whereas Section 3 focuses on the estimation in the presence of unshared subspaces across matrices. Section 4 concerns our proposed algorithms for tracing shared and unshared singular vectors. Sections 5 and 6 contain our numerical results from simulations and real data analysis. Lastly, in Section 7, we discuss the broader potential of our work.

**1.1. Notation.** For  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$ ,  $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ . For a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ , write the SVD as  $A = U \Sigma V^T$ , where  $\Sigma = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1(A), \sigma_2(A), \dots\}$  with the singular values  $\sigma_1(A) \geq \sigma_2(A) \geq \dots \geq 0$  in descending order unless particularly specified. We use  $\sigma_{\min}(A), \sigma_{\max}(A)$  to denote the smallest and largest non-trivial singular values of  $A$ . We use  $\sigma_{(i)}(A)$  to denote the singular value of  $A$  corresponding to the  $i$ -th left singular vector of  $A$  and  $\sigma_i(A)$  denote the  $i$ -th largest singular value of  $A$ . For matrix norms,  $\|A\| = \sigma_{\max}(A)$  is the spectral norm and  $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum \sigma_i^2(A)}$  is the Frobenius norm. The  $\sin \Theta$  distance between matrices  $A$  and  $B$  is denoted as  $\|\sin \Theta(A, B)\|$ . For two scalar sequences  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  and  $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ , we denote  $a_n \gtrsim b_n$  ( $a_n \lesssim b_n$ ) if there exist a universal constant  $C$  such that  $a_n \geq C b_n$  ( $a_n \leq C b_n$ ) and  $a_n \asymp b_n$  if both  $a_n \gtrsim b_n$  and  $a_n \lesssim b_n$ . We use  $\mathbb{O}(n, p)$  to denote the class of orthonormal matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ . Lastly,  $C, c, c_1, c_2, \dots$  are universal constants that may vary from place to place.

## 2. Rate-Optimal Estimation of Fully Shared Singular Subspace via Stack-SVD.

2.1. *Minimax upper and lower bounds.* In this section, we establish the minimax upper and lower bounds for estimating the shared singular subspace when multiple signal matrices share identical left (or right) singular subspaces, thereby demonstrating the rate-optimality of the Stack-SVD procedure. We also analyze the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) conditions necessary for the consistency of Stack-SVD estimators and compare with the traditional SVD estimators based on individual matrices. To streamline our presentation, we start with the two-matrix case and then extend our results to multiple matrices.

Throughout our theoretical analysis, we assume the entries of the noise matrices  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are drawn independently and identically from a zero-mean sub-Gaussian distribution. Specifically, the noise distribution class  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$  is defined as follows: for some constant  $c > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{G}_\tau = \{Z \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{E}Z = 0, \mathbb{E}Z^2 = \tau^2, \mathbb{E} \exp(tZ) \leq \exp(c\tau^2 t^2), \forall t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

For the low-rank signal matrices  $X_i$  in the observation model (1), we consider the following parameter space indexed by  $(r, \gamma)$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma} = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p_1 + p_2)} : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r, X_i = U \Sigma_i V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, i = 1, 2, \\ \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\} \geq \gamma^2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

where  $U \in \mathbb{O}(n, r)$ ,  $V_i \in \mathbb{O}(p_i, r)$ , and  $\Sigma_i = \text{diag}(\sigma_{(1)}(X_i), \dots, \sigma_{(r)}(X_i))$ . Here  $\sigma_{(i)}(X_j)$  denotes the the singular value of  $X_j$  associated with the  $i$ -th column of  $U$ , which means  $\sigma_{(i)}(X_j)$  are not necessarily in a decreasing order. In particular, the parameter  $\gamma$  indicates the overall signal strength of the stacked matrix  $X$ , which plays an important role in the subsequent minimax risk analysis. Unlike the singular subspace estimation based on a single matrix, where the overall signal strength is determined by the minimum singular value of the low-rank signal matrix [9], for estimation across multiple matrices, our analysis reveals that the overall signal strength would depend on all the singular values across multiple matrices in a non-trivial way. The following result provides a theoretical guarantee for the performance of Stack-SVD by establishing the risk upper bounds and minimax lower bounds for two distance metrics between subspaces.

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Suppose  $Y_i, i = 1, 2$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrices  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . Define  $\hat{U}$  as the Stack-SVD estimator, whose columns are the first  $r$  left singular vectors of  $Y = (Y_1 \ Y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p_1 + p_2)}$ , and denote  $X = (X_1 \ X_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p_1 + p_2)}$ . Then there exists a constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that:*

$$(5) \quad \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\gamma^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1,$$

$$(6) \quad \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|_F^2 \leq \frac{c nr(\gamma^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{\gamma^4} \wedge r.$$

If we further assume  $r \leq \frac{n}{2} \wedge \frac{p_1}{16} \wedge \frac{p_2}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$  holds, then there exists a small constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that:

$$(7) \quad \inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|^2 \geq c \left( \frac{n(\gamma^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1 \right),$$

$$(8) \quad \inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|_F^2 \geq c \left( \frac{nr(\gamma^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{\gamma^4} \wedge r \right).$$

The first part of Theorem 2.1 concerns the risk upper bounds (5) and (6) for the Stack-SVD estimator  $\hat{U}$  over the parameter space  $\mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}$ , whereas the second part establishes the minimax risk lower bounds (7) and (8) for estimating of  $U$  over  $\mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}$  by any estimators. The minimax lower bounds delineates the fundamental limit on the estimation accuracy achieved by any estimator. Comparing these lower and upper bounds, we conclude that the Stack-SVD estimator achieves the optimal rate of convergence whenever the dimensions  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are comparable ( $p_1 \asymp p_2$ ), or the signal strength is sufficiently large ( $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$ ), thereby justifying its efficacy in estimating the shared singular subspaces in many applications. Note that Theorem 2.1 does not require the rank  $r$  to be finite. Our proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on a novel lower-bound argument for estimating singular subspaces from stacked matrices, which directly links the fundamental limits to the properties of the individual component matrices. Unlike prior lower-bound arguments, such as those in [9, 11], our approach addresses a more intricate parameter space, highlighting the contributions and roles of the individual submatrices. The detailed discussion can be found in the Section S1.4 of the Supplement.

*2.2. Comparison with individual subspace estimators and phase diagrams.* Theorem 2.1 establishes the rate-optimality of Stack-SVD when the dimensions of the matrices  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are of comparable size or overall signal strength is sufficiently large. However, when the orders of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  differ substantially, with one being much larger than the other, we find that, interestingly, there is no need to integrate the two matrices. Instead, under some signal constraints, the minimax optimal rate can actually be achieved by applying SVD to one of the two matrices with smaller dimension.

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 2.1 hold, and that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\sigma_r^2(X_1) \geq c \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}$ . Define  $\hat{U}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{O}(n, r)$  whose columns are the top  $r$  left singular vectors of  $Y_1$ . Then, we have for constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that*

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(1)})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\gamma^2 + p_1)}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1,$$

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(1)})\|_F^2 \leq \frac{cnr(\gamma^2 + p_1)}{\gamma^4} \wedge r.$$

*If we further assume  $r \leq \frac{n}{2} \wedge \frac{p_1}{16} \wedge \frac{p_2}{16}$  and  $p_1 \leq Cp_2$ , then for constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , we have*

$$\inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|^2 \geq c \left( \frac{n(\gamma^2 + p_1)}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1 \right),$$

$$\inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|_F^2 \geq c \left( \frac{nr(\gamma^2 + p_1)}{\gamma^4} \wedge r \right).$$

Corollary 2.2 demonstrates that when the dimensions  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are unbalanced, and the matrix (say,  $Y_1$ ) with the smaller dimension exhibits a sufficiently large signal strength, then leading  $r$  singular vectors ( $\hat{U}^{(1)}$ ) of that matrix achieves the minimax optimal rates, that is

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U}^{(1)})\|_F^2 \asymp \inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|_F^2 \asymp \frac{nr(\gamma^2 + p_1)}{\gamma^4} \wedge r.$$



In particular, when  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  and the signal strength of one matrix  $Y_1$  is particularly large, so that  $\sigma_r^2(X_1) \gtrsim \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}$ , then both  $\hat{U}^{(1)}$  and Stack-SVD estimator  $\hat{U}$  achieve the minimax optimal rates. The results are further illustrated in the simulation studies presented in Section 5.

To better elucidate the advantages of integrating multiple data matrices through Stack-SVD, we compare the minimum SNR conditions for the consistency of Stack-SVD with those of the individual SVD estimators. On the one hand, by Theorem 2.1, there is a phase transition in the consistency of the Stack-SVD estimator in terms of the SNR  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}/\tau^2$ , with the critical point at

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}/\tau^2 \asymp \sqrt{n(n + p_1 + p_2)}.$$

More specifically, when  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}/\tau^2 \gg \sqrt{n(n + p_1 + p_2)}$ , the right-hand-side of (5) and (6) converges to 0, thereby ensuring the consistency of  $\hat{U}$ ; when  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}/\tau^2 \lesssim \sqrt{n(n + p_1 + p_2)}$ , the minimax lower bounds (7) and (8) indicate the impossibility of consistent estimation. On the other hand, for the singular subspace estimation based on a single data matrix, the results in [11] state that the phase transition for consistently estimating the singular subspaces of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  happens at

$$\sigma_r^2(X_1)/\tau^2 \asymp \sqrt{n(n + p_1)}, \quad \sigma_r^2(X_2)/\tau^2 \asymp \sqrt{n(n + p_2)},$$

respectively. In other words, consistent estimation of the shared singular subspace based on  $X_i$  alone is possible only if  $\sigma_r^2(X_i)/\tau^2 \gg \sqrt{n(n + p_i)}$ .

It can be seen that the minimum SNR condition can be more easily achieved with Stack-SVD. Specifically, we elaborate this point by considering an interesting scenario where the SNR  $\sigma_r^2(X_1)/\tau^2$  in  $Y_1$  required by  $\hat{U}^{(1)}$  is below its own critical point  $\sqrt{n(n + p_1)}$ , whereas the SNR in  $Y_2$  required by  $\hat{U}^{(2)}$  is above its critical point  $\sqrt{n(n + p_2)}$ . In this case, only one of the two matrices can lead to consistent subspace estimation, but the Stack-SVD based on both matrices may still lead to consistent estimation. For example, if  $p_2 \gtrsim p_1$ ,  $n \gtrsim p_1$ , and

$$\sigma_r^2(X_1)/\tau^2 = c\sqrt{n(\sqrt{n} + p_1)} \ll \sqrt{n(n + p_1)}, \quad \sigma_r^2(X_2)/\tau^2 \gg \sqrt{n(n + p_2)},$$

then we have

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}/\tau^2 \geq (\sigma_r^2(X_1) + \sigma_r^2(X_2))/\tau^2 \gg \sqrt{n(n + p_1 + p_2)}.$$

As such, there is no need to determine which matrix among the two has the stronger SNR. Consistent optimal estimation is automatically achieved by Stack-SVD that integrates both matrices.

The above observations regarding Stack-SVD can be more systematically demonstrated through the phase diagrams as shown in Figure 1. Suppose here  $k = \arg \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \{\sigma_{(i)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(i)}^2(X_2)\}$ . On the left of Figure 1, when the datasets are both high-dimensional ( $\min(p_1, p_2) \gg n$ ) and  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are of the same order, Stack-SVD is simultaneously rate-optimal whenever consistent estimation is possible (above the solid line) whereas individual SVD only achieve consistency over smaller regions (above or to the right of the dashed line). Importantly, there is a region (in red) in which Stack-SVD achieves optimal estimation, whereas neither  $\hat{U}^{(1)}$  nor  $\hat{U}^{(2)}$  is consistent. Moreover, on the right of Figure 1, when  $p_1 \gg p_2$ , the individual estimator  $\hat{U}^{(2)}$  based on  $X_2$  has strictly weaker SNR requirement (above the horizontal dashed line) compared to  $\hat{U}^{(1)}$  based on  $X_1$ , whereas Stack-SVD still shows advantage when both  $\hat{U}^{(1)}$  or  $\hat{U}^{(2)}$  are inconsistent (green region). In practice, when it is unclear which dataset has higher SNR, Stack-SVD can be adopted a practical and oftentimes optimal solution.




Fig 1: Phase diagrams when  $p_1 \asymp p_2 \gg n$  (Left) and when  $p_1 \gg p_2 \gg n$  (Right). Each region is labeled by the name of consistent estimators: " $X_i$ " indicates  $\hat{U}^{(i)}$  is consistent, "Stack" indicates  $\hat{U}$  is consistent, "Stack(opt)" indicates  $\hat{U}$  is minimax rate-optimal, and "impossible" indicates no consistent estimator exists.

2.3. *Extension to multiple matrices.* So far, our discussion has been primarily focusing on two matrices sharing the same singular subspace. From Lemma 2.1 in the Supplement, it is evident that the above results can be extended to the estimation based on finite  $k > 2$  matrices. The following corollary demonstrates this generalization, whose proof can be derived in a manner analogous to the proofs of Proposition S1 and Theorem 2.1.

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *For a finite integer  $k > 2$ , suppose  $Y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrices  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . Define  $\hat{U}$  as the Stack-SVD estimator, whose columns are the first  $r$  left singular vectors of  $Y = (Y_1 \ Y_2 \ \dots \ Y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \sum_{j=1}^k p_j}$ , and denote  $X = (X_1 \ X_2 \ \dots \ X_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \sum_{j=1}^k p_j}$ . Define*

$$\mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}^k = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2 \ \dots \ X_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \sum_{j=1}^k p_j} : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r, X_i = U \Sigma_i V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, \\ \min_{1 \leq s \leq r} \{ \sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_{(s)}^2(X_j) \} \geq \gamma^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, k \end{array} \right\}.$$

where  $U \in \mathbb{O}(n, r)$ ,  $V_i \in \mathbb{O}(p_i, r)$ , and  $\Sigma_i = \text{diag}(\sigma_{(1)}(X_i), \dots, \sigma_{(r)}(X_i))$ . Then there exists a constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that:

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}^k} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\gamma^2 + (\sum_{j=1}^k p_j))}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1,$$

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}^k} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|_F^2 \leq \frac{cnr(\gamma^2 + (\sum_{j=1}^k p_j))}{\gamma^4} \wedge r.$$

If we further assume  $r \leq \frac{n}{k} \wedge \frac{p_1}{16} \wedge \frac{p_2}{16} \cdots \wedge \frac{p_k}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2 \asymp \dots \asymp p_k$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2 \sum_{j=1}^k p_j$  holds, then there exists a small constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that:

$$\inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}^k} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|^2 \geq c \left( \frac{n(\gamma^2 + (\sum_{j=1}^k p_j))}{\gamma^4} \wedge 1 \right),$$

$$\inf_{\tilde{U}} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{F}_{r,\gamma}^k} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U, \tilde{U})\|_F^2 \geq c \left( \frac{nr(\gamma^2 + (\sum_{j=1}^k p_j))}{\gamma^4} \wedge r \right).$$



The corollary indicates that when multiple matrices share the identical singular subspace, Stack-SVD still allows us to utilize all the relevant information contained in the  $k$  matrices, to achieve the minimax rate-optimal estimation.

**3. Estimation in the Presence of Unshared Singular Vectors.** In many applications, different matrices may not share an identical singular subspace. Instead, each matrix may possess its own unique singular vectors in addition to the shared singular subspace. This section explores the estimation of the shared singular subspace while accounting for the presence of these unshared vectors.

*3.1. Minimax upper and lower bounds.* In this section, we analyze the scenario in which the singular subspaces of the signal matrices consist of both shared and unshared singular vectors. We first derive both upper bounds and matching minimax lower bounds under the condition that the unshared singular vectors are orthogonal to each other. Similar setup has been considered previously [28, 48], but the fundamental limit has not been established. In Section 3.3, we will extend our results to the general non-orthogonal settings. We first present an algebraic result clarifying the relationship between the singular subspace of the individual matrices and that of the stacked matrix, which plays a key role in our analysis.

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Let the SVDs of  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and their stacked version  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  be given as  $X_1 = U_1 \Sigma_1 V_1^T$ ,  $X_2 = U_2 \Sigma_2 V_2^T$ , and  $(X_1 \ X_2) = U \Sigma V^T$ . Assume that the singular values of  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ , and  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  are all distinct, and that  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  may share some identical singular vectors. If all distinct singular vectors in  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are pairwise orthogonal, then every singular vector in  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  is contained in the columns of  $U$ .*

Proposition 1 underscores that with the orthogonality constraint on the unshared singular vectors, all singular vectors—whether shared or unshared—will be present in the singular subspace of the stacked signal matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ , albeit potentially in an intermixed order. For example, suppose we are interested in estimating the shared singular vectors  $(u_1 \ u_2)$  in

$$X_1 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_{1*}) \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \end{pmatrix} V_1^T, \quad X_2 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_{2*}) \begin{pmatrix} 2\beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \end{pmatrix} V_2^T$$

where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  and  $u_{1*}^\top u_{2*} = 0$ . It follows that the SVD of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  is

$$(X_1 \ X_2) = (u_1 \ u_{1*} \ u_2 \ u_{2*}) \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} \end{pmatrix} V^T.$$

Comparing the orders of the singular vectors in  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$  and  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ , especially the order of  $u_{1*}$  and  $u_2$  before and after stacking, we see that the singular vectors of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  can be intermixed after stacking, depending on the relations between the singular values. Thus, to reliably estimate the shared singular vectors, it is important to trace their locations in the SVD of the stacked matrix.

Before defining the parameter space, we need to introduce some notations. We say that the shared (left) singular vectors and unshared (left) singular vectors are in different *vector types*. For the (left) singular vectors of the stacked matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ , ordered based on the singular values of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ , we say that there is a *vector type switch* at  $s$ -th position if, the  $s$ -th and  $(s + 1)$ -th singular vectors associated to the  $s$ -th and  $(s + 1)$ -th largest singular values

are in different vector types. Suppose there are  $N$  vector type switches in  $X = (X_1 \ X_2)$ , and we denote  $\mathbb{S}$  as the index set of the locations where the switch happens. The eigen-gap at the  $i$ -th switch that happens at  $s$ -th position is denoted as

$$g_{i(s)}^2(X) := \sigma_s^2(X) - \sigma_{s+1}^2(X), \quad s \in \mathbb{S},$$

where  $i(s) \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  is the rank of  $s$  in  $\mathbb{S}$ , sorted in increasing order. In particular, when a shared vector appears to be the last singular vector of  $X$ , associated with the smallest singular value  $\sigma_{\min}(X)$ , we still consider that a vector type switch exists. The eigen-gap is thus defined as

$$g_N^2(X) := \sigma_{\min}^2(X) - 0.$$

We should note that in this case, such an eigen-gap is not to be counted in the index set  $\mathbb{S}$ .

To effectively distinguish the shared and unshared singular vectors, it is essential that the eigen-gaps are sufficiently large. Therefore, for any small constant  $c > 0$ , we define the parameter space

$$\mathcal{H}_{r,t} = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2) : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r + r_{i*}, X_i = (U_r \ U_{i*}) \Sigma_i V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, \\ U_{1*}^T U_{2*} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ g_{i(s)}^2(X) > c \sigma_{s+1}^2(X), \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, \min_{1 \leq k \leq N} g_k^2(X) \geq t^2 \end{array} \right\}$$

where the  $U_r \in \mathbb{O}(n, r)$  are the shared singular vectors while  $U_{i*} \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{i*})$  are respective unshared singular vectors for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . Here, we do not necessarily require the diagonal of  $\Sigma_i = \text{diag}(\sigma_{(1)}(X_i), \dots, \sigma_{(r+r_{i*})}(X_i))$  to have a decreasing order, which means after manually sorting in a decreasing order, the vectors in the shared  $U_r$  and the unshared  $U_{i*}$  might be shuffled in the left singular subspaces of individual  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . In particular, if the last singular vector in  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  is a shared singular vector, then we have  $|\mathbb{S}| = N - 1$ , and the condition on  $g_N^2(X)$  is still imposed through  $\min_{1 \leq k \leq N} g_k^2(X)$ .

Suppose the positions of shared singular vectors in the stacked noiseless matrix are known, and we denote their positions as an index set  $\mathbb{J}$ . We consider the estimator  $\hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ , whose columns are  $r$  selected left singular vectors of  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$  indexed by  $\mathbb{J}$ . We have the following upper and lower bound results.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Suppose  $Y_i, i = 1, 2$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrices  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . For any finite  $r$ , we have for some constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , such that*

$$(9) \quad \sup_{X \in \mathcal{H}_{r,t}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(t^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{t^4} \wedge 1,$$

$$(10) \quad \sup_{X \in \mathcal{H}_{r,t}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}})\|_F^2 \leq \frac{c nr(t^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{t^4} \wedge r.$$

*If we further assume  $r + r_{1*} + r_{2*} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $r + r_{1*} \leq \frac{p_1}{16}$ ,  $r + r_{2*} \leq \frac{p_2}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$  holds, then for constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , we have*

$$(11) \quad \inf_{\tilde{U}_r} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{H}_{r,t}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U_r, \tilde{U}_r)\|^2 \geq c \left( \frac{n(t^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{t^4} \wedge 1 \right),$$

$$(12) \quad \inf_{\tilde{U}_r} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{H}_{r,t}} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U_r, \tilde{U}_r)\|_F^2 \geq c \left( \frac{nr(t^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{t^4} \wedge r \right).$$

Theorem 3.1 asserts that when both shared and unshared vectors are present, the rate-optimal estimation can be achieved, given that the location of the shared vectors can be identified. Compared with Theorem 2.1, Theorem 3.1 indicates that the minimax-optimal estimation requires both a sufficiently large minimum eigen-gap at the switch location, and a minimum singular value condition. Indeed, under the current assumptions, the minimum singular value  $\sigma_{\min}^2(U_{shared})$ , among those associated to the singular vectors in  $U_{shared}$ , and the minimum eigen-gap  $\min_{1 \leq k \leq N} g_k^2$  have the same order

$$\sigma_{\min}^2(U_{shared}) \geq g_N^2 \geq \min_{1 \leq k \leq N} g_k^2 \geq c\sigma_s^2 \geq c\sigma_{\min}^2(U_{shared}),$$

where  $s = \operatorname{argmin}_k g_k^2$ . The eigen-gap requirement at the switch points is necessary. When the gap is too small, it becomes difficult to effectively distinguish between shared and unshared singular vectors, resulting in a fundamental limitation in estimation due to non-identifiability; see Section S1.1 of Supplement for detailed discussion. On the other hand, the eigen-gap condition is only required at the switch points – if the vector type remains unchanged, insufficient or even no eigen-gap between the singular vectors does not affect our theoretical results.

We remark on the key difference between our results and the analysis of AJIVE [39]. Specifically, AJIVE aims to estimate the joint matrix rather than the singular subspace. Consequently, both the left and right singular subspaces contribute valuable information in AJIVE. To account for this, AJIVE employs a perturbation bound within the framework of Wedin’s bound [61]. This bound is expressed as  $\frac{\max(|A|, |B|)}{\delta}$ , where  $A$  captures information from the left singular subspace,  $B$  pertains to the right singular subspace, and  $\delta$  quantifies the minimum eigen-gap. While this perturbation bound is effective for the AJIVE framework, it proves less effective for our analysis, as we focus on estimating the shared (left) singular subspace alone. The Wedin perturbation bound is uniform for both left and right singular subspaces, which may lead to sub-optimal results when the perturbation affects the two subspaces differently. In contrast, similar to [11], our upper bound is tailored specifically to one side of the singular subspace, leading to sharp results reflecting different roles of  $n$  and  $p_i$  in the rates of convergence. Furthermore, while our work establishes the minimax rate-optimality of the estimator, to the best of our knowledge, no previous work has provided a minimax lower bound for the JIVE framework.

The practical implications of Theorem 3.1 are also significant. In many applications, estimating the shared singular subspace for multiple matrices typically involves the use of Stack-SVD, which concatenates all matrices and selects the top  $r$  singular vectors from the noisy stacked matrix as the estimation. However, as indicated by Theorem 3.1, the shared and unshared singular vectors may become intermixed after stacking. To achieve optimal estimation, it is crucial to identify the correct index set  $\mathbb{J}$ . Relying solely on the top  $r$  singular vectors from the stacked matrix  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$  for estimating the shared singular subspace may result in biased or inconsistent estimation.

When the dimensions  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are not of comparable sizes and the signal strength of the matrix with smaller dimension becomes particularly strong, similar results in parallel to Corollary 2.2 can be obtained, where the minimax optimal rates are achieved by different estimators. Specifically, when one matrix exhibits a considerably larger signal strength and a relatively smaller or equal dimension, the individual SVD estimator of that matrix is also minimax optimal. Besides, when both general signal strength for stacked matrix ( $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$ ) and the individual signal strength of the matrix with smaller dimension are large enough, the oracle Stack-SVD  $\hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}}$  and the individual SVD on the matrix with smaller dimension are both rate-optimal estimators.

To obtain the minimax lower bounds in Theorem 3.1, we develop a general argument surrounding a structured parameter space tailored to matrix-stacking; see Section S1.4 of

the Supplement. For the upper bound results in Theorem 3.1, we leverage the following proposition, which generalizes the results in [11] to the case of partial subspace estimation.

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Suppose  $X = U\Sigma V^T \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2}$  has rank greater than  $r$  and there exists some small constant  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sigma_r^2(X) > (1 + \delta)\sigma_{r+1}^2(X)$ . Let  $U_r$  be the top  $r$  left singular vectors of  $X$  and  $\hat{U}_r$  be the top  $r$  left singular vectors of  $Y = X + Z$ , with  $Z \in \mathcal{G}_\tau$ . Then for some constant  $c > 0$  that only depends on  $\tau$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r)\|^2 \leq \frac{cp_1(\sigma_r^2(X) + p_2)}{\sigma_r^4(X)} \wedge 1,$$

$$\mathbb{E}\|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{cp_1r(\sigma_r^2(X) + p_2)}{\sigma_r^4(X)} \wedge r.$$

Proposition 2 plays a crucial role here and in our subsequent analysis. It highlights that the accurate estimation of any subspace relies on the separation of its singular values from those of the orthogonal subspace.

**3.2. Two special cases of partial sharing.** To further elaborate the implications of Theorem 3.1, and the advantages and limitations of Stack-SVD, we analyze two special scenarios of partial sharing. The first scenario involves relatively weak unshared signals, whereas the second scenario concerning cases with strong unshared signals.

**3.2.1. Scenario I: estimation with weak unshared signals.** When the singular values associated with the unshared vectors are relatively small compared to those of the shared vectors, it is reasonable to expect that the singular subspace derived from Stack-SVD, which prioritizes the leading singular vectors, will still yield a reliable estimate for the shared vectors. Furthermore, since both matrices  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  contain the shared singular vectors, stacking the matrices enhances the signal strength of these shared vectors. In contrast, the unshared vectors, present in only one of the matrices, retain their original signal strength.

Let  $X = (X_1 \ X_2)$  be the stacked signal matrix. We consider the scenario when the singular values  $\sigma_i(X)$  of the unshared singular vectors are all smaller than the singular values of the shared singular vectors. Specifically, recall the definition of  $\mathbb{J}$  prior to Theorem 3.1; we consider that  $\min_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \sigma_j^2(X) \geq (1 + \delta) \max_{j \notin \mathbb{J}} \sigma_j^2(X)$ , for some small  $\delta > 0$ . In particular, if  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  have individual SVDs

$$(13) \quad X_1 = (U_r \ U_{1*}) \Sigma_1 V_1^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_1}, \quad X_2 = (U_r \ U_{2*}) \Sigma_2 V_2^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_2},$$

where  $U_r$  is the shared left singular subspace,  $U_{1*}$  and  $U_{2*}$  are the unshared left singular subspaces satisfying  $U_{1*}^T U_{2*} = 0$ , and  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$  are diagonal matrices with decreasing singular values, then the above requirement can be implied by

$$(14) \quad \max_{r+1 \leq k \leq \text{rank}(X_1)} \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_1) \vee \max_{r+1 \leq k \leq \text{rank}(X_2)} \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_2) < c_1 \min_{1 \leq k \leq r} (\sigma_{(k)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_2)),$$

where  $c_1 \in (0, 1)$  is some constant,  $\sigma_{(k)}(X_i)$  is the singular value corresponding to the  $k$ -th singular vector of  $X_i$  as displayed in (13). Our next theorem concerns the minimax optimality of Stack-SVD in this scenario, showing that the fundamental limit is driven by the eigen-gap

$$(15) \quad G_1(X) = \min_{1 \leq k \leq r} \{\sigma_{(k)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_2)\} - \max_{r+1 \leq k \leq \text{rank}(X_1)} \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_1) \vee \max_{r+1 \leq k \leq \text{rank}(X_2)} \sigma_{(k)}^2(X_2)$$

**THEOREM 3.2.** *Suppose  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrices  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . Define the parameter space*

$$\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(1)} = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2) : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r + r_{i*}, X_i = (U_r \ U_{i*}) \Sigma_i V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, i = 1, 2, \\ (14) \text{ holds, } U_{1*}^T U_{2*} = 0, \quad G_1(X) \geq t^2 \end{array} \right\}$$

where  $\Sigma_i$  contains decreasing singular values and  $G_1(X)$  is defined in (15). Denote  $\hat{U}_r$  as the Stack-SVD estimator, whose columns are the first  $r$  left singular vectors of  $Y = (Y_1 \ Y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p_1 + p_2)}$ . Then Equations (9) and (10) hold with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(1)}$ , and  $\hat{U}_r^\mathbb{J}$  replaced by  $\hat{U}_r$ . If we further assume  $r + r_{1*} + r_{2*} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $r + r_{1*} \leq \frac{p_1}{16}$ ,  $r + r_{2*} \leq \frac{p_2}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$  holds, then the minimax lower bounds (11) and (12) holds, with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(1)}$ .

Theorem 3.2 indicates that the performance of Stack-SVD is guaranteed and in fact minimax rate-optimal in the presence of weak unshared signals, provided that the shared signals are significantly more prominent than the unshared ones. Importantly, for Stack-SVD, the conditions outlined in Theorem 3.2 can be relaxed: we do not need to require that the singular values of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , associated to  $U_r$ , are the largest ones for each matrix. By Propositions 1 and 2, it can be seen that, as long as the singular values associated to  $U_r$  are the largest ones in the stacked matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  and there is an eigen-gap between the  $r$ -th and  $(r + 1)$ -th singular values, the Stack-SVD estimator will still lead to consistent estimation. Here is an example.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Suppose  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  share left singular vector  $u$ , while  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are respective orthogonal unshared vectors. Expressed in SVDs, we have the individual signal matrices  $X_1 = (u_1 \ u) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} V_1^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_1}$  and  $X_2 = (u \ u_2) \begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} V_2^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_2}$ , where  $\alpha \asymp \beta$ ,  $\beta \geq \sigma_1 > \alpha$  and  $\beta > \sigma_2$ . We consider estimating  $u$  by Stack-SVD, using the first left singular vector  $\hat{u}$  of  $Y = (Y_1 \ Y_2)$ . In this case, it can be verified that  $(X_1 \ X_2) = (u \ u_1 \ u_2) \text{diag}(\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) V^T$ . If in addition  $\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} > (1 + \delta) \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$  for some small  $\delta > 0$ , by Proposition 2, we have  $\mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(u, \hat{u})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2} \wedge 1$ .

In Example 1, the shared singular vectors are not simultaneously top singular vectors in the individual matrices, but stacking the two matrices enhances the overall signal strength of the shared singular vector, enabling its correct identification and consistent estimation by Stack-SVD. Building on this observation, we present another example highlighting its impact on the identifiability issue in singular subspace estimation.

**EXAMPLE 2.** Suppose  $X_1 = (U_r \ U_1) \alpha I V_1^T$ ,  $X_2 = (U_r \ U_2) \beta I V_2^T$ , where  $\alpha \asymp \beta$ ,  $U_r$  is the shared singular subspace,  $U_1 \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{1*})$  and  $U_2 \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{2*})$  are the unshared singular subspaces satisfying  $U_1^T U_2 = 0$ . Apparently, estimating  $U_r$  from noisy observations of individual matrices  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is impossible, due to the non-identifiability issue between the shared and unshared singular subspaces in each case. However, after stacking, we have  $(X_1 \ X_2) = (U_r \ U_1 \ U_2) \text{diag}(\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} I_r, \alpha I_{r_{1*}}, \beta I_{r_{2*}}) V^T$ . If we define  $\hat{U}_r$  as the leading  $r$  singular vectors of  $Y = (Y_1 \ Y_2)$ , under the additional condition that  $\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2} > (1 + \delta) \max\{\alpha, \beta\}$  for some small  $\delta > 0$ , by Proposition 2, we have  $\mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r)\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2} \wedge 1$ .

Example 2 suggests that when consistent estimation of the shared singular subspace is unattainable using individual matrices due to non-identifiability with the orthogonal singular subspace, integrating another matrix can resolve the identifiability issue by effectively enhancing and differentiating the signal strength associated with the shared subspaces.

**3.2.2. Scenario II: estimation with strong unshared signals.** We also consider an opposite scenario where the singular values of unshared vectors are greater than those of the shared vectors, heavily influencing the estimation of the shared subspace. Standard Stack-SVD fails in this setting, but optimal estimation is still possible by correctly selecting vectors from the singular subspace of the stacked noisy matrix  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$ . In this part, we require that after stacking the singular values of the shared vectors are all smaller than the singular values of the unshared vectors. Specifically, we consider that  $\min_{j \notin \mathbb{J}} \sigma_j^2(X) \geq (1 + \delta) \max_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \sigma_j^2(X)$ , for some small  $\delta > 0$ . Similar to the previous case, we denote the individual SVDs of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  as

$$(16) \quad X_1 = (U_{1*} \ U_r) \Sigma_1 V_1^T, \quad X_2 = (U_{2*} \ U_r) \Sigma_2 V_2^T,$$

where  $U_{1*}^T U_{2*} = 0$ , and  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are diagonal matrices containing decreasing singular values. In particular, if we denote the number of unshared vectors in  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  as  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ , respectively with  $d = d_1 + d_2$ , then the above condition can be satisfied if

$$(17) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq r} \{\sigma_{(d_1+k)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(d_2+k)}^2(X_2)\} < c_1 (\sigma_{d_1}^2(X_1) \wedge \sigma_{d_2}^2(X_2)),$$

where  $c_1 \in (0, 1)$  is some constant,  $\sigma_{(k)}(X_i)$  is the the singular value corresponding to the  $k$ -th singular vector of  $X_i$  as displayed in (16). Our next theorem concerns the minimax optimality of an alternative estimator  $\hat{U}_r^S$ , which consists of the left singular vectors associated with the  $(d + 1)$ -th to  $(d + r)$ -th largest singular values of stacked matrix  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$ .

**THEOREM 3.3.** *Suppose  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrix  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . Define the parameter space*

$$\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(2)} = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2) : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r + r_{i*}, X_i = (U_{i*} \ U_r) \Sigma_i V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}, i = 1, 2, \\ (17) \text{ holds, } U_{1*}^T U_{2*} = 0, \quad G_2(X) \geq t^2 \end{array} \right\},$$

where  $\Sigma_i$  contains decreasing singular values and  $G_2(X)$  is given by

$$G_2(X) = \sigma_{d_1}^2(X_1) \wedge \sigma_{d_2}^2(X_2) - \max_{1 \leq k \leq r} \{\sigma_{(d_1+k)}^2(X_1) + \sigma_{(d_2+k)}^2(X_2)\}.$$

Then Equations (9) and (10) hold with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(2)}$ , and  $\hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}}$  replaced by  $\hat{U}_r^S$ . If we further assume  $r + r_{1*} + r_{2*} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $r + r_{1*} \leq \frac{p_1}{16}$ ,  $r + r_{2*} \leq \frac{p_2}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$  holds, then the minimax lower bounds (11) and (12) holds, with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}^{(2)}$ .

To better illustrate the implications of Theorem 3.3 and the limitations of the naive Stack-SVD estimators in this scenario, we consider the following example.

**EXAMPLE 3.** Suppose  $X_1 = (u_1 \ u) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} V_1^T$ ,  $X_2 = (u_2 \ u) \begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix} V_2^T$ , where  $\alpha \asymp \beta$ ,  $u_1^T u_2 = 0$ , and  $\sigma$  is the relatively large so that  $\sigma > \sqrt{2}c\alpha$  and  $\sigma > \sqrt{2}c\beta$  for a constant  $c > 1$ . Apparently, focusing on  $X_1$  or  $X_2$  individually, the shared singular vector is either not associated to the largest singular value, or not identifiable. Moreover, the staked signal matrix satisfies  $(X_1 \ X_2) = (X_1 \ X_2) = (u_1 \ u \ u_2) \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}, \sigma_2) V^T$ . If we apply



the naive Stack-SVD estimator, the first singular vector  $\hat{u}_1$  of  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$ , it can be shown that  $\lim_{\sigma_1 \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_s, u)\| \geq c$ . In contrast, the 2nd singular vector  $\hat{u}$  of  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$ , by Proposition 2, satisfies  $\mathbb{E} \|\sin \Theta(u, \hat{u})\|^2 \leq \frac{cn(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + (p_1 + p_2))}{(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2} \wedge 1$ .

Example 3 underscores the need for an efficient algorithm to identify the positions of the shared singular vectors within the stacked noisy matrix  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$ , enabling Stack-SVD to achieve more practical and effective estimation. We will address this challenge in Section 4.

**3.3. Estimation with non-orthogonal unshared singular subspaces.** So far we have been focusing on the cases with orthogonal unshared singular subspaces. When the unshared singular subspaces are not orthogonal, we show that it can be transformed into an orthogonal scenario by studying the SVD of the stacked signal matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ . In this case, the shared components remain unchanged, whereas the unshared subspaces will undergo rotation by a certain angle to achieve orthogonality. Generally, this rotation does not impact the estimation of the shared component. The linear transformations resulting from the non-orthogonality of the unshared subspaces only influence the unshared components, without inducing any interaction between shared and unshared components. Therefore, as long as similar gap conditions are still satisfied, the non-orthogonality does not compromise the optimal estimation of the shared subspace.

Our key insight comes from the following result, which concerns the SVD of the stacked signal matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  when the unshared subspaces are not orthogonal to each other.

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Let*

$$X_1 = (U_r \ U_{1*}) \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{1*} \end{pmatrix} V_1^T, \quad X_2 = (U_r \ U_{2*}) \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{2*} \end{pmatrix} V_2^T,$$

be the SVDs of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , where some left singular vectors in the unshared subspaces  $U_{1*} \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{1*})$  and  $U_{2*} \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{2*})$  are not orthogonal to each other. Suppose we have the eigen-decomposition  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*})^T (U_{1*} \ U_{2*}) = \Gamma^T \Sigma \Gamma$ . Then the following hold:

1. If  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*})$  is not a column singular matrix, then the SVD of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  is

$$(X_1 \ X_2) = (U_r \ (U_{1*} \ U_{2*}) S U^*) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2} & \\ & \Sigma^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & V^{*T} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Sigma_1}{\sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2}} V_1^T & \frac{\Sigma_2}{\sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2}} V_2^T \\ V_{1*}^T & 0 \\ 0 & V_{2*}^T \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $S = \Gamma^T \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma$ , and  $U^*, \Sigma^*, V^*$  are defined from the SVD  $S^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1*} \\ \Sigma_{2*} \end{pmatrix} = U^* \Sigma^* V^{*T}$ .

2. If  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*})$  is a column singular matrix and  $\text{rank}(U_{1*} \ U_{2*}) = r^*$ , there exist a transformation  $L \in \mathbb{R}^{(r_{1*} + r_{2*}) \times (r_{1*} + r_{2*} - r^*)}$  such that  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*}) L = (\tilde{U}^* \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times (r_{1*} + r_{2*} - r^*)})$ , where  $\tilde{U}^*$  is a column normalized matrix. Similarly define  $S = \Gamma^T \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Gamma$  based on  $\tilde{U}^{*T} \tilde{U}^* = \Gamma^T \Sigma \Gamma$ . Then the SVD of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$  is

$$(X_1 \ X_2) = (U_r \ \tilde{U}^* S U^*) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2} & \\ & \Sigma^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & \\ & V^{*T} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Sigma_1}{\sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2}} V_1^T & \frac{\Sigma_2}{\sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2}} V_2^T \\ V_{1*}^T & 0 \\ 0 & V_{2*}^T \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $U^*, \Sigma^*, V^*$  come from the SVD  $(S^{-1} \mathbf{0}_{r^* \times (r_{1*} + r_{2*} - r^*)}) L^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1*} \\ \Sigma_{2*} \end{pmatrix} = U^* \Sigma^* V^{*T}$

Theorem 3.4 demonstrates that, in the SVD of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ , compared to that obtained in the orthogonal case, while there may be rotations within the subspace related to the unshared singular vectors, the shared singular subspace and their corresponding singular values remain unaffected by such non-orthogonality. Without merging the shared and unshared signals, the stacking preserves the structure of the shared subspace in its SVD, making it feasible to estimate the shared singular subspace.

In fact, optimal estimation is achievable as long as the gap conditions are still met. Recall  $\mathbb{S}$  defined in Section 3.1. We consider the parameter space

$$\mathcal{S}_{r,t} = \left\{ X = (X_1 \ X_2) : \begin{array}{l} \text{rank}(X_i) = r + r_{i*}, X_i = (U_r \ U_{i*})_{\Sigma_i} V_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i} \\ g_{i(s)}^2(X) > c\sigma_{s+1}^2(X), \forall s \in \mathbb{S}, \min_{1 \leq k \leq N} g_k^2(X) \geq t^2, i = 1, 2 \end{array} \right\}$$

where  $U_{i*} \in \mathbb{O}(n, r_{i*}), i = 1, 2$ , are not necessarily orthogonal to each other. In particular, given the different forms of SVD, the eigen-gap condition  $g_{i(s)}^2(X) > c\sigma_{s+1}^2(X)$  may also vary from case to case. Specifically, based on Theorem 3.4, for the shared subspace, the corresponding singular values are still in the diagonals of  $\sqrt{\Sigma_1^2 + \Sigma_2^2}$ ; however, the singular values for the unshared vectors in this case are the singular values of the matrix  $S^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1*} \\ \Sigma_{2*} \end{pmatrix}$

when  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*})$  is column non-singular and  $(S^{-1} \ \mathbf{0}_{r^* \times (r_{1*} + r_{2*} - r^*)}) L^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1*} \\ \Sigma_{2*} \end{pmatrix}$  when  $(U_{1*} \ U_{2*})$  is not column non-singular.

To achieve minimax optimal estimation, we still consider the oracle estimator  $\hat{U}_r^{\mathbb{J}}$  in which the locations of the shared singular vectors are correctly identified. The following theorem establishes its minimax optimality.

**THEOREM 3.5.** *Suppose  $Y_i, i = 1, 2$ , are generated from (1), where the noise matrices  $Z_i$  are i.i.d. generated from  $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ . For any finite  $r$ , the upper bounds (9) and (10) in Theorem 3.1 hold, with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{S}_{r,t}$ . If we further assume  $r + r_{1*} + r_{2*} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ ,  $r + r_{1*} \leq \frac{p_1}{16}$ ,  $r + r_{2*} \leq \frac{p_2}{16}$ , and either  $p_1 \asymp p_2$  or  $\gamma \gtrsim \tau^2(p_1 + p_2)$  holds, then the minimax lower bounds (11) and (12) in Theorem 3.1 still hold, with  $\mathcal{H}_{r,t}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{S}_{r,t}$ .*

Theorem 3.5 demonstrates that the presence of non-orthogonal unshared singular subspace will not significantly alter the landscape regarding the optimal estimation of the shared singular subspace. The analysis of a detailed non-orthogonal case can be found in Section S1.2 of the Supplement.

**4. Tracing Shared and Unshared Singular Vectors.** As suggested by the previous discussions, achieving optimal estimation requires accurately identifying the shared and unshared singular vectors from the stacked matrix. Here we propose an algorithm designed to distinguish the shared and unshared singular vectors across multiple matrices. This is accomplished by carefully comparing the singular subspaces of the stacked matrix with those of the individual matrices. Specifically, we assume that the unshared singular vectors are mutually orthogonal and that the singular values in the signal matrices are sufficiently well-separated.

We first present the algorithm for the case of two matrices and then extend it to the general case involving  $k$  matrices. Suppose  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  have ranks  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ , respectively, with  $r < \min(r_1, r_2)$  shared left singular vectors. Denote the number of unshared left singular vectors as  $k_1 = r_1 - r$  and  $k_2 = r_2 - r$  for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively. Let  $\hat{U}_1$  and  $\hat{U}_2$  represent the top  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  left singular vectors of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$ , with the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th singular vectors denoted as  $\hat{u}_{1i}$  and  $\hat{u}_{2j}$ . The top  $r + k_1 + k_2$  left singular subspace of the stacked matrix  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$  is denoted as  $\hat{U}$ , with the  $i$ -th vector as  $\hat{u}_i$ . The noiseless counterparts of these

singular vectors and subspaces can be defined analogously, without the hats. For the moment, we assume  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are known while presenting the following Algorithm 1. Later, we will introduce a method to estimate them.

---

**Algorithm 1** Identifying Shared Singular Vectors
 

---

**Input:**  $Y_1, Y_2, k_1, k_2, r$

**Output:**  $\mathbb{J}$

- 1: Compute top  $r_1, r_2, r + k_1 + k_2$  left singular vectors, denoted as  $\hat{U}_1, \hat{U}_2, \hat{U}$ , for  $Y_1, Y_2$  and  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$  respectively.
  - 2: **for** each  $i \in 1, \dots, r_1$  **do**
  - 3:    $d_{1i} = \min_{j \in [1, r_2]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{1i}, \hat{u}_{2j})\|^2$
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5: **for** each  $j \in 1, \dots, r_2$  **do**
  - 6:    $d_{2j} = \min_{i \in [1, r_1]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{2j}, \hat{u}_{1i})\|^2$
  - 7: **end for**
  - 8: Take the last  $r_1 - k_1$  and  $r_2 - k_2$  index sets,  $I$  and  $J$ , for  $d_{1i}$  and  $d_{2j}$  respectively.  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{r_1 - k_1}\}$ ,  $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_{r_2 - k_2}\}$ , satisfying that  $d_{1i_k}$  is the  $k$ -th smallest value among  $d_{1i}$  while  $d_{2j_k}$  is the  $k$ -th smallest value among  $d_{2j}$
  - 9: Compute index sets:
 
$$K_1 = \{k : k = \arg \min_{k \in 1, \dots, r + k_1 + k_2} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{1i}, \hat{u}_k)\|^2, i \in I\}$$

$$K_2 = \{k : k = \arg \min_{k \in 1, \dots, r + k_1 + k_2} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{2j}, \hat{u}_k)\|^2, j \in J\}$$
  - 10: **return**  $\hat{\mathbb{J}} = K_1 \cup K_2$
- 

The idea behind Algorithm 1 is simple: based on the assumption that the individual SVDs of  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  and the SVD of  $(Y_1 \ Y_2)$  provide sufficiently accurate estimations of their respective individual singular vectors under some conditions, we can leverage this information to identify shared and unshared vectors. Specifically, if a vector  $u$  in the singular subspace of  $Y_1$  is shared, there will be a corresponding vector in the singular subspace of  $Y_2$  that is close to  $u$ . Conversely, if a vector  $u$  in the singular subspace of  $Y_1$  is unshared, by the orthogonality assumption, all vectors in the singular subspace of  $Y_2$  will be largely different from  $u$ . The following theorem concerns the consistency of this approach, which is proved under the assumption that the unshared vectors are mutually orthogonal and the singular values in both signal matrices are sufficiently large and separated.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Suppose the unshared singular vectors are mutually orthogonal and there exists a small constant  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sigma_k \geq (1 + \delta)\sigma_{k+1}$  for all singular values in  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ . We denote  $\mathbb{J}$  as the index set for the shared singular vectors in the singular subspace of  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ . Suppose  $(\alpha^{c_1} \wedge \beta^{c_1}) \geq Cn$ , for some constant  $c_1 < 2$  and sufficiently large  $C > 0$ , and  $(\alpha \wedge \beta)^2 \geq C_2(p_1 \vee p_2)$  for some  $C_2 > 0$ , where  $\alpha = \sigma_{\min}(X_1)$  and  $\beta = \sigma_{\min}(X_2)$ . Then for sufficiently large  $(n, p_1, p_2)$ , there exists some constant  $0 < \epsilon < 2 - c_1$ , such that  $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{\mathbb{J}} = \mathbb{J}\} \geq 1 - o(\alpha^{-\epsilon/2}) - o(\beta^{-\epsilon/2}) - o(\gamma^{-\epsilon/2})$ , where  $\gamma = \alpha \wedge \beta$ .*

It is important to emphasize that by requiring sufficiently large signal strength, we implicitly ensure that the singular values are well separated and each singular vector is sufficiently identifiable. This is because the minimum gap between singular values and the minimum signal strength are inherently in the same order according to previous analysis.

Our analyses reveal that for unshared vectors in one individual matrix, the distances between these vectors and any left singular vectors in the other individual matrix tend to

be relatively large—approaching 1 as the signal strength increases. In contrast, for shared vectors in one individual matrix, there exists a corresponding vector in the other individual matrix with a relatively small distance—approaching 0 as the signal strength becomes sufficiently large. This observation enables us to determine the number of unshared vectors, denoted as  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ , by analyzing the distances  $d_{1i}$  and  $d_{2j}$ . Algorithm 2 outlines a method for estimating  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  by identifying the largest gap in these distance measurements.

---

**Algorithm 2** Estimating  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ 


---

**Input:**  $Y_1, Y_2$ ;

**Output:**  $\hat{k}_1 \hat{k}_2$

- 1: Similarly calculate  $d_{1i}, i = 1, \dots, r_1$  and  $d_{2j}, j = 1, \dots, r_2$  as in Algorithm 1.
  - 2: Sort  $d_{1i}, i = 1, \dots, r_1$  and  $d_{2j}, j = 1, \dots, r_2$  in decreasing order respectively. The ordered sequences are denoted as  $d_{1(i)}$  and  $d_{2(j)}$ , with values in the parenthesis representing its order.
  - 3: Set  $g_0^{(1)} = 1 - d_{1(1)}, g_{r_1}^{(1)} = d_{1(r_1)} - 0; g_0^{(2)} = 1 - d_{2(1)}, g_{r_2}^{(2)} = d_{2(r_2)} - 0$
  - 4: **for** each  $i \in 1, \dots, r_1 - 1$  **do**
  - 5:  $g_i^{(1)} = d_{1(i)} - d_{1(i+1)}$
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: **for** each  $j \in 1, \dots, r_2 - 1$  **do**
  - 8:  $g_j^{(2)} = d_{2(j)} - d_{2(j+1)}$
  - 9: **end for**
  - 10: Compute:  $\hat{k}_1 = \arg \max_{k \in 0, \dots, r_1} g_k^{(1)}, \hat{k}_2 = \arg \max_{k \in 0, \dots, r_2} g_k^{(2)}$
  - 11: **return**  $\hat{k}_1 \hat{k}_2$
- 

The consistency of the estimators  $\hat{k}_1$  and  $\hat{k}_2$ , obtained in Algorithm 2, is established in Theorem 4.2 below. Together with Theorem 4.1, these results provide a rigorous theoretical justification for our proposed algorithms.

**THEOREM 4.2.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.1, for sufficiently large  $(n, p_1, p_2)$ , we have  $P(\hat{k}_1 = k_1, \hat{k}_2 = k_2) \geq 1 - o(\alpha^{-\epsilon/2}) - o(\beta^{-\epsilon/2}) - o(\gamma^{-\epsilon/2})$ .*

Note that Algorithms 1 and 2 are designed to help identify the shared singular vectors. To identify the unshared singular vectors, we can either look at the complement index set  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}^c = \{1, 2, \dots, r + k_1 + k_2\} \setminus \hat{\mathbb{J}}$ , or modify the step 8 in Algorithm 1 by selecting the top  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  index sets and tracing them in the stacked matrix. For the estimation of  $\mathbb{J}$  in the presence of non-orthogonal unshared singular vectors, see Section 7 for more discussion.

Finally, there are several ways to extend the above methods to the case involving  $k$  matrices. One way is to select the pairwise shared singular vectors and then integrate the results. Another approach for generalizing the algorithm to trace shared singular vectors across  $k$  noisy matrices is to redefine the distance used in Algorithm 1 accordingly as

$$d_{si} = \max\left\{ \min_{j \in [1, r_1]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{si}, \hat{u}_{1j})\|^2, \dots, \min_{j \in [1, r_{s-1}]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{si}, \hat{u}_{(s-1)j})\|^2, \right. \\ \left. \min_{j \in [1, r_{s+1}]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{si}, \hat{u}_{(s+1)j})\|^2, \dots, \min_{j \in [1, r_k]} \|\sin \Theta(\hat{u}_{si}, \hat{u}_{kj})\|^2 \right\}$$

for any  $s = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . The implication of this generalization is straightforward. Specifically, if a vector is identified as a shared vector, then for any other matrix, there must exist a vector that is close to it. The subsequent steps in Algorithms 1 and 2 can be correspondingly generalized to handle  $k$  matrices with ease. Under conditions analogous to those in Theorem 4, but in the context of  $k$  matrices, the performance of the generalized algorithms can also be guaranteed by similar asymptotic results.

**5. Simulation Studies.** In this section, we conduct simulation studies to evaluate the advantages and limitations of Stack-SVD across various scenarios. Additionally, we present simulations that demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm.

*5.1. Assessing numerical performance of Stack-SVD.* We first demonstrate the empirical advantages of Stack-SVD when the singular subspace is completely shared. We randomly generate three  $n$ -dimensional orthonormal vectors to serve as the shared left singular vectors. Then we generate random orthonormal matrices of dimensions  $3 \times p_1$  and  $3 \times p_2$  for the right singular subspaces of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , respectively. We set the corresponding singular values as  $\Sigma_1 = \text{diag}\{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{4}\}$  and  $\Sigma_2 = \text{diag}\{\beta, \frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{\beta}{4}\}$ . The noise matrices  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are generated from iid  $N(0, 1)$  and we run 500 simulations for each setting. In each case, we compare the empirical estimation error with the true singular subspace using the square of  $\sin \Theta$  distance,  $\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|^2$ , between the true subspace and the estimation. Both the mean and standard deviation of such distances are recorded.

We set  $n = 10$  and  $n = 20$  respectively, and also divide the scenarios into balanced and unbalanced dimension groups, with  $(p_1, p_2)$  being  $(20, 20)$  and  $(300, 400)$  for balanced dimension group, and  $(20, 300)$  and  $(50, 500)$  for unbalanced dimension group. For the signal strength, while the overall signal strength  $\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}$  remains approximately constant, the individual signal strengths  $(\alpha, \beta)$  transition from balanced values  $(50, 50)$  to progressively unbalanced values  $(37, 60)$  and  $(10, 70)$  in relatively low-dimensional settings and from balanced values  $(100, 100)$  to progressively unbalanced values  $(74, 120)$  and  $(20, 140)$  in relatively high-dimensional settings. Also, for the unbalanced dimension settings, we reverse the above signal strengths in  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  to evaluate the performance. We compare the performance of the following four estimators: two Individual SVD estimators ("SVD- $X_1$ " and "SVD- $X_2$ "), defined as the leading left singular vectors of  $X_1$  or  $X_2$ , the Stack-SVD estimator ("Stack-SVD") and the Average-SVD estimator ("Average-SVD"). In particular, the idea of Average-SVD, also known as the principal angle estimator, has been used and analyzed in several works [16, 25, 28, 48]. This estimator combines the individual singular subspace estimators obtained from each matrix by using a post-processing SVD step; see Section S1.5 of the Supplement for its definition and discussion. The simulation results are summarized in Table 1.

Several observations can be made from Table 1. First, by maintaining the overall signal strength  $\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}$  at an approximately constant level, the estimation error for Stack-SVD remains small. Second, Stack-SVD exhibits the greatest stability, generally presenting the smallest standard deviation among the estimation methods. Third, Stack-SVD generally outperforms individual SVD in most cases. However, there are scenarios where an individual SVD may yield a smaller estimation error. This outcome is primarily driven by highly unbalanced signal strengths across matrices, where a strong performance by one individual-SVD estimator is often accompanied by poor estimation from the estimator of another matrix; see, for example, the last row of Table 1. In this case, even if one of the individual-SVD estimators is precise, we should note that in practice it requires the users to determine which individual-SVD estimator performs better. In comparison, Stack-SVD provides a simple solution with competitive performance. Lastly, while Average-SVD performs adequately under balanced signal strength, their estimates become less accurate when the signal strength is unbalanced.

*5.2. Estimating individually non-identifiable singular vectors.* Our next experiment focuses on the interesting scenario where the shared singular vectors are not individually identifiable in each data matrix, whereas Stack-SVD is still able to capture them accurately. This experiment is designed in a way similar to Example 2, that is  $X_1 =$

TABLE 1

Average estimation errors ( $\|\sin \Theta(U, \hat{U})\|^2$ ) and their standard deviations based on 500 simulations. The smallest estimation error in each row is highlighted in bold.

$(n, p_1, p_2)$	$(\alpha, \beta)$	SVD- $X_1$	SVD- $X_2$	Stack-SVD	Average-SVD
(10,20,20)	(50,50)	0.049(0.024)	0.050(0.025)	<b>0.027(0.012)</b>	<b>0.027(0.012)</b>
	(37,60)	0.095(0.047)	0.034(0.017)	<b>0.027(0.012)</b>	0.035(0.016)
	(10,70)	0.806(0.191)	<b>0.025(0.012)</b>	0.026(0.012)	0.321(0.116)
(20,300,400)	(100,100)	0.039(0.013)	0.045(0.016)	<b>0.021(0.008)</b>	<b>0.021(0.008)</b>
	(74,120)	0.088(0.031)	0.028(0.010)	<b>0.021(0.008)</b>	0.030(0.011)
	(20,140)	0.911(0.104)	<b>0.019(0.006)</b>	0.021(0.008)	0.388(0.090)
(10,20,300)	(50,50)	0.051(0.025)	0.146(0.090)	<b>0.050(0.025)</b>	0.052(0.031)
	(37,60)	0.098(0.048)	0.080(0.044)	0.050(0.026)	<b>0.047(0.024)</b>
	(60,37)	<b>0.035(0.017)</b>	0.381(0.236)	0.050(0.025)	0.130(0.102)
	(10,70)	0.808(0.182)	<b>0.049(0.026)</b>	<b>0.049(0.026)</b>	0.332(0.126)
	(70,10)	<b>0.025(0.013)</b>	0.914(0.098)	0.049(0.025)	0.388(0.088)
(20,50,500)	(100,100)	0.030(0.010)	0.050(0.015)	<b>0.020(0.007)</b>	<b>0.020(0.007)</b>
	(74,120)	0.056(0.019)	0.030(0.009)	<b>0.020(0.007)</b>	0.022(0.008)
	(120,74)	<b>0.020(0.007)</b>	0.125(0.043)	<b>0.020(0.007)</b>	0.038(0.014)
	(20,140)	0.781(0.187)	<b>0.020(0.006)</b>	<b>0.020(0.006)</b>	0.302(0.116)
	(140,20)	<b>0.015(0.005)</b>	0.927(0.090)	0.020(0.007)	0.398(0.084)

TABLE 2

Average estimation errors ( $\|\sin \Theta(U_r, \hat{U}_r)\|^2$ ) and their standard deviations based on 500 simulations. The SVD on individual  $X_i$  are denoted as SVD- $X_i$ .

$(n, p_1, p_2)$	$(\alpha, \beta)$	SVD- $X_1$	SVD- $X_2$	Stack-SVD
(10,100,100)	(10,15)	0.541(0.323)	0.502(0.337)	0.114(0.126)
	(20,20)	0.485(0.359)	0.492(0.347)	0.025(0.017)
	(50,60)	0.470(0.362)	0.481(0.352)	0.003(0.002)
(20,1000,1000)	(10,15)	0.856(0.144)	0.683(0.255)	0.553(0.241)
	(20,20)	0.574(0.311)	0.580(0.326)	0.113(0.063)
	(50,60)	0.493(0.358)	0.503(0.367)	0.006(0.003)
(10,100,500)	(10,15)	0.558(0.312)	0.554(0.318)	0.222(0.221)
	(20,20)	0.493(0.351)	0.527(0.332)	0.040(0.026)
	(50,60)	0.485(0.358)	0.506(0.346)	0.004(0.003)
(20,1000,2000)	(10,15)	0.851(0.153)	0.756(0.195)	0.637(0.228)
	(20,20)	0.569(0.304)	0.608(0.281)	0.159(0.081)
	(50,60)	0.508(0.355)	0.502(0.356)	0.007(0.003)

$(u \ u_1) \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} V_1^T$ ,  $X_2 = (u \ u_2) \begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix} V_2^T$ . The dimension settings include both low and high, balanced and unbalanced dimensions. For signal strength  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , we consider various settings from (10, 15), (20, 20) to (50, 60). The estimation errors for both individual SVD and Stack-SVD are reported in Table 2 based on 500 simulations.

As expected, individual-SVD estimators are not able to provide reliable estimates, with most estimation errors above 0.5. In contrast, Stack-SVD reliably estimates the shared vector, with estimation error significantly decreasing as the signal strength increases. Additionally, we observe that the estimation errors for individual matrices also decrease with increased signal strength, but at a slower pace. To verify that the estimation errors for individual SVD will not converge to 0, we examine a case with very large signal strengths (Table S1 in the Supplement) of 5,000 or 10,000; we find the estimation errors remain greater than 0.45.

**5.3. Assessing the proposed signal-tracing algorithms.** Finally, we conduct a simulation study to evaluate the algorithm for tracing the shared and unshared singular vectors. Specifically, we examine three simulation settings with increasing complexity. We denote  $U_1$



TABLE 3  
Accuracy for The Algorithm under Different Settings Based on 1000 Simulations

$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} G_i$	Setting 1	$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} G_i$	Setting 2	$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} G_i$	Setting 3
1	0.622	1	0.187	1	0.089
3	0.981	5	0.782	5	0.727
5	1.000	10	0.815	10	0.798
7	1.000	15	1.000	20	0.999
10	1.000	20	1.000	25	1.000

and  $U_2$  as the left singular subspace corresponding to  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  respectively. The shared vectors are denoted as  $u_i$  while the unshared vectors are denoted as  $u_{i*}$ .


- Setting 1:  $U_1 = (u \ u_{1*})$ ,  $U_2 = (u \ u_{2*} \ u_{3*})$ , with one shared and three unshared vectors.
- Setting 2:  $U_1 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_{1*} \ u_{2*})$ ,  $U_2 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_{3*} \ u_{4*})$ , with two shared and four unshared vectors.
- Setting 3:  $U_1 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_3 \ u_{1*} \ u_{2*} \ u_{3*})$ ,  $U_2 = (u_1 \ u_2 \ u_3 \ u_{4*} \ u_{5*} \ u_{6*})$ , with three shared and six unshared vectors.

The unshared vectors are orthogonal to each other. Upon stacking two matrices, the shared and unshared singular vectors become shuffled within the left singular subspace of the stacked signal matrix. Here we define the  $G_i := \sigma_i - \sigma_{i+1}$  as the singular value gaps in the noiseless stacked matrix  $(X_1 \ X_2)$ . The minimum  $\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} G_i$  measures overall SNR. In this case, given our focus on the interactions between shared and unshared signals rather than distinguishing signals from noise like previous examples, we set the minimum singular value of the stacked signal matrix to be sufficiently large. A situation is classified as a success if all unshared vectors are accurately detected without any errors. To evaluate the effectiveness of our approach, we estimate the success rates across different settings and various signal strengths, based on 1,000 simulation trials. A more detailed description of the construction of matrices  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  can be found in Section S3.5 of the Supplement.

As illustrated in Table 3, the algorithm demonstrates reliable performance across all cases when the minimum singular value gap is sufficiently high. Additionally, when considering the complexity of the various scenarios, there is a noticeable trend that more complicated cases tend to necessitate greater minimum gap conditions to ensure accurate detection.

**6. Application to Single-Cell Data Integration.** We apply our proposed methods to jointly analyze three single-cell RNA-seq datasets of human peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs), each generated using a distinct sequencing technology [20, 21]. Specifically, the datasets correspond to three technologies: 10x Chromium v3 (Dataset 1), 10x Chromium v2 (Dataset 2), and Drop-seq (Dataset 3). Each dataset consists of a gene expression matrix  $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{g \times c_i}$  containing thousands of cells (whose numbers are denoted by  $c_i$  for each dataset) and  $g$  genes. For these datasets, since they are all related to PBMCs, we expect they contain the same family of cell types, governed by the similar genetic programs. In particular, we reason that the latent gene structures captured by the leading left singular vectors of each gene expression matrix is at least partially shared across all datasets. Following standard preprocessing and feature selection pipelines using the R package `Seurat`, we obtain three gene-by-cell matrices, each with  $g = 1000$  genes and  $c_1 = 3222$ ,  $c_2 = 3362$ , and  $c_3 = 3500$  cells respectively. We then apply different methods to estimate the shared left singular subspaces  $U_r$  across the three datasets that captures the latent gene structures. For each dataset, for each shared subspace estimator  $\hat{U}_r$ , we compute the joint low-dimensional cell embeddings as  $Y_i^\top \hat{U}_r$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . We expect that more accurate estimation of the shared latent subspace  $U_r$  will produce improved cell embeddings where different cell types are more distinctly clustered. To evaluate this, we use three metrics: the Silhouette index [50], the Calinski-Harabasz

Fig 2: Comparison of the Silhouette Index, Calinski-Harabasz Index, and Neighborhood Purity. The embeddings of data from 10x Chromium (v3), 10x Chromium (v2) and Drop-seq are labeled as Data 1, Data 2 and Data 3.



index [12], and the Neighborhood Purity index [43], evaluated using the cell type annotations from the original scientific publication [20, 21] or conducting clustering algorithms. A brief description for these metrics are provided in Section S3 of the Supplement. The results of our analysis are summarized in Figure 2.

We find that the shared-signal tracing algorithm (Shared-SVD) consistently outperforms other methods across all three evaluation criteria for each of the three embedding tasks. Specifically, Shared-SVD achieves a significantly higher Calinski-Harabasz Index—approximately 100%, 125%, and 160% higher—compared to both Individual-SVD and Stack-SVD for cell embeddings derived from three data matrices. For neighborhood purity, the cell embeddings based on Shared-SVD show substantial improvements over those based on Individual-SVD, Stack-SVD and Average-SVD in the Drop-seq data, with notable gains also observed in the other two datasets. Besides, the comparative performance of Average-SVD to other methods is not stable measured in Neighborhood Purity. Additionally, Shared-SVD outperforms the other methods when evaluated using the Silhouette Index. Overall, these results highlight the superior performance of the shared-signal tracing algorithm in effectively estimating shared information across noisy data matrices. In Section S3 of the Supplement, we analyze another set of single-cell datasets, which yields similar findings.

**7. Discussion.** A limitation of our study is that the minimax optimality results for Stack-SVD (both naive and modified versions) are established only when the dimensions of the individual matrices are comparable or when the signal strength is sufficiently large. However, our analysis suggests that when dimensions are not comparable, individual SVD estimators based on the smaller matrix can still achieve the optimal rate under certain signal constraints. A interesting direction for future research is to explore the minimax landscape when matrix dimensions differ significantly and to develop adaptive, minimax-optimal estimators that do not rely on signal constraints and remain effective in such scenarios.

For the algorithm designed to detect shared and unshared singular vectors, we focus on the case where unshared vectors are orthogonal. Heuristically, the algorithm relies on the distance between vectors and remains effective even in the presence of mild non-orthogonality among unshared vectors. This is because mildly non-orthogonal unshared vectors generally still exhibit a relatively large  $\sin \Theta$  distance. In cases where the non-orthogonality is more pronounced, the algorithms still yield a result such that  $\mathbb{J} \subset \hat{\mathbb{J}}$ . The detailed discussion can be found in Section S1.3 of the Supplement. Investigating the degree of non-orthogonality

that the algorithm can tolerate and extending it to handle non-orthogonal unshared singular vectors are intriguing directions for future research.

In this work, we focus exclusively on leveraging the shared singular subspace. However, when unshared singular vectors are not exactly orthogonal, there may be latent shared information embedded within them. For instance, if two unshared vectors form a small angle, their near alignment suggests potential shared structure. To simplify the problem, we do not account for such shared information within the unshared singular subspaces. A promising avenue for future exploration would involve redefining the notions of shared and unshared information and developing methods to capture shared structure arising from non-orthogonal unshared vectors.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### Supplement to "Optimal Estimation of Shared Singular Subspaces across Multiple Noisy Matrices"

In the supplementary material, we provide some further discussion, all the technical proofs for the theoretical results, and some complements to the numerical studies in the article.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ABBE, E., FAN, J. and WANG, K. (2022). An  $\ell_p$  theory of PCA and spectral clustering. *The Annals of Statistics* **50** 2359–2385.
- [2] AGTERBERG, J., LUBBERTS, Z. and PRIEBE, C. E. (2022). Entrywise estimation of singular vectors of low-rank matrices with heteroskedasticity and dependence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **68** 4618–4650.
- [3] APARICIO, L., BORDYUH, M., BLUMBERG, A. J. and RABADAN, R. (2020). A random matrix theory approach to denoise single-cell data. *Patterns* **1**.
- [4] ARGELAGUET, R., ARNOL, D., BREDIKHIN, D., DELORO, Y., VELTEN, B., MARIONI, J. C. and STEGLE, O. (2020). MOFA+: a statistical framework for comprehensive integration of multi-modal single-cell data. *Genome biology* **21** 1–17.
- [5] BAO, Z., HU, J., PAN, G. and ZHOU, W. (2019). Canonical correlation coefficients of high-dimensional Gaussian vectors: Finite rank case. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 612–640.
- [6] BENAYCH-GEORGES, F. and NADAKUDITI, R. R. (2012). The singular values and vectors of low rank perturbations of large rectangular random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **111** 120–135.
- [7] BURA, E. and PFEIFFER, R. (2008). On the distribution of the left singular vectors of a random matrix and its applications. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **78** 2275–2280.
- [8] BYKHOVSKAYA, A. and GORIN, V. (2023). High-dimensional canonical correlation analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16393*.
- [9] CAI, C., LI, G., CHI, Y., POOR, H. V. and CHEN, Y. (2021). Subspace estimation from unbalanced and incomplete data matrices:  $L_2 \rightarrow \infty$  statistical guarantees. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 944–967.
- [10] CAI, T., LI, H. and MA, R. (2021). Optimal Structured Principal Subspace Estimation: Metric Entropy and Minimax Rates. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22** 1–45.
- [11] CAI, T. T. and ZHANG, A. (2018). Rate-optimal perturbation bounds for singular subspaces with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics* **46** 60 – 89.
- [12] CALIŃSKI, T. and HARABASZ, J. (1974). A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications in Statistics-theory and Methods* **3** 1–27.
- [13] CANDÈS, E. J., SING-LONG, C. A. and TRZASKO, J. D. (2013). Unbiased Risk Estimates for Singular Value Thresholding and Spectral Estimators. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **61** 4643–4657.
- [14] CAPE, J., TANG, M. and PRIEBE, C. E. (2019). The two-to-infinity norm and singular subspace geometry with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 2405–2439.
- [15] CAPITAINÉ, M., DONATI-MARTIN, C. and FÉRAL, D. (2009). The largest eigenvalues of finite rank deformation of large Wigner matrices: Convergence and nonuniversality of the fluctuations. *Annals of probability: An official journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics* **37** 1–47.
- [16] CHEN, X., LEE, J. D., LI, H. and YANG, Y. (2022). Distributed estimation for principal component analysis: An enlarged eigenspace analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **117** 1775–1786.
- [17] CHEN, Y., CHI, Y., FAN, J., MA, C. et al. (2021). Spectral methods for data science: A statistical perspective. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* **14** 566–806.

- [18] CHOI, S. G. and JUNG, S. (2022). Integrative decomposition of multi-source data by identifying partially-joint score subspaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14041*.
- [19] DAVIS, C. and KAHAN, W. M. (1970). The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. III. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* **7** 1–46.
- [20] DING, J., ADICONIS, X., SIMMONS, S. K., KOWALCZYK, M. S., HESSION, C. C., MARJANOVIC, N. D., HUGHES, T. K., WADSWORTH, M. H., BURKS, T., NGUYEN, L. T. et al. (2019). Systematic comparative analysis of single cell RNA-sequencing methods. *BioRxiv* 632216.
- [21] DING, J., ADICONIS, X., SIMMONS, S. K., KOWALCZYK, M. S., HESSION, C. C., MARJANOVIC, N. D., HUGHES, T. K., WADSWORTH, M. H., BURKS, T., NGUYEN, L. T. et al. (2020). Systematic comparison of single-cell and single-nucleus RNA-sequencing methods. *Nature biotechnology* **38** 737–746.
- [22] DING, X., HU, Y. and WANG, Z. (2024). Two sample test for covariance matrices in ultra-high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **just-accepted** 1–22.
- [23] DONOHO, D. L. and GAVISH, M. (2013). Minimax risk of matrix denoising by singular value thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics* **42** 2413–2440.
- [24] ERASLAN, G., SIMON, L. M., MIRCEA, M., MUELLER, N. S. and THEIS, F. J. (2019). Single-cell RNA-seq denoising using a deep count autoencoder. *Nature communications* **10** 390.
- [25] FAN, J., WANG, D., WANG, K. and ZHU, Z. (2017). Distributed estimation of principal eigenspaces. *The Annals of statistics* **47** 6 3009–3031.
- [26] FAN, L., MENG, R., GUO, Q., SHI, M. and MING ZHANG, C. (2019). Image denoising by low-rank approximation with estimation of noise energy distribution in SVD domain. *IET Image Process.* **13** 680–691.
- [27] FAN, Z. and JOHNSTONE, I. M. (2022). Tracy–Widom at each edge of real covariance and MANOVA estimators. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **32**.
- [28] FENG, Q., JIANG, M., HANNIG, J. and MARRON, J. (2018). Angle-based joint and individual variation explained. *Journal of multivariate analysis* **166** 241–265.
- [29] GAN, Z., ZHOU, D., RUSH, E., PANICKAN, V. A., HO, Y.-L., OSTROUCHOV, G., XU, Z., SHEN, S., XIONG, X., GRECO, K. F. et al. (2023). Arch: Large-scale knowledge graph via aggregated narrative codified health records analysis. *medRxiv*.
- [30] GARTHWAITE, P. H. (1994). An interpretation of partial least squares. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89** 122–127.
- [31] GAVISH, M. and DONOHO, D. L. (2014). The Optimal Hard Threshold for Singular Values is  $4/\sqrt{3}$ . *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60** 5040–5053.
- [32] GAYNANOVA, I. and LI, G. (2017). Structural learning and integrative decomposition of multi-view data. *Biometrics* **75** 1121 - 1132.
- [33] HAN, R., WILLETT, R. and ZHANG, A. R. (2022). An optimal statistical and computational framework for generalized tensor estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **50** 1–29.
- [34] HIE, B. L., BRYSON, B. D. and BERGER, B. (2019). Efficient integration of heterogeneous single-cell transcriptomes using Scanorama. *Nature Biotechnology* **37** 685 - 691.
- [35] JIN, S., ZHANG, Y. and LU, M. (2022). Heterogeneous Adaptive Denoising Networks for Recommendation. In *International Conference on Neural Computing for Advanced Applications* 30–43. Springer.
- [36] JOHNSTONE, I. M. (2008). Multivariate analysis and Jacobi ensembles: Largest eigenvalue, Tracy–Widom limits and rates of convergence. *Annals of statistics* **36** 2638.
- [37] JOHNSTONE, I. M. and ONATSKI, A. (2020). Testing in High-Dimensional Spiked Models. *The Annals of Statistics* **48** 1231–1254.
- [38] LEONE, S., SUN, X., PERLMUTTER, M. and KRISHNASWAMY, S. (2024). Bayesian Spectral Graph Denoising with Smoothness Prior. *2024 58th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)* 1–6.
- [39] LOCK, E. F., HOADLEY, K. A., MARRON, J. S. and NOBEL, A. B. (2013). Joint and individual variation explained (JIVE) for integrated analysis of multiple data types. *The annals of applied statistics* **7** 523.
- [40] LÖFFLER, M., ZHANG, A. Y. and ZHOU, H. H. (2021). Optimality of spectral clustering in the Gaussian mixture model. *The Annals of Statistics* **49** 2506–2530.
- [41] MA, R., TONY CAI, T. and LI, H. (2021). Optimal permutation recovery in permuted monotone matrix model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **116** 1358–1372.
- [42] MA, Z. and YANG, F. (2023). Sample canonical correlation coefficients of high-dimensional random vectors with finite rank correlations. *Bernoulli* **29** 1905–1932.
- [43] MANNING, C. D., RAGHAVAN, P. and SCHÜTZE, H. (2008). *Dictionaries and tolerant retrieval* In *Introduction to Information Retrieval* 45–60. Cambridge University Press.
- [44] MURDEN, R. J., ZHANG, Z., GUO, Y. and RISK, B. B. (2022). Interpretive JIVE: Connections with CCA and an application to brain connectivity. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **16** 969510.

- [45] O'ROURKE, S., VU, V. and WANG, K. (2018). Random perturbation of low rank matrices: Improving classical bounds. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **540** 26-59.
- [46] PALZER, E. F. (2022). Multi-source Data Decomposition and Prediction for Various Data Types, PhD thesis, University of Minnesota.
- [47] PALZER, E. F., WENDT, C. H., BOWLER, R. P., HERSH, C. P., SAFO, S. E. and LOCK, E. F. (2022). sjive: Supervised joint and individual variation explained. *Computational statistics & data analysis* **175** 107547.
- [48] PONZI, E., THORESEN, M. and GHOSH, A. (2021). RaJIVE: Robust Angle Based JIVE for Integrating Noisy Multi-Source Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09110*.
- [49] PROTERO, J., JIANG, M., HANNIG, J., TRAN-DINH, Q., ACKERMAN, A. and MARRON, J. (2024). Data integration via analysis of subspaces (DIVAS). *TEST* 1–42.
- [50] ROUSSEUW, P. J. (1987). Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* **20** 53-65.
- [51] SALLE, A., IDIART, M. and VILLAVICENCIO, A. (2016). Matrix factorization using window sampling and negative sampling for improved word representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00819*.
- [52] SERGAZINOV, R., TAEB, A. and GAYNANOVA, I. (2024). A spectral method for multi-view subspace learning using the product of projections. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.19125*.
- [53] SHABALIN, A. A. and NOBEL, A. B. (2013). Reconstruction of a low-rank matrix in the presence of Gaussian noise. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **118** 67-76.
- [54] SHEN, R., WANG, S. and MO, Q. (2013). Sparse integrative clustering of multiple omics data sets. *The annals of applied statistics* **7** 269.
- [55] SHU, H. (2024). D-CDLF: Decomposition of Common and Distinctive Latent Factors for Multi-view High-dimensional Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00730*.
- [56] STEWART, G. (1990). Perturbation theory for the singular value decomposition. svd and signal processing, II: algorithms. *Analysis and Applications* 99-109.
- [57] STEWART, M. (2006). Perturbation of the SVD in the presence of small singular values. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **419** 53-77.
- [58] VU, V. (2011). Singular vectors under random perturbation. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **39** 526–538.
- [59] WANG, H., CEN, Y., HE, Z., HE, Z., ZHAO, R. and ZHANG, F. (2018). Reweighted Low-Rank Matrix Analysis With Structural Smoothness for Image Denoising. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **27** 1777-1792.
- [60] WANG, W., FENG, F., HE, X., NIE, L. and CHUA, T.-S. (2021). Denoising implicit feedback for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining* 373–381.
- [61] WEDIN, P.-Å. (1972). Perturbation bounds in connection with singular value decomposition. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* **12** 99–111.
- [62] WEYL, H. V. (1912). Das asymptotische Verteilungsgesetz der Eigenwerte linearer partieller Differentialgleichungen (mit einer Anwendung auf die Theorie der Hohlraumstrahlung). *Mathematische Annalen* **71** 441-479.
- [63] WU, W., WU, Z. and ZHANG, H. (2024). Weighted bilinear factorization of low-rank matrix with structural smoothness for image denoising. *Multim. Syst.* **30** 41.
- [64] YAN, Y., CHEN, Y. and FAN, J. (2024). Inference for heteroskedastic PCA with missing data. *The Annals of Statistics* **52** 729–756.
- [65] YI, S., WONG, R. K. W. and GAYNANOVA, I. (2022). Hierarchical nuclear norm penalization for multi-view data integration. *Biometrics* **79** 2933 - 2946.
- [66] YU, Y., WANG, T. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2015). A useful variant of the Davis—Kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika* **102** 315–323.
- [67] ZHANG, A. and HAN, R. (2019). Optimal Sparse Singular Value Decomposition for High-Dimensional High-Order Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114** 1708.
- [68] ZHANG, A. and XIA, D. (2018). Tensor SVD: Statistical and computational limits. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **64** 7311–7338.
- [69] ZHANG, A. R., CAI, T. T. and WU, Y. (2022). Heteroskedastic PCA: Algorithm, optimality, and applications. *The Annals of Statistics* **50** 53–80.
- [70] ZHENG, R. and TANG, M. (2022). Limit results for distributed estimation of invariant subspaces in multiple networks inference and PCA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04306*.
- [71] ZHU, Z., WANG, T. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2022). High-dimensional principal component analysis with heterogeneous missingness. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **84** 2000–2031.