

Sparse PCA: Phase Transitions in the Critical Sparsity Regime

Michael J. Feldman*, Theodor Misiakiewicz† and Elad Romanov‡

December 30, 2024

Abstract

This work studies estimation of sparse principal components in high dimensions. Specifically, we consider a class of estimators based on kernel PCA, generalizing the covariance thresholding algorithm proposed by Krauthgamer et al. (2015). Focusing on Johnstone’s spiked covariance model, we investigate the “critical” sparsity regime, where the sparsity level m , sample size n , and dimension p each diverge and $m/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \beta$, $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$.

Within this framework, we develop a fine-grained understanding of signal detection and recovery. Our results establish a detectability phase transition, analogous to the Baik–Ben Arous–Péché (BBP) transition: above a certain threshold—depending on the kernel function, γ , and β —kernel PCA is informative. Conversely, below the threshold, kernel principal components are asymptotically orthogonal to the signal. Notably, above this detection threshold, we find that consistent support recovery is possible with high probability. Sparsity plays a key role in our analysis, and results in more nuanced phenomena than in related studies of kernel PCA with delocalized (dense) components. Finally, we identify optimal kernel functions for detection—and consequently, support recovery—and numerical calculations suggest that soft thresholding is nearly optimal.

1 Introduction

From factor analysis to covariance estimation to matrix factorization, principal component analysis (PCA) is a standard tool for dimensionality reduction and low-rank signal recovery. Given data with n observations and p variables, the principal components are the eigenvectors of the $p \times p$ sample covariance matrix. PCA, however, has two key drawbacks: (1) the principal components are linear combinations of each of the original p variables and (2) in high dimensions, the principal components are inconsistent estimators of the eigenvectors of the population covariance.

The lack of sparsity in principal components complicates interpretability, and fails to capture the fact that signal matrices are often simultaneously low-rank and sparse—such matrices arise in diverse fields, including genetics, computer vision, imaging, and neuroscience [18, 19, 25, 39, 43]. As a result, numerous alternatives to classical PCA have emerged that generate sparse principal components, collectively referred to as sparse PCA methods. In this literature, the assumption of a low-rank and sparse ground truth is often implicit in applied and methodological papers, and explicit in theoretical analyses [35].

*Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Weizmann Institute of Science

†Department of Statistics and Data Science, Yale University

‡Department of Statistics, Stanford University

In high dimensions, several phenomena emerge that are absent in classical fixed- p statistics, with deep implications for PCA. We assume Johnstone’s spiked covariance model (henceforth referred to as the “spiked model”): we observe data $\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}$, where the elements of $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are standard Gaussians and the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is a rank-one perturbation of identity,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} := (\lambda - 1)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{I}_p. \quad (1.1)$$

Forming the sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{Y} := n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}^\top\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}$, our goal is to estimate the “spike” $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$. As $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ with $p/n \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, 1]$,¹ the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of \mathbf{Y} converges weakly almost surely to the Marchenko-Pastur distribution, supported on $[(1 - \sqrt{\gamma})^2, (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2]$. Moreover, PCA exhibits a *phase transition*: denoting the leading eigenvalue of \mathbf{Y} and corresponding eigenvector by λ_1 and \mathbf{u}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \lambda + \frac{\lambda\gamma}{\lambda - 1} & \lambda > 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}, \\ (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 & \lambda \leq 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}, \end{cases} \\ \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{(\lambda - 1)^2}\right) / \left(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\lambda - 1}\right) & \lambda > 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}, \\ 0 & \lambda \leq 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

Thus, if $\lambda \leq 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$, λ_1 converges to the upper edge of the support of the Marchenko-Pastur distribution, and \mathbf{u}_1 is asymptotically orthogonal to \mathbf{v} . On the other hand, if $\lambda > 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$, λ_1 is an *outlier eigenvalue*, occurring outside the Marchenko-Pastur support, and the cosine similarity between \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{v} is non-trivial; that is, \mathbf{u}_1 contains (partial) information about \mathbf{v} . These results are due to Baik, Ben Arous, and P  ch   [5] and Paul [40], and $1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$ is known as the BBP transition.

If \mathbf{v} is sparse, is it possible to reliably and efficiently recover it below the BBP transition? In other words, can the sparsity of \mathbf{v} be leveraged to improve estimation? A body of literature, beginning with Johnstone and Lu’s diagonal thresholding (DT) algorithm [28], answers this question in the affirmative. Informally, DT estimates the support of \mathbf{v} by the indices of the largest-magnitude diagonal elements of \mathbf{Y} . Assuming the spiked model (1.1), knowledge of the sparsity level $m := \|\mathbf{v}\|_0$, and that the non-zero elements of \mathbf{v} are of the form $\pm 1/\sqrt{m}$, Amini and Wainwright [2] prove DT recovers the support² of \mathbf{v} with high probability if $m \leq C(\lambda)\sqrt{n/\log p}$. Semidefinite programming approaches were unable to improve on this result (see the discussion in [15]).

Building on DT, Krauthgamer, Nadler, and Vilenchik [33] proposed the covariance thresholding (CT) algorithm, which is based on the soft-thresholding operator $\eta_s(x, t) := \text{sign}(x) \cdot (|x| - t)_+$ and the kernel matrix $\mathbf{K}(\eta_s(\cdot, t)) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ defined by

$$(\mathbf{K}(\eta_s(\cdot, t)))_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_s(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{ij}, t) & i \neq j, \\ 0 & i = j, \end{cases} \quad i, j \in [p].$$

Specifically, CT estimates \mathbf{v} by the first eigenvector \mathbf{u}_1 of $\mathbf{K}(\eta_s(\cdot, t))$, and the support of \mathbf{v} by the indices of the largest-magnitude elements of \mathbf{u}_1 . This method is preliminarily analyzed by Deshpande and Montanari [15], who prove CT recovers the support of \mathbf{v} with probability converging to one if $m \leq C(\lambda)\sqrt{n}$, thereby confirming a conjecture of [33]. In particular, below the BBP transition, CT is successful if m/\sqrt{n} is sufficiently small, representing a significant improvement

¹This is a standard asymptotic framework in random matrix theory; γ is the limiting aspect ratio of the data. Our assumption that $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ is for ease of exposition; analogous results hold for $\gamma \in (1, \infty)$.

²“Support recovery” and “recovery” refer to exact estimation of $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})$ and \mathbf{v} , respectively.

over PCA. On the other hand, work of Berthet and Rigollet [8] strongly suggests that no polynomial-time algorithm can recover \mathbf{v} below the BBP transition if $m \gg \sqrt{n}$.³ In summary, “the sparse PCA problem demonstrates a fascinating interplay between computational and statistical barriers” [15].

This work focuses on the “critical” regime $m \asymp \sqrt{n}$, with the goal of understanding the fundamental limits of signal recovery. As discussed above, this is the coarsest sparsity level at which \mathbf{v} is believed recoverable below the BBP transition in polynomial time. We assume $m/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \beta \in (0, \infty)$ and, as in [2, 33], that the spiked model (1.1) holds with \mathbf{v} taking the form

$$\sqrt{m}v_1, \sqrt{m}v_2, \dots, \sqrt{m}v_m \in \{-1, 1\}, \quad v_{m+1} = v_{m+2} = \dots = v_p = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

While this model is admittedly restrictive, it naturally extends from the first to the second moment the sparse Gaussian sequence model with a Rademacher prior [29]. Note that the assumptions that \mathbf{v} is sparse with respect to the canonical basis and that the first m elements are non-zero hold without loss of generality.

We consider a generalization of CT based on the matrix $\mathbf{K}(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ defined by

$$(\mathbf{K}(f))_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} f(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) & i \neq j, \\ 0 & i = j, \end{cases} \quad i, j \in [p], \quad (1.4)$$

where $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a kernel function. Denoting the leading eigenvalue and corresponding eigenvector of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ by λ_1 and \mathbf{u}_1 , we will estimate \mathbf{v} by hard thresholding \mathbf{u}_1 .⁴ We refer to this algorithm as generalized covariance thresholding (GCT).

Given this background, we now state our primary contributions:

- (1) We establish that the leading eigenvalue and eigenvector of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ exhibit complex phase transition behavior, extending the BBP transition. Within a region \mathcal{R} of the parameter space—defined by f , γ , β , and λ —GCT is informative: λ_1 is an outlier eigenvalue and the cosine similarity between \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{v} is non-trivial. Outside of \mathcal{R} , \mathbf{u}_1 is asymptotically orthogonal to \mathbf{v} . We provide limiting formulas for cosine similarity analogous to (1.2). Importantly, the domains in which GCT detects the presence of \mathbf{v} , produces a non-trivial estimate of \mathbf{v} , and recovers \mathbf{v} are identical and equal to \mathcal{R} .
- (2) We explicitly characterize \mathcal{R} . For many kernel functions f of interest, a “traditional” phase transition occurs: there exists $\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta) > 1$ such that $(f, \gamma, \beta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}$ if and only if $\lambda > \lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta)$.⁵ As $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta) \rightarrow 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$, matching the BBP transition. We numerically optimize $\lambda_*(\eta_s(\cdot, t), \gamma, \beta)$ over $t > 0$ and $\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta)$ over $f \in L^2(\phi)$, where ϕ is the Gaussian density. The results suggest that CT is nearly optimal, and we propose to adaptively select the thresholding level to maximize the (normalized) spectral gap.
- (3) For polynomial kernel functions, we prove that within \mathcal{R} , hard thresholding \mathbf{u}_1 recovers \mathbf{v} with probability $1 - n^{-D}$, for any $D > 0$. Our hard thresholding level does not depend on λ or β , which are generally unknown.

³In the regime $m \log p \lesssim n$, by exhaustive search over subsets of indices of size m , the support of \mathbf{v} is recoverable in exponential time [15, 44].

⁴Specifically, we estimate \mathbf{v} by $\text{sign}(\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_1, n^{-\varepsilon})) / \|\text{sign}(\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_1, n^{-\varepsilon}))\|_2$, where $\eta_h(x, t) := x \cdot \mathbf{1}_{|x| \geq t}$ denotes hard thresholding and $\varepsilon \in (1/4, 1/2)$.

⁵For non-monotonic kernel functions, the set $\{\lambda : (f, \gamma, \beta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ may be the union of disjoint intervals, in which case GCT exhibits multiple phase transitions.




Figure 1: Stylized illustration of sparse PCA in the critical regime $m/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow \beta$ and $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$. Area (I) is the recovery region of PCA, the union of areas (I) and (II) is the recovery region of GCT, and (III) is the GCT impossibility region. The boundary between regions (II) and (III) is the curve $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$, and $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta) \rightarrow 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$ (the BBP transition) as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$.

- (4) We derive novel concentration inequalities for quadratic forms of the resolvent of $\mathbf{K}(f)$, with optimal rates of convergence, as detailed in Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3. These bounds enable entrywise control of \mathbf{u}_1 , which is essential to proving recovery of the support of \mathbf{v} . Prior works on kernel matrices, including those by Chen and Singer [13] and Fan and Montanari [22], as well as entrywise eigenvector perturbation bounds such as those in Abbe et al. [1], do not suffice for this purpose. Our proofs employ a “leave-one-out” argument that is standard in random matrix theory, although the extension to kernel matrices is involved.

These results offer a comprehensive description of the salient properties of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ in high dimensions. For example, while Theorem 2 of [15] lower bounds the cosine similarity achieved by CT assuming $m < \sqrt{n}$, we derive the exact limit for all $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, demonstrating that CT improves upon PCA throughout the critical sparsity regime. Moreover, we prove that GCT exhibits a phase transition, with the location depending on f, γ and β , a phenomenon that was previously observed only in simulations of CT in [15].

We conclude this section with an intriguing open question: we will prove there exists a function $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$ such that \mathbf{v} is recoverable via GCT if and only if $\lambda > \lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$ —see Figure 1 for an illustration. Can alternative algorithms consistently estimate \mathbf{v} in the GCT “impossibility region” where $\lambda \leq \lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$? In other words, is GCT optimal?

1.1 Related Work

DT and CT are connected to the works of Bickel and Levina [9], Ma [37], and Cai, Ma, and Wu [12], all of which use thresholding to induce sparsity. In contrast to the spiked model, the first paper considers estimation of covariance matrices that are sparse and have “approximately bandable” structure, where elements decay with distance from the diagonal.

Rather than thresholding, many sparse PCA methods induce sparsity through L_1 -penalized regression, for example the elastic net-based algorithm developed by Zou, Hastie, and Tibshirani

[45].⁶ We intend to investigate its theoretical properties in future work.

El Karoui’s work [21] represents an important early contribution to the study of high-dimensional kernel matrices. In this paper, the off-diagonal kernel elements are modeled as $n^{-1/2}f(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})$ rather than $n^{-1/2}f(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{ij})$. Consequently, properties of the kernel matrix are determined by the value of f and its derivatives at the origin (rather than the global properties of f), and the kernel matrix acts as a spiked covariance matrix plus a low-rank term. Denoting $\mathbf{S} := n^{-1}\mathbf{Z}^\top\mathbf{Z}$, Chen and Singer [13] characterized the spectrum of the kernel matrix of noise $\mathbf{K}_0(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, defined by

$$(\mathbf{K}_0(f))_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}f(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{S}_{ij}) & i \neq j, \\ 0 & i = j, \end{cases} \quad i, j \in [p]. \quad (1.5)$$

As $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ and $p/n \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, \infty)$, the ESD of $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ converges to a probability measure μ , which is the additive free convolution of the (scaled) semicircle and Marcenko-Pastur laws. Subsequently, Fan and Montanari [22] proved that the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ converges to the supremum or “upper edge” of $\text{supp}(\mu)$.

The present paper is also closely related to the work of El Amine Seddik, Tamaazousti, and Couillet [20], which considers sparse PCA yet excludes the critical sparsity regime $m \asymp \sqrt{n}$. As a result, the phase transition phenomena that we uncover do not arise.

Nonlinear transformations of spiked matrices is an active area of research not limited to sparse PCA, with recent contributions from Liao, Couillet, and Mahoney [36], Guionnet et al. [26], Feldman [23], and Wang, Wu, and Fan [42]. The first paper assumes delocalized (dense) spikes and investigates thresholding and quantization kernels (which reduce PCA’s computational cost), finding that their application minimally impacts estimation. The second and third papers study a related model in which a transform f is applied elementwise to the data $\mathbf{Z}\Sigma^{1/2}$, rather than to the sample covariance \mathbf{Y} . Similarly to [36], spikes are delocalized. For a more detailed discussion of the technical distinctions between our work and [20, 36, 26, 23], see (2.5) and the following comments.

1.2 Model Details and Notations

In this section, we state necessary definitions and assumptions, as well as summarize those introduced above for ease of reference. Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ have rows $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be a (deterministic) spiked covariance matrix (1.1), and

$$\mathbf{S} := n^{-1}\mathbf{Z}^\top\mathbf{Z}, \quad \mathbf{Y} := \Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{S}\Sigma^{1/2}, \quad \mathbf{X} := \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{S}.$$

We assume $\lambda \geq 1$ is constant, $m := \|\mathbf{v}\|_0$, and \mathbf{v} satisfies (1.3). We study kernel matrices $\mathbf{K}(f), \mathbf{K}_0(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ of the forms given in (1.4) and (1.5),

$$(\mathbf{K}(f))_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}f(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{ij}) & i \neq j, \\ 0 & i = j, \end{cases} \quad (\mathbf{K}_0(f))_{ij} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}f(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{S}_{ij}) & i \neq j, \\ 0 & i = j, \end{cases} \quad i, j \in [p],$$

and work within the asymptotic framework where $n, p, m \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\frac{p}{n} \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, \infty), \quad \frac{m}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow \beta \in (0, \infty).$$

⁶This algorithm is the sparse PCA method implemented in the widely-used scikit-learn library, and in some contexts is synonymous with sparse PCA.

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p$ denote the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ and $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_p$ the corresponding eigenvectors. We will use non-bold symbols to denote the elements of certain matrices and vectors. For example, $\mathbf{u}_1 = (u_{11}, u_{12}, \dots, u_{1p})$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (z_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p)$.

The soft- and hard-thresholding operators are $\eta_s(x, t) := \text{sign}(x) \cdot (|x| - t)_+$ and $\eta_h(x, t) := x \cdot \mathbf{1}_{|x| \geq t}$. Let $\phi(z) := (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-z^2/2}$ denote the Gaussian density and define the inner product on the space of real-valued functions

$$\langle f, g \rangle_\phi := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z)g(z)\phi(z)dz.$$

Let $\{h_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the Hermite polynomials (normalized such that $\langle h_k, h_\ell \rangle_\phi = \mathbf{1}_{k=\ell}$), $\|f\|_\phi^2 := \langle f, f \rangle_\phi$, and $a_\ell := \langle f, h_\ell \rangle_\phi$; $\{a_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the Hermite coefficients of f . We will use \odot to denote the Hadamard (elementwise) product.

Results for polynomial kernel functions will be stated using the notion of *stochastic domination* from [10]: for two sequences of nonnegative random variables ξ_n and ζ_n , we say ξ_n is stochastically dominated by ζ_n and write $\xi_n \prec \zeta_n$ if for all $\varepsilon, D > 0$, there exists $n_{\varepsilon, D} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_n > n^\varepsilon \zeta_n) \leq n^{-D}$$

for all $n \geq n_{\varepsilon, D}$. If ξ_n is not assumed nonnegative and $|\xi_n| \prec \zeta_n$, we may write $\xi_n = O_{\prec}(\zeta_n)$.

2 Results

Our results are organized into four sections. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 present our core technical findings on the spectral properties of $\mathbf{K}(f)$, with Section 2.1 covering polynomial kernels and Section 2.2 non-polynomial kernels. Section 2.3 discusses the scientific implications of these results.

We first state key properties of the kernel matrix of noise $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$, recalling that $a_\ell := \langle f, h_\ell \rangle_\phi$ are the Hermite coefficients of f .

Theorem 2.1. (Theorem 3.4 of [13]⁷) *Let $a_0 = 0$, $\|f\|_\phi^2 < \infty$, and f be bounded on compact sets. The ESD of $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ converges weakly almost surely to a continuous probability measure μ on \mathbb{R} . The Stieltjes transform $s(z)$ of μ solves the equation*

$$-\frac{1}{s(z)} = z + a_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)}\right) + \gamma (\|f\|_\phi^2 - a_1^2) s(z). \quad (2.1)$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, equation (2.1) has a unique solution $s(z)$ with $\text{Im}(s(z)) > 0$.

Corollary 2.2. (see Corollary 3 of [36]) *In the setting of Theorem 2.1, assume $a_1 > 0$ and let $\psi(s)$ denote the functional inverse of $s(z)$:*

$$\psi(s) := -\frac{1}{s} - a_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + a_1 \gamma s}\right) - \gamma (\|f\|_\phi^2 - a_1^2) s \quad (2.2)$$

The upper edge of $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is given by

$$\lambda_+ := \psi(s_0),$$

where s_0 is the unique solution of $\psi'(s) = 0$ in the interval $(-1/(a_1 \gamma), 0)$.

⁷For brevity, we do not state Theorem 3.4 of [13] in its full generality.

Before stating our results, we define a key function $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$:

$$\tau(f, \beta, \lambda) := \sum_{\ell=3}^{\infty} \frac{a_{\ell}(\lambda-1)^{\ell}}{\sqrt{\ell!}\beta^{\ell-1}}. \quad (2.3)$$

We shall see that the spectral properties of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ are determined by $\lambda, a_1, \|f\|_{\phi}^2$, and τ ; in particular, the performance of GCT depends on β only through $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$.

2.1 Polynomial Kernel Functions

Throughout this section, we assume f is an odd polynomial, $L := \deg(f)$, and

$$\frac{p}{n} = \gamma + O(n^{-1/2}), \quad \beta_n := \frac{m}{\sqrt{n}} = \beta + o(1). \quad (2.4)$$

For brevity, we will write τ in place of $\tau(f, \beta_n, \lambda)$ (note that τ contains at most L non-zero terms).

Our first result is that $\mathbf{K}(f)$ is approximately the sum of three components: a (diagonal centered) sample covariance matrix $a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p)$, a rank-one signal term proportional to $\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^{\top}$, and a noise matrix $\mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1)$. This third term acts as an (asymptotically) independent Wigner matrix with semicircular limiting spectral distribution (LSD).

Theorem 2.3. *Defining $\mathbf{A}(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ as*

$$\mathbf{A}(f) := a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p) + \tau \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^{\top} + \mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1),$$

we have that $\mathbf{A}(f)$ accurately approximates $\mathbf{K}(f)$ in operator norm:

$$\|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}.$$

In our view, this is a rather unexpected result. Consider the decomposition

$$\mathbf{K}(f) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \frac{1}{\ell!} (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot \ell} \odot \mathbf{K}_0(f^{(\ell)}). \quad (2.5)$$

In related studies such as [36, 26, 23], where the signal \mathbf{v} is dense (for example, if \mathbf{v} is generated uniformly on \mathbb{S}^{p-1}), Hadamard powers of \mathbf{X} have vanishing operator norm: for $\ell > 1$, $\|(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot \ell}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$; $\mathbf{K}(f)$ is therefore well approximated by $\mathbf{K}_0(f) + \sqrt{n}\mathbf{X} \odot \mathbf{K}_0(f')$. In our setting, such powers of $\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X}$ are no longer negligible, and each term of (2.5) now contains a non-vanishing component. Representing f in the basis of Hermite polynomials and using the identity $h_k^{(\ell)}(z) = \sqrt{k!/(k-\ell)!} h_{k-\ell}(z)$, (2.5) becomes

$$\mathbf{K}(f) = \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=\ell}^L \frac{a_k}{\ell!} \sqrt{\frac{k!}{(k-\ell)!}} ((\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot \ell} \odot \mathbf{K}_0(h_{k-\ell})). \quad (2.6)$$

Theorem 2.3 is a consequence of the convergence

$$\|(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot \ell} \odot \mathbf{K}_0(h_k)\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$$

for $\ell, k > 0$ —in short, this occurs because \mathbf{X} sparsifies $\mathbf{K}_0(h_k)$, which is an array of weakly dependent elements with means converging to zero.⁸

⁸Let $i \neq j$. Since $\sqrt{n}\mathbf{S}_{ij} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and h_k is continuous and orthogonal to h_0 , the continuous mapping theorem implies $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{K}_0(h_k))_{ij} = \mathbb{E}h_k(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{S}_{ij}) \rightarrow \langle h_k, h_0 \rangle_{\phi} = 0$.

The operator-norm convergence established in Theorem 2.3 implies that the spectral properties of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ and $\mathbf{A}(f)$ are closely related (see Lemma 2.1 of [21]). In particular, (1) the ESDs of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ and $\mathbf{A}(f)$ converge weakly almost surely to the common limit of μ by Cauchy's interlacing inequality and (2) the leading eigenvalues of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ and $\mathbf{A}(f)$ are asymptotically equal. Leveraging this relationship, we obtain descriptions of the maximum eigenvalue λ_1 and \mathbf{u}_1 :

Theorem 2.4. *Assume $a_1 > 0$, $\tau \neq 0$, and define*

$$s_+ := \frac{-a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) - \tau + \sqrt{(a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau)^2 - 4a_1\gamma\tau}}{2a_1\gamma\tau},$$

$$\theta^2(x) := -\frac{1 + \gamma x(a_1(2 + a_1\gamma x)(1 + a_1^2\gamma x^2) - x(1 + a_1\gamma x)^2\|f\|_\phi^2)}{x(1 + a_1\gamma x)(\tau + a_1(\lambda + \gamma + 2\tau\gamma x - 1))}.$$

If $\psi'(s_+) > 0$,

$$|\lambda_1 - \psi(s_+)| \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 = \theta^2(s_+) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (2.7)$$

and for $i \in [p]$, assuming $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq 0$ without loss of generality,

$$u_{1i} = \theta(s_+)v_i + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (2.8)$$

If $\psi'(s_+) \leq 0$,

$$\lambda_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \quad (2.9)$$

We note that $\psi'(s_+) > 0$ implies $\psi(s_+) > \lambda_+$ and $\theta^2(s_+) > 0$ —see the proofs of (4.16) and (4.17) in Section 4. Thus, if $\psi'(s_+) > 0$, GCT is informative: λ_1 is an outlier eigenvalue and \mathbf{u}_1 contains information about \mathbf{v} . On the other hand, if $\psi'(s_+) \leq 0$, λ_1 converges to λ_+ —the supremum of $\text{supp}(\mu)$ —and \mathbf{u}_1 is asymptotically orthogonal to \mathbf{v} . For comments on the cases $a_1 \leq 0$ and $\tau = 0$, which are not covered by Theorem 2.4, see Remark 2.2.

As a consequence of (2.8), if $\psi'(s_+) > 0$, hard thresholding \mathbf{u}_1 at level $n^{-\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \in (1/4, 1/2)$ recovers \mathbf{v} . Importantly, the thresholding level does not depend on λ or β , which are generally unknown:

Theorem 2.5. *Assume $a_1 > 0$, $\tau \neq 0$, and $\psi'(s_+) > 0$, and define the estimator*

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}} := \frac{\text{sign}((\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_1, n^{-\varepsilon})))}{\|\text{sign}((\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_1, n^{-\varepsilon})))\|_2},$$

where $\varepsilon \in (1/4, 1/2)$. For any $D > 0$, there exists $n_{\varepsilon, D} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{v}) \geq 1 - n^{-D}, \quad \forall n \geq n_{\varepsilon, D}.$$

Remark 2.1. We believe the convergence rates in Theorem 2.4 are optimal as they match results for the spiked model given in [10, 11] (for example, (2.7) and (2.8) compare to Theorems 2.3 and 2.16 of [11]). In contrast, relating λ_1 to the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathbf{A}(f)$ using Weyl's inequality and Theorem 2.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_1 - \psi(s_+)| &\leq |\lambda_1 - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}(f))| + |\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}(f)) - \psi(s_+)| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

We will prove that $|\lambda_1 - \psi(s_+)|$ is bounded by quadratic forms such as

$$\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} (\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)) (\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{v},$$

which have fluctuations of order $O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2})$ —see Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3.

2.2 Non-polynomial Kernel Functions

Throughout this section, we assume

$$\frac{p}{n} \rightarrow \gamma \in (0, \infty), \quad \frac{m}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow \beta \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.10)$$

For brevity, we will write τ in place of $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$.

The following results are analogs of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4:

Theorem 2.6. *Let $f(x)$ be odd, everywhere continuous, and twice differentiable except at finitely many points. Assume there is some $c > 0$ such that $|f(x)|, |f'(x)|, |f''(x)| \leq ce^{c|x|}$ whenever they exist. Defining $\mathbf{A}(f) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ as*

$$\mathbf{A}(f) := a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p) + \tau \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1),$$

we have that $\mathbf{A}(f)$ accurately approximates $\mathbf{K}(f)$ in operator norm:

$$\|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Theorem 2.7. *In the setting of Theorem 2.6, assume $a_1 > 0$, $\tau \neq 0$, and recall s_+ and $\theta^2(x)$ defined in Theorem 2.4. Then,*

$$\lambda_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \psi(s_+) & \psi'(s_+) > 0, \\ \lambda_+ & \psi'(s_+) \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \theta^2(s_+) & \psi'(s_+) > 0, \\ 0 & \psi'(s_+) \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

To prove Theorems 2.6 and 2.7 from Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, we construct in Lemma 4.6 a sequence of odd polynomials $\{f_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|f - f_\ell\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{K}(f_\ell)\|_2 = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0. \quad (2.12)$$

This result builds upon [22] in that (1) Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 of [22] pertain only to the kernel matrix of noise $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ and (2) Theorem 1.4 assumes f is continuously differentiable. We stress that the specific conditions Theorem 2.6 places on f are not the focus of this paper and are likely improvable. Rather, we developed in (2.12) a minimal extension of [22] that includes soft thresholding.

Remark 2.2. Theorems 2.4, 2.5, and 2.7 exclude $\tau = 0$ or $a_1 \leq 0$. The former case arises under linear kernel functions (the limits of λ_1 and $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2$ are then given by [5]) or $\lambda = 1$ (\mathbf{v} is then unidentifiable). If $a_1 < 0$, our results apply to $\mathbf{K}(-f)$. If $a_1 = 0$, $\mathbf{K}(f)$ is approximately a spiked Wigner matrix, and the limits of interest are derived by applying [6] to $\mathbf{A}(f)$ in Theorem 2.6:⁹

$$\lambda_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \tau + \frac{\gamma \|f\|_\phi^2}{\tau} & \tau > \sqrt{\gamma} \|f\|_\phi, \\ 2\sqrt{\gamma} \|f\|_\phi & \tau \leq \sqrt{\gamma} \|f\|_\phi, \end{cases} \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\gamma \|f\|_\phi^2}{\tau^2} & \tau > \sqrt{\gamma} \|f\|_\phi, \\ 0 & \tau \leq \sqrt{\gamma} \|f\|_\phi. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

These are the standard formulas (appropriate scaled) for limiting eigenvalue bias and eigenvector inconsistency under the spiked Wigner model; see Example 3.1 of [6].

⁹The argument of [6] requires that quadratic forms such as $\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{K}(f) - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{v}$ concentrate around their expectations; we provide the necessary technical conditions in Lemma 4.2.

Remark 2.3. We assume f is odd as an even component may introduce spurious spikes into the spectrum of $\mathbf{K}(f)$. Specifically, if f is not odd, $\mathbf{A}(f)$ of Corollary 2.6 becomes

$$\mathbf{A}(f) = a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p) + \tau_e \cdot \mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^\top + \tau_o \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1),$$

where $\mathbf{w} := [\mathbf{1}_m/\sqrt{m}, \mathbf{0}_{p-m}]$ and

$$\tau_e := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{2k}(\lambda - 1)^{2k}}{\sqrt{(2k)!}\beta^{2k-1}}, \quad \tau_o := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{2k+1}(\lambda - 1)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{(2k+1)!}\beta^{2k}}.$$

The spectrum of $\mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1)$ contains an outlier eigenvalue with eigenvector $\mathbf{1}_p$ if $|a_2|$ is sufficiently large (see [22] and [36]). We note that an even component to f can contribute to support recovery (since $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{w})$); in this work, however, we are also concerned with recovery of $\text{sign}(v_1), \dots, \text{sign}(v_m)$.

2.3 The Recovery Region of GCT

This section presents three of the main scientific contributions of this paper. First, we establish that under (1.3), the domains in which GCT (1) detects the presence of \mathbf{v} , (2) produces a non-trivial estimate of \mathbf{v} , and (3) recovers \mathbf{v} are identical. In other words, three distinct notions of success are essentially equivalent. Second, we demonstrate that as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, GCT fails below the BBP transition. This aligns with the belief that sparse methods cannot outperform PCA for $m \gg \sqrt{n}$ —see the discussion in Section 1. Third, we will prove the existence of and characterize an optimal kernel $f^*(\cdot; \gamma, \beta)$ with the largest region of recovery. Proofs are deferred to Section 4.3.

Let $L_o^2(\phi) := \{f : \|f\|_\phi^2 < \infty, f(x) = -f(-x)\}$. In light of Theorems 2.4 and 2.7, we define a region \mathcal{R} in which GCT is informative,

$$\mathcal{R} := \left\{ (f, \gamma, \beta, \lambda) : \psi'(s_+) > 0, f \in L_o^2(\phi), \gamma \in (0, \infty), \beta \in (0, \infty), \lambda > 1 \right\}, \quad (2.14)$$

as well as $\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) := \{\lambda : (f, \gamma, \beta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}\}$.

Corollary 2.8. *To test $H_0: \lambda = 1$ versus $H_1: \lambda \in \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot)$, we reject the null hypothesis when*

$$\lambda_1 > \lambda_+ + \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, \inf \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot))$.

This test is asymptotically correct and fully powerful by Theorem 2.7.

The next corollary, which proves \mathbf{v} is recoverable throughout \mathcal{R} , leverages results from Section 2.1. Recalling the Hermite polynomials $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and coefficients $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of f , we approximate f by $f_\ell := \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_k h_k$. Let $\lambda_{1,\ell}$ denote the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathbf{K}(f_\ell)$ and $\mathbf{u}_{1,\ell}$ the corresponding eigenvector.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $(f, \gamma, \beta, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}$, $\varepsilon \in (1/4, 1/2)$, and*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_\ell := \frac{\text{sign}((\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_{1,\ell}, n^{-\varepsilon})))}{\|\text{sign}((\eta_h(\mathbf{u}_{1,\ell}, n^{-\varepsilon})))\|_2}.$$

For any $D > 0$, there exist $L, n_{\varepsilon,D} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{v}}_\ell = \mathbf{v}) \geq 1 - n^{-D}, \quad \forall n \geq n_{\varepsilon,D}, \ell \geq L.$$

Informally, if the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ is an outlier (which Corollary 2.8 tests), then GCT recovers \mathbf{v} . In particular, any point within \mathcal{R} is covered for all sufficiently large ℓ . We expect this results holds for $\mathbf{K}(f)$ directly, without polynomial approximation. However, we only prove entrywise eigenvector bounds for polynomial kernels, see (2.8). We leave addressing this technicality to future work.

Lemma 2.10. *For $f \in L^2(\phi)$ and $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \inf \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) \geq 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}.$$

Corollary 2.11. *Let f satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.6 and $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. By Theorem 2.7 and Lemma 2.10, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 = 0.$$

If $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$ is non-decreasing in λ , a “traditional” phase transition occurs: GCT is informative for signal strengths exceeding a critical value $\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta)$.

Lemma 2.12. *If $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$ is non-decreasing in λ , then there exists $\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta) > 1$ such that*

$$\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = (\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta), \infty).$$

Lemma 2.12 applies to kernels with non-negative Hermite coefficients, as well as to the soft thresholding operator $\eta_s(\cdot, t)$, which has coefficients $a_0 = 0$, $a_1 = 1 - \text{erf}(t/\sqrt{2})$, and

$$a_k = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{2}{k(k-1)\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} h_{k-2}(t) & k \text{ odd,} \\ 0 & k \text{ even,} \end{cases} \quad k > 1.$$

Now, we establish an optimal kernel $f^*(\cdot; \gamma, \beta)$ with the largest region of recovery. For brevity, we omit the explicit dependence of f^* on γ and β .

Corollary 2.13. *There exists a kernel function f^* and a critical value $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{f \in L^2_o(\phi)} \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \mathcal{R}(f^*, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = (\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta), \infty).$$

The Hermite coefficients $\{a_k^*\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of f^* are of the form

$$a_k^* = \begin{cases} \frac{(\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta) - 1)^k}{\sqrt{k!} \beta^{k-1}} & k \text{ odd,} \\ 0 & k \text{ even,} \end{cases} \quad k \neq 1,$$

and f^* satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.6.

By design, f^* maximizes $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda_*(\gamma, \beta))$ over

$$\{f \in L^2_o(\phi) : \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi = a_1^*, \|f\|_\phi = \|f^*\|_\phi\}.$$

In Section 3, we will numerically calculate $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$.

3 Numerical Calculations and Simulations

This section presents numerical calculations and simulations.

Figure 2 compares GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, 2)$ (soft thresholding) to standard PCA in terms of cosine similarity, illustrating the phase transition of Theorem 2.7 and the BBP transition. As β decreases, the performance gap between GCT and PCA increases. Figure 3 plots the corresponding chance of recovery using the estimator of Theorem 2.5; empirically, GCT recovers \mathbf{v} with high probability above the detection threshold. For example, in the left plot, we recovered \mathbf{v} in 100% of simulations with $\lambda \geq 1.7$.

Figure 4 depicts the optimal phase transitions of GCT (right) and soft thresholding (left), for $\gamma \in \{.5, 1, 1.5\}$ and $\beta \in [.1, 2.5]$. From Corollary 2.13, recall the optimal transition of GCT is

$$\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta) = \inf \bigcup_{f \in L_o^2(\phi)} \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot).$$

We define the optimal transition of soft thresholding analogously:

$$\lambda_{s,*}(\gamma, \beta) := \inf \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{R}(\eta_s(\cdot, t), \gamma, \beta, \cdot).$$

By an analogous argument to the proof of Corollary 2.13, the infimum is achieved for a specific thresholding level $t_*(\gamma, \beta)$.

Surprisingly, soft thresholding is close to optimal: the left and right plots of Figure 4 are visually nearly indistinguishable, and the discrepancy between the plotted curves is less than .05.¹⁰ Based on these calculations, we advocate soft thresholding; it is likely more robust to model misspecification than f^* , which is tailored to (1.3). Figure 4 also illustrates Lemma 2.10 and Corollary 2.11. As $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, GCT cannot outperform standard PCA: $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta) \rightarrow 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$, the BBP transition. In fact, for $\beta \geq 1$, there is little potential for improvement over PCA.

As the optimal soft thresholding level depends on β , which is generally unknown, we propose to adaptively select the threshold to maximize the normalized spectral gap $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)/\lambda_2$. This procedure is motivated by Corollaries 2.8 and 2.9: since the presence of an outlier eigenvalue indicates that recovery is possible, it is natural to choose the threshold that produces the most distinct outlier. This procedure compares well to optimal fixed-level thresholding, GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, t_*(\gamma, \beta))$ —see Figure 5.

Empirically, the phenomena we uncover are not restricted to $\sqrt{m}v_1, \dots, \sqrt{m}v_m \in \{-1, +1\}$ as in (1.3). In Figure 6, we generate $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ according to

$$\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{unif}([-2, -1] \cup [1, 2]), \quad (3.1)$$

and set $\mathbf{v}_{[1:m]} = \boldsymbol{\xi}/\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_2$. The left plot depicts the cosine similarity of GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, 2)$, which undergoes a clear phase transition. The right plot depicts support recovery, measured as follows:

$$\frac{|\text{supp}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{v})| - |\text{supp}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}) \cap ([p] \setminus \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}))|}{m}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is defined in Theorem 2.5. That is, (3.2) counts the number of correctly identified elements minus the number of false positives, normalized by m . The signal detection and recovery thresholds seem aligned, as we expect from Section 2.3.

¹⁰To calculate $\lambda_{s,*}(\gamma, \beta)$, we ran a grid search over the thresholding level t , and computed for each the value of λ such that $\psi'(s_+) = 0$. To calculate $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$, we used the characterization of f^* provided by Corollary 2.13, and ran grid searches over possible values of a_1^* and $\|f^*\|_\phi$. For a given function $f \in L_o^2(\phi)$, we approximated s_+ using $\tau(f_L, \beta, \lambda)$ in place of $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$, where f_L is the Hermite approximation of f with degree $L = 21$.




Figure 2: Cosine similarities for GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, 2)$ (blue) and standard PCA (orange). There is close agreement between Theorem 2.7 (solid lines) and simulations (points, each representing the average over 50 simulations). On the left, $n = 10,000$, $p = 5,000$, and $m = 25$, so $\beta = 1/4$. On the right, $n = 10,000$, $p = 5,000$, and $m = 50$, so $\beta = 1/2$. Observe that the phase transition of GCT decreases with β .




Figure 3: Simulations of GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, 2)$ (blue) and standard PCA (orange). Points represent the fraction of 50 simulations in which \mathbf{v} was recovered. On the left, $n = 10,000$, $p = 5,000$, and $m = 25$, so $\beta = 1/4$. On the right, $n = 10,000$, $p = 5,000$, and $m = 50$, so $\beta = 1/2$.




Figure 5: Cosine similarities for soft thresholding with adaptive threshold selection (blue) and the optimal threshold $t_*(\gamma, \beta)$ (orange). Here, $n = 10,000$ and $p = 5,000$, so $\gamma = .5$. At each value of $\beta \in [.1, 2]$, we set the signal strength to be $\lambda = \lambda_{s,*}(\gamma, \beta) + .1$. Each point is the average of 50 simulations. Interestingly, for intermediate values of β , adaptive thresholding empirically outperforms the optimal fixed level $t_*(\gamma, \beta)$.




Figure 4: The optimal phase transition of GCT (left) and soft thresholding (right), for $\gamma \in \{.5, 1, 1.5\}$ and $\beta \in [.1, 2.5]$. Notice that (1) $\lambda_{s,*}(\gamma, \beta)$ and $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta)$ are visually nearly indistinguishable, suggesting that soft thresholding is close to optimal, and (2) $\lambda_*(\gamma, \beta) \rightarrow 1 + \sqrt{\gamma}$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, supporting Lemma 2.10.




Figure 6: Simulations of GCT with the kernel $\eta_s(\cdot, 2)$ (blue) and standard PCA (orange). The non-zero elements of \mathbf{v} are generated from a uniform prior (3.1). On the right, we plot support recovery, measured according to (3.2). Empirically, the signal detection and recovery thresholds seem aligned. Here, $n = 10,000$, $p = 5,000$, and $m = 25$, so $\beta = 1/4$. Each point is the average of 50 simulations.

4 Proofs

4.1 Proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4

Throughout this section, we assume f is an odd polynomial, $L := \deg(f)$, and (2.4) holds.

We shall show that all terms of (2.6) are vanishing in operator norm except those with indices (ℓ, k) of the form $(0, k)$ or (ℓ, ℓ) . In contrast, in the setting where \mathbf{v} is distributed uniformly on \mathbb{S}^{p-1} , only those terms with (ℓ, k) equal to $(0, 1)$ or (ℓ, ℓ) are non negligible.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Rearranging (2.6), we have the following decomposition of $\mathbf{K}(f)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}(f) &= a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \text{diag}(\mathbf{Y})) + \sum_{\ell=3}^L \frac{a_\ell}{\sqrt{\ell!}} n^{(\ell-1)/2} (\mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell} - \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell})) + \mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^{L-\ell} \frac{a_{\ell+k}}{k!} \sqrt{\frac{(\ell+k)!}{\ell!}} \left(\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot k} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Recalling that $\mathbf{A}(f) := a_1(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p) + \tau \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{K}_0(f - a_1 h_1)$, it suffices to demonstrate that

- (1) $\|\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbf{I}_p\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$,
- (2) $\|n^{(\ell-1)/2}(\mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell} - \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell})) - (\lambda - 1)^\ell \beta_n^{-(\ell-1)} \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}$ for $\ell \in \{3, \dots, L\}$,
- (3) $\|\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})^{\odot k}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}$ for $\ell \in [L]$ and $k \in [L - \ell]$.

We shall refer to these bounds as claims (1)–(3).

Expanding $\mathbf{X} = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{S} \Sigma^{1/2} - \mathbf{S}$ using $\Sigma^{1/2} = (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{I}_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X} &= (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2 (\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S} + \mathbf{S} \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top) \\ &= c \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})^\top + (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}^\top), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $c := (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2 (\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{v}) + 2(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)$ satisfies $|c - (\lambda - 1)| \prec n^{-1/2}$ since $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} \sim n^{-1} \chi_n^2$. Writing the coordinates of $\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}$ as

$$w_j = \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{S}_{ij} v_i - v_j = \frac{v_j}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (z_{ij}^2 - 1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{ij} (\mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{v} - z_{ij} v_j),$$

the independence of $\{z_{ij}\}_{i \in [n]}$ and $\{\mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{v} - z_{ij} v_j\}_{i \in [n]}$ implies w_j is an average of i.i.d. sub-exponential variables. Therefore, using a Hoeffding inequality and a union bound,

$$\sup_{j \in [p]} |w_j| = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (4.3)$$

Similarly bounding $\|\text{diag}(\mathbf{S}) - \mathbf{I}_p\|_2$, we obtain claim (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbf{I}_p\|_2 &\leq \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{S}) - \mathbf{I}_p\|_2 + \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{X})\|_2 \\ &\leq \sup_{j \in [p]} (|n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{z}_j - 1| + c v_j^2 + 2(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) |v_j w_j|) \\ &\prec n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Now, consider the expansion

$$\mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell} = \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2, k_3 \in [\ell] \\ k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = \ell}} \binom{\ell}{k_1, k_2, k_3} c^{k_1} (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^{k_2 + k_3} (\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1 + k_2)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_3}) (\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1 + k_3)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_2})^\top, \quad (4.5)$$

the first term of which is $c^\ell m^{-(\ell-1)} \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top$ (corresponding to $k_1 = \ell, k_2 = k_3 = 0$). Using (4.3), for $k_1 \in [\ell]$ and $k_2 \in \{0\} \cup [\ell]$, we have the bounds

$$\|\mathbf{v}^{\odot k_1} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_2}\|_2 \prec \frac{1}{m^{(k_1-1)/2} n^{k_2/2}}, \quad \|\mathbf{w}^{\odot k_1}\|_2 \prec \frac{1}{n^{(k_1-1)/2}},$$

implying that terms of (4.5) with $k_2 + k_3 > 0$ are $O_{\prec}(n^{-\ell/2+1/4})$. Thus,

$$\|n^{(\ell-1)/2} \mathbf{X}^{\odot \ell} - c^\ell \beta_n^{-(\ell-1)} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^\top\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}. \quad (4.6)$$

Claim (2) now follows from $|c - (\lambda - 1)| \prec n^{-1/2}$ and $\|\text{diag}(\mathbf{X})\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$, shown in (4.4).

Claim (3) is a consequence of Theorem 1.6 of [22], the sparsity of \mathbf{v} , and the bound

$$\|\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot \mathbf{X}^{\odot k}\|_2 \lesssim \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2, k_3 \in [k] \\ k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = k}} c^{k_1} \left\| \mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot ((\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1+k_2)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_3})(\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1+k_3)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_2})^\top) \right\|_2.$$

Since the Hadamard product satisfies $\mathbf{A} \odot (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}^\top) = \text{diag}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{A} \text{diag}(\mathbf{y})$, for $k_2 + k_3 > 0$,

$$n^{k/2} \left\| \mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot ((\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1+k_2)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_3})(\mathbf{v}^{\odot(k_1+k_3)} \odot \mathbf{w}^{\odot k_2})^\top) \right\|_2 \prec \frac{1}{m^{(k_2+k_3)/2}} \|\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell)\|_2, \quad (4.7)$$

where we used (4.3), that the operator norm of a diagonal matrix is the maximum absolute entry, and $n^{k_1/2} m^{-k_1} \asymp 1$. For $k_2 = k_3 = 0$, we have

$$n^{k/2} \left\| \mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot (\mathbf{v}^{\odot k} (\mathbf{v}^{\odot k})^\top) \right\|_2 = n^{k/2} m^{-k} \|(\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell))_{[1:m, 1:m]}\|_2. \quad (4.8)$$

Theorem 1.6 of [22] yields

$$\|\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell)\|_2 \prec 1, \quad \|(\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell))_{[1:m, 1:m]}\|_2 \prec m^{-1/2}. \quad (4.9)$$

Thus, $\|\mathbf{K}_0(h_\ell) \odot (\sqrt{n} \mathbf{X})^{\odot k}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}$, completing the proof. \square

Let $\mathbf{R}(f, z)$ and $\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)$ denote the resolvents of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ and $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$, respectively, defined as

$$\mathbf{R}(f, z) := (\mathbf{K}(f) - z \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) := (\mathbf{K}_0(f) - z \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}.$$

The resolvents $\mathbf{R}(f, z)$ and $\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)$ are holomorphic at all points $z \in \mathbb{C}$ not equal to an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{K}(f)$ or $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$, respectively (Theorem 1.5 of [32]). Recalling the Stieltjes transform $s(z)$ of μ , we define the related quantities

$$\check{s}(z) := \frac{s(z)}{1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)}, \quad \check{\circ}s(z) := \check{s}(z)(1 + \gamma - a_1 \gamma \check{s}(z)).$$

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\varepsilon, D > 0$, there exists $n_{\varepsilon, D} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{K}_0(f)\|_2 > (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_+) \leq n^{-D}, \quad \forall n \geq n_{\varepsilon, D}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$,*

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle s(z) = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (4.10)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \check{s}(z) = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{w} - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \check{\circ}s(z) = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (4.12)$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Re}(z) > \lambda_+$.

Lemma 4.3. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 \vee \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \lesssim m$,

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) (\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (4.13)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) (\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (4.14)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) (\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{w} = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (4.15)$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \operatorname{Re}(z) > \lambda_+$.

The proofs of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 are deferred to Section 5. The proof of Lemma 4.1, which is a slight extension of Section 6 of [22], is given in Appendix A.

Drawing upon [6, 10, 23, 36], we prove Theorem 2.4 in two stages: eigenvalue results,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_1 - \psi(s_+)| &\prec n^{-1/2}, & \psi'(s_+) &> 0, \\ \lambda_1 &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+, & \psi'(s_+) &\leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

and eigenvector results,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 = \theta^2(s_+) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad \psi'(s_+) > 0, \quad (4.17)$$

$$u_{1i} = \theta(s_+) v_i + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad \psi'(s_+) > 0, \quad (4.18)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad \psi'(s_+) \leq 0. \quad (4.19)$$

For brevity, we often suppress the arguments of matrices such as $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ and $\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)$.

Proof of (4.16). Assume $\psi'(s_+) > 0$ and define the contours

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \psi(s_+)| = \delta_n\},$$

where (1) $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and (2) there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\delta_n \geq n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$. We shall prove that $\psi(s_+) > \lambda_+$ and \mathcal{C}_n encircles exactly one eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} with probability $1 - n^{-D}$ (for any $D > 0$). Furthermore, taking \mathcal{C} to be an arbitrary, bounded contour such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \operatorname{Re}(z) > \lambda_+$ and $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}_n = \emptyset$, an identical argument shows that \mathcal{C} encircles no eigenvalues of \mathbf{K} with probability $1 - n^{-D}$. In combination, these results yield $|\lambda_1 - \psi(s_+)| \prec n^{-1/2}$. Proof that $\psi'(s_+) \leq 0$ leads to $\lambda_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+$ is similar and omitted.

From Corollary 2.2 and the discussion on page 19 of [36], we have that $\psi(s_+) > \lambda_+$ if and only if $s_+ \in (-1/(a_1\gamma), 0)$ and $\psi'(s_+) > 0$. Noticing that s_+ is negative and increasing in λ on $[1, \infty)$,¹¹

$$\frac{\partial s_+}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{2\tau\gamma} \left(-1 + \frac{a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau}{\sqrt{(a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau)^2 - 4a_1\tau\gamma}} \right) > 0, \quad (4.20)$$

we obtain the lower bound

$$s_+ > \frac{-a_1\gamma - \tau + \sqrt{(a_1\gamma + \tau)^2 - 4a_1\tau\gamma}}{2a_1\tau\gamma} = \frac{-a_1\gamma - \tau + |a_1\gamma - \tau|}{2a_1\tau\gamma} \geq -\frac{1}{a_1\gamma}.$$

By Theorem 2.3, we may write $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^\top + \mathbf{K}_0 + \mathbf{\Delta}$, where

$$\mathbf{V} := [\mathbf{v} \quad \mathbf{S}\mathbf{v}], \quad \mathbf{\Lambda} := \begin{bmatrix} a_1(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2 + \tau & a_1(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) \\ a_1(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

¹¹The partial derivative (4.20) is symbolic and ignores the dependence of τ on λ .

and $\mathbf{\Delta} := \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{A} + (c - (\lambda - 1))\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top$. Denoting $\mathbf{R}_\Delta := (\mathbf{K}_0 + \mathbf{\Delta} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}$, as $\psi(s_+) > \lambda_+$, Lemma 4.1 and the bound $\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}$ imply \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_Δ are holomorphic within \mathcal{C}_n with probability $1 - n^{-D}$ and

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} (\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_2 \vee \|\mathbf{R}_\Delta\|_2) \prec 1. \quad (4.21)$$

From these facts and the Woodbury identity, which yields

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}_\Delta - \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V} (\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V})^{-1} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta, \quad (4.22)$$

we have that any eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} (equivalently, a pole of \mathbf{R}) encircled by \mathcal{C}_n is a pole of $(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V})^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V}) = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Our approach is to relate solutions of (4.23) to the roots of

$$\xi(z) := \det \left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} s(z) & \check{s}(z) \\ \check{s}(z) & \hat{s}(z) \end{bmatrix} \right) = -\frac{1 + \tau s(z) + a_1 s(z)(\lambda + \gamma + \tau \gamma s(z) - 1)}{a_1^2 (1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)) (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2} \quad (4.24)$$

(this is our *master equation*, in the parlance of [6]). Specifically, we will prove the following claims:

- (1) $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V}) - \xi(z)| \prec n^{-1/2}$,
- (2) $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\xi(z)| \gtrsim \delta_n$,
- (3) Within \mathcal{C}_n , $\psi(s_+)$ is the unique root of ξ and has multiplicity one, and ξ is holomorphic.

Then, Rouché's theorem and the bound

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V}) - \xi(z)| < \inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |\xi(z)|,$$

holding with probability $1 - n^{-D}$, implies that \mathcal{C}_n encircles equal numbers of roots of $\xi(z)$ and $\det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V})$, completing the proof. Rouché's theorem is applicable as \mathbf{R}_Δ is holomorphic within \mathcal{C}_n .

On \mathcal{C}_n , Lemma 4.3 implies $\|\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$, and (4.21), $\|\mathbf{S}\|_2 \prec 1$, and $\|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/4}$ imply $\|\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V}\|_2 \prec \|\mathbf{\Delta}\|_2^2 \prec n^{-1/2}$. Thus, using the relations $\mathbf{R}_\Delta^{-1} - \mathbf{R}_0^{-1} = \mathbf{\Delta}$ and

$$\mathbf{R}_\Delta = \mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_0 + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{R}_0, \quad (4.25)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}, \\ & \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V}) - \det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V}) \right| \prec n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Moreover, Lemma 4.2 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V} - \begin{bmatrix} s(z) & \check{s}(z) \\ \check{s}(z) & \hat{s}(z) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}, \\ & \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} \left| \det(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{V}) - \xi(z) \right| \prec n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Claim (1) follows from (4.26) and (4.27).

As the numerator of ξ is quadratic in $s(z)$, the roots of ξ are $\psi(s_+)$ and $\psi(s_-)$, where

$$s_- := \frac{-a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) - \tau - \sqrt{(a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau)^2 - 4a_1\tau\gamma}}{2a_1\tau\gamma}.$$

Similarly to (4.20), s_- is decreasing in λ on $[1, \infty)$, giving the upper bound

$$s_- < \frac{-a_1\gamma - \tau - \sqrt{(a_1\gamma + \tau)^2 - 4a_1\tau\gamma}}{2a_1\tau\gamma} \leq \frac{-a_1\gamma - \tau}{2a_1\tau\gamma} \leq -\frac{1}{a_1\gamma}$$

and establishing claim (3). Now, we write ξ as

$$\xi(z) = -\frac{(s(z) - s_+)(s(z) - s_-)}{a_1^2(1 + a_1\gamma s(z))(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2}. \quad (4.28)$$

On \mathcal{C}_n , we have $|s(z) - s_-| \asymp |1 + a_1\gamma s(z)| \asymp 1$. Furthermore, the relation

$$s(z) - s_+ = \int \left(\frac{1}{\lambda - z} - \frac{1}{\lambda - \psi(s_+)} \right) d\mu(z) = \int \frac{z - \psi(s_+)}{(\lambda - z)(\lambda - \psi(s_+))} d\mu(z), \quad (4.29)$$

along with $|z - \psi(s_+)| = \delta_n$ and $|(\lambda - z)(\lambda - \psi(s_+))| \asymp 1$ for $\lambda \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, implies

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}_n} |s(z) - s_+| \gtrsim \delta_n. \quad (4.30)$$

Claim (2) follows from (4.28) and (4.30). \square

Lemma 4.4. *Defining the quantity*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(z) &:= s(z) - \begin{bmatrix} s(z) \\ \check{s}(z) \end{bmatrix}^\top \left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} s(z) & \check{s}(z) \\ \check{s}(z) & \check{\circ}(z) \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} s(z) \\ \check{s}(z) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{s(z)(1 + a_1\gamma s(z))}{1 + \tau s(z) + a_1 s(z)(\lambda + \gamma + \tau\gamma s(z) - 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{S}^{p-1}$,

$$\left| \mathbf{u}^\top (\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_\Delta) \mathbf{u} - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 (\zeta(z) - s(z)) \right| \prec \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Re}(z) > \lambda_+$.

Proof. The claim follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^\top (\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}_\Delta) \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V} (\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V})^{-1} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{u}, \\ \left\| (\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{V})^{-1} - \left(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} s(z) & \check{s}(z) \\ \check{s}(z) & \check{\circ}(z) \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \right\|_2 &\prec n^{-1/2}, \\ \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta \mathbf{R}_\Delta \Delta \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \begin{bmatrix} s(z) \\ \check{s}(z) \end{bmatrix} + O_\prec(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

These equations are derived from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 as well as (4.22) and (4.25)–(4.27). \square

Proof of (4.17). Let \mathcal{C} denote a positively-oriented contour that encircles $\psi(s_+)$ and is bounded away from $\text{supp}(\mu)$; as in the proof of (4.16), with probability $1 - n^{-D}$, \mathcal{C} encircles only the maximum eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} . Cauchy's integral formula and Lemma 4.4 therefore yield

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{R}(z) \mathbf{v} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \zeta(z) dz + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2})\end{aligned}\tag{4.32}$$

Here, the first equality is a particular case of (1.16) in [32] and the second uses the fact that \mathbf{R}_Δ and $s(z)$ are holomorphic on and within \mathcal{C} , implying

$$\oint_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{R}_\Delta \mathbf{v} dz = \oint_{\mathcal{C}} s(z) dz = 0.$$

Since $\psi(s_+)$ is the unique pole of $\zeta(z)$ in \mathcal{C} (recall that $\xi(\psi(s_+)) = 0$),

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 = \lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} (z - \psi(s_+)) \zeta(z) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}).\tag{4.33}$$

We compute the limit on the right-hand side using L'Hôpital's rule, as in Corollary 2 in [36]:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} (z - \psi(s_+)) \zeta(z) &= \lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} \frac{-s(z)(1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)) - (z - \psi(s_+))(1 + 2a_1 \gamma s(z))s'(z)}{(a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau)s'(z) + 2a_1 \tau \gamma s(z)s'(z)} \\ &= \lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} \frac{-s(z)(1 + a_1 \gamma s(z))}{(a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau)s'(z) + 2a_1 \tau \gamma s(z)s'(z)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.34}$$

The second equality follows from the continuity of $s(z)$ on (λ_+, ∞) , implying $s(z) \rightarrow s_+$ as $z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)$, and the observation

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau + 2a_1 \tau \gamma s(z) &= a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau + 2a_1 \tau \gamma s_+ > 0, \\ \lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} \frac{(z - \psi(s_+))(1 + 2a_1 \gamma s(z))}{a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1) + \tau + 2a_1 \tau \gamma s(z)} &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof using the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} s'(z) &= \lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} \left(\frac{1}{s^2(z)} - \frac{a_1^2 \gamma}{(1 + a_1 \gamma s(z))^2} - \gamma(\|f\|_\phi^2 - a_1^2) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{s_+^2} - \frac{a_1^2 \gamma}{(1 + a_1 \gamma s_+)^2} - \gamma(\|f\|_\phi^2 - a_1^2) \right)^{-1},\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

which is obtained by differentiating (2.1). By (4.34) and (4.35),

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \psi(s_+)} (z - \psi(s_+)) \zeta(z) = \theta^2(s_+).\tag{4.36}$$

Finally, we note that (4.34), $s_+ \in (-1/(a_1 \gamma), 0)$, and $s'(s_+) > 0$ imply $\theta^2(s_+) > 0$. \square

Proof of (4.18). Assume $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq 0$ without loss of generality and let \mathcal{C} denote a contour as in the proof of (4.17). Similarly to (4.32)–(4.36),

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle u_{1i} &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \mathbf{R}(z) \mathbf{v} dz = -\frac{v_i}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \zeta(z) dz + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \theta^2(s_+) v_i + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}).\end{aligned}\tag{4.37}$$

The claim now follows from (4.17) and the fact that the limit of $\theta(s_+)$ is strictly positive:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \theta(s_+) &= \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 - \theta^2(s_+)}{\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle + \theta(s_+)} = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \\ u_{1i} &= \frac{\theta^2(s_+)v_i}{\theta(s_+) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2})} + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}) = \theta(s_+)v_i + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}).\end{aligned}\tag{4.38}$$

□

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-1)}$ be a semi-orthogonal matrix such that $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top = \mathbf{I}_p$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,*

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}(z\mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} = z + (\zeta(z))^{-1} - a_1(\lambda - 1) - \tau + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/4}).$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets of \mathbb{C}^+ .

Proof. As the proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.4, we only sketch the argument. By the Woodbury identity, we have

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}(z\mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} = z + (\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{R}\mathbf{v})^{-1} - \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v}.$$

Theorem 2.3, Lemma 4.4, and the bound $|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - 1| \prec n^{-1/2}$ yield $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{R}\mathbf{v} = \zeta(z) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^\top + \mathbf{K}_0 + \mathbf{\Delta})\mathbf{v} \\ &= (\mathbf{\Lambda})_{11} + 2(\mathbf{\Lambda})_{12} + \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}_0\mathbf{v} + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/4}).\end{aligned}$$

The claim now follows from $|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}_0\mathbf{v}| \prec n^{-1/2}$, which is proven similarly to (4.10).

□

Proof of (4.19). Let $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-1)}$ be a semi-orthogonal matrix such that $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\top + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top = \mathbf{I}_p$. Similarly to Section 2 of [38], we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} & \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W} \\ \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} & \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}_1 \end{bmatrix},$$

yielding $\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_1^\top \mathbf{v}(\lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v}$ (the inverse exists almost surely). Furthermore, using the normalization condition $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 + \|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}_1\|_2^2 = 1$, we obtain the equation

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 (1 + \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}(\lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v}) = 1.\tag{4.39}$$

We shall prove

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}(\lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty,\tag{4.40}$$

implying $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ by (4.39).

By Lemma 4.5,

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}(z\mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-1} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{a.s.} z + (\zeta(z))^{-1} - a_1(\lambda - 1) - \tau,$$

where the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets of \mathbb{C}^+ . Since $\lambda_1 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+$ by (4.17) and uniform convergence of an analytic sequence implies uniform convergence of the derivative,

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W}((\lambda_1 + i\eta)\mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K}\mathbf{v} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1 - \frac{\zeta'(\lambda_+ + i\eta)}{\zeta^2(\lambda_+ + i\eta)},\tag{4.41}$$

for any $\eta > 0$. Since $s(\lambda_+ + i\eta) \rightarrow s_0$ and $|s'(\lambda_+ + i\eta)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, and

$$1 - \frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta^2(z)} = \frac{1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)(2 + a_1(\lambda + \gamma - 1)s(z))}{s^2(z)(1 + a_1 \gamma s(z))^2} \cdot s'(z),$$

we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} ((\lambda_1 + i\eta) \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{v} \right| \\ & \geq \liminf_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} ((\lambda_+ + i\eta) \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{v} \right| \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

The claim now follows from

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} (\lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{v} > \left| \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} ((\lambda_1 + i\eta) \mathbf{I}_{p-1} - \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W})^{-2} \mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{v} \right|.$$

□

4.2 Proof of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7

Throughout this section, we assume (2.10) and f satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.6.

Lemma 4.6. *There exist odd polynomials $\{f_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\|f - f_\ell\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$ and*

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{K}(f_\ell)\|_2 = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0.$$

Lemma 4.6, the proof of which is deferred to Appendix B, builds on [22] in that (1) Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 of [22] pertain only to the kernel matrix of noise $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ and (2) Theorem 1.4 assumes f is continuously differentiable.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Let $\{f_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the polynomials given by Lemma 4.6 and $a_{\ell,k} := \langle f_\ell, h_k \rangle_\phi$. We shall bound the right-hand side of

$$\|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{K}(f_\ell)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{K}(f_\ell) - \mathbf{A}(f_\ell)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{A}(f_\ell) - \mathbf{A}(f)\|_2. \quad (4.43)$$

Since Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 2.3 state that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}(f) - \mathbf{K}(f_\ell)\|_2 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}(f_\ell) - \mathbf{A}(f_\ell)\|_2 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0,$$

we focus on the third term of (4.43):

$$\|\mathbf{A}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f_\ell)\|_2 \leq |a_1 - a_{\ell,1}| \cdot \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{K}_0(h_1)\|_2 + |\tau - \tau(f_\ell)| + \|\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2, \quad (4.44)$$

where $\tau(f_\ell) := \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_{\ell,k} (\lambda - 1)^k / (\sqrt{k!} \beta^{k-1})$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and $\|f - f_\ell\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$, we have $|a_1 - a_{\ell,1}| \rightarrow 0$ and

$$|\tau - \tau(f_\ell)| \leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(\lambda - 1)^k}{\sqrt{k!} \beta^{k-1}} \right)^2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k - a_{\ell,k})^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \|f - f_\ell\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$$

as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, using the almost-sure bound $\|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{K}_0(h_1)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{X}\|_2 + \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{S}) - \mathbf{I}_p\|_2 \lesssim 1$,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{A}(f) - \mathbf{A}(f_\ell)\|_2 \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0.$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *The operator norm of the kernel matrix of noise satisfies*

$$\|\mathbf{K}_0(f)\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+.$$

Proof. Let $\{f_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the polynomials given by Lemma 4.6 and $\lambda_+(f_\ell)$ the supremum of the support of the LSD of $\mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)$; by Theorem 1.7 of [22], $\|\mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_+(f_\ell)$. As $\|f - f_\ell\|_\phi \rightarrow 0$ and the solutions to $\psi'(s) = 0$ depend continuously on the coefficients of equation (2.2), we have $\lambda_+(f_\ell) \rightarrow \lambda_+$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}_0(f)\|_2 &\leq \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|\mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \lambda_+, \\ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}_0(f)\|_2 &\geq \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|\mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_0(f_\ell)\|_2) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \lambda_+. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

□

Theorem 2.7 follows from Theorems 2.3 and 2.6, Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7, Weyl's inequality, and the Davis-Kahan theorem.

4.3 Proofs for Section 2.3

Recall $\psi(s)$ and s_+ , defined in Corollary 2.2 and Theorem 2.4, respectively. In this section, for clarity, we write $[\psi'(s_+)](f, \lambda)$ to reflect that s_+ and $\psi'(s)$ each depend on f and λ . Corollary 2.9 is a consequence of Theorem 2.5 and Lemma 4.8:

Lemma 4.8. *If $[\psi'(s_+)](f, \lambda) > 0$, there exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[\psi'(s_+)](f_\ell, \lambda) > 0$ for all $\ell \geq L$.*

This follows from $\tau(f_\ell, \beta, \lambda) \rightarrow \tau(f, \beta, \lambda)$ and $[\psi'(s_+)](f_\ell) \rightarrow [\psi'(s_+)](f)$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 2.10. We will consider $\gamma < 1$; the cases $\gamma = 1$ and $\gamma > \infty$ are similar. Let $a_1 := \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi$. Since $\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \mathcal{R}(f/a_1, \gamma, \beta, \cdot)$ and $\inf \mathcal{R}(f - a_1 h_1, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ (see Remark 2.2), we may assume $a_1 = 1$ without loss of generality. Then,

$$\psi'(s) = \frac{1}{s^2} - \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma s)^2} - \gamma(\|f\|_\phi^2 - 1).$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot)$,

$$\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) \subseteq \left\{ \lambda \geq 1 : \frac{1}{s_+^2} - \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma s_+)^2} > 0 \right\}. \quad (4.46)$$

Since $\tau(f, \beta, \lambda) \rightarrow 0$ and $s_+ \rightarrow -1/(\lambda + \gamma - 1)$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$(1 + \gamma s_+)^2 - \gamma s_+^2 = -\gamma(1 - \gamma) \left(s_+ - \frac{\sqrt{\gamma} + \gamma}{\gamma - \gamma^2} \right) \left(s_+ + \frac{\sqrt{\gamma} - \gamma}{\gamma - \gamma^2} \right),$$

we obtain from (4.46) the lower bound

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \inf \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) \geq \inf \left\{ \lambda \geq 1 : \frac{1}{\lambda + \gamma - 1} < \frac{\sqrt{\gamma} - \gamma}{\gamma - \gamma^2} \right\}. \quad (4.47)$$

The inequality on the right-hand side is equivalent to

$$\lambda > 1 + \frac{\gamma - \gamma^2}{\sqrt{\gamma} - \gamma} - \gamma = 1 + \sqrt{\gamma},$$

completing the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 2.12. In this proof, we write $s_+(\lambda, \tau(\lambda))$ as f , γ , and β are fixed. Since $s_+(\lambda, \tau)$ is increasing in each argument (see (4.20)), $s_+(\lambda, \tau(\lambda))$ is increasing in λ . Recalling that $s_+ \in (-1/(a_1, \gamma), 0)$ and $\psi'(s)$ has a unique root s_0 in this interval, it follows that

$$\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \{\lambda \geq 1 : \psi'(s_+(\lambda, \tau(\lambda))) > 0\} = (\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta), \infty),$$

where we define

$$\lambda_*(f, \gamma, \beta) := \inf \{\lambda \geq 1 : \psi'(s_+(\lambda, \tau(\lambda))) > 0\}.$$

□

Proof of Corollary 2.13. Let f_λ have Hermite coefficients $\langle f_\lambda, h_1 \rangle_\phi = 0$ and

$$\langle f_\lambda, h_k \rangle_\phi = \begin{cases} \frac{(\lambda - 1)^k}{\sqrt{k!} \beta^{k-1}} & k \text{ odd,} \\ 0 & k \text{ even,} \end{cases} \quad k \neq 1.$$

Given any $f \in L_o^2(\phi)$, consider the kernel

$$\check{f}_\lambda := \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi h_1 + \frac{\sqrt{\|f\|_\phi^2 - \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi^2}}{\|f_\lambda\|_\phi} f_\lambda.$$

The orthogonality of the Hermite polynomials implies $\|\check{f}_\lambda\|_\phi = \|f\|_\phi$ and $\langle \check{f}_\lambda, h_1 \rangle_\phi = \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi$. Moreover, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(f, \beta, \lambda) &= \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{\langle f, h_k \rangle_\phi (\lambda - 1)^k}{\sqrt{k!} \beta^{k-1}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\|f\|_\phi^2 - \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi^2} \left(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda - 1)^{2k}}{k! \beta^{2(k-1)}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{\|f\|_\phi^2 - \langle f, h_1 \rangle_\phi^2} \|f_\lambda\|_\phi. \\ &= \tau(\check{f}_\lambda, \beta, \lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.12, these properties imply

$$[\psi'(s_+)](f, \lambda) \leq [\psi'(s_+)](\check{f}_\lambda, \lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot).$$

Thus, since $\mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot)$ is invariant under rescalings of f ,

$$\bigcup_{f \in L_o^2(\phi)} \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \bigcup_{a \geq 0} \bigcup_{\lambda > 1} \mathcal{R}(ah_1 + f_\lambda, \gamma, \beta, \cdot). \tag{4.49}$$

Consider $\{(a_k, \lambda_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}(a_k h_1 + f_{\lambda_k}, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \inf_{a \geq 0, \lambda \geq 1} \mathcal{R}(ah_1 + f_\lambda, \gamma, \beta, \cdot).$$

Assuming $\{\|a_k h_1 + f_{\lambda_k}\|_\phi\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded without loss of generality, there exists a convergent subsequence $\{(a_{k_\ell}, \lambda_{k_\ell})\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$; let $a_{k_\ell} \rightarrow a_* \geq 0$ and $\lambda_{k_\ell} \rightarrow \lambda_* > 1$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, and define $f^* := a_* h_1 + f_{\lambda_*}$. As $[\psi'(s_+)](f, \lambda)$ is continuous in the Hermite coefficients of f , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}(a_{k_\ell} h_1 + f_{\lambda_{k_\ell}}, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(f^*, \gamma, \beta, \cdot).$$

Together with Lemma 2.12, this yields

$$\bigcup_{f \in L^2_\beta(\phi)} \mathcal{R}(f, \gamma, \beta, \cdot) = \mathcal{R}(f^*, \gamma, \beta, \cdot). \quad (4.50)$$

To complete the proof, we note that (4.48) implies

$$\lambda_* = \inf \{ \lambda \geq 1 : [\psi'(s_+)](f^*, \lambda) > 0 \}.$$

□

5 Proof of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3

Throughout this section, f and g are odd polynomials and $L := \deg(f) \vee \deg(g)$. For simplicity, the proofs given below assume $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, implying $\|\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\|_2 \leq \text{Im}(z)^{-1} < \infty$. Given a compact set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Re}(z) > \lambda_+$, the extension from pointwise to uniform convergence is made by restricting calculations to the event $\{\|\mathbf{K}_0(f)\|_2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_+\}$, which occurs with probability at least $1 - n^{-D}$ by Lemma 4.1. As $\varepsilon, D > 0$ are arbitrary, this implies

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}} \|\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\|_2 \prec 1.$$

The generalizations of (4.10) and (4.12) to the asymmetric case $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{w}$ follows by applying symmetric results to $\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}) &= \|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 s(z) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= 2s(z) + 2\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w} + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

yielding $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w} = (\|\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}\|_2^2/2 - 1)s(z) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}) = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle s(z) + O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2})$. The generalization of (4.11) follows from slight modifications of arguments in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

Lemma 4.2 is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2:

Lemma 5.1. *For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$,*

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w}] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w}] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{w}] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (5.3)$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let $p/n = \gamma + O(n^{-1/2})$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w}] - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle s(z) = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.4)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{w}] - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \check{s}(z) = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.5)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)\mathbf{S}\mathbf{w}] - \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \rangle \check{s}(z) = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \quad (5.6)$$

Lemma 4.3 is a corollary of Lemmas 5.3–5.5 and the proof of Theorem 2.3. Recalling

$$\mathbf{X} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{S} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} - \mathbf{S} = c \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})^\top + (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}^\top),$$

with $c := (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)^2(\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{v}) + 2(\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)$, we define $\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) := \mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})$; the superscript of $\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g)$ signifies that only the first m rows and columns of this matrix are non-zero.

Lemma 5.3. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 \vee \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \lesssim m$,

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} \right] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (5.7)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} \right] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (5.8)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{w} - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{w} \right] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (5.9)$$

Lemma 5.4. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 \vee \|\mathbf{w}\|_0 \lesssim m$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} \right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.10)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{w} \right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.11)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)}(g) \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) \mathbf{S} \mathbf{w} \right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \quad (5.12)$$

Lemma 5.5. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{S}^{p-1}$,

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) (\mathbf{v} \odot (\mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})) = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (5.13)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0(f, z) (\mathbf{v} \odot (\mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})) = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (5.14)$$

The proof of Lemma 5.5 is similar to that of Lemma 5.1 and is omitted.

Henceforth, for brevity, we shall often suppress the arguments of matrices such as $\mathbf{K}_0(f)$ and $\mathbf{R}_0(f, z)$.

5.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

We shall prove (5.3); the proofs of (5.1) and (5.2) are similar and omitted.

Our approach is to express $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}]$ as the sum of a martingale difference sequence and then apply the Burkholder inequality (Lemma 5.8); this method, applied to sample covariance matrices, is standard in random matrix theory (see Sections 8 and 10 of [3]), although the extension to kernel matrices is involved.

For $j \in [n]$, let $\mathbf{S}_{-j} := \mathbf{S} - n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top$, $\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}$ denote the kernel matrix of \mathbf{S}_{-j} (defined analogously to (1.5)), and $\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} := (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} - z \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}$. Define $\mathcal{F}_0 := \emptyset$, $\mathcal{F}_j := \sigma(\{\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_j\})$, the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_j(\cdot) := \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_j)$, and $\alpha_j := (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}$. Then, $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in [n]}$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_j\}_{j \in [n]}$ and we have the decomposition

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}] = \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j. \quad (5.15)$$

We further expand α_j into four terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j &= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right] \\ &= \alpha_{j,1} + 2\alpha_{j,2} + 2\alpha_{j,3} + \alpha_{j,4}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{j,1} &:= \frac{1}{n^2} (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j)^2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_j \right], \\ \alpha_{j,2} &:= \frac{1}{n} (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right], \\ \alpha_{j,3} &:= \frac{1}{n} (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right], \\ \alpha_{j,4} &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

The proof of (5.3) is a consequence of the Burkholder inequality applied to $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in [n]}$ and the following bound on $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}|\alpha_j|^k$ (which we derive by bounding $\alpha_{j_1}, \dots, \alpha_{j_4}$):

Lemma 5.6. *For each $j \in [n]$, define the random variable*

$$\Gamma_j := 1 \vee \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 \vee \left(\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2 \right) \vee \left(\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_\infty \right).$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1}|\alpha_j|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^{4k}.$$

Lemma 5.7. *For all $j \in [n]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\Gamma_j \prec 1, \quad \mathbb{E} \Gamma_j^k \lesssim n^\varepsilon. \quad (5.17)$$

Lemma 5.8 (Burkholder inequality, Lemma 2.13 of [4]). *Let $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a martingale difference sequence with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, and let $\mathbb{E}_j(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_j)$. Then, for $k \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \right|^k \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_j|^2 \right)^{k/2} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |\alpha_j|^k$$

(the implied constant depends only on k).

Proof of (5.3). By Lemma 5.6 and Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |\alpha_j|^k &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^{k-1}} \mathbb{E} \Gamma_1^{4k}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_j|^2 \right)^{k/2} \right] &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^8 \right)^{k/2} \right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^8 \right)^{k/2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Now, for $j \in [n]$, let $\tilde{\Gamma}_j$ denote Γ_j with columns $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{j-1}$ of \mathbf{Z} replaced by i.i.d. copies $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{j-1}$, enabling us to write $\mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^8 = \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\Gamma}_j^8 | \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n]$ and yielding the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_j|^2 \right)^{k/2} \right] &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{j \in [n]} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{\Gamma}_j^8 | \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n] \right)^{k/2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{4k} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Using Lemma 5.7 and a union bound, for $\varepsilon, D > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{4k} \right] &\lesssim n^\varepsilon + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{4k} \cdot \mathbf{1} \left(\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{4k} > n^\varepsilon \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim n^\varepsilon + \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{8k} \right] \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{j \in [n]} \tilde{\Gamma}_j^{4k} > n^\varepsilon \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim n^\varepsilon + n^{1+\varepsilon-D/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Thus, applying the Burkholder inequality (Lemma 5.8) to (5.15) with (5.18)–(5.20), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}]|^k \lesssim n^{1+\varepsilon-k} + n^{\varepsilon-k/2},$$

implying (5.3) by Markov's inequality as $k \geq 2$ is arbitrary. \square

Lemma 5.9. *The kernel matrix has the decomposition*

$$\mathbf{K}_0(f) = \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f) + \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j},$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} := \frac{a_1}{n} \mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top, \quad \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top),$$

and the operator norm of $\mathbf{\Delta}_3$ satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n} (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L}) \cdot \Gamma_j.$$

The following concentration inequality for Gaussian quadratic forms, which is a special case of Lemma B.26 from [3], is key to the proof of Lemma 5.6:

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be independent of \mathbf{z}_j . For $k \geq 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z}_j|^k &= |\mathbb{E}_{j-1}(\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z}_j - \text{tr} \mathbf{A})|^k \leq \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j}(\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z}_j - \text{tr} \mathbf{A})|^k \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^k. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.6. The claim follows immediately from the bounds

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_{j,r}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^{4k}, \quad r \in [4],$$

which we prove below:

(1) By Jensen's inequality and $\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_2 \leq \text{Im}(z)^{-1} \lesssim 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_{j,1}|^k \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{2k}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [(\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_j)^k |\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j|^{2k}] \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{2k}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2^{2k} |\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j|^{2k}] \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k}. \quad (5.21)$$

(2) Let $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j}(\cdot)$ denote expectation with respect to \mathbf{z}_j . Since $\mathbb{E}_{j-1}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j}(\cdot)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_{j,2}|^k \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_j \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}|^k \right] \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_j \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^k \leq \mathbb{E}_j \Gamma_j^k. \quad (5.22)$$

(3) By Lemma 5.9 and $\|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_j^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}, \\ |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}| &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2^2 |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}| \leq \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}|, \\ |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f' - a_1) \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2 \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f' - a_1)\|_2 \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^3 \Gamma_j^2, \\ |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}| &\lesssim \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2 \|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}\|_2 \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L+1}) \Gamma_j^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Moreover, as $\mathbf{R}_{0,-j}$ and \mathbf{S}_{-j} are independent of \mathbf{z}_j , $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}|^k \lesssim \|\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}\|_2^k \lesssim \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^k$. Together, these bounds imply

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_{j,3}|^k \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left| \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_j \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_j \Gamma_j^{2k}.$$

(4) Since $\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} = -\mathbf{R}_0(\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j})\mathbf{R}_{0,-j}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} &= -\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \\ &= -\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

We bound $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}$ similarly to (5.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^k &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^{2k} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \Gamma_j^{2k}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^k &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^{2k} \|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}\|_2^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^k} \Gamma_j^{3k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

To analyze the corresponding term involving $\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j}$, we use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top)) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{z}_j^\top \left(\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \right) \mathbf{z}_j \end{aligned}$$

(this follows from $\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{z}_j$) and concentration of Gaussian quadratic forms (Lemma 5.10):

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\mathbf{z}_j^\top \left(\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \right) \mathbf{z}_j \right] \right|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\| \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \right\|_F^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[\|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^{2k} \|\sqrt{n} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1)\|_\infty^k \right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^{3k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Here, to obtain the second inequality, we used $\|\mathbf{A} \odot (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top)\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top\|_F = \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$, for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

The second term on the right-hand side of (5.24) satisfies

$$\left| \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right| \lesssim \delta_{1,j} + \delta_{2,j} + \delta_{3,j}, \quad (5.27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{1,j} &:= \frac{1}{n^2} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2^2 \left| \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right|^2, \\ \delta_{2,j} &:= \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_2 \left| \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{R}_{-j} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{u} \right| \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}\|_2), \\ \delta_{3,j} &:= \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^2 (\|\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j}\|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

By arguments similar to (5.23)–(5.25), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} |\delta_{1,j}|^k \lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \Gamma_j^{2k}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} |\delta_{2,j}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^k} \Gamma_j^{3k}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} |\delta_{3,j}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \Gamma_j^{4k}. \quad (5.28)$$

Combining the above bounds completes the proof:

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\alpha_{j,4}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \Gamma_j^{4k}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5.7. By Theorem 1.6 of [22] and standard results on Gaussian matrices (such as Corollary 5.35 of [41]), we have $\|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2 \prec 1$ for $\ell \in [L]$ and $\|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 \prec 1$. Moreover,

$$\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_\infty = \sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sup_{k_1 \neq k_2 \in [n] \setminus \{j\}} |h_\ell(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}_{k_1}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k_2})|,$$

and each term satisfies $|h_\ell(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}_{k_1}^\top \mathbf{z}_{k_2})| \prec 1$ by Lemma 4.1 of [13] and Markov's inequality. Thus, using a union bound, we conclude that $\Gamma_j \prec 1$.

To prove the second point of the lemma, we use the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \Gamma_j^{2k} \lesssim 1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2^{2k} + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2^{2k} + \|\sqrt{n} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_\infty^{2k} \right] \lesssim n^{2k} \quad (5.29)$$

(which follows from $\|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\|_F$ and $\|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_F$) and the fact that for any $\varepsilon, D > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_j| > n^\varepsilon) \leq n^{-D}$ for sufficiently large n :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \Gamma_j^k &\leq \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_j^k \mathbf{1}(\Gamma_j \leq n^\varepsilon)] + \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_j^k \mathbf{1}(\Gamma_j > n^\varepsilon)] \\ &\leq n^\varepsilon + (\mathbb{E} \Gamma_j^{2k} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_j > n^\varepsilon))^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim n^\varepsilon + n^{k-D/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Taking $D \geq 2k$ completes the proof.

□

Proof of Lemma 5.9. Similarly to (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_0(f) &= \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f') \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=2}^{L-\ell} \frac{a_{\ell+k}}{k! n^{k/2}} \sqrt{\frac{(\ell+k)!}{\ell!}} \left[\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top)^{\odot k} \right], \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f') \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) &= \frac{a_1}{n} \mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f' - a_1) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) - \frac{a_1}{n} \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot 2}) \\ &= \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} - \frac{a_1}{n} \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot 2}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,j} &:= \mathbf{K}_0(f) - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(f) - \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,j} - \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,j} \\ &= -\frac{a_1}{n} \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot 2}) + \sum_{\ell=0}^L \sum_{k=2}^{L-\ell} \frac{a_{\ell+k}}{k! n^{k/2}} \sqrt{\frac{(\ell+k)!}{\ell!}} \left[\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top)^{\odot k} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma now follows from $\|\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot 2})\|_2 = \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2$, our assumption that f is an odd function (implying $a_2 = 0$), and the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_0) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top)^{\odot k}\|_2 &\leq \frac{2}{n^{(k-1)/2}} \|\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot k}\|_\infty^2 \leq \frac{2}{n^{(k-1)/2}} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2k}, \\ \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top)^{\odot k}\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot k}) \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell) \text{diag}(\mathbf{z}_j^{\odot k})\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

□

5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Lemma 5.11. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 5.2,*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} - s(z) = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} - \check{s}(z) = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets disjoint from $\text{supp}(\mu)$.

Proof. The first claim follows from the proof of Theorem 3.4 of [13] and Theorem 1.6 of [22]. The proof of the second claim is similar to that of Lemma 1 of [36]. □

For $j \in [p]$, let $\mathbf{z}_{(j)}$ denote the j -th column of \mathbf{Z} and $\mathbf{Z}_{(-j)}$ contain the remaining columns. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} &= -\left(z + n^{-1} f(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}_{(1)}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{(-1)}^\top) \left((\mathbf{K}_0)_{[2:p,2:p]} - z \mathbf{I}_{p-1} \right)^{-1} f(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{Z}_{(-1)} \mathbf{z}_{(1)}) \right)^{-1}, \\ (\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} \cdot f(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}_{(1)}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{(-1)}^\top) \left((\mathbf{K}_0)_{[2:p,2:p]} - z \mathbf{I}_{p-1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{e}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where f is applied elementwise.

Proof of (5.4). By exchangeability,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u}] = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} + (\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}_p \rangle^2 - 1) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}. \quad (5.34)$$

Since f is an odd function, (5.33) implies $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}$ is odd with respect to $\mathbf{z}_{(1)}$; therefore, by the symmetry of the Gaussian distribution,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} | \mathbf{Z}_{(-1)}]] = 0.$$

The claim now follows Lemma 5.11. □

Proof of (5.5). The proof is similar to that of (5.4):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u}] &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{11} + (\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}_p \rangle^2 - 1) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}, \\ (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p \langle \mathbf{z}_{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{(j)} \rangle (\mathbf{R}_0)_{j2} = \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{z}_{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{(2)} \rangle (\mathbf{R}_0)_{22} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq 2} \langle \mathbf{z}_{(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{(j)} \rangle (\mathbf{R}_0)_{j2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

Since $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{22}$ and $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{j2}$ are even and odd functions of $\mathbf{z}_{(2)}$, respectively,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} | \mathbf{Z}_{(-2)}]] = 0.$$

□

Proof of (5.6). By exchangeability,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_i)^2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_i] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S}_{-i} \mathbf{u}] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1)^2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1] + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1)^2 (\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1])] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_1^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-1}) \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}],
\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

where the final equality holds as $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1)^2 = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}]$. We will consider each of the terms on the right-hand side (5.36), beginning with the first and third: using (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1] &= \frac{p}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0) = \gamma \check{s}(z) + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \\
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] &= \check{s}(z) + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

The second term is negligible: an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 5.1 yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1] = O_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1]|^2 = O(n^{-1+\varepsilon}), \tag{5.38}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, implying

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1)^2 (\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1])] &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1]|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

We expand the fourth term of (5.36) using Lemma 5.9:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-1}) \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1] = - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1]. \tag{5.40}$$

Denoting $\eta_1 := \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}$, we have $\mathbb{E}|\eta_1|^2 = O(n^\varepsilon)$ by Lemma 5.10 and $\|\mathbf{S}_{-1}\|_2 \prec 1$. Using this bound, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.37), and (5.38), we find that the component of (5.40) involving $\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1}$ is approximately $-a_1 \gamma \check{s}^2(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1] &= \frac{a_1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1] \\
&= a_1 \mathbb{E}[(n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \gamma \check{s}(z)) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] + a_1 \gamma \check{s}(z) \mathbb{E} \eta_1 \\
&\quad + a_1 \mathbb{E}[(n^{-1} \mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_1 - \gamma \check{s}(z)) \eta_1] + a_1 \gamma \check{s}(z) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}] \\
&= a_1 \gamma \check{s}^2(z) + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the final line of (5.23) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1] &\lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} ((\log n)^{4L+2} \mathbb{E} \Gamma_1^4)^{1/2} \\
&= O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

It remains to prove that the component of (5.40) involving $\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1}$ is negligible,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.42)$$

which we address below. From (5.40)–(5.42), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-1}) \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] = -a_1 \gamma \check{s}^2(z) + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Together with (5.36)–(5.39), this equation yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{S} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{S} \mathbf{u}] = \gamma \check{s}(z) + \check{s}(z) - a_1 \gamma \check{s}^2(z) + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}),$$

completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of (5.42). By Lemma 5.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} (\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} + \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1}) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds $\|\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1}\|_2 \leq n^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty^2 \Gamma_1$ and $\|\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1}\|_2 \leq n^{-1} (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty^{2L}) \Gamma_1$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we find that the terms of this expansion involving $\mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1}$ and $\mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1}$ are negligible:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] &\lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}\left|\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty^{10} \Gamma_1^6\right]\right)^{1/2} = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \\ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] &\lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}\left|\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{3,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u}\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{z}_1\|_\infty^{4L+6} \Gamma_1^6\right]\right)^{1/2} = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

However, the corresponding term containing $\mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1}$ is significant: by (5.37) and (5.38),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{1,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] = a_1 \gamma s(z) \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + a_1 \gamma s(z)} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] + O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

We proceed by expanding the expectation on the right-hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i,j,k,\ell=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[z_{1i} z_{1j} z_{1k} z_{1\ell} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ik} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{k\ell} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{\ell j}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

Now, for $\mathbf{z}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$ and an array $(a_{ijkl} : i, j, k, \ell \in [p])$,

$$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell=1}^p a_{ijkl} \mathbb{E}[z_{1i} z_{1j} z_{1k} z_{1\ell}] = \sum_{i,j=1}^p (a_{iijj} + a_{ijij} + a_{ijji}).$$

Applying this identity to (5.45), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{z}_1^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{2,1} \mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_1\right] &= \sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ij} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{jj} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{ii}\right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{jj}\right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ij} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{ij}\right], \end{aligned}$$

with the first summation equal to zero as $\text{diag}(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1)) = 0$.

Since $\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1)_{ij}$ and $(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii}$ are even functions of $\mathbf{z}_{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{(j)}$ (recall that $f' - a_1$ is even), and $(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{j\ell}$ is an odd function of $\mathbf{z}_{(\ell)}$ unless $j = \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{jj}\right] \\ &= \sum_{i,j,\ell=1}^p u_j u_\ell \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{j\ell}\right] \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^p u_j^2 \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{jj}\right] \\ &= (p-1) \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{11} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{22}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

Recall that $|(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} - s(z)| \prec n^{-1/2}$ and $|(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{ii} - \gamma \check{s}(z)| \prec n^{-1/2}$ by Lemma 5.1, (5.4), and (5.5); the corresponding bounds

$$\mathbb{E}|(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} - s(z)|^k \lesssim n^{-k/2+\varepsilon}, \quad \mathbb{E}|(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{ii} - \gamma \check{s}(z)|^k \lesssim n^{-k/2+\varepsilon}, \tag{5.47}$$

are established through an analogous argument to the proof of Lemma 5.7. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left|((\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{11} - s(z)) (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{22}\right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left|(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{22}\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1-\varepsilon}} (\mathbb{E} \Gamma_1^4)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1-\varepsilon}}, \\ &\mathbb{E}\left|(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} ((\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{22} - \gamma \check{s}(z))\right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left|(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12}\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{1-\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.48}$$

Applying these bounds to (5.46), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{jj}\right] \\ &= \gamma s(z) \check{s}(z) (p-1) \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} + O(n^\varepsilon) = O(n^\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{5.49}$$

where the second equality follows from Section 4.1 of [13]:

$$\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} = \langle f' - a_1, h_0 \rangle_\phi + O(p^{-1}) = O(p^{-1}).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{ij} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}^\top)_{ij} \right] \right| \\ & \leq (p-1) \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1})_{12} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-1}(f' - a_1))_{12} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-1} \mathbf{S}_{-1})_{12} \right| \leq O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

The claim follows from (5.44), (5.49), and (5.50). \square

5.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

We shall prove (5.7); the proofs of (5.8) and (5.9) are similar and omitted.

Lemma 5.12. *For each $j \in [n]$, define the random variables*

$$\mathbf{X}_{-j} := \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{S}_{-j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} := \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\sqrt{n} \mathbf{X}_{-j}),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Gamma}_j &:= \Gamma_j \vee \left(\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sqrt{m} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}(h_\ell)\|_2 \right) \vee \left(\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}(h_\ell)\|_\infty \right) \\ &\vee \left(\sup_{i \in [p]} \sqrt{n} (\mathbf{S}_{-j} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})_i \right) \vee \left(\sup_{i \in [p]} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ii} \right) \vee \left(\sup_{i,k \in [p], i \neq k} \sqrt{n} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ik} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\bar{\Gamma}_j \prec 1, \quad \mathbb{E} \bar{\Gamma}_j^k \lesssim n^\varepsilon.$$

Lemma 5.13. *For each $j \in [n]$,*

$$\|\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (1 + |\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{z}_j|) \cdot (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L+1}) \cdot \bar{\Gamma}_j^2$$

Proofs of Lemmas 5.12 and 5.13 are provided at the end of this section.

Proof of (5.7). Analogous to Section 5.1, we express the left-hand side of (5.7) as the sum of a martingale difference sequence: defining

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}_j &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left(\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u} \right), \\ \bar{\alpha}_{j,1} &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{u}, \\ \bar{\alpha}_{j,2} &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} (\mathbf{R}_0 - \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{u}, \\ \bar{\alpha}_{j,3} &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\sqrt{n} \mathbf{X}_{-j})) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u} \\ \bar{\alpha}_{j,4} &:= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\sqrt{n} \mathbf{X}_{-j}) - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

we have the decomposition

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{K}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{K}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u}] = \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{\alpha}_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (\bar{\alpha}_{j,1} + 2\bar{\alpha}_{j,2} + \bar{\alpha}_{j,3} + \bar{\alpha}_{j,4}). \quad (5.51)$$

Given the proof of Lemma 5.1, it suffices to establish

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\alpha}_{j,r}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4k}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{4k}, \quad r \in [4]. \quad (5.52)$$

For brevity, we bound only $\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\alpha}_{j,2}|^k$ and $\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\alpha}_{j,3}|^k$; the analysis of $\bar{\alpha}_{j,1}$ and $\bar{\alpha}_{j,4}$ does not differ substantively from the arguments presented below and in Section 5.1.

(2) We expand $\bar{\alpha}_{j,2}$ using the identity $\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} - \mathbf{R}_0(\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j})\mathbf{R}_{0,-j}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}_{j,2} &= -(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u} \\ &= -(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\bar{\delta}_{j,1} + \bar{\delta}_{j,2} - \bar{\delta}_{j,3}), \\ \bar{\delta}_{j,1} &:= \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u}, \\ \bar{\delta}_{j,2} &:= \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u}, \\ \bar{\delta}_{j,3} &:= \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

The component of $\bar{\alpha}_{j,2}$ involving $\bar{\delta}_{j,1}$ is bounded similarly to (5.26): denoting $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j := \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{u}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k &= \frac{1}{n^k} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{z}_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{z}_j \right|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \right\|_F^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{5k/4}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^k, \\ \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\| \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \odot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \right\|_F^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{5k/4}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{2k}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,3} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^{5k/4}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{2k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Together with Lemma 5.9, these bounds yield

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\delta}_{j,1}|^k = \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} (\Delta_{j,1} + \Delta_{j,2} + \Delta_{j,3}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^{5k/4}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{2k}. \quad (5.55)$$

Now, we consider $\bar{\delta}_{j,2}$. By Lemma 5.13 and the independence of \mathbf{z}_j and $(\bar{\Gamma}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left\| \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \right\|_2 \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \Big|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| (1 + \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2(L+1)}) \bar{\Gamma}_j^2 \cdot (1 + |\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbf{v}|) \cdot \mathbf{z}_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2(L+1)k}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{2k}, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_j} \left\| \mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \right\|_2 \left\| \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1) \right\|_2 \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 \Big|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{(2L+3)k}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{3k}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly bounding $|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}) \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,3} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| \lesssim \|\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}\|_2 \|\Delta_{j,3}\|_2$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\delta}_{j,2}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{(4L+1)k}}{n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{3k}. \quad (5.56)$$

The analysis of $\bar{\delta}_{j,3}$ is analogous to (5.27)–(5.28). For example,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| &= \frac{1}{n^2} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{z}_j| |z_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| |z_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{z}_j| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{z}_j\|_2 |z_j^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| \|z_j\|_\infty^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_{z_j} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j|^k &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2k}}{n^k} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j}\|_2^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2k}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^k, \\ |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| &= \frac{1}{n} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{z}_j| |z_j^\top \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j| \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \mathbf{z}_j\|_2 \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (f' - a_1)\|_2 \|z_j\|_\infty^3, \\ \mathbb{E}_{z_j} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} \mathbf{R}_{0,-j} \Delta_{j,1} \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta_{j,2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j|^k &\lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{3k}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{2k}. \end{aligned}$$

From these and related bounds, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\delta}_{j,3}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4Lk}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{3k}. \quad (5.57)$$

Thus, by (5.55), (5.56), and (5.57),

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\alpha}_{j,2}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{4(L+1)k}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^{3k}. \quad (5.58)$$

(3) Since $\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_{-j} = (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}) + (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j})\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)$, it suffices to consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}))) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}))) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top ((\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}))) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j. \end{aligned}$$

We prove below a bound on the first term on the right-hand side; the second is handled in the standard manner by applying Lemma 5.9 to $\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}$, which yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{z_j} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top ((\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}))) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2k}}{n^k} + \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^{5k/4}} \bar{\Gamma}_j^k. \quad (5.59)$$

Similarly to (5.26),

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_{-j}))) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \right|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \left| (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) z_j^\top \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top)) z_j \right|^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \|\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top))\|_F^k \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{m^{k/2} n^k} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \|(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_{[1:m]}\|_1^k \Gamma_j^k, \end{aligned} \quad (5.60)$$

where the final inequality follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top(\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top))\|_F^2 &= |\mathbf{v}^\top(\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^\top))^2 \mathbf{v}| \\
&\leq \sum_{i,k=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left| v_i v_k (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j})_{i\ell} (\mathbf{K}_{0,-j})_{\ell k} (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_i (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_k (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_\ell^2 \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i,k=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^p |(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_i (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_k (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_\ell^2| \cdot \Gamma_j^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, to bound $\|(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_{[1:m]}\|_1$, we use $\|\mathbf{u}\|_0 \lesssim m$ and Lemma 5.12:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j)_{[1:m]}\|_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^m |(\mathbf{R}_{0,-j}\mathbf{u})_i| = \sum_{i=1}^m \left| (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ii} u_i + \sum_{k \in [p], k \neq i} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ik} u_k \right| \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^m (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ii}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{k \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}), k \neq i} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ik}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{m} \bar{\Gamma}_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.61}$$

From (5.59)–(5.61), we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\bar{\alpha}_{j,3}|^k \lesssim \frac{(\log n)^{2Lk}}{n^k} \bar{\Gamma}_j^k. \tag{5.62}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5.12. Recall the identity $\mathbf{A} \odot (\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^\top) = \text{diag}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{A}\text{diag}(\mathbf{y})$ and from the proof of Theorem 2.3

$$\mathbf{X}_{-j} = c_{-j} \cdot \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1)(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})^\top + (\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}^\top), \tag{5.63}$$

where c_{-j} (defined analogously to c in (4.2)) satisfies $|c_{-j} - 1| \prec n^{-1/2}$. Used together with (4.3) and (4.9), these expressions lead to

$$\|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X})\|_2 \lesssim \|(\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell))_{[1:m,1:m]}\|_2 + \sqrt{m} \left(\sup_{i \in [p]} |(\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})_i| \right) \|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j}(h_\ell)\|_2 \prec \frac{1}{n^{1/4}}.$$

Thus,

$$\left(\sup_{\ell \in [L]} \sqrt{m} \| \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)}(h_\ell) \|_2 \right) \vee \left(\sup_{i \in [p]} \sqrt{n} (\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})_i \right) \prec 1.$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\left(\sup_{i \in [p]} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ii} \right) \vee \left(\sup_{i,k \in [p], i \neq k} \sqrt{n} (\mathbf{R}_{0,-j})_{ik} \right) \prec 1.$$

The claim now follows from Lemma 5.6 and an argument analogous to (5.29)–(5.30). □

Proof of Lemma 5.13. Using (5.63),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}_0^{(m)} - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}^{(m)} &= \mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X} - \sqrt{n}\mathbf{X}_{-j}) + (\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X}_{-j}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\sqrt{\lambda} - 1) \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{z}_j \cdot \mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{z}_j^\top + \mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{v}^\top) + \Delta_{j,1}^{(m)} + \Delta_{j,2}^{(m)} + \Delta_{j,3}^{(m)},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.64}$$

where $\Delta_{j,3}^{(m)} = \Delta_{j,3} \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{X}_{-j}) + (c - c_{-j})\mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)$ and

$$\Delta_{j,1}^{(m)} := \frac{\langle g, h_1 \rangle_\phi}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \odot \mathbf{X}_{-j}, \quad \Delta_{j,2}^{(m)} := \mathbf{K}_{0,-j} (g' - \langle g, h_1 \rangle_\phi) \odot (\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \odot \mathbf{X}_{-j}.$$

Using (4.3) and (4.9) as in the proof of Lemma 5.12,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{j,2}^{(m)}\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{3/4}} (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2) \cdot \bar{\Gamma}_j^2, & \|\Delta_{j,3}^{(m)}\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{n^{5/4}} (1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L}) \cdot \bar{\Gamma}_j^2, \\ \|\Delta_{j,1}^{(m)}\|_2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\|(\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \odot (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)\|_2 + \|(\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \odot (\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v})^\top)\|_2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{S}_{-j}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}\|_\infty \prec \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2 \bar{\Gamma}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (5.65)$$

Similarly, by Lemma 5.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{K}_0 \odot (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{z}_j^\top + \mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{v}^\top)\|_2 &\leq 2\|\mathbf{K}_{0,-j} \odot (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{z}_j^\top)\|_2 + 2\|(\mathbf{K}_0 - \mathbf{K}_{0,-j}) \odot (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{z}_j^\top)\|_2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty}{\sqrt{m}} \left(\bar{\Gamma}_j + \|\Delta_{j,1}\|_2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^2}{\sqrt{n}} \bar{\Gamma}_j + \frac{(1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L})}{n} \bar{\Gamma}_j \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1 \vee \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_\infty^{2L+1}}{\sqrt{m}} \bar{\Gamma}_j. \end{aligned}$$

□

5.4 Proof of Lemma 5.4

We shall prove the bounds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} \right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.66)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} \right] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \quad (5.67)$$

from which (5.10) immediately follows; the proofs of (5.11) and (5.12) are similar and omitted. For simplicity, we assume $\text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) = [m]$.

Proof of (5.66). Expanding the expectation,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u} \right] = \frac{\sqrt{n}}{m} \sum_{i,j,k,\ell=1}^m u_i u_j \mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik} (\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j}], \quad (5.68)$$

we claim only those terms on the right-hand side with $i = j$ have non-zero mean. To see this, suppose $i \neq j$, and recall that (1) $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ij}$ and $(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{ij}$ are odd functions of $\mathbf{z}_{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{(j)}$ and (2) $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ii}$ is an even function of $\mathbf{z}_{(i)}$ by (5.33). Therefore, unless $(i, j) = (k, \ell)$ or $(i, j) = (\ell, k)$,

$$\mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik} (\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j}] = 0.$$

In the former case,

$$\mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik} (\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j}] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_{(i)}} [(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ii} (\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{ij} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{jj}]] = 0,$$

and in the latter,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_{(i)}}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ij}^2(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{ij}]] = 0.$$

Thus, by exchangeability and the fact that the diagonal of $\mathbf{K}_0(g)$ is zero,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u}] &= \frac{\sqrt{n}}{m} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \in [m] \\ k \neq \ell}} u_i^2 \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell i}] \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}(m-1)(m-2)}{m} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{23}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{31}] \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{n}(m-1)}{m} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{12}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{21}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.69)$$

To complete the proof, we use the bounds $|(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12} \vee (\mathbf{R}_0)_{31}| \prec n^{-1/2}$ and $|(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11}| \prec 1$ (Lemma 4.2) as well as $|(\mathbf{K}_0)_{23}| \prec n^{-1/2}$ (Lemma 5.7): by a similar argument to (5.29)–(5.30), this implies $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{23}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{31}] = O(n^{-3/2+\varepsilon})$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{12}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{21}] = O(n^{-1+\varepsilon})$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R}_0(\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top)) \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{u}] = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).$$

□

Proof of (5.67). Similarly to (5.68),

$$(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})] \mathbf{R}_0)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k,q=1}^m \sum_{\ell=1}^p v_k v_q (\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik} (\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell} (\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j} \mathbf{z}_{(q)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(i)}. \quad (5.70)$$

If $i \neq j$, the expectation of $(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell j} \mathbf{z}_{(q)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(i)}$ is zero unless $(k, \ell, q) = (i, j, i)$ or $(k, \ell, q) = (j, i, j)$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})] \mathbf{R}_0)_{ij} &= \frac{1}{m\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ii}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{ij}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{jj} \mathbf{z}_{(i)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(j)}] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ij}^2(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{ij} \mathbf{z}_{(i)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(j)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\mathbf{z}_{(i)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(j)}| \prec \sqrt{n}$ and $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{m}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})] \mathbf{R}_0)_{ij} &= O(n^{-1+\varepsilon}), \\ \sum_{\substack{i,j \in [m] \\ i \neq j}} u_i u_j \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})] \mathbf{R}_0)_{ij} &= O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.71)$$

We now consider $i = j$. Using the identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}_{(\ell)}}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell i} \mathbf{z}_{(\ell)}^\top \mathbf{z}_{(q)}] = \mathbf{1}_{\ell=q} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell i} \|\mathbf{z}_{(\ell)}\|_2^2],$$

and exchangeability, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})]\mathbf{R}_0)_{ii} &= \frac{1}{m\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k,\ell=1}^m \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{ik}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{k\ell}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{\ell i} \|\mathbf{z}_{(\ell)}\|_2^2] \\
&= \frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{m\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{12}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{23}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{31} \|\mathbf{z}_{(3)}\|_2^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{m-1}{m\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{12}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{21} \|\mathbf{z}_{(1)}\|_2^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{m-1}{m\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{R}_0)_{11}(\mathbf{K}_0(g))_{12}(\mathbf{R}_0)_{21} \|\mathbf{z}_{(2)}\|_2^2] \\
&= O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.72}$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m u_i^2 \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{R}_0[\mathbf{K}_0(g) \odot (\sqrt{n}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S})]\mathbf{R}_0)_{ii} = O(n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \tag{5.73}$$

The claim follows from (5.71) and (5.73). \square

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to David Donoho and Boaz Nadler for discussions and comments.

References

- [1] E. Abbe, J. Fan, K. Wang, and Y. Zhong. Entrywise eigenvector analysis of random matrices with low expected rank. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1452–1474, 2020.
- [2] A. A. Amini and M. J. Wainwright. High-dimensional analysis of semidefinite relaxations for sparse principal components. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5):2877–2921, 2009.
- [3] Z. Bai, B. Miao, and G. Pan. On asymptotics of eigenvectors of large sample covariance matrix. *The Annals of Probability*, 35(4):1532–1572, 2007.
- [4] Z. Bai and J. W. Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, volume 20. Springer, 2010.
- [5] J. Baik, G. Ben Arous, and S. Péché. Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for non-null complex sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 33:1643–1697, 2005.
- [6] F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices. *Advances in Mathematics*, 227(1):494–521, 2011.
- [7] F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The singular values and vectors of low rank perturbations of large rectangular random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 111:120–135, 2012.
- [8] Q. Berthet and P. Rigollet. Complexity theoretic lower bounds for sparse principal component detection. *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 30:1046–1066, 2013.

- [9] P. J. Bickel and E. Levina. Covariance regularization by thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(6):2577–2604, 2008.
- [10] A. Bloemendal, L. Erdős, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. Isotropic local laws for sample covariance and generalized wigner matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 19(33):1–53, 2014.
- [11] A. Bloemendal, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin. On the principal components of sample covariance matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164:459–552, 2016.
- [12] T. T. Cai, Z. Ma, and Y. Wu. Sparse PCA: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(6):3074–3110, 2013.
- [13] X. Cheng and A. Singer. The spectrum of random inner-product kernel matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 2(4):1350010, 2013.
- [14] Y. Deshpande and A. Montanari. Information-theoretically optimal sparse pca. *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2197—2201, 2014.
- [15] Y. Deshpande and A. Montanari. Sparse pca via covariance thresholding. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(141):1–41, 2016.
- [16] D. L. Donoho and M. J. Feldman. Optimal eigenvalue shrinkage in the semicircle limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04488*, 2022.
- [17] S. Dubova, Y. M. Lu, B. McKenna, and H.-T. Yau. Universality for the global spectrum of random inner-product kernel matrices in the polynomial regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18280*, 2023.
- [18] A. d’Aspremont, F. R. Bach, and L. El Ghaoui. Full regularization path for sparse principal component analysis. *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2007.
- [19] A. d’Aspremont, F. R. Bach, and L. El Ghaoui. Optimal solutions for sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:1269–1294, 2008.
- [20] M. El Amine Seddik, M. Tamaazousti, and R. Couillet. A kernel random matrix based approach for sparse pca. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [21] N. El Karoui. The spectrum of kernel random matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(1):1–50, 2010.
- [22] Z. Fan and A. Montanari. The spectral norm of random inner-product kernel matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173:27–85, 2019.
- [23] M. J. Feldman. Spectral properties of elementwise-transformed spiked matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02040*, 2023.
- [24] M. J. Feldman. Spiked singular values and vectors under extreme aspect ratios. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 196:105187, 2023.
- [25] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, S. Rosset, R. Tibshirani, and J. Zhu. Consistency in boosting: Discussion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(1):102–107, 2004.

- [26] A. Guionnet, J. Ko, F. Krzakala, P. Mergny, and L. Zdeborová. Spectral phase transitions in nonlinear wigner spiked models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14055*, 2023.
- [27] I. M. Johnstone and P. Debashis. Pca in high dimensions: An orientation. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 106(8):1277–1292, 2018.
- [28] I. M. Johnstone and A. Y. Lu. On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(486):682–693, 2004.
- [29] I. M. Johnstone and B. W. Silverman. August 2004 needles and straw in haystacks: Empirical bayes estimates of possibly sparse sequences. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(4):1594–1649, 2004.
- [30] I. T. Jolliffe, N. T. Trendafilov, and M. Uddin. A modified principal component technique based on the lasso. *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics*, 12(3):531–547, 2003.
- [31] A. Kammoun and R. Couillet. Covariance discriminative power of kernel clustering methods. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 17:291–390, 2023.
- [32] T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Springer, 1980.
- [33] R. Krauthgamer, B. Nadler, and D. Vilenchik. Do semidefinite relaxations solve sparse pca up to the information limit? *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(3):1300–1322, 2015.
- [34] R. Latała. Some estimates of norms of random matrices. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 133(5):1273–1282, 2005.
- [35] J. Lei and V. Q. Vu. Sparsistency and agnostic inference in sparse pca. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):299–322, 2015.
- [36] Z. Liao, R. Couillet, and M. W. Mahoney. Sparse quantized spectral clustering. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [37] Z. Ma. Sparse principal component analysis and iterative thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):772–801, 2013.
- [38] D. Morales-Jimenez, I. M. Johnstone, M. R. McKay, and J. Yang. Asymptotics of eigenstructure of sample correlation matrices for high-dimensional spiked models. *Statistica Sinica*, 31:571–601, 2021.
- [39] R. Otazo, E. Candès, and D. K. Sodickson. Low-rank plus sparse matrix decomposition for accelerated dynamic mri with separation of background and dynamic components. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 73(3):1125–1136, 2015.
- [40] D. Paul. Asymptotics of sample eigenstructure for a large dimensional spiked covariance model. *Statistica Sinica*, 17:1617–1642, 2007.
- [41] R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. In Y. C. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, editors, *Compressed Sensing*, page 210–268. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [42] Z. Wang, D. Wu, and Z. Fan. Nonlinear spiked covariance matrices and signal propagation in deep neural networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 196:1–67, 2024.

- [43] M. Yu, V. Gupta, and M. Kolar. Recovery of simultaneous low rank and two-way sparse coefficient matrices, a nonconvex approach. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(1):413–457, 2020.
- [44] D. Yunzi, D. Kunisky, A. S. Wein, and A. S. Bandeira. Subexponential-time algorithms for sparse pca. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 24:865–914, 2024.
- [45] H. Zou, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse principal component analysis. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(2):265–286, 2006.

A Proof of Lemma 4.1

We will work with the decomposition

$$\mathbf{K}_0(f) = \mathbf{Q}(f) + \mathbf{R}(f) + \mathbf{S}(f) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

developed in [22].¹² Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 6.1 in [22] prove there exists $n_{\varepsilon, D} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{Q}(f)\|_2 > (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_+) \leq n^{-D}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{S}(f)\|_2 > n^{-\varepsilon}) \leq n^{-D}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for all $n \geq n_{\varepsilon, D}$, while Lemma 6.3 proves $\|\mathbf{R}(f)\|_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. Defining \mathcal{J}_ℓ to be the set of sequences $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \in [p]^\ell$ without repetitions, $\mathbf{R}(f)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(f) &:= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{a_\ell}{\sqrt{\ell!}} \binom{\ell}{2} \mathbf{R}_\ell, \\ (\mathbf{R}_\ell)_{ik} &:= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n^{(\ell+1)/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-1}} \left[(z_{ij_1}^2 z_{kj_1}^2 - 1) \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-1} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \right] & i \neq k, \\ 0 & i = k. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We will generalize the moment method of [22] to prove

$$\|\mathbf{R}_\ell\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for odd indices ℓ , implying $\|\mathbf{R}(f)\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$. Together with (A.2), this establishes Lemma 4.1.

Proof of (A.3). Using the identities

$$\begin{aligned} (z_{ij_1}^2 z_{kj_1}^2 - 1) &= (z_{ij_1}^2 - 1)(z_{kj_1}^2 - 1) + (z_{ij_1}^2 - 1) + (z_{kj_1}^2 - 1), \\ \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-1}} \left[(z_{ij_1}^2 - 1) \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-1} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \right] &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^p (z_{ij}^2 - 1) \right) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-2}} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-2} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \\ &\quad - (\ell - 2) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-2}} \left[(z_{ij_1}^2 - 1) z_{ij_1} z_{kj_1} \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-2} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \right] \end{aligned}$$

(we adopt the convention that $\prod_{t=2}^1 = 1$), we expand \mathbf{R}_ℓ as

$$\mathbf{R}_\ell = \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell + \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A}_\ell + \mathbf{A}_\ell\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{B}_\ell. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Here, \mathbf{D} is a diagonal matrix with

$$(\mathbf{D})_{ii} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^p (z_{ij}^2 - 1)$$

¹²In this section, we adopt the notation of [22]; \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{S} are distinct from the resolvent and sample covariance matrices that appear in the body of this paper.

and $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell$, \mathbf{A}_ℓ , and \mathbf{B}_ℓ have zero diagonal and off-diagonal elements

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell)_{ik} &:= \frac{1}{n^{(\ell+1)/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-1}} \left[(z_{ij_1}^2 - 1)(z_{kj_1}^2 - 1) \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-1} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \right], \\ (\mathbf{A}_\ell)_{ik} &:= \frac{1}{n^{\ell/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-2}} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-2} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t}, \\ (\mathbf{B}_\ell)_{ik} &:= \frac{1}{n^{(\ell+1)/2}} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-2}} \left[(z_{ij_1}^2 + z_{kj_1}^2 - 2) z_{ij_1} z_{kj_1} \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-2} z_{ij_t} z_{kj_t} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We bound the operator norm of each matrix appearing in the decomposition (A.4).

First, using the sub-exponentiality of the Chi-squared distribution and a union bound, we have $\|\mathbf{D}\|_2 \prec 1$. Furthermore, $\sqrt{n}\mathbf{A}_\ell$ corresponds to the tensor matrix $\mathbf{Q}(h_{\ell-2})$ in the decomposition (A.1) of $\mathbf{K}(h_{\ell-2})$, and equation (A.2) readily implies that $\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{A}_\ell\|_2 \prec 1$. Combining, these two bounds, we get $\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{A}_\ell + \mathbf{A}_\ell\mathbf{D}\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$.

For matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell$, we use instead a moment method argument: for $k \geq 2$, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell^k) &= \frac{1}{n^{k(\ell+1)/2}} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \dots \neq i_k \in [n]} \sum_{\mathbf{j}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{j}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{J}_{\ell-1}} \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s \in [k]} \left((x_{i_s j_1^{(s)}}^2 - 1)(x_{i_{s+1} j_1^{(s)}}^2 - 1) \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-1} x_{i_s j_t^{(s)}} x_{i_{s+1} j_t^{(s)}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If a pair (i, j) appears only once in this product, the expectation is equal to 0. Following the approach in [22], we can enumerate the non-zero terms using k -graph (n, p) -multi-labeling. For our purpose, it is enough to consider the crude bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s \in [k]} \left((x_{i_s j_1^{(s)}}^2 - 1)(x_{i_{s+1} j_1^{(s)}}^2 - 1) \prod_{t=2}^{\ell-1} x_{i_s j_t^{(s)}} x_{i_{s+1} j_t^{(s)}} \right) \right] \leq [Ck(\ell+1)]^{Ck(\ell+1)} \lesssim 1.$$

Denote \mathcal{L} a multi-labeling, $[\mathcal{L}]$ its equivalence class, and $\Delta([\mathcal{L}])$ the excess of $[\mathcal{L}]$ [22, Definition 5.4 and 5.6]. By definition, $\Delta([\mathcal{L}]) := 1 + k\ell/2 - m$, where m is the number of distinct n and p labels in $[\mathcal{L}]$, and $\Delta([\mathcal{L}]) \geq 0$ by [22, Lemma 5.5]. Using these notations,

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell^k) \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k\frac{\ell+1}{2}}} \sum_{\delta \geq 0} \sum_{[\mathcal{L}], \Delta([\mathcal{L}]) = \delta} \operatorname{card}([\mathcal{L}]) \lesssim \frac{1}{n^{k\frac{\ell+1}{2}}} \sum_{\delta \geq 0} n^{1+k\ell/2-\delta} \lesssim n^{1-k/2},$$

where we used that the number of equivalent classes is bounded and $\operatorname{card}([\mathcal{L}]) \lesssim n^m$.

By Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\operatorname{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell^k)]}{n^{-k/2+k\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{C_k}{n^{k\varepsilon-1}}.$$

Taking k sufficiently large, we deduce that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_\ell\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$. The bound $\|\mathbf{B}_\ell\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}$ follows from the same argument. \square

B Proof of Lemma 4.6

The proof extends an argument of Theorem 1.6 of [22]. We first show that the derivative f' can be well approximated by a polynomial. Since f is allowed to be piecewise differentiable, hence f' may be discontinuous—as is the case for soft thresholding—this polynomial approximation a priori cannot be uniform.

Lemma B.1. *Suppose that $f(x)$ is odd and piecewise twice differentiable in the following sense: there exist finitely many $x_0 := -\infty < x_1 < \dots < x_N < \infty =: x_{N+1}$ such that $f(x)$ is twice-differentiable in the interior $x \in (x_{i-1}, x_i)$. Suppose further that for some $c > 0$,*

$$|f(x)|, |f'(x)|, |f''(x)| \leq ce^{c|x|} \quad \text{for all } x \neq x_i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N+1.$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, set $\delta_\varepsilon := \varepsilon/N \asymp \varepsilon$ and $\Omega_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} (x_i - \delta_\varepsilon, x_i + \delta_\varepsilon)$, so that $|\Omega_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon$.¹³ There exists an odd polynomial p_ε such that the residual $\kappa(x) := f(x) - p_\varepsilon(x)$ satisfies

$$|\kappa'(x)| \lesssim \begin{cases} c_1 e^{c_1|x|} \varepsilon & \text{on } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ c_1 e^{c_1|x|} & \text{on } x \in \Omega_\varepsilon \end{cases}, \quad (c_1 = c_1(c)) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for all $x \neq x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.

The proof is deferred to Section B.1 below. We stress that we have not put significant effort into making the conditions in Lemma B.1 as general as possible; rather we were aiming for a minimal extension of [22] that would accommodate for the soft thresholding function.

Lemma 4.6 follows immediately from Lemma B.1 and the following result.

Theorem B.2. *Suppose that $\kappa(x)$ is odd, continuous everywhere, and differentiable at all but finitely many points, with the derivative satisfying (B.1) whenever it exists. Denote by $\mathbf{K}(\kappa)$ the corresponding transformed matrix (1.4). Almost surely,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{K}(\kappa)\| \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/4} \quad \text{as } n, p, m \rightarrow \infty.$$

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Theorem B.2. Towards this end, we adapt the proof of Theorem 1.6 in [22].

For brevity, we use the shorthand $\mathbf{K} := \mathbf{K}[\kappa]$ for the remainder of this section. Write the array $\mathbf{Z}\Sigma^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ as $\mathbf{Z}\Sigma^{1/2}/\sqrt{n} = \sqrt{\lambda-1}\boldsymbol{\xi}\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{N}$, where \mathbf{N} has i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$ entries; and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, which collects the factor loadings, has i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/n)$ entries. Accordingly,

$$\mathbf{Y} = (\lambda-1)\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top + \sqrt{\lambda-1}\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{N}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi})^\top + \sqrt{\lambda-1}(\mathbf{N}^\top \boldsymbol{\xi})\mathbf{v}^\top + \mathbf{N}^\top \mathbf{N}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

In what follows, we think of $\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}$ as fixed, so that $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq m$, $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \lesssim m^{-1/2}$, $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \lesssim 1$. We first bound the expectation of \mathbf{K} ; note that it is not zero, owing to the presence of the spike.

Lemma B.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem B.2,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}]\| \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

The proof appears below in Section B.2. At the heart of [22, Proof of Theorem 1.6] is a delicate net argument. The idea, originally due to Latała [34], is to construct an explicit net of the sphere such that the number of localized directions (that have large ℓ^∞ norm) is small.

Denote $\check{\mathbf{K}} := \mathbf{K} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}]$. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|, \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 1$, let $F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N}) := \mathbf{x}^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y}$, where we think of $\check{\mathbf{K}}$ as a function of \mathbf{N} . A key step in [22] is a bound on the gradient of $F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}$.

¹³Here $|\Omega_\varepsilon|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure (length) of Ω_ε .

Lemma B.4. *The following holds with probability one:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{N}} F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})\|^2 &\leq 8\|\mathbf{N}\|^2\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \max_{1\leq\ell\leq p} \left(\sum_{i\neq\ell} (\kappa'(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}))^4 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + 8(\lambda-1)\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty^2 \max_{1\leq\ell\leq p} \sum_{i\in\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})\setminus\{\ell\}} |\kappa'(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{i\ell})|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is given below in Section B.3. As in [22], we restrict attention to a high-probability subset of matrices \mathbf{N} on which $F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})$ is Lipschitz. Fix $D > 0$. For sufficiently large $C = C(D)$, let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be the subset of matrices \mathbf{N} satisfying

- (1) $\|\mathbf{N}\| \leq C(1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2$,
- (2) $\max_{1\leq\ell\leq p} \sum_{i=1, i\neq\ell}^p (\kappa'(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}))^4 \leq pC\varepsilon$,
- (3) $\max_{1\leq\ell\leq p} \sum_{i\in\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})\setminus\{\ell\}} |\kappa'(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Y}_{i\ell})|^2 \leq mC\varepsilon$.

Lemma B.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem B.2, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}) \lesssim n^{-D}$.*

The proof is essentially identical to [22, Lemma 3.1], and is therefore omitted. Note that Lemma B.4 implies that $F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ is Lipschitz on \mathcal{G} , with

$$L := \|F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}|_{\mathcal{G}}\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \lesssim \|y\|_\infty \sqrt{p\varepsilon} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty^2 m\varepsilon \lesssim \|y\|_\infty \sqrt{p\varepsilon},$$

we used that $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \lesssim m^{-1/2}$ and $\varepsilon < 1$ (by assumption), and $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \lesssim 1$. (Note that $p\|y\|_\infty^2 \geq 1$, hence the first term is always the dominant one).

We now show that $F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ concentrates, using the Gaussian Lipschitz concentration inequality. To this end, recall a well-known result on Lipschitz extension.

Theorem B.6 (Kirschbraun). *Let $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, be L -Lipschitz. Then F has an L -Lipschitz extension to \mathbb{R}^{d_1} :*

$$\tilde{F} : \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}, \quad \tilde{F}|_{\mathcal{G}} = F.$$

When $d_2 = 1$ and \mathcal{G} is compact, there is a simple construction:

$$\tilde{F}(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{G}} (F(y) + L\|x - y\|).$$

Let $\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ be a Lipschitz extension of $F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}|_{\mathcal{G}}$.

Lemma B.7. *Under the conditions of Theorem B.2, for $\tilde{D} = \tilde{D}(D)$ that can be made arbitrarily small,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})] - \mathbb{E}[F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})] \right| \lesssim n^{-\tilde{D}}.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}$

$$|F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})| \leq \|\check{\mathbf{K}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\check{\mathbf{K}}\|_F, \quad |\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})| \leq F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(0) + L\|\mathbf{N}\|_F.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}}]| &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})|^2])^{1/2} (\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}))^{1/2} \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{K}\|_F^2])^{1/2} (\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}))^{1/2} \lesssim pn^{-D/2} \lesssim n^{-\tilde{D}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can bound $|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}}]|$. □

Lemma B.8. For $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\tilde{D}} + \varepsilon t\right) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\sqrt{p}}{\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty} t^2}.$$

Proof. Gaussian Lipschitz concentration. \square

Finally, we apply the net argument of [22]. As in [22, Section 2], let

$$D_2^p = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 1, y_i^2 \in \{0, 1, 2^{-1}, \dots, 2^{-(K+3)}\} \right\}, \quad K := \lceil \log_2 p \rceil. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Lemma B.9. ([22, Lemma 3.3].) For \mathbf{A} symmetric, $\|\mathbf{A}\| \leq 10 \max_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y}$.

For $l = 0, 1, \dots, K+3$, define the projection $\pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}$ (resp. π_l) on dyadic scale l (resp. $\leq l$):

$$\pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})_i = y_i \mathbf{1}_{y_i^2 = 2^{-l}}, \quad \pi_l(\mathbf{y})_i = y_i \mathbf{1}_{y_i^2 \geq 2^{-l}}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

As shown in [22, Eq. (7)],

$$\mathbf{y}^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{y} = \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} \pi_l(\mathbf{y})^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \pi_{l-1}(\mathbf{y}). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Lemma B.10. ([22, Lemma 3.4].) For universal $C > 0$, for all $l = 0, 1, \dots, K+3$,

$$|\{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in D_2^p\}| \leq \exp(C(K+4-l)2^l). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Set, for c_0 large enough,

$$t_l^2 = c_0(K+4-l)2^{l/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

As shown in [22, Proof of Theorem 1.6],

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} t_l &\leq c_0^{1/2} p^{-1/4} \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} (K+4-l)2^{l/4} \leq c_0^{1/2} p^{-1/4} \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} \sum_{j=0}^l 2^{j/4} \\ &\lesssim p^{-1/4} \sum_{l=0}^{K+3} 2^{l/4} \lesssim p^{-1/4} 2^{K/4} = p^{-1/4} 2^{\frac{1}{4} \lceil \log_2 p \rceil} = O(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Proof of Theorem B.2. By Lemma B.9 and (B.5) and (B.8), it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} \pi_l(\mathbf{y})^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y}), \quad \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \pi_{l-1}(\mathbf{y}) \lesssim n^{-\tilde{D}} + \varepsilon t_l, \quad \forall 0 \leq l \leq K+3.$$

holds with high probability. Without loss of generality, we focus on terms

$$\pi_l(\mathbf{y})^\top \check{\mathbf{K}} \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y}) =: F_{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}), \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{N});$$

the other terms are similar. Under the high-probability event $F_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N}) = \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})$ for any \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} , where \tilde{F} is the Lipschitz extension of $F|_{\mathcal{G}}$. Consequently, as $\Pr(\mathbf{N} \notin \mathcal{G}) \lesssim n^{-D}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} F_{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}), \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\tilde{D}} + \varepsilon t_l\right) \lesssim \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} \tilde{F}_{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}), \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\tilde{D}} + \varepsilon t_l\right) + n^{-D}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Denote

$$\Pi_l = \{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in D_2^p\}, \quad \Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)} = \{\pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in D_2^p\}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq K+3.$$

Clearly, $\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} \tilde{F}_{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}), \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{N}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}, \mathbf{z} \in \Pi_l} \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{N})$. By Lemma B.10, $|\Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}| \leq |\Pi_l| \leq \exp(C(K+4-l)2^l)$. Consequently, using a union bound, we bound the first term in the r.h.s. of (B.9) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}, \mathbf{z} \in \Pi_l} \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\bar{D}} + \varepsilon t_l\right) &\leq |\Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}| |\Pi_l| \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}, \mathbf{z} \in \Pi_l} \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\bar{D}} + \varepsilon t_l\right) \\ &\lesssim e^{2C(K+4-l)2^l} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}, \mathbf{z} \in \Pi_l} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} t_l^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = 2^{-l/2}$ and $t_l^2 = c_0(K+4-l)2^{l/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}$, the above is $\lesssim e^{(2C-c_0)(K+4-l)2^l}$. Choosing c_0 sufficiently large but constant, so that $c_1 := c_0 - 2C$ is large, we can guarantee that $e^{-c_1(K+4-l)2^l} \leq e^{-c_1(\log_2 p + 4 - l)2^l}$ is smaller than p^{-C} for any pre-specified $C > 0$. Finally taking a union bound over all $0 \leq l \leq K+3 \lesssim \log p$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{0 \leq l \leq K+3} \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in D_2^p} F_{\pi_l(\mathbf{y}), \pi_{l \setminus (l-1)}(\mathbf{y})}(\mathbf{N}) \gtrsim n^{-\bar{D}} + \varepsilon t_l\right) \leq (K+3)p^{-C} + n^{-\bar{D}} \asymp n^{-\bar{D}'}. \quad \square$$

As explained before, Theorem B.2 now follows using Lemma B.9. □

B.1 Proof of Lemma B.1

We adapt the argument in [22, Proof of Theorem 1.4], with an additional smoothing step. The latter is needed because f' is not assumed to be continuous, unlike in [22].

For bandwidth $\eta \in (0, 1)$, let $T_\eta : L^2(\phi) \rightarrow L^2(\phi)$ be the Gaussian smoothing (heat flow) operator,

$$T_\eta[f](x) := \mathbb{E}_{G \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)}[f(x + \eta G)] = \frac{1}{\eta\sqrt{2\pi}} \int f(y) e^{-\frac{1}{2\eta^2}(x-y)^2} dy. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Note that under the conditions of Lemma B.1, $T_\eta[f]$ is odd and everywhere twice-differentiable, with $(T_\eta[f])' = T_\eta[f']$, $(T_\eta[f])'' = T_\eta[f'']$ and $|T_\eta[f](x)|, |T_\eta[f'](x)|, |T_\eta[f''](x)| \lesssim e^{c_1|x|}$. We shall show that (1) $T_\eta[f']$ approximates f' well away from its discontinuity points; and (2) $T_\eta[f']$ is well-approximated by a polynomial uniformly. We note that the second step, which relies on the differentiability of $T_\eta[f']$, follows from [22] immediately.

Recall: $-\infty < x_1 < \dots < x_N < \infty$ denote the points where either f, f', f'' are discontinuous. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, set $\delta_\varepsilon := \varepsilon/N \asymp \varepsilon$ and

$$\Omega_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} (x_i - \delta_\varepsilon, x_i + \delta_\varepsilon).$$

This set is symmetric ($\Omega_\varepsilon = -\Omega_\varepsilon$) and $|\Omega_\varepsilon| < \varepsilon$. We next show that $T_\eta[f']$ approximates f' uniformly on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$. Note that on the “bad” set $x \in \Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, we already have $|f'(x) - T_\eta[f'](x)| \lesssim e^{c_1|x|}$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$. By definition, f', f'' exist on $I_{x,\varepsilon} := (x - \delta_\varepsilon, x + \delta_\varepsilon)$. By the mean value theorem, for $y \in I_{x,\varepsilon}$,

$$|f'(y) - f'(x)| \leq \max_{z \in (x,y)} |f''(z)| |x - y| \lesssim e^{C \max\{|x|, |y|\}} |x - y| \lesssim e^{C|x|} e^{C|x-y|} |x - y|. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Decompose

$$f'(x) - T_\eta[f'](x) = \mathbb{E}[(f'(x) - f'(x + \eta G))\mathbf{1}_{|G| \leq \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}] + \mathbb{E}[(f'(x) - f'(x + \eta G))\mathbf{1}_{|G| > \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}]. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Using (B.11), the first term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[(f'(x) - f'(x + \eta G))\mathbf{1}_{|G| \leq \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}]| &\lesssim e^{C|x|} \mathbb{E}[e^{C\eta|G|} |\eta G| \mathbf{1}_{|G| \leq \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}] \leq e^{C|x|} \delta_\varepsilon e^{C\delta_\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{|G| \leq \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}] \\ &\lesssim e^{C|x|} \delta_\varepsilon \asymp e^{C|x|} \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\delta_\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon \lesssim 1$. For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[(f'(x) - f'(x + \eta G))\mathbf{1}_{|G| > \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}]| &\lesssim e^{2C|x|} \mathbb{E}[e^{C\eta|G|} \mathbf{1}_{|G| > \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}] \\ &\leq e^{2C|x|} \left(\mathbb{E}[e^{2C\eta|G|}] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{|G| > \delta_\varepsilon/\eta}] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim e^{C_1|x|} e^{C_2\eta^2} e^{-C_3(\delta_\varepsilon/\eta)^2} \lesssim e^{C_1|x|} e^{-C_4(\varepsilon/\eta)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the final two inequalities follow from $\eta \lesssim 1$, the Gaussian tail behavior and $\delta_\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon$. Choosing $\eta = \eta_\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon/\sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$, which is ≤ 1 for small $\varepsilon > 0$, implies that the above is $\lesssim e^{C_1|x|} \varepsilon$. Combining our bounds for the two terms above, we deduce that for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$, $|f'(x) - T_{\eta_\varepsilon}[f'](x)| \lesssim e^{C_1|x|} \varepsilon$. Combining with the coarse bound we had before for $x \in \Omega_\varepsilon$,

$$|f'(x) - T_{\eta_\varepsilon}[f'](x)| \lesssim e^{C|x|} \varepsilon + e^{C|x|} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_\varepsilon}(x). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

for appropriate $C > 0$.

The final step is to approximate $T_{\eta_\varepsilon}[f]$ by a polynomial uniformly. This follows from the argument of [22, Proof of Theorem 1.4], which yields a polynomial p_ε such that $\kappa_1(x) = T_{\eta_\varepsilon}[f](x) - p_\varepsilon(x)$ satisfies $|\kappa_1'(x)| \lesssim \varepsilon e^{C|x|}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The total residual $\kappa(x) = f(x) - p_\varepsilon(x)$ thus satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\kappa'(x)| &\leq |f'(x) - (T_{\eta_\varepsilon}[f])'(x)| + |\kappa_1'(x)| \\ &\lesssim e^{C|x|} \varepsilon + e^{C|x|} \mathbf{1}_{x \in \Omega_\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \neq x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, as claimed.

B.2 Proof of Lemma B.3

Denote by $\mathbf{N}_1, \dots, \mathbf{N}_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the columns of \mathbf{N} .

Recall that $\mathbf{K}(\kappa)_{i,i} = 0$ and for $i \neq j$,

$$(\mathbf{K}(\kappa))_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \kappa(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \kappa(\sqrt{n}(\lambda - 1) \|\xi\|^2 v_i v_j + \mathbf{A}_{ij}).$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \sqrt{n}(\sqrt{\lambda - 1} v_i \mathbf{N}_j^\top \xi + \sqrt{\lambda - 1} v_j \mathbf{N}_i^\top \xi + \mathbf{N}_i^\top \mathbf{N}_j)$.

Recall that κ is continuous and piecewise differentiable, hence the fundamental theorem of calculus holds. For brevity, denote $\eta_{i,j} := \sqrt{n}(\lambda - 1) \|\xi\|^2 v_i v_j$, so that $\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij} = \mathbf{A}_{ij} + \eta_{i,j}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) - \kappa(\mathbf{A}_{ij}) &= \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}]} \kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t) dt \\ &= \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}] \cap (\Omega_\varepsilon - \mathbf{A}_{ij})} \kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t) dt + \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}] \setminus (\Omega_\varepsilon - \mathbf{A}_{ij})} \kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where Ω_ε is the set from Lemma B.1. We can bound each term using (B.1). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}] \cap (\Omega_\varepsilon - \mathbf{A}_{ij})} \kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t) dt \right| &\leq |[0, \eta_{i,j}] \cap \Omega_\varepsilon| \cdot \max_{t \in [0, \eta_{i,j}] \cap (\Omega_\varepsilon - \mathbf{A}_{ij})} |\kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t)| \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon \cdot e^{c_1 |\eta_{i,j}|} e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{ij}|} \lesssim e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{ij}|} \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\eta_{i,j} \lesssim 1$ (thinking of λ as constant), since $|v_i v_j| \in \{0, 1/\sqrt{n}\}$. As for the other term,

$$\left| \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}] \setminus (\Omega_\varepsilon - \mathbf{A}_{ij})} \kappa'(\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t) dt \right| \lesssim \int_{[0, \eta_{i,j}]} (e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{ij} + t|} \varepsilon) dt \lesssim e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{ij}|} \varepsilon.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\mathbb{E}[e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{i,j}|}] \lesssim 1$ (again, thinking of λ as constant). For completeness' sake, let us verify this for the heavier-tailed term $\mathbb{E}[e^{c_1 \sqrt{n} \mathbf{N}_i^\top \mathbf{N}_j}]$. Conditioned on \mathbf{N}_i , $\sqrt{n} \mathbf{N}_i^\top \mathbf{N}_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \|\mathbf{N}_i\|^2)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{c_1 \sqrt{n} \mathbf{N}_i^\top \mathbf{N}_j}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\frac{1}{2} c_1^2 \|\mathbf{N}_i\|^2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\frac{c_1^2}{2n} \chi^2(n)}] = (1 - c_1^2/n)^{-n/2} \approx e^{-c_1^2/2},$$

where $\chi^2(n)$ denotes a chi-squared random variable with n degrees of freedom. (Indeed, note that $\sqrt{n} \mathbf{N}_i^\top \mathbf{N}_j$ tends to a $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variable.)

Now, note that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{i,j}] = 0$, since $\mathbf{A}_{i,j}$ has a symmetric distribution. Thus,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}_{i,j}]| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\mathbb{E}[\kappa(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij})] - \mathbb{E}[\kappa(\mathbf{A}_{ij})]| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}[e^{c_1 |\mathbf{A}_{ij}|}] \varepsilon \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon.$$

Also note that $\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}$ differs from \mathbf{A}_{ij} only when $i, j \in \text{supp}(v)$; accordingly, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}]$ has at most $m^2 \asymp n$ nonzero entries. Thus,

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}]\| \leq \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}]\|_F \lesssim m \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

B.3 Proof of Lemma B.4

As in the previous section, denote by $\mathbf{N}_1, \dots, \mathbf{N}_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the columns of \mathbf{N} .

The gradient of an entry ($i \neq j$) with respect to \mathbf{N}_ℓ

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell}(\mathbf{K}_{i,j}) &= \nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \kappa \left((\lambda - 1) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \sqrt{n} v_i v_j + \sqrt{\lambda - 1} \sqrt{n} v_i \langle \mathbf{N}_j, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\lambda - 1} \sqrt{n} v_j \langle \mathbf{N}_i, \boldsymbol{\xi} \rangle + \sqrt{n} \langle \mathbf{N}_i, \mathbf{N}_j \rangle \right) \\ &= \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) \left(\sqrt{\lambda - 1} v_i \boldsymbol{\xi} \mathbf{1}_{j=\ell} + \sqrt{\lambda - 1} v_j \boldsymbol{\xi} \mathbf{1}_{i=\ell} + \mathbf{N}_i \mathbf{1}_{j=\ell} + \mathbf{N}_j \mathbf{1}_{i=\ell} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Denote the following vectors $\mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{b}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $1 \leq i, j, \ell \leq p$, so that $\nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{i,j} = \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)} + \mathbf{b}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \sqrt{\lambda - 1} \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) \cdot (v_i \boldsymbol{\xi} \mathbf{1}_{j=\ell} + v_j \boldsymbol{\xi} \mathbf{1}_{i=\ell}), \\ \mathbf{b}_{ij}^{(\ell)} &= \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}) \cdot (\mathbf{N}_i \mathbf{1}_{j=\ell} + \mathbf{N}_j \mathbf{1}_{i=\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

We have $\nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell} F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N}) = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_j \nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell}(\mathbf{K}_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The total gradient of $F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}$ with respect to \mathbf{N} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{N}} F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})\|^2 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^p \|\nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell} F_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{N})\|^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_j \nabla_{\mathbf{N}_\ell}(\mathbf{K}_{i,j}) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_i \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_j \mathbf{b}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the vectors $\mathbf{b}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$ depend on the spike only through $\kappa'(\mathbf{Y}_{ij})$. To bound the second term, we apply verbatim the calculations in [22, Eq. (10)]:

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^p \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_j \mathbf{b}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 \leq 4 \|\mathbf{N}\|^2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p} \left(\sum_{i \neq \ell} \left(\kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}) \right)^4 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

As for the first term, by plugging in the definition of $\mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} x_i y_j \mathbf{a}_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right\|^2 &= (\lambda - 1) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p \left[y_\ell \sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^p \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}) x_i v_i + x_\ell \sum_{j=1, j \neq \ell}^p \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{j\ell}) y_j v_j \right]^2 \\ &\leq 2(\lambda - 1) \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p y_\ell^2 \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^p \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}) x_i v_i \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2\tau^2 \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2 \sum_{\ell=1}^p x_\ell^2 \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq \ell}^p \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{j\ell}) y_j v_j \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz and $\|\mathbf{x}\|, \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^p y_\ell^2 \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^p \kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell}) x_i v_i \right)^2 &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^p y_\ell^2 \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^p x_i^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^p |\kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell})|^2 v_i^2 \right) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty^2 \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\ell\}} |\kappa'(\sqrt{n} \mathbf{Y}_{i\ell})|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above bounds yields the lemma.