

# A Large-dimensional Analysis of ESPRIT DoA Estimation: Inconsistency and a Correction via RMT

Zhengyu Wang, *Student Member, IEEE*, Wei Yang, Xiaoyi Mai, Zenan Ling, *Member, IEEE*,  
Zhenyu Liao, *Member, IEEE*, Robert C. Qiu, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In this paper, we perform asymptotic analyses of the widely used ESPRIT direction-of-arrival (DoA) estimator for large arrays, where the array size  $N$  and the number of snapshots  $T$  grow to infinity at the same pace. In this large-dimensional regime, the sample covariance matrix (SCM) is known to be a poor eigenspectral estimator of the population covariance. We show that the classical ESPRIT algorithm, that relies on the SCM, and as a consequence of the large-dimensional inconsistency of the SCM, produces *inconsistent* DoA estimates as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  with  $N/T \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$ , for both widely- and closely-spaced DoAs. Leveraging tools from random matrix theory (RMT), we propose an improved G-ESPRIT method and prove its *consistency* in the same large-dimensional setting. From a technical perspective, we derive a novel bound on the eigenvalue differences between two potentially non-Hermitian random matrices, which may be of independent interest. Numerical simulations are provided to corroborate our theoretical findings.

**Index Terms**—Array signal processing, DoA estimation, ESPRIT, high-dimensional statistics, random matrix theory, sample covariance matrix, subspace method.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Direction-of-arrival (DoA) estimation is a fundamental task in array signal processing with various applications, ranging from radar, sonar, and wireless communications, to medical imaging. Accurate DoA estimation enables systems to localize sources, optimize resource allocation, and enhance signal quality in complex environments. Among the numerous methods developed for DoA estimation, subspace-based methods such as MUSIC and its variants, as well as the ESPRIT approach, have gained significant popularity [1]–[3]. Their effectiveness and computational efficiency (compared to, e.g., maximum likelihood estimators) have made them mainstays in modern array signal processing.

Subspace-based methods such as MUSIC and ESPRIT exploit the inherent orthogonality between the signal and noise

Z. Wang, W. Yang, Z. Ling, Z. Liao, and R. C. Qiu are with the School of Electronic Information and Communications (EIC), Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST), Wuhan 430074, China. X. Mai is with the Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse (IMT), University of Toulouse-Jean Jaurès, Toulouse, France. *Corresponding author: Zhenyu Liao* (email: zhenyu\_liao@hust.edu.cn).

Part of this work was presented at the IEEE 32nd European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO 2024), Lyon, France.

Z. Liao would like to acknowledge the National Natural Science Foundation of China (via fund NSFC-62206101) and the Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Mathematical Foundations for Artificial Intelligence (2023B1212010001) for providing partial support. R. C. Qiu would like to acknowledge the National Natural Science Foundation of China (via fund NSFC-12141107) and the Interdisciplinary Research Program of HUST (2023JCYJ012) for providing partial support. Z. Ling is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (via NSFC-62406119) and the Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province (2024AFB074).

subspace of the *population covariance* to estimate DoAs from noisy observations. Since the population covariance is practically inaccessible, eigenspectral decomposition is performed on the sample covariance matrix (SCM) of the received signals to extract DoA information. When the number of snapshots  $T$  is *much larger* than the array size  $N$ , the SCM provides an accurate estimate of the population covariance, and the statistical performance of, e.g., MUSIC [4], total least squares ESPRIT [5], and least squares ESPRIT [6] has been well-studied in prior work.

However, these subspace-based methods are known to suffer from the so-called “threshold effect,” where their performance degrades drastically when either the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) or the number of snapshots falls below a certain threshold [7]. This limitation has sparked renewed interest in analyzing these methods in the regime of *large arrays and limited snapshots*, where both  $N$  and  $T$  grow to infinity at the same pace, i.e.,

$$N, T \rightarrow \infty, \quad N/T \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty),$$

a setting that models scenarios where large sensing arrays acquire data within relatively short sampling durations.

With the progress of random matrix theory (RMT) over the past decade, many methods in statistics, signal processing, and machine learning have been revisited in the large-dimensional regime, leading to novel insights and improved algorithms tailored for large-dimensional data [8], [9]. A key takeaway from these developments is that when  $T$  is *not much larger* than  $N$ , the SCM becomes a poor eigenspectral estimator of the population covariance (see [9] and Section II-C for a brief review). In such cases, the sample eigenvectors/eigenspaces are *biased* from their population counterparts. Consequently, subspace methods *cannot* be expected to provide consistent estimates of the true DoAs in scenarios where  $N, T$  are both large and comparable. Notably, the empirically observed “threshold effect” of these methods is a direct manifestation of the *phase transition* behavior inherent in the large-dimensional SCM eigenspace.

In the case of MUSIC, it has been shown in [10] that despite the eigenspectral *inconsistency* of the SCM in the large  $N, T$  regime, MUSIC still provides consistent DoA estimates in widely-spaced DoA scenarios (see Assumption 3 for a precise definition), when above the phase transition threshold. However, for closely-spaced sources (see Assumption 4), where the separation between angles is of the order  $O(N^{-1})$ , the classical MUSIC approach *fails to deliver accurate estimates*.

To address this limitation, a modified MUSIC algorithm, G-MUSIC, was introduced by “correcting” the sample signal subspace using RMT. G-MUSIC is guaranteed to provide  $N$ -consistent<sup>1</sup> DoA estimates in the large  $N, T$  regime [10]–[13], making it particularly valuable in closely-spaced DoA scenarios. Beyond these first-order analyses of MUSIC and G-MUSIC, further research has explored the asymptotic properties of their Mean Square Errors (MSEs), by establishing the second-order behavior of these estimators through Central Limit Theorem (CLT), see for example [14], [15].

In this paper, we analyze the equally popular subspace-based DoA method ESPRIT [16] (reviewed in Section II-A) in this *large array and limited snapshot* regime, where ESPRIT is also observed to suffer from the “threshold effect.” While ESPRIT, like MUSIC, also relies on the SCM, it exploits the rotational invariance property of the signal subspaces between different subarrays using a (more intricate) least squares approach. This distinction makes prior analyses, such as those in [10]–[13] for MUSIC through eigenvector projections, not directly applicable. Although it has been empirically observed that ESPRIT outperforms MUSIC in certain cases [17] but not in others [18], its theoretical analysis remains an *open problem* [19] due to its mathematically involved nature compared to, e.g., MUSIC and G-MUSIC.

Our contribution is summarized as follows.

- 1) We prove in Theorem 2 that classical ESPRIT algorithm yields *inconsistent* DoA estimates in the large-dimensional regime as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  with  $N/T \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$ , except in the special case of uncorrelated and widely-spaced sources (Remark 5).
- 2) We propose a novel G-ESPRIT method (Algorithm 2) and demonstrate in Proposition 1 that it provides consistent DoA estimates in the same regime, for both widely- and closely-spaced DoAs.
- 3) As part of our analysis, we establish a novel bound on the eigenvalue differences between two non-Hermitian matrices in Theorem 3 of Section III-B, which is of independent technical interest.

*Organization of the paper:* The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present the system model and review the classical ESPRIT algorithm. Additionally, we summarize some useful results from RMT on the eigenspectral behavior of the SCM in the large  $N, T$  regime. In Section III, we demonstrate the *inconsistency* of classical ESPRIT in large-dimensional regime and provide related discussions. In Section IV, we introduce the G-ESPRIT method, which addresses the large-dimensional inconsistency of classical ESPRIT, and is shown to provide consistent estimates of both widely- and closely-spaced DoAs. Simulation results supporting our theoretical findings are presented in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

*Notions:* Upper-case and lower-case boldface letters denote matrices and column vectors, respectively. The operators  $(\cdot)^\top$ ,  $(\cdot)^*$ , and  $(\cdot)^H$  denote the transpose, conjugate, and Hermitian

<sup>1</sup>An estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  is called  $N$ -consistent for  $\theta$  if  $N(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \rightarrow 0$  almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , see Remark 1 for a detailed discussion.




Fig. 1: System diagram for DoA estimation. A far-field signal with incident angle  $\theta$  impinges on a ULA of  $N$  sensors spaced  $d$  apart.

transpose, respectively. We denote  $\mathbb{R}$  the set of real numbers and  $\mathbb{C}$  the set of imaginary numbers, respectively. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , we denote by  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\det(\mathbf{A})$  its trace and determinant. We use  $\|\cdot\|$  to denote the Euclidean norm for vectors and spectral/operator norm for matrices.  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{a})$  returns a diagonal matrix with the elements in  $\mathbf{a}$  as its main diagonal entries. Additionally,  $\mathbf{I}_n$  denotes  $n \times n$  identity matrix and  $\odot$  represents the Hadamard matrix product. For a complex number  $z$ , we use  $\Re[z]$ ,  $\Im[z]$ , and  $\arg(z)$  to represent the real and imaginary parts, as well as the argument of  $z$  respectively. For a random variable  $x$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[x]$  denotes its expectation. We use  $\mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$  for the real Gaussian distribution with mean  $m$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , and say  $z$  follows a complex circular Gaussian distribution and denote  $z \sim \mathcal{CN}(m, \sigma^2)$  if  $z = x + iy$  with independent  $x, y$  such that  $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\Re[m], \sigma^2/2)$  and  $y \sim \mathcal{N}(\Im[m], \sigma^2/2)$ . We use  $O(\cdot)$  and  $o(\cdot)$  notations as in standard asymptotic statistics [20].

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we present the system model under study in Section II-A and revisit the ESPRIT algorithm in Section II-B. In Section II-C, we review some results on the eigenspectra of large sample covariance matrices as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  at the same pace, to be used in the large-dimensional analysis of ESPRIT.

### A. System Model

In this paper, we consider a uniform linear array (ULA) of  $N$  sensors that receives  $K$  narrow-band and far-field source signals with DoA  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K$  as shown in Figure 1. The received signal at time  $t = 1, \dots, T$  is given by

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{a}(\theta_k) s_k(t) + \mathbf{n}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N, \quad (1)$$

with complex signal  $s_k(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ , and complex circular Gaussian white noise  $\mathbf{n}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^N$  having i.i.d.  $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$  entries.  $\mathbf{a}(\theta_k) \in \mathbb{C}^N$  represents the steering vector of source  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  at DoA  $\theta_k$ , given by<sup>2</sup>

$$\mathbf{a}(\theta_k) = [1, e^{i\theta_k}, \dots, e^{i(N-1)\theta_k}]^\top / \sqrt{N} \in \mathbb{C}^N. \quad (2)$$

This model can be rewritten in matrix form as

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{N}, \quad \mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}(\theta_1), \dots, \mathbf{a}(\theta_K)] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}, \quad (3)$$

with  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(T)] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  the matrix of received signals,  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  the matrix of steering vectors,

<sup>2</sup>The normalization by  $\sqrt{N}$  is made so that  $\mathbf{a}(\theta_k)$  is of unit norm. Here, we use  $\theta_k$  for the DoA in the Fourier space as in [10], which is related to the “physical” angle  $\phi_k$  of the source wave via  $\theta_k = \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda_0} \sin(\phi_k)$ .

$\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{s}(1), \dots, \mathbf{s}(T)] \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times T}$  the matrix containing source signals, and random noise  $\mathbf{N} = [\mathbf{n}(1), \dots, \mathbf{n}(T)] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  with identity power matrix. Then, the *population* covariance of the received signal is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} &\equiv \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H]/T = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H\mathbf{A}^H/T + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{N}\mathbf{N}^H]/T \\ &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{I}_N, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we denote the signal power matrix as  $\mathbf{P} \equiv \mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H/T$ .

Note from (4) that the population covariance  $\mathbf{C}$  is highly structured, in the sense that its top subspace relates to the subspace spanned by the steering vectors  $\mathbf{a}(\theta_k)$ , and thus provides information of the desired DoAs  $\theta_k$ . The eigenspace associated with the  $K$  largest eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{C}$  is referred to in the literature as the ‘‘signal subspace’’  $\mathbf{U}_K$ . Since  $\mathbf{C}$  is not available in practical situations, subspace methods are performed on the SCM constructed from  $T$  observations as

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/T. \quad (5)$$

### B. The ESPRIT DoA Estimator

The ESPRIT method [21] relies on the following structure of rotational invariance: For steering matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  defined in (3) and  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$  two selection matrices that select  $n$  out of  $N$  rows of  $\mathbf{A}$  with distance  $\Delta \geq 1$ , that is

$$\mathbf{J}_1^T = [\mathbf{e}_\ell, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{n+\ell-1}], \quad \mathbf{J}_2^T = [\mathbf{e}_{\ell+\Delta}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{n+\ell+\Delta-1}], \quad (6)$$

for  $\mathbf{e}_i$  the canonical vector of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  such that  $[\mathbf{e}_i]_j = \delta_{ij}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{A}$  is a Vandermonde matrix and satisfies

$$\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A} \operatorname{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_k}\}_{k=1}^K = \mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{A}. \quad (7)$$

While  $\mathbf{A}$  is unknown, it follows from (4) that the top- $K$  subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  of  $\mathbf{C}$  is the same as the subspace spanned by the columns of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1/2}$ , so that

$$\mathbf{U}_K = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}^{-1/2}\mathbf{M}, \quad (8)$$

for some invertible  $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$ . ESPRIT algorithm then exploits the rotational invariance property of signal subspaces spanned by the two subarrays selected by  $\mathbf{J}_1$  and  $\mathbf{J}_2$ . Combing (7) with (8), the DoAs  $\theta_k$  can be written as the angles of the  $k$ th complex eigenvalues of

$$\hat{\Phi} = (\mathbf{U}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{U}_K)^{-1} \mathbf{U}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{U}_K \equiv \hat{\Phi}_1^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2, \quad (9)$$

assuming invertible  $\hat{\Phi}_1 \equiv \mathbf{U}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{U}_K \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$ . While the population signal subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K$  is not practically available, ESPRIT proposes to estimate the DoAs by replacing  $\mathbf{U}_K$  in (9) with the empirical estimate  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$  obtained from the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ , assuming that  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  is ‘‘close’’ to the population covariance  $\mathbf{C}$  in some sense. This leads to the ESPRIT DoA estimation procedure summarized in Algorithm 1.

### C. Eigenspectral Inconsistency for Large-dimensional SCM

ESPRIT relies on the assumption that the signal subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K$  can be accurately estimated by  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$ . This is typically valid when the number of observations  $T$  is much larger than the array size  $N$ , making the sample covariance  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  a good ‘‘proxy’’ of population covariance  $\mathbf{C}$  in the sense that  $\|\hat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}\| \rightarrow 0$  as

---

### Algorithm 1 ESPRIT DoA estimation.

---

- Input:** Received signal  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$ , number of sources  $K$ .  
**Output:** Estimated DoA angles  $\hat{\theta}_k, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .
- 1: Compute the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/T$  as in (5) to retrieve  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K = [\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  the estimated signal subspace composed of the top- $K$  eigenvectors  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_K \in \mathbb{C}^N$  associated to the largest  $K$  eigenvalues of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ ;
  - 2: Define two selection matrices  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$  as in (6) that both select  $n$  among  $N$  rows with a distance  $\Delta \geq 1$ ;
  - 3: Compute  $\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$ , for invertible  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$ , and then the *angles* of  $\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi})$ , the  $k$ th (complex) eigenvalue of  $\hat{\Phi}$ ;
  - 4: **return**  $\hat{\theta}_k = \arg(\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}))/\Delta, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .
- 

$T \rightarrow \infty$  for fixed  $N$ , by the law of large numbers. However, in the case of large arrays and/or limited snapshots, where  $N$  and  $T$  are of the same order of magnitude,  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  is *not* a consistent estimator of  $\mathbf{C}$  in a spectral norm sense. Consequently, we should *not* expect that the top subspace  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$  used in ESPRIT is a good estimate of the true signal subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K$ .

In the following, we recall a few results from large-dimensional RMT that provide precise eigenspectral characterizations of SCM in the large  $N, T$  regime. We positive ourselves under the following assumptions.

**Assumption 1** (Large arrays and limited snapshots). *As  $T \rightarrow \infty, N/T \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty), n/N \rightarrow \tau \in (0, 1)$  and  $K$  fixed.*

**Assumption 2** (Subspace separation). *Consider the eigen-decomposition of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  in (4) as*

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H) \cdot \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_k^H. \quad (10)$$

*Then, as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , the top eigenvalues  $\lambda_k(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H)$  satisfy*

$$\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H) \rightarrow \ell_1 > \dots > \lambda_K(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H) \rightarrow \ell_K > \sqrt{c}, \quad (11)$$

*where we recall  $c = \lim N/T$  in Assumption 1, for  $\ell_k$  the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the  $k$ -th source signal.*

For the eigenspectral characterization of large (random or deterministic) matrices, we define the empirical spectral measure and its Stieltjes transform as follows.

**Definition 1** (Empirical spectral measure). *For a Hermitian matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ , its empirical spectral measure is defined as the normalized counting measure of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, \lambda_N(\mathbf{X})$  of  $\mathbf{X}$ ,*

$$\mu_{\mathbf{X}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\lambda_i(\mathbf{X})}, \quad (12)$$

*where  $\delta_x$  represents the Dirac measure at  $x$ .*

**Definition 2** (Stieltjes transform). *For a probability measure  $\mu$  (e.g., an empirical spectral measure in Definition 1), its Stieltjes transform  $m_\mu(z)$  is defined, for  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ , as*

$$m_\mu(z) = \int \frac{\mu(dt)}{t - z} = \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{X}}(z), \quad (13)$$

*with  $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{X}}(z) = (\mathbf{X} - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  the resolvent of  $\mathbf{X}$ .*

The resolvent and Stieltjes transform provide convenient access to the eigenspectral behavior of large random matrices. We refer the interested readers to [9, Section 2] as well as [22], [23] for more discussions.

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have the following results, due to a sequence of previous efforts [24]–[27].

**Theorem 1** (Eigenspectral characterization of large-dimensional SCM [24]–[27]). *Under the settings and notations of Assumption 1, we have, for  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  defined (3) and as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  with  $N/T \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$  that, with probability one, the empirical spectral measure in Definition 1 of the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/T$  converges weakly to the Marčenko-Pastur law*

$$\mu(dx) = (1 + c^{-1})^+ \delta_0(x) + \frac{\sqrt{(x - E_-)^+(E_+ - x)^+} dx}{2\pi c x},$$

with  $E_{\pm} = (1 \pm \sqrt{c})^2$  and  $(x)^+ = \max(x, 0)$ . And its Stieltjes transform (see Definition 2) converges to  $m(z)$ , the unique Stieltjes transform solution to the Marčenko-Pastur equation [24]

$$zcm^2(z) - (1 - c - z)m(z) + 1 = 0. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, let Assumption 2 hold and denote  $\hat{\lambda}_1 > \dots > \hat{\lambda}_N$  the ordered eigenvalues of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  with corresponding eigenvectors  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_N$ , we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_i \rightarrow \begin{cases} \bar{\lambda}_i = \left(1 + \ell_i + c \frac{1 + \ell_i}{\ell_i}\right) > E_+, & i \leq K \\ E_+ = (1 + \sqrt{c})^2, & i > K \end{cases}; \quad (15)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ . Also, for all deterministic sequences of unit norm vectors  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , we have,

$$\mathbf{a}^H \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{b} - \frac{1 - c\ell_k^{-2}}{1 + c\ell_k^{-1}} \mathbf{a}^H \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{b} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \quad (16)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\mathbf{u}_k \equiv \mathbf{u}_k(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H)$  in (10).

Theorem 1 states that for  $N, T$  both large and comparable with ratio  $c = \lim N/T$ , the eigenvalues of the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ , instead of being close to those of its population counterpart  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H + \mathbf{I}_N$  in (4), spread out on the interval  $[E_-, E_+]$  of length  $4\sqrt{c} \gg 0$ . Moreover, under the additional Assumption 2, it is known that the largest eigenvalues of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  (that are due to the “signal”  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H$ ) are guaranteed to “separate” from those due to the random white noise. However, even in this case, the empirical eigenvalues  $\hat{\lambda}_i$  of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  are larger than the population ones (i.e.,  $1 + \ell_i$ ), by a quantity that is proportional to  $c = \lim N/T$ , and eigenvectors  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k$  are *biased* estimate of the population eigenvectors  $\mathbf{u}_k(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H)$ , in the sense that for arbitrary deterministic  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ , the eigenspace  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H$  is *biased* by a factor of  $(1 - c\ell_k^{-2})/(1 + c\ell_k^{-1})$  as in (16).

Theorem 1 can be proven using the so-called “Deterministic Equivalent for resolvent” analysis framework. This approach will be constantly exploited in the proof of our technical results in this paper. We refer the interested readers to Section B of the appendix as well as [9, Chapter 2] for a detailed discussion of this approach.

### III. INCONSISTENCY OF ESPRIT FOR LARGE ARRAYS

In this section, we present our main result in Theorem 2 on the large-dimensional inconsistency of classical ESPRIT in Section III-A. The proof of Theorem 2 relies on a novel bound on eigenvalue difference between two matrices derived in Section III-B, and is given in detail in Section III-C.

Built upon recent advances in RMT, we perform in this section an in-depth analysis of the classical ESPRIT method in Algorithm 1 in the large array and limited snapshot setting of Assumption 1. We show that, in general, classical ESPRIT provides *inconsistent* estimates of the DoAs in the following two scenarios: *widely-spaced* DoAs and *closely-spaced* DoAs, defined respectively as follows.

**Assumption 3** (Widely spaced DoAs). *The DoAs  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K$  are fixed as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , and they have angular separation much larger than a beam-width  $2\pi/N$ .*

**Assumption 4** (Closely spaced DoAs). *The DoAs  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K$  are spaced with a “distance” of order  $O(N^{-1})$ , that is*

$$|\theta_k - \theta| = O(N^{-1}), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \quad (17)$$

for some  $\theta > 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 1** ( $N$ -consistent estimator). In the case of closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4, the DoAs are within a “distance” of order  $O(N^{-1})$ . As such, for an estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  of the true DoA  $\theta_k$  to be distinguished from other DoAs, one must have an estimation error of order  $o(N^{-1})$ . We say, in this case, that the estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  is  $N$ -consistent if  $N(\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , see also [10]. Note that this differs from the widely-spaced DoA scenario in Assumption 3, in which case we only need  $\hat{\theta}_k$  to be a consistent estimation of  $\theta_k$ , that is  $\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 2** (Widely versus closely-spaced DoAs). Under Assumption 1 and in the case of widely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 3, we have, as  $N, n, T \rightarrow \infty$  at the same pace that  $\|\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_K\| = O(N^{-1})$ , so that the steering matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is (approximately for  $N$  large) the same as the signal subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K$ , and that both  $\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_2^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A}$  are asymptotically diagonal. On the contrary, in the case of closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4,  $\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A}$  is no longer asymptotically identity, and  $\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_2^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A}$  are no longer asymptotically diagonal. See Lemma 5 in Section A of the appendix for a detailed characterization of these quantities.

#### A. Large-dimensional behavior of ESPRIT

According to Algorithm 1, the ESPRIT DoA estimates depend on the angles of the eigenvalues of

$$\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{U}}_K \equiv \hat{\Phi}_1^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2, \quad (18)$$

where  $\hat{\Phi}, \hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  are empirical estimates of their population counterparts in (9).

In the following result, by studying the behavior of  $\hat{\Phi}$ , we provide a precise large-dimensional characterization of the classical ESPRIT method in the large array and limited snapshot regime. The key idea and technical challenges to prove Theorem 2 will be discussed in Section III-C.

**Theorem 2** (Large-dimensional behavior of ESPRIT). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, let in addition either Assumption 3 or Assumption 4 hold, denote  $\hat{\theta}_k$  the DoA estimate obtained from the classical ESPRIT in Algorithm 1, we have, for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and  $\bar{\theta}_k \equiv \arg(\lambda_k(\bar{\Phi}))/\Delta$  that*

$$\Delta(\hat{\theta}_k - \bar{\theta}_k) \rightarrow 0, \quad (19)$$

*almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\lambda_k(\bar{\Phi})$  the  $k$ th largest eigenvalue of  $\bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}_1^{-1}\bar{\Phi}_2$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}_1 &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}})\mathbf{\Phi}_1 \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}}) + \tau(\mathbf{I}_K - \text{diag}(\mathbf{g})), \\ \bar{\Phi}_2 &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}})\mathbf{\Phi}_2 \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}}), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

*for  $\sqrt{\mathbf{g}} = [\sqrt{g_1}, \dots, \sqrt{g_K}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$  with*

$$g_k \equiv \frac{1 - c\ell_k^{-2}}{1 + c\ell_k^{-1}} \in (0, 1). \quad (21)$$

Theorem 2 tells us that in the large  $N, T$  regime, the estimates  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$ , due to the large-dimensional inconsistency of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  discussed in Section II-C, are *biased* from their population counterparts  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  defined in (9), and connect instead to  $\bar{\Phi}_1, \bar{\Phi}_2$  in (20). As a direct consequence of Theorem 2, we have, in the case of large arrays, that ESPRIT method diverges from its original design discussed in Section II-A and should in general *not* be able to provide consistent DoA estimates in neither widely- nor closely-spaced DoAs scenarios.

In the following, we discuss special cases where the aforementioned large-dimensional inconsistency of classical ESPRIT holds or, by chance, fails.

To start with, one may expect that in the limit of infinite snapshots and/or high SNR, the large-dimensional corrections in Theorem 1 vanish and, as a consequence, ESPRIT becomes consistent. This is true per the following remark.

**Remark 3** (Limiting cases: infinite snapshots or high SNR). In the limit of infinite snapshots as  $c = \lim N/T \rightarrow 0$  or of high SNR as  $\ell_k \rightarrow \infty$ , one has  $g_k \rightarrow 1$ , so that  $\bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}_1^{-1}\bar{\Phi}_2 = \Phi$  and classical ESPRIT provides consistent DoA estimates.

**Remark 4** (Limiting case: small subarray). While at first sight of Theorem 2, one may want to take the limit of  $\tau = \lim n/N \rightarrow 0$ , so that the large-dimensional bias term  $\text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}})$  in both  $\bar{\Phi}_1$  and  $\bar{\Phi}_2$  could cancel out, rendering classical ESPRIT consistent, this is *not* true. This is due to the fact that under both Assumptions 3 and 4, one has  $\Phi_1 \rightarrow 0$  in the limit of  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  and  $\bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}_1^{-1}\bar{\Phi}_2$  is not well defined.

Beyond the limiting case discussed in Remark 3, classical ESPRIT also holds consistency in the uncorrelated and widely-spaced DoAs scenario, as in the following remark.

**Remark 5** (Special case: widely-spaced DoAs with uncorrelated sources). For widely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 3, assume in addition that the sources are *uncorrelated* so that  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H/T$  is (asymptotically) diagonal. In this case, it follows from Remark 2 that the top- $K$  subspace  $\mathbf{U}_K$  is approximately the same as that spanned by the steering vectors, and that  $\Phi_1 = \tau\mathbf{I}_K + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1})$ ,  $\Phi_2 = \tau \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_k}\}_{k=1}^K + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1})$ , so that  $\bar{\Phi}$  defined in (20) writes

$$\bar{\Phi} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}}) \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_k}\}_{k=1}^K \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mathbf{g}}) + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}),$$

for  $\mathbf{g}$  a real vector. As such,  $\bar{\Phi}$  has the same eigenvalue *angles* as  $\Phi$ , and that  $\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k \rightarrow 0$  almost surely. Classical ESPRIT thus provides consistent DoA estimation in this setting.

Beyond the special cases discussed in Remarks 3 and 5, where the classical ESPRIT estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k$  obtained from Algorithm 1 are “lucky” enough to be consistent, it can be shown that  $\hat{\theta}_k$  in general deviates from the true DoA  $\theta_k$  in the large  $N, T$  regime. We provide in the following two examples: widely-spaced DoAs with correlated sources and closely-spaced DoAs with equal power sources.

**Remark 6** (Special case: widely-spaced DoAs with correlated sources). In the case of widely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 3, consider a general scenario where the sources are *correlated* with generic  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H/T$ . This is in contrast to the uncorrelated source setting in Remark 5. Denote  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P}^H$  the eigen-decomposition of  $\mathbf{P}$ , it then follows from Lemma 5 in Section A of the appendix that  $\Phi_1 = \mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P}^H\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}) = \tau\mathbf{I}_K + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1})$  and similarly that  $\Phi_2 = \tau\mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P}^H \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_i}\}_{i=1}^K \mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1})$ , so that

$$\bar{\Phi} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{g})\mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P}^H \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_i}\}_{i=1}^K \mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P} \text{diag}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}).$$

As such,  $\bar{\Phi}$  has, in general, its eigenvalues different from those of  $\Phi$ . This, by Theorem 2, leads to *inconsistent* ESPRIT estimates such that  $\arg(\lambda_k(\bar{\Phi}))/\Delta - \theta_k \not\rightarrow 0$  as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

It can be checked, in the case of  $K = 2$  sources with different DoAs  $\Delta\theta_1 \neq \Delta\theta_2 + m\pi$  for positive integer  $m$ , that the classical ESPRIT estimates *cannot* be consistent *unless*  $\mathbf{U}_\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_2$ , that is, when the two sources are *uncorrelated*. See Section C-A in the appendix for a detailed exposition of this counterexample.

**Remark 7** (Special case: closely-spaced DoAs with equal power sources). In the case of closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4, we consider  $K = 2$  sources with  $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \alpha/N$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and assume uncorrelated signals with equal powers, that is,  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_2$ . It can be checked that classical ESPRIT is *not*  $N$ -consistent in this case, that is  $N(\arg(\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}))/\Delta - \theta_k) \not\rightarrow 0$  as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , see Section C-B in the appendix for a detailed proof.

## B. A novel bound on eigenvalue difference

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 2. The major technical challenge in characterizing the large-dimensional behavior of ESPRIT in Algorithm 1 lies in the fact that the corresponding DoA estimates, which are the angles of the complex eigenvalues of the  $K$ -by- $K$  random matrix  $\hat{\Phi}$  defined in (18), depend on the entries of two *strongly dependent* random matrices  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$  in a non-trivial manner. In addition, the off-diagonal complex entry of  $\hat{\Phi}_2$  in (18), for  $i \neq j$ , is given by

$$[\hat{\Phi}_2]_{ij} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j = \sum_{m=\ell}^{n+\ell-1} \mathbf{e}_{m+\Delta}^H \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_j^H \mathbf{e}_m, \quad (22)$$

and cannot be handled using standard RMT techniques. The same holds true for  $[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{ij}$ , the off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$ . Indeed, standard RMT and contour integration techniques

provide direct access to the following bilinear forms in the large  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  limit,

$$\mathbf{a}^H \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_i^H \mathbf{b}, \quad (23)$$

for  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  of bounded norm, see for example [9, Section 2.5]. This thus provides access to (limits of) the diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$ , but *not* their off-diagonal entries.

To resolve this technical challenge, we introduce the following bound on the eigenvalue difference between two (possibly non-Hermitian) matrices, using the products of their entries with indices forming a circle.

**Theorem 3** (Eigenvalue approximation between two matrices). *For two matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$ , if for any  $m$ -node cycle of indices  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq K$ , the entries of  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  satisfy, for some  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  that*

$$|A_{i_1 i_2} A_{i_2 i_3} \dots A_{i_m i_1} - B_{i_1 i_2} B_{i_2 i_3} \dots B_{i_m i_1}| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (24)$$

then, the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  satisfy

$$|\lambda_k(\mathbf{A}) - \lambda_k(\mathbf{B})| \leq C \sqrt[k]{\varepsilon}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \quad (25)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  that only depends on  $K$  and the value of  $\max\{\max_{i,j} |A_{ij}|, \max_{i,j} |B_{ij}|\}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.* To prove Theorem 3, we work on the characteristic polynomials of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ . It is known, e.g., from [28] that the characteristic polynomial of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K}$  writes

$$\det(\lambda \mathbf{I}_K - \mathbf{A}) = \lambda^K - S_1(\mathbf{A})\lambda^{K-1} \dots + (-1)^K S_K(\mathbf{A}), \quad (26)$$

for  $S_k(\mathbf{A})$  the sum of all  $k$ -by- $k$  principal minors of  $\mathbf{A}$ , with  $S_1(\mathbf{A}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $S_K(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{A})$ . Note that this is a polynomial (of  $\lambda$ ) of degree  $K$ , and it suffices to evaluate its coefficients (i.e., the sum of principal minors).

Consider one of the  $k$ -by- $k$  principal minors of two matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k]$  and  $\mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]$ , respectively, with ordered indices  $\mathcal{I}_k : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq K$ , we have, by definition of principal minor, that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\sigma} \text{sign}(\sigma) \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} A_{j\sigma(j)} - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} B_{j\sigma(j)} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma} \left| \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} A_{j\sigma(j)} - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} B_{j\sigma(j)} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where we denote  $\sigma : \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \rightarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  the permutations of the index set  $\mathcal{I}_k$  as in [28, Section 0.3.2] (that are  $k!$  distinct permutations). It is known that every permutation  $\sigma$  of a finite set can be uniquely decomposed into a product of disjoint cycles (and the uniqueness is up to the order of the cycles), see for example [29]. See Example 1 in Section A of

the appendix for an example of such decomposition. Then, it follows from (27) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma} \left| \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} A_{j\sigma(j)} - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} B_{j\sigma(j)} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\sigma} \left| \prod_{i=1}^p \underbrace{A_{j_1 j_2} \dots A_{j_m j_1}}_{\text{indices form an } m_i\text{-node circle}} - \prod_{i=1}^p B_{j_1 j_2} \dots B_{j_m j_1} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where we decompose every  $\sigma$  into  $1 \leq p \leq k$  disjoint circles of possibly different lengths. Since we assume that (24) holds for *any*  $m$ -node cycle (of indices), we have

$$|\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]| \leq \sum_{\sigma} \rho^{p-1} \varepsilon \leq k! \rho^k \varepsilon, \quad (28)$$

where we denote  $\rho \equiv \max\{\max_{i,j} |A_{ij}|, \max_{i,j} |B_{ij}|\}$ .

As such, for the  $k$ -th order coefficient of the characteristic polynomial of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  as in (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_k(\mathbf{A}) - S_k(\mathbf{B})| &= \left| \sum_{|\mathcal{I}_k|=k} \binom{K}{k} |\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]| \right| \\ &\leq \binom{K}{k} \max_{|\mathcal{I}_k|=k} (|\mathbf{A}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \mathbf{B}[\mathcal{I}_k]|) \leq C_K \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C_K$  that only depends on  $\rho$  and  $K$ . This, together with the following quantitative control on the roots of a polynomial, concludes the proof of Theorem 3.  $\square$

**Theorem 4** (Continuity of roots of a polynomial, [30, Theorem 5]). *Let  $f(z)$  be a polynomial of degree  $K$  with only simple roots. For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if the polynomial  $g(z)$  is a  $\delta$ -deformation of  $f(z)$ , that is, their coefficients  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  satisfy  $|a_i - b_i| \leq \delta, i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , then  $g(z)$  has only simple roots and for every root  $r_f$  of  $f(z)$ , there exists a root  $r_g$  of  $g(z)$  such that  $|r_f - r_g| \leq C' \delta^{1/K} < \varepsilon$  for some  $C' > 0$  that depends only on the coefficient and  $K$ .*

### C. Proof of Theorem 2

Here, we present the detailed proof of Theorem 2, following the same line of arguments as that of Theorem 3. The major difference is that, to prove Theorem 2, we need to evaluate the eigenvalues of the *product* of two matrices  $\hat{\Phi} = \hat{\Phi}_1^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2$  as in (18), as opposed to the single matrix ( $\mathbf{A}$ ) in Theorem 3.

Following the idea of Theorem 3, we provide, in the following result, characterization of the diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  and the product of the off-diagonal entries, when their indices form a circle.

**Theorem 5** (Large-dimensional characterization of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$ ). *Under the same settings and notations of Theorem 2, we have, for  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  defined in (18), that*

- 1) their diagonal entries satisfy, for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ ,

$$[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_1]_{kk} \rightarrow 0, \quad [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_2]_{kk} \rightarrow 0, \quad (29)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $\bar{\Phi}_1, \bar{\Phi}_2$  defined in (20);

- 2) for indices  $1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_m \leq K$  that form an  $m$ -node cycle, denote  $\mathbf{M}_{k_j} = \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2$  or  $\mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,

so that the off-diagonal entries  $[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{k_i k_j}$  or  $[\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k_i k_j}$  of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  can be uniformly written as  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_i}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_j}$ , we have

$$\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} - \bar{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} \rightarrow 0, \quad (30)$$

with  $\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_m}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_1} (\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_j}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_{j+1}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_{j+1}})$ ,  $\bar{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} \equiv g_1 \mathbf{u}_{k_m}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1} (\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} g_{j+1} \mathbf{u}_{k_j}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_{j+1}} \mathbf{u}_{k_{j+1}})$  almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .<sup>3</sup>

*Proof of Theorem 5.* See Section C-C of the appendix.  $\square$

Theorem 5 provides, in the large-dimensional regime of Assumption 1, characterizations of the diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  and any product of their off-diagonal entries when their indices form a circle. Using Theorem 5, we have the following result for the product of the off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi} = \hat{\Phi}_1^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2$ , again when their indices form a circle.

**Lemma 1** (Large-dimensional characterization of  $\hat{\Phi}$ ). *For  $\hat{\Phi}, \bar{\Phi}$  defined in Theorem 2, and any  $m$ -node cycle of indices  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq K$ , the entries of  $\hat{\Phi}, \bar{\Phi}$  satisfy*

$$[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_2 i_3} \dots [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_m i_1} - [\bar{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} [\bar{\Phi}]_{i_2 i_3} \dots [\bar{\Phi}]_{i_m i_1} \rightarrow 0,$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1.* See Section C-D of the appendix.  $\square$

With Lemma 1 at hand, we then have, for any  $k$ -by- $k$  principal minors of  $\hat{\Phi}$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$ , denoted respectively as  $\hat{\Phi}[\mathcal{I}_k], \bar{\Phi}[\mathcal{I}_k]$  that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\hat{\Phi}[\mathcal{I}_k] - \bar{\Phi}[\mathcal{I}_k]| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\sigma} \text{sign}(\sigma) \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} [\hat{\Phi}]_{j\sigma(j)} - \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} [\bar{\Phi}]_{j\sigma(j)} \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\sigma} \left| \prod_{i=1}^p \underbrace{[\hat{\Phi}]_{j_1 j_2} \dots [\hat{\Phi}]_{j_{m_i} j_1}}_{\text{indices form an } m_i\text{-node circle}} - \prod_{i=1}^p [\bar{\Phi}]_{j_1 j_2} \dots [\bar{\Phi}]_{j_{m_i} j_1} \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, the  $k$ -th order coefficient of the characteristic polynomial of  $\hat{\Phi}$  and  $\bar{\Phi}$  satisfies  $|S_k(\hat{\Phi}) - S_k(\bar{\Phi})| \rightarrow 0$ . This, together with Theorem 4, concludes that  $\lambda(\hat{\Phi}) - \lambda(\bar{\Phi}) \rightarrow 0$  and thus the proof of Theorem 2.

#### IV. CONSISTENT DOA ESTIMATION WITH G-ESPRIT

We have seen in Theorem 2 and the discussions thereafter that classical ESPRIT in Algorithm 1 is, in general, *incapable* of providing consistent DoA estimates in the large array and limited snapshot regime. In this section, we present an improved approach: the generalized ESPRIT (G-ESPRIT) method that fixes the large-dimensional inconsistency of classical ESPRIT in this regime.

The G-ESPRIT method is as simple as classical ESPRIT, but with the large-dimensional ‘‘bias’’ terms of latter consistently estimated and removed. Precisely, it follows from Theorem 2

<sup>3</sup>Note that  $\bar{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m}$  is nothing but the product of off-diagonal entries of  $\bar{\Phi}_1, \bar{\Phi}_2$  defined in (20).

that the top subspace  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$  of SCM contains additional large-dimensional bias terms (in  $\bar{\Phi}$ ) of the form  $g_k = \frac{1 - c\hat{\ell}_k^{-2}}{1 + c\hat{\ell}_k^{-1}}$  defined in (21). These quantities, for known dimension ratio  $N/T$ , can be consistently estimated from the SCM per the following result.

**Lemma 2** (Consistent estimates of  $g_k$ ). *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, let  $\hat{\lambda}_k$  be the  $k$ th largest eigenvalue of SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ ,  $g_k$  be defined in (21),  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , and*

$$\hat{g}_k = \frac{1 - \frac{N}{T} \hat{\ell}_k^{-2}}{1 + \frac{N}{T} \hat{\ell}_k^{-1}}, \quad (31)$$

with  $\hat{\ell}_k \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\lambda}_k - 1 - \frac{N}{T} + \sqrt{(\hat{\lambda}_k - 1 - \frac{N}{T})^2 - \frac{4N}{T}})$ . We have that  $\hat{\ell}_k - \ell_k \rightarrow 0$  and  $\hat{g}_k - g_k \rightarrow 0$  almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Under Assumptions 1 and 2, it follows from Theorem 1 that the  $k$ -th largest eigenvalue  $\hat{\lambda}_k$  of SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  satisfies  $\hat{\lambda}_k \rightarrow 1 + \ell_k + c \frac{1 + \ell_k}{\ell_k}$  almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ . Inverting the expression and using continuous mapping theorem, we have that  $\hat{\ell}_k - \ell_k \rightarrow 0$ . By definition of  $g_k$  and continuous mapping theorem, we conclude the proof of Lemma 2.  $\square$

Lemma 2 provides consistent estimates of the bias terms in classical ESPRIT. These estimates, combining with Theorem 2, lead to the G-ESPRIT DoA estimation procedure summarized in Algorithm 2, with the following guarantee.

**Proposition 1** (Consistent DoA estimation with G-ESPRIT). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, let in addition either Assumption 3 or Assumption 4 hold, denote  $\theta_k$  the true DoAs, we have, for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and  $\hat{\theta}_k^G \equiv \arg(\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}^G))/\Delta$  that*

$$\Delta(\hat{\theta}_k^G - \theta_k) \rightarrow 0, \quad (32)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}^G)$  the  $k$ th largest eigenvalue of  $\hat{\Phi}^G = (\hat{\Phi}_1^G)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2^G$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_1^G &= \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}) \left( \hat{\Phi}_1 - \tau \mathbf{I}_K \right) \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}) + \tau \mathbf{I}_K, \\ \hat{\Phi}_2^G &= \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}) \hat{\Phi}_2 \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

for  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2} = [1/\sqrt{\hat{g}_1}, \dots, 1/\sqrt{\hat{g}_K}]^T$  and  $\hat{g}_k$  as defined in (31).

The proof of Proposition 1 follows from the almost sure convergence of the estimates  $\hat{\ell}_k$  and  $\hat{g}_k$  in Lemma 2 and the line of arguments in Sections III-B and III-C for Theorem 2, and is omitted here.

A few remarks and discussions on Proposition 1 are in order.

**Remark 8** (Special case: G-ESPRIT for widely-spaced DoAs). For widely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 3, it follows from Remark 6 and Lemma 5 in Section A of the appendix that  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  is approximately diagonal with *real* diagonal entries, and it thus suffices to ‘‘de-bias’’  $\hat{\Phi}_2$  as

$$\hat{\Phi}_2^G = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}) \hat{\Phi}_2 \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}^{-1/2}), \quad (34)$$

and that both  $\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}_1^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_2^G)/\Delta$  and  $\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}_2^G)/\Delta$  alone in fact yield consistent DoA estimation.

Proposition 1 tells us that the G-ESPRIT approach in Algorithm 2 provides consistent DoA estimates in the large

---

**Algorithm 2** The proposed G-ESPRIT DoA estimation.

---

**Input:** Received signal  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$ , number of sources  $K$ .

**Output:** Estimated DoA angles  $\hat{\theta}_k^G, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .

- 1: Compute the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/T$  to retrieve  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K = [\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  the estimated signal subspace composed of the top- $K$  eigenvectors  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}_K \in \mathbb{C}^N$  associated to the largest  $K$  eigenvalues of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ ;
  - 2: Define two selection matrices  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$  as in (6) that both select  $n$  among  $N$  rows with distance  $\Delta \geq 1$ ;
  - 3: Compute  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_2$  using  $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_K$  and  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$  as in (18);
  - 4: Compute  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G$  as in Proposition 1 and then the *angles* of  $\lambda_k(\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G)$ , the  $k$ th complex eigenvalue of  $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G$ ;
  - 5: **return**  $\hat{\theta}_k^G = \arg(\lambda_k(\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G))/\Delta, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .
- 

array and limited snapshot regime while the classical ESPRIT in Algorithm 1 cannot. However, Proposition 1 alone provides theoretical guarantees for G-ESPRIT in the widely-spaced DoA (Assumption 3) but *not* in the closely-spaced DoA (Assumption 4) setting. In the latter case, one needs  $N$ -consistent estimator to separate closely-spaced DoAs, see our discussion in Remark 1 above. This  $N$ -consistency can be shown under an additional assumption on the subarray “distance”  $\Delta$  as follow.

**Corollary 1** ( $N$ -consistency of G-ESPRIT). *Under the notations and settings of Proposition 1, assume in addition that the subarray distance  $\Delta$  satisfies that  $\Delta/N$  converges in  $(0, 1)$ , then, the G-ESPRIT estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k^G$  are  $N$ -consistent, that is*

$$N(\hat{\theta}_k^G - \theta_k) \rightarrow 0, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \quad (35)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Corollary 1 is a direct consequence of Proposition 1 and the assumption that  $\Delta$  is of order  $N$ .<sup>4</sup> It shows that G-ESPRIT in fact provides  $N$ -consistent DoA estimations in both widely and closely-spaced DoA scenarios, with estimation errors of order  $o(N^{-1})$ . Typically, the estimation error is of order  $O(N^{-3/2})$ , as per the following remark.

**Remark 9** (Precise estimation error for two DoAs). In the case of  $K = 2$  DoAs, under the same notations and settings of Corollary 1, one has that

$$\hat{\theta}_k^G - \theta_k = O(N^{-3/2}), \quad k \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (36)$$

See Section C-E for a proof of this result. For  $K > 2$ , it follows from Theorem 4 that one has instead  $\lambda(\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G) - \lambda(\mathbf{\Phi}) = O(N^{-1/(2K)})$  and  $\hat{\theta}_k^G - \theta_k = O(N^{-1-1/(2K)})$ .

## V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we provide numerical simulations to validate our theoretical analysis of classical ESPRIT in Section III and the proposed G-ESPRIT method in Section IV. Precisely, in Section V-A we provide simulations on not-so-large  $N, T$ , to validate our asymptotic analysis

<sup>4</sup>As we shall see below in Section V, taking a large subarray distance  $\Delta$  of order  $N$  leads to small MSEs that are empirically close to the theoretically optimal Cramér–Rao Bound. The theoretical investigation of this observation, however, needs second-order analysis (of the fluctuation) of ESPRIT and/or G-ESPRIT estimators and is beyond the scope of this paper.

(as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  together) in Sections III and IV for finite dimensional signals. Then, in Section V-B, we compare the proposed G-ESPRIT approach to other DoA estimation methods such as MUSIC and G-MUSIC [14], as well as to the (theoretically optimal) Cramér–Rao Bound (CRB). Code to reproduce the results in this section is available at <https://github.com/zhengyuwang0/GESPRIT>.

**Remark 10** (On the choice of subarray size  $n$  and distance  $\Delta$ ). Increasing the subarray size  $n$  expands the array’s effective aperture, leading to improved resolution and enhanced performance of ESPRIT method. At the same time, the choice of  $(n, \Delta)$  in Algorithms 1 and 2 must satisfy  $n + \Delta \leq N$  and  $-\pi \leq \Delta\theta \leq \pi$ . Specifically, if the phase difference  $\Delta\theta_k$  for different  $k$  exceeds  $2\pi$ , it will “wrap around” due to the periodic nature of the phase, leading to a misinterpretation of the true angles. Therefore, in the simulations in this section, we choose, in the case of widely-spaced DoAs, and without prior information about the DoAs,  $\Delta = 1$  to avoid this phase ambiguity, and  $n = N - 1$ . In the closely-spaced DoA setting, we set  $n = N - \Delta$ ,  $0 \leq \Delta \leq \pi/\theta$ , and compare the MSEs for different choices of  $(n, \Delta)$  in Figure 2. We observe from Figure 2 that  $n = 2N/3$  and  $\Delta = N/3$  yields the minimum MSE. This is consistent with the results in [31], and we stick to these settings in the remainder of this section.




Fig. 2: MSEs of classical ESPRIT as a function of subarray size  $n$  with  $n + \Delta = N$ ,  $N = 80$ ,  $T = 160$ . The two closely-spaced sources at DoA  $\theta_1 = 0$  and  $\theta_2 = 0.8 \times 2\pi/N$ , and the power matrix  $\mathbf{P} = 2\mathbf{I}_2$ . Results are obtained by averaging over 500 independent trials.

### A. Validation of asymptotic theoretical results

We start by showing that the proposed asymptotic analyses in Theorem 2 and Proposition 1 provide accurate predictions on finite dimensional signals.

Figure 3 compares the approximation errors  $\|\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}} - \bar{\mathbf{\Phi}}\|$  for classical ESPRIT and  $\|\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}^G - \mathbf{\Phi}\|$  for the proposed G-ESPRIT, in Theorem 2 and Proposition 1 respectively. We see, in both widely-spaced (Assumption 3) and closely-spaced (Assumption 4) scenarios, in the left and right plot of Figure 3, respectively, that as the array length  $N$  grows, the spectral norm errors empirically decay at a rate of  $O(N^{-1/2})$ , as in line with Remark 9 above.

Figure 4 provides empirical support to our discussions on the special case of widely-spaced DoAs with correlated






Fig. 3: Approximation errors in spectral norm versus array length  $N$ , for  $T = 2N$ . Simulation results in **blue** are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials, versus polynomial fit in **red**. **Left**: widely-spaced DoAs with correlated sources at DoA  $\theta_1 = 0$  and  $\theta_2 = \pi/4$ , power matrix  $\mathbf{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0.8 \\ 0.8 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ , subarray size  $n = N - 1$ , and distance  $\Delta = 1$ . **Right**: closely-spaced DoAs ( $\theta_1 = 0$  and  $\theta_2 = 0.8 \times 2\pi/N$ ) having equal powers with  $\mathbf{P} = 2\mathbf{I}_2$ ,  $n = 2N/3$ , and  $\Delta = N/3$ .

sources in Remark 6. Here, under the same setting as in the left plot of Figure 3, we compare, in the left plot of Figure 4, the DoAs estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  from classical ESPRIT (as well as the theoretical characterizations  $\bar{\theta}$  given in Theorem 2), to  $\hat{\theta}^G$  from the G-ESPRIT method in Proposition 1. We observe that:

- 1) the theoretical characterization ( $\bar{\theta}$ ) perfectly matches the classical ESPRIT estimate ( $\hat{\theta}$ , that is observed to diverge from the true DoAs  $\theta$ ); and
- 2) the proposed G-ESPRIT estimates  $\hat{\theta}^G$  remove this bias.

In the right plot of Figure 4, we compare the MSEs and variances of both classical ESPRIT ( $\hat{\theta}$ ) and G-ESPRIT ( $\hat{\theta}^G$ ) estimates, as the array length  $N$  increases, with a fixed ratio  $N/T = 1/2$ . We observe that:

- 1) classical ESPRIT provides *inconsistent* DoA estimates, with MSE much larger than the variance; and
- 2) G-ESPRIT provides consistent estimates and, in addition, yields *smaller variances* than ESPRIT, but they are both way above the Cramér–Rao Bound (CRB)<sup>5</sup> in this setting, as a consequence of small  $\Delta$ .

In Figure 5, we investigate the case of closely-spaced DoAs with equal power as discussed in Remark 7, in the same setting as the right plot of Figure 3. We observe that:

- 1) classical ESPRIT fails to distinguish two closely-spaced DoAs with a distance of order  $O(N^{-1})$ ; and
- 2) the proposed G-ESPRIT is  $N$ -consistent in this setting, with variance coinciding with the MSE.

To illustrate the “lucky” consistency of classical ESPRIT in the case of widely-spaced DoAs from uncorrelated sources discussed in Remark 5, we show, in Figure 6, the DoA estimation results in the setting as in Figure 4 but with power matrix  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_K$ . We observe that the classical ESPRIT estimates are in agreement with those of G-ESPRIT, and are close to the true

<sup>5</sup>Here we compute the Cramér–Rao Bound for ULA according to [4, Theorem 4.3] as  $\text{CRB} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2N} \{ \Re \{ [\mathbf{D}^H (\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^H) \mathbf{D}] \circ \mathbf{P}^T \} \}^{-1}$  with  $\mathbf{D} = [\frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\theta_1)}{\partial \theta_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\theta_K)}{\partial \theta_K}] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$ .




Fig. 4: **Left**: comparison between DoA estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  from ESPRIT in **blue**,  $\theta$  from Theorem 2 in **green**,  $\hat{\theta}^G$  from G-ESPRIT of Proposition 1 in **red**, and true DoAs  $\theta$  in **purple**; in the same setting as in the left plot of Figure 3, for  $N = 80$  and  $T = 160$ . **Right**: MSEs and variances of DoA estimates for ESPRIT ( $\hat{\theta}$ ) and the improved G-ESPRIT method ( $\hat{\theta}^G$ ), as a function of the array length  $N$ . Results are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials.

DoAs. In this case, both ESPRIT and G-ESPRIT are unbiased estimators, having their MSEs coinciding with variances, but much larger than the CRB, again as a consequence of small  $\Delta$ .




Fig. 5: **Left**: comparison between DoA estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  from ESPRIT in **blue**,  $\theta$  from Theorem 2 in **green**,  $\hat{\theta}^G$  from G-ESPRIT of Proposition 1 in **red**, and true DoAs  $\theta$  in **purple**; in the same setting as the right plot of Figure 3. **Right**: DoA estimation MSEs and variances of ESPRIT and the improved G-ESPRIT methods as the array length  $N$  increases. Results are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials.

## B. Comparison to other DoA approaches

In this subsection, we compare the performances of classical ESPRIT in Algorithm 1, the proposed G-ESPRIT in Algorithm 2, to other popular DoA estimation methods such as MUSIC [1], and G-MUSIC [10], [12].

Figure 7 compares the MSEs of the aforementioned four DoA estimation methods as a function of the (relative) signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), in the case of widely-spaced DoAs (Assumption 3) and under the same settings as in Figure 4. In this case, the subspace separation conditions in Assumption 2 for the two sources are at relative SNR  $-5.2\text{dB}$  and  $-1.5\text{dB}$ , and are marked as vertical dotted lines. Note interestingly that




Fig. 6: **Left:** comparison between DoA estimates  $\hat{\theta}$  from ESPRIT in blue,  $\bar{\theta}$  from Theorem 2 in green,  $\hat{\theta}^G$  from G-ESPRIT of Proposition 1 in red, and true DoAs  $\theta$  in purple; in the same setting as the right plot of Figure 3. **Right:** DoA estimation MSEs and variances of ESPRIT and the improved G-ESPRIT methods as the array length  $N$  increases. Results are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials. Note that all (averaged) MSE and variance curves overlap in this setting.

a *phase transition* behavior can be observed for all subspace methods. When the SNR exceeds the first phase transition threshold, the MSE experiences a significant drop. Upon surpassing the second phase transition threshold, the G-ESPRIT outperforms the classical ESPRIT method. This is an empirical manifestation of the counterintuitive large-dimensional behavior of SCM eigenspectral discussed in Theorem 1. We observe in this widely-spaced DoA setting that both MUSIC and G-MUSIC are close to the CRB, as in line with [10], and the improved G-ESPRIT outperforms the classical ESPRIT. It should be noted, that as the SNR increases, there is still a relatively large performance gap between ESPRIT and the CRB. It appears that ESPRIT is sub-optimal in this setting, as a consequence of the choice of small  $\Delta = 1$ . To have a theoretical grasp of this empirical observation, a second-order behavior analysis is needed.

We then compare in Figure 8 the MSEs of four subspace methods for closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4, and under the same settings as in Figure 5. The subspace separations for two sources occur at relative SNR =  $-3.6$  dB and  $-1.5$  dB, respectively. We observe that the classical MUSIC performs poorly and has a relatively large MSE in this setting, in accordance with the inconsistency proven in [10]. Different from the case of widely-spaced DoA in Figure 7, here the proposed G-ESPRIT beats classical ESPRIT and gets close to the CRB. We believe that this is due to the better choice of large  $\Delta = N/3$ .

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we perform a large-dimensional analysis of the classical ESPRIT DoA estimation method in the regime of large arrays and limited snapshots, where the array length  $N$  and the number of samples  $T$  are both large and comparable. Our study covers both widely-spaced and closely-spaced DoA scenarios. We show that while classical ESPRIT is generally *inconsistent* in these settings, this bias can be corrected using the proposed G-ESPRIT approach.




Fig. 7: Empirical MSEs for widely-spaced DoAs (with  $\theta_1 = 0$ ,  $\theta_2 = \pi/4$ ) versus relative SNR ( $R_{\text{SNR}}$  in dB), with  $N = 400$ ,  $T = 800$ ,  $n = N - 1$ ,  $\Delta = 1$ , and power matrix  $\mathbf{P} = \frac{R_{\text{SNR}}}{1.2} \times \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0.8 \\ 0.8 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ . Vertical dotted lines are the relative SNR phase transition thresholds for the two sources. Results are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials.




Fig. 8: Empirical MSEs for closely-spaced DoA (with  $\theta_1 = 0$ ,  $\theta_2 = 0.8 \times 2\pi/N$ ) versus relative SNR ( $R_{\text{SNR}}$  in dB), with  $N = 400$ ,  $T = 800$ ,  $n = 2N/3$ ,  $\Delta = N/3$  and power matrix  $\mathbf{P} = \frac{R_{\text{SNR}}}{1.5} \times 2\mathbf{I}_2$ . Vertical dotted line are the relative SNR phase transition thresholds for the two sources. Results are obtained by averaging over 200 independent trials.

From a technical perspective, we establish a novel bound on the eigenvalue differences between two possibly non-Hermitian (random) matrices, which is of independent interest to the RMT community. Numerical simulations validate the consistency of G-ESPRIT and highlight its reduced variance compared to classical ESPRIT – though a rigorous theoretical characterization of this variance reduction is beyond the scope of this paper.

It would be of future interest to extend the RMT analysis framework in this paper to characterize the (e.g., CLT-type) second-order fluctuation of both ESPRIT and G-ESPRIT, as to assess quantitatively their performance gaps from the CRB.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ralph Schmidt, "Multiple emitter location and signal parameter estimation," *IEEE Trans Antennas Propag.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 276–280, 1986.
- [2] Bhaskar D Rao and KV SI Hari, "Performance analysis of root-music," *IEEE Trans Acoust.*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1939–1949, 1989.
- [3] A. Paulraj, R. Roy, and T. Kailath, "A subspace rotation approach to signal parameter estimation," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 1044–1046, 1986.
- [4] Petre Stoica and Arye Nehorai, "Music, maximum likelihood, and cramer-rao bound," *IEEE Trans Acoust.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 720–741, 1989.
- [5] Bjorn Ottersten, Mats Viberg, and Thomas Kailath, "Performance analysis of the total least squares esprit algorithm," *IEEE Trans Signal Process.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1122–1135, 1991.
- [6] Mats Viberg and Bjorn Ottersten, "Sensor array processing based on subspace fitting," *IEEE Trans Signal Process.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1110–1121, 1991.
- [7] Petre Stoica, Virginija Šimonyte, and Torsten Söderström, "On the resolution performance of spectral analysis," *Signal processing*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 153–161, 1995.
- [8] Debashis Paul and Alexander Aue, "Random matrix theory in statistics: A review," *J Stat Plan Inference.*, vol. 150, pp. 1–29, July 2014.
- [9] Romain Couillet and Zhenyu Liao, *Random Matrix Methods for Machine Learning*, Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [10] Pascal Vallet, Xavier Mestre, and Philippe Loubaton, "Performance analysis of an improved MUSIC DoA estimator," *IEEE Trans Signal Process.*, vol. 63, no. 23, pp. 6407–6422, 2015.
- [11] Xavier Mestre and Miguel Ángel Lagunas, "Modified subspace algorithms for DoA estimation with large arrays," *IEEE Trans Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 598–614, 2008.
- [12] Pascal Vallet, Philippe Loubaton, and Xavier Mestre, "Improved subspace estimation for multivariate observations of high dimension: the deterministic signals case," *IEEE Trans Inf Theory.*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1043–1068, 2012.
- [13] Walid Hachem, Philippe Loubaton, Xavier Mestre, Jamal Najim, and Pascal Vallet, "Large information plus noise random matrix models and consistent subspace estimation in large sensor networks," *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, vol. 1, no. 02, pp. 1150006, 2012.
- [14] Pascal Vallet, Xavier Mestre, and Philippe Loubaton, "A cft for the g-music doa estimator," *Proc. European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pp. 2298–2302, 2012.
- [15] Xavier Mestre, Pascal Vallet, Philippe Loubaton, and Walid Hachem, "Asymptotic analysis of a consistent subspace estimator for observations of increasing dimension," pp. 677–680, 07 2011.
- [16] A. Paulraj, R. Roy, and T. Kailath, "A subspace rotation approach to signal parameter estimation," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 1044–1046, 1986.
- [17] R. Roy, A. Paulraj, and T. Kailath, "Comparative performance of ESPRIT and MUSIC for direction-of-arrival estimation," in *ICASSP '87. IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, Apr. 1987, vol. 12, pp. 2344–2347.
- [18] T.B. Lavate, V.K. Kokate, and A.M. Sapkal, "Performance Analysis of MUSIC and ESPRIT DOA Estimation Algorithms for Adaptive Array Smart Antenna in Mobile Communication," in *2010 Second International Conference on Computer and Network Technology*, Apr. 2010, pp. 308–311.
- [19] Pascal Vallet and Philippe Loubaton, "On the Performance of MUSIC With Toeplitz Rectification in the Context of Large Arrays," *IEEE Trans Signal Process.*, vol. 65, no. 22, pp. 5848–5859, Nov. 2017.
- [20] Aad W. Van der Vaart, *Asymptotic Statistics*, vol. 3 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [21] R. Roy and T. Kailath, "Esprit-estimation of signal parameters via rotational invariance techniques," *IEEE Trans Acoust.*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 984–995, 1989.
- [22] Walid Hachem, Philippe Loubaton, and Jamal Najim, "Deterministic equivalents for certain functionals of large random matrices," *Ann Appl Probab.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 875–930, 2007.
- [23] Yu. A. Rozanov, *Stationary Random Processes*, Holden-Day series in time series analysis. Holden-Day, San Francisco, 1967.
- [24] Vladimir A Marcenko and Leonid Andreevich Pastur, "Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices," *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 457, 1967.
- [25] Jack W. Silverstein and Zhidong Bai, "On the Empirical Distribution of Eigenvalues of a Class of Large Dimensional Random Matrices," *J Multivar Anal.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 175–192, 1995.
- [26] Jinho Baik and Jack W. Silverstein, "Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models," *J Multivar Anal.*, vol. 97, no. 6, pp. 1382–1408, 2006.
- [27] Florent Benaych-Georges and Raj Rao Nadakuditi, "The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices," *Adv Math (N Y)*, vol. 227, no. 1, pp. 494–521, 2011.
- [28] Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, pp. 38–42, Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [29] William Raymond Scott, *Group theory*, pp. 8–11, Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [30] Melvyn B. Nathanson and David A. Ross, "Continuity of the roots of a polynomial," *Commun Algebra.*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 2509–2518, June 2024.
- [31] Jens Steinwandt, Florian Roemer, and Martin Haardt, "Performance analysis of esprit-type algorithms for non-circular sources," *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pp. 3986–3990, 2013.

APPENDIX A  
TECHNICAL LEMMAS

In this section, we prepare the readers with a few technical lemmas and examples.

**Lemma 3** (Woodbury identity). *For  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times p}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times n}$  such that both  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{UV}^H$  are invertible, we have*

$$(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{UV}^H)^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{U})^{-1}\mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{A}^{-1}.$$

**Lemma 4.** *For  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{p \times n}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times p}$ , we have*

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{BA} - z\mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} = (\mathbf{AB} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}\mathbf{A},$$

for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  distinct from zero and from the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{AB}$ .

**Lemma 5** (Large-dimensional approximations involving steering matrix). *Under the large-dimensional setting in Assumption 1, we have, as  $N, n, T \rightarrow \infty$  at the same pace:*

1) *in the case of widely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 3 that,*

$$\|\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_K\| = O(N^{-1}), \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A} - \tau\mathbf{I}_K\| &= O(N^{-1}) \\ \|\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{A} - \tau \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_i}\}_{i=1}^K\| &= O(N^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

with  $\tau = \lim n/N \in (0, 1)$ , so that the steering matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is (approximately for  $N$  large) the same as  $\mathbf{U}_K$ , the top- $K$  subspace of  $\mathbf{C}$ , and that both  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{A}$  are asymptotically diagonal; and

2) *in the case of closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4 with  $K = 2$  sources such that  $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \alpha/N$  for  $\alpha > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & e^{i\alpha/2} \text{sinc}(\frac{\alpha}{2}) \\ e^{-i\alpha/2} \text{sinc}(\frac{\alpha}{2}) & 1 \end{bmatrix} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}),$$

where  $\text{sinc}(t) = \sin(t)/t$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tau & \frac{1-e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha} \\ \frac{1-e^{-i\alpha\tau}}{i\alpha} & \tau \end{bmatrix} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}), \\ \mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{A} &= \begin{bmatrix} \tau e^{i\Delta\theta_1} & \frac{1-e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} \\ \frac{1-e^{-i\alpha\tau}}{i\alpha} e^{i\Delta\theta_1} & \tau e^{i\Delta\theta_2} \end{bmatrix} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

so that the steering vectors are no longer orthogonal, and  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{A}$  are no long diagonal. In particular, it can be checked that in this setting asymptotically as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{A}$  admits  $1 \pm |\text{sinc}(\frac{\alpha}{2})|$  as eigenvalues, with corresponding eigenvectors

$$\mathbf{v}_{\pm} = [e^{\frac{i\alpha}{2}}, \pm 1]^T / \sqrt{2}. \quad (40)$$

In particular, the approximation errors of both eigenvalues and eigenvectors (in an Euclidean norm sense) are of order  $O(N^{-1})$ , by Weyl's inequality and Davis–Kahan theorem, respectively.

*Proof of Lemma 5.* In the case of widely-spaced DoAs under Assumption 3, we have, per the definition of  $\mathbf{a}(\theta_i)$  in (2) and of  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$  in (6), that

$$\mathbf{a}(\theta_i)^H\mathbf{a}(\theta_j) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N e^{i(k-1)(\theta_j - \theta_i)} = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{N}, & i = j, \\ \frac{e^{i(N-1)(\theta_j - \theta_i)} - 1}{N} \frac{1 - e^{iN(\theta_j - \theta_i)}}{1 - e^{i(\theta_j - \theta_i)}} = O(N^{-1}), & i \neq j; \end{cases}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}(\theta_i)^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{a}(\theta_j) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=\ell}^{\ell+n-1} e^{i(k-1)(\theta_j - \theta_i)} = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{N}, & i = j, \\ O(N^{-1}), & i \neq j; \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{a}(\theta_i)^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{a}(\theta_j) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=\ell}^{\ell+n-1} e^{i\Delta\theta_j} e^{i(k-1)(\theta_j - \theta_i)} = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{N} e^{-i\Delta\theta_i}, & i = j; \\ O(N^{-1}), & i \neq j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the first item of Lemma 5.

In the case of closely-spaced DoAs in Assumption 4 with  $K = 2$  sources such that  $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \alpha/N$  for  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

$$\mathbf{a}(\theta_1)^H\mathbf{J}_1^H\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{a}(\theta_2) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=\ell}^{\ell+n-1} e^{i(k-1)(\theta_2 - \theta_1)} = \frac{e^{i(\ell-1)\alpha/N} (1 - e^{i\alpha n/N})}{N(1 - e^{i\alpha/N})} = \frac{1 - e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha} + O(N^{-1}),$$

by Taylor expansion with  $\tau = \lim n/N$ , and similarly


$$\mathbf{a}(\theta_1)^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{a}(\theta_2) = \frac{1 - e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} + O(N^{-1}).$$

This concludes the proof of the second item of Lemma 5.  $\square$

**Example 1** (Circle decomposition of permutation). *For example, the permutation written in two-line notation as*

$$\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 & 6 & 8 & 3 & 9 & 7 & 2 & 5 \\ 4 & 6 & 8 & 3 & 9 & 1 & 2 & 7 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$$

*has the decomposition of one 6-node cycle, one 2-node cycle, and a 1-node cycle. Its cycle diagram is shown below.*



*After deleting node 4 in the first row and deleting node 6 in the second row, the permutation becomes*

$$\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 6 & 8 & 3 & 9 & 7 & 2 & 5 \\ 4 & 8 & 3 & 9 & 1 & 2 & 7 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$$

*which can be decomposed into a path from node 6 to node 4 and several disjoint cycles, as shown below.*



## APPENDIX B

### DETERMINISTIC EQUIVALENT FOR RESOLVENT

In this section, we present the Deterministic Equivalent as a convenient technical tool to assess the asymptotic behavior of (eigen)spectral scalar observations of large random matrices. We refer the interested readers to [9, Chapter 2] for a review.

**Definition 3** (Deterministic Equivalent). *For Hermitian random matrix  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ , we say a deterministic matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{Q}} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  is a Deterministic Equivalent of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and denote*

$$\mathbf{Q} \leftrightarrow \bar{\mathbf{Q}}, \quad (41)$$

*if for all deterministic matrices  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  and vectors  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^N$  of unit spectral and Euclidean norm, respectively, we have*

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Q} - \bar{\mathbf{Q}})) \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathbf{a}^H(\mathbf{Q} - \bar{\mathbf{Q}})\mathbf{b} \rightarrow 0,$$

*almost surely as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Lemma 6** (First- and second-order Deterministic Equivalents for resolvent, [9, Theorem 2.4]). *For random matrix  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  having i.i.d.  $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$  entries,  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  not eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H/T$  and deterministic matrix  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  of bounded spectral norm, then, for the resolvent  $\mathbf{Q}(z) = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H/T - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1}$ , the following deterministic equivalents hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}(z_1) &\leftrightarrow m(z_1)\mathbf{I}_N, \\ \mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}(z_2) &\leftrightarrow m(z_1)m(z_2)\mathbf{B} + \eta(z_1, z_2)\frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B})\mathbf{I}_N, \end{aligned}$$

*with*

$$\eta(z_1, z_2) = \frac{m^2(z_1)m^2(z_2)}{(1 + cm(z_1))(1 + cm(z_2)) - cm(z_1)m(z_2)}, \quad (42)$$

*and  $m(z)$  the unique Stieltjes transform solution to the Marcenko-Pastur equation [24] as defined in (14) of Theorem 1. In particular, for  $z_1 = z_2 = z$ , we obtain  $\eta(z, z) = \frac{m'(z)m^2(z)}{(1+cm(z))^2}$  with  $m'(z) = \frac{m^2(z)}{1 - cm^2(z)/(1 - cm(z))^2}$ .*

**Lemma 7** (Further Deterministic Equivalent results). *For random matrix  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  having i.i.d.  $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$  entries, its resolvent  $\mathbf{Q}(z) = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H/T - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1}$ , and matrices  $\mathbf{J}_1, \mathbf{J}_2$  defined in (6), the following Deterministic Equivalents hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{Z}^H \mathbf{Q}(z_1) \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{Q}(z_2) \mathbf{Z} &\leftrightarrow \mathbf{0}_T, \\ \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{Z}^H \mathbf{Q}(z_1) \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{Q}(z_2) \mathbf{Z} &\leftrightarrow \gamma(z_1, z_2) \mathbf{I}_T, \end{aligned}$$

*where*

$$\gamma(z_1, z_2) = c\tau \times \frac{m(z_1)m(z_2) + c\eta(z_1, z_2)}{(1 + cm(z_1))(1 + cm(z_2))} \quad (43)$$

for  $c = \lim N/T$ ,  $\tau = \lim n/N$ , and  $\eta(z_1, z_2)$  defined in (42).

*Proof of Lemma 7.* The proof of Deterministic Equivalents generally comes in two steps:

- 1) approximation (in a spectral norm sense) of the expectation of the random matrix model of interest; and
- 2) concentration of trace and bilinear norms as in Definition 3 around the corresponding expectations.

Here, we provide detailed derivation of the first step for the results in Lemma 7, the second concentration step is rather standard, see [9, Chapter 2].

We evaluate the expectation  $\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{Z}]$ , and that of  $\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{Z}^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_2\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{Z}$  can be derived similarly.

Consider the  $(i, i)$ th diagonal entry of the expectation  $\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{Z}]$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_i] &= \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_i}{(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_1))(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_2))}\right] + o(1) \\ &= \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_2))/T}{(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_1))(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_2))} + o(1) = \frac{\frac{n}{T}m(z_1)m(z_2) + c\eta(z_1, z_2)\frac{n}{T}}{(1+cm(z_1))(1+cm(z_2))} + o(1) = \gamma(z_1, z_2) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the second line the Woodbury identity in Lemma 3 (the rank-one case is known as the Sherman–Morrison formula) to write

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{z}_i = \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{-i}\mathbf{z}_i}{1+\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-i}\mathbf{z}_i} = \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{-i}\mathbf{z}_i}{1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}} + o(1),$$

for  $\mathbf{Q}_{-i} = (\frac{1}{T}\sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^H - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1}$  independent of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  so that  $\|\mathbf{Q}_{-i} - \mathbf{Q}\| = O(N^{-1})$ , and then Lemma 6 in the last line.

For off-diagonal entries of  $\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{Z}^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{Z}$ , we write, for  $i \neq j$  that by Lemmas 3 and 6 that

$$\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_j = \frac{1}{T}\frac{\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}_{-j}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_j}{(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_1))(1+\frac{1}{T}\text{tr}\mathbf{Q}(z_2))} + o(1) = \frac{1}{T}\frac{\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}_{-j}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_j}{(1+cm(z_1))(1+cm(z_2))} + o(1).$$

Note that  $\mathbf{x}_j$  still depends on  $\mathbf{Q}_{-i}$ , so we further write  $\mathbf{Q}_{-i} = (\mathbf{Q}_{-ij} + \frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^H)^{-1} = \mathbf{Q}_{-ij} - \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^H\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}}{1+\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_j^H\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}\mathbf{z}_j}$  for  $\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}$  that is independent of both  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_j$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-i}(z_1)\mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\mathbf{Q}_{-j}(z_2)\mathbf{z}_j &= \frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_i^H\left(\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_1) - \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_1)\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_j\mathbf{z}_j^H\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_1)}{1+cm(z_1)}\right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{J}_1^T\mathbf{J}_1\left(\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_2) - \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_2)\frac{1}{T}\mathbf{z}_i\mathbf{z}_i^H\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}(z_2)}{1+cm(z_2)}\right)\mathbf{z}_j + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

the expectation of which is zero for  $i \neq j$  by independence  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_{-ij}$ . This concludes the proof of Lemma 7.  $\square$

## APPENDIX C MATHEMATICAL PROOFS

In this section, we present the proofs of our technical results of Remark 6, Remark 7 and Theorem 5 in Section C-A, Section C-B and Section III-C, respectively.

### A. Proof of Remark 6

To prove Remark 6, we propose to check, in the case of  $K = 2$  sources with widely-spaced (see Assumption 3) DoAs  $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2 \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ , that the classical ESPRIT estimates  $\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2$  from Algorithm 1 *cannot* be consistent *unless*  $\mathbf{U}_P = \mathbf{I}_2$ , that is, when the two sources are *uncorrelated*.

To this end, recall from Remark 6 that for  $\mathbf{U}_P = \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$  the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{P}$ , it follows from Lemma 5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= \mathbf{U}_P^H \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_P + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}) = \tau \mathbf{I}_2 + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}), \\ \Phi_2 &= \mathbf{U}_P^H \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{U}_P + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}) = \tau \mathbf{U}_P^H \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_k}\}_{k=1}^K \mathbf{U}_P + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

so that by Theorem 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{g})\mathbf{U}_P^H \text{diag}\{e^{i\Delta\theta_k}\}_{k=1}^2 \mathbf{U}_P \text{diag}(\sqrt{g}) + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} g_1(|u_{11}|^2 e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + |u_{21}|^2 e^{i\Delta\theta_2}) & \sqrt{g_1 g_2}(u_{11}^* u_{12} e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + u_{21}^* u_{22} e^{i\Delta\theta_2}) \\ \sqrt{g_1 g_2}(u_{12}^* u_{11} e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + u_{22}^* u_{21} e^{i\Delta\theta_2}) & g_2(|u_{12}|^2 e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + |u_{22}|^2 e^{i\Delta\theta_2}) \end{bmatrix} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

As such, for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lambda_1 = ae^{i\Delta\theta_1}$  is an eigenvalue of  $\bar{\Phi}$  if and only if it satisfies asymptotically the following quadratic equation

$$\lambda^2 - \text{tr}(\bar{\Phi})\lambda + \det(\bar{\Phi}) = \varepsilon, \quad |\varepsilon| = O(N^{-1}). \quad (44)$$

This can be further written as

$$(\lambda - (g_1|u_{11}|^2 + g_2|u_{12}|^2)e^{i\Delta\theta_1}) (\lambda - (g_1|u_{21}|^2 + g_2|u_{22}|^2)e^{i\Delta\theta_2}) = (g_1 - g_2)^2 |u_{12}|^2 |u_{22}|^2 e^{i\Delta\theta_1} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} + \varepsilon,$$

with  $g_1, g_2$  defined in (21) of Theorem 2. By substituting  $\lambda = ae^{i\Delta\theta_1}$ , we obtain that the equation holds if the corresponding real and imaginary parts satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & (a - (g_1|u_{11}|^2 + g_2|u_{12}|^2)) a \cos(2\Delta\theta_1) - \Re[\varepsilon] \\ &= ((a - (g_1|u_{11}|^2 + g_2|u_{12}|^2)) (g_1|u_{21}|^2 + g_2|u_{22}|^2) + (g_1 - g_2)^2 |u_{12}|^2 |u_{22}|^2) \cos(\Delta(\theta_1 + \theta_2)), \\ & (a - (g_1|u_{11}|^2 + g_2|u_{12}|^2)) a \sin(2\Delta\theta_1) - \Im[\varepsilon] \\ &= ((a - (g_1|u_{11}|^2 + g_2|u_{12}|^2)) (g_1|u_{21}|^2 + g_2|u_{22}|^2) + (g_1 - g_2)^2 |u_{12}|^2 |u_{22}|^2) \sin(\Delta(\theta_1 + \theta_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Therefore, for any  $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$  such that  $\Delta\theta_1 \neq \Delta\theta_2 + m\pi$ ,  $a > 0$  and  $m, \Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ , (44) holds *if and only if* both equations in (45) are satisfied. It can be checked this is possible *only* when  $(g_1 - g_2)^2 |u_{12}|^2 |u_{22}|^2 = O(N^{-1})$ . Recall from (21) and Assumption 2 that  $g_1 \neq g_2 > 0$ , so that one must have  $|u_{12}| |u_{22}| = O(N^{-1/2})$ . A similar conclusion can be drawn by considering  $\lambda_2 = be^{i\Delta\theta_2}$ , and one can thus conclude that classical ESPRIT estimates  $\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2$  from Algorithm 1 *cannot* be consistent *unless*  $\mathbf{U}_P = \mathbf{I}_2$ , that is, when the two sources are *uncorrelated*. This concludes the proof of Remark 6.

### B. Proof of Remark 7

To prove Remark 7, we propose to check, in the case of  $K = 2$  sources with  $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \alpha/N$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and uncorrelated signals with equal power (i.e.,  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_2$ ), that the estimated DoAs  $\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2$  from classical ESPRIT are *not*  $N$ -inconsistent (see Remark 1) as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this case, it follows from the second item of Lemma 5 that the nonzero eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^H$  are the same as those of  $\mathbf{A}^H\mathbf{A}$  and are (asymptotically up to an error of order  $O(N^{-1})$ ) given by  $1 \pm |\text{sinc}(\alpha/2)|$ , so that the subspace separation condition in Assumption 2 becomes

$$|\text{sinc}(\alpha/2)| < 1 - \sqrt{c}, \quad (46)$$

and we will be working in this setting. Note in particular that we *must* have  $c \in (0, 1)$ .

Recall again from the second item of Lemma 5 that the top two eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^H$  are approximately given by  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_\pm = \mathbf{A}[e^{\pm i\frac{\alpha}{2}}, \pm 1]^T / \sqrt{2}$ , up to some error in Euclidean norm of order  $O(N^{-1})$ . We thus have,

$$\Phi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \tau + \Re[e^{-i\alpha/2}\beta_1] & -i\Im[e^{-i\alpha/2}\beta_1] \\ i\Im[e^{-i\alpha/2}\beta_1] & \tau - \Re[e^{-i\alpha/2}\beta_1] \end{bmatrix} + O_{\|\cdot\|}(N^{-1}),$$

and

$$[\Phi_2]_{ij} = \tau e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + (-1)^{i+1} \beta_2 e^{i\alpha/2} e^{i\Delta\theta_1} + (-1)^{j+1} \beta_1 e^{-i\alpha/2} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} + (-1)^{i+j} \tau e^{i\Delta\theta_2} + O(N^{-1}),$$

with the shortcuts  $\beta_1 = \frac{1 - e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha}$ ,  $\beta_2 = \beta_1^*$ .

It follows from Theorem 2 that the DoA estimates given by classical ESPRIT are asymptotically given by the angles of the complex eigenvalues of  $\bar{\Phi} = \bar{\Phi}^{-1}\Phi_2$  defined in (20), the determinant of which is given by

$$\det(\bar{\Phi}) = \nu_1 e^{i\Delta\theta_1} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} - \nu_2 + \varepsilon, \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{R}, |\varepsilon| = O(N^{-1}),$$

where  $g_i$  are defined in (21),  $h_i = 1 - g_1$ , and  $\nu_1, \nu_2$  defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1 &= g_1^2 g_2^2 (\tau^2 - \beta_1 \beta_2)^2 + (1 - g_1)(1 - g_2) g_1 g_2 \tau^4 + g_1 g_2 \tau^2 \left[ \tau^2 (g_1 + g_2 - 2g_1 g_2) + \frac{\tau(g_1 - g_2)}{2} (e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2}} \beta_2 + e^{-i\frac{\alpha}{2}} \beta_1) \right], \\ \nu_2 &= \frac{g_1 g_2 \beta_1 \beta_2 \tau}{\det^2(\bar{\Phi}_1)} \left[ \tau(1 - g_1)(1 - g_2) + \tau(g_1 + g_2 - 2g_1 g_2) + \frac{1}{2} (g_1 - g_2) (e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2}} \beta_2 + e^{-i\frac{\alpha}{2}} \beta_1) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove Remark 7 by contradiction: assume that  $\lambda_1 = ae^{i\Delta\theta_1}, \lambda_2 = be^{i\Delta\theta_2}, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  are two eigenvalues of  $\bar{\Phi}$ , satisfying  $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \alpha/N$ , then we must have asymptotically

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = abe^{i\Delta\theta_1} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} = \nu_1 e^{i\Delta\theta_1} e^{i\Delta\theta_2} - \nu_2 + \varepsilon, \quad (47)$$

for some  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|\varepsilon| = O(N^{-1})$ . This can be further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} (ab - \nu_1) [\sin(2\Delta\theta_1) \cos(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{N}) + \cos(2\Delta\theta_1) \sin(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{N})] &= \Im[\varepsilon], \\ (ab - \nu_1) [\cos(2\Delta\theta_1) \cos(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{N}) - \sin(2\Delta\theta_1) \sin(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{N})] + \nu_2 &= \Re[\varepsilon]. \end{aligned}$$

The above equation holds if and only if

$$\nu_1 = ab + O(N^{-1}), \quad \nu_2 = O(N^{-1}). \quad (48)$$

Let us now focus on the term  $\nu_2$ . For any given  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $c \in (0, \infty)$ , and  $\tau = \lim n/N \in (0, 1)$ , note that  $\beta_1\beta_2 = \left|\frac{1-e^{i\alpha\tau}}{-i\alpha}\right|^2 \geq 0$  (with equality if and only if  $\cos(\alpha\tau) = 1$ ) so that  $\nu_2 > 0$  if and only if

$$\tau(1-g_1)(1-g_2) + \tau(g_1+g_2-2g_1g_2) + \frac{1}{2}(g_1-g_2)(e^{\frac{i\alpha}{2}}\beta_2 + e^{-\frac{i\alpha}{2}}\beta_1) > 0, \quad (49)$$

which can be further reduced to

$$\kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) \equiv \tau \left( 4 - c \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right) + \left( \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) - \frac{2}{\alpha} \sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \alpha\tau\right) \right) \left( (c+3) \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right| - \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right|^3 \right) > 0, \quad (50)$$

by substituting  $g_i$  defined in (21) and  $\ell_1, \ell_2$ . Note that the (partial) derivative of  $\kappa(\alpha, \tau, c)$  with respect to  $\tau$  is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) = 4 - c \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) + 2 \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \alpha\tau\right) \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right| \left( c + 3 - \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right).$$

For any  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\tau \in (0, 1)$ , it can be observed that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \kappa(\alpha, \tau, c)$  is linear in  $c \in (0, 1)$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) &= 4 + 2 \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \alpha\tau\right) \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right| \left( 3 - \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right) \\ &\geq 4 - 2 \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right| \left( 3 - \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right) > 0, \\ \lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) &= \lim_{|\operatorname{sinc}(\alpha/2)| \rightarrow 0} \left( 4 - \operatorname{sinc}^2\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right) \left( 1 + 2 \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \alpha\tau\right) \left| \operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right| \right) = 4, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that  $|\operatorname{sinc}(\alpha/2)| < 1 - \sqrt{c}$ . As such, we have that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) > 0$  for all  $c \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\kappa(\alpha, \tau, c)$  is thus an increasing function of  $\tau$ , so that

$$\kappa(\alpha, \tau, c) > \kappa(\alpha, 0, c) = 0, \quad (51)$$

We thus conclude that the traditional ESPRIT is not  $N$ -consistent in the case of closely-spaced DoAs with equal power sources. This concludes the proof of Remark 7.

### C. Proof of Theorem 5

Here we provide the detailed proof of Theorem 5. We first consider the diagonal entries and then the off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$ .

a) *Diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$* : Here, we would like to show that for  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  and  $\bar{\Phi}_1, \bar{\Phi}_2$  defined in (18) and (20) respectively, we have

$$[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_1]_{kk} \rightarrow 0, \quad [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_2]_{kk} \rightarrow 0.$$

Let us start with the diagonal entries of the asymmetric matrix  $[\hat{\Phi}_2]_{kk} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k$ , for  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k$  the  $k$ th dominant eigenvector of the SCM  $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H/T$ . First note that under the subspace separation condition in Assumption 2, it follows from Theorem 1 that the top- $K$  empirical eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$  of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$  converge almost surely to different limits in the large  $N, T$  limit. We thus have, for  $\Gamma_k$  a positively (i.e., counterclockwise) oriented contour circling around *only* the  $k$ th largest eigenvalue of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ , that

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k = \operatorname{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \operatorname{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{C}} - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 dz = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \operatorname{tr} \left( \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H - z\mathbf{I}_N + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{V}^H \right)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 dz,$$

where we used Cauchy's integral formula in the second line, and  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{S} + \mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{S}^H/T$  the signal power matrix, as well as

$$\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{A} \quad \frac{1}{T}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{S}^H] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times 2K}, \quad \mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{I}_K \\ \mathbf{I}_K & \mathbf{0}_K \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{2K \times 2K},$$

in the third line. We then get, by Woodbury identity in Lemma 3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{Q}(z) - \mathbf{Q}(z)\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{Q}(z)\mathbf{V})^{-1}\mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{Q}(z)) \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{Q}(z)\mathbf{V})^{-1} \mathbf{V}^H\mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the resolvent  $\mathbf{Q}(z) = (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H/T - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1}$  as in Definition 2 and use the fact that the term  $\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{Q}(z)\mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_2)$  has no pole circled by  $\Gamma_k$ . It is important to note that till now we have *not* used any (asymptotic) approximation in the large  $N, T$  limit.



We then use the deterministic equivalents for resolvent result in Lemma 6 to approximate this trace term, we start by approximating the block matrix  $(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V})^{-1}$  as

$$(\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z) & \mathbf{H}_2(z) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z) & \mathbf{H}_3(z) \end{bmatrix} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1), \quad (52)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_1(z) &= \frac{zm(z) + 1}{m(z)} \mathbf{H}_2(z) \mathbf{P}, \\ \mathbf{H}_2(z) &= (\mathbf{I}_K + (zm(z) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{H}_3(z) &= -m(z) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}_2(z), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z_1) \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{Q}(z_2) \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} m(z_1)m(z_2) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_K \\ \mathbf{0}_K & \mathbf{0}_K \end{bmatrix} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1). \quad (54)$$

Using these spectral norm approximations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(m^2(z) \mathbf{H}_1(z) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A}) dz + o(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr} \left( \frac{zm(z) + 1}{m(z)} (\mathbf{I}_N + (1 + zm(z) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \cdot m^2(z) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{A}) \right) dz + o(1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr} \left( \frac{(zm(z) + 1)^2}{m(z)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_N + (1 + zm(z) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \cdot m^2(z) \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2) \right) dz + o(1) \\ &\equiv -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_1(z) \mathbf{T}_2(z, z)) dz + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we define the shortcuts  $\mathbf{T}_1(z)$  and  $\mathbf{T}_2(z)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_1(z) &= \frac{(zm(z) + 1)^2}{m(z)} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{L}^{-1} + (1 + zm(z)))^{-1} \\ \mathbf{T}_2(z_1, z_2) &= m(z_1) m(z_2) \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{U}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

for (asymptotic) eigendecomposition  $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}^H + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1)$  with diagonal  $\mathbf{L} = \text{diag}\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_K\} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  containing the eigenvalues and  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  containing the associated eigenvectors, as in Assumption 2. Note here that  $\mathbf{T}_1(z)$  is diagonal, we have, by residue calculus, that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{k'=1}^K \oint_{\Gamma_k} \frac{(zm(z) + 1)^2 m(z) \ell_{k'}}{\ell_{k'}^{-1} + 1 + zm(z)} \times \mathbf{u}_{k'}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{u}_{k'} dz + o(1) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \frac{(zm(z) + 1)^2 m(z) \ell_k}{\ell_k^{-1} + 1 + zm(z)} \times \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{u}_k dz + o(1) \\ &= -\lim_{z \rightarrow \bar{\lambda}_k} \frac{(z - \bar{\lambda}_k)(zm(z) + 1)^2 m(z) \ell_k}{\ell_k^{-1} + 1 + zm(z)} \times \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{u}_k + o(1), \\ &= \frac{1 - c\ell_k^{-2}}{1 + c\ell_k^{-1}} \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \mathbf{u}_k + o(1) = g_k [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{kk} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\bar{\lambda}_k$  the limiting spike position given in (15) of Theorem 1, and  $g_k$  defined in (21) of Theorem 2. This allows us to conclude that

$$[\hat{\Phi}_2]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_2]_{kk} \rightarrow 0, \quad (56)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Similarly, we evaluate the diagonal entries of  $\Phi_1$  as

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}((\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1} + \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V})^{-1} \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V}) dz,$$

for which we have

$$\mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{Q}(z) \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} m(z_1)m(z_2) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A} + c\tau\eta(z_1, z_2) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_K \\ \mathbf{0}_K & \gamma(z_1, z_2) \mathbf{P} \end{bmatrix} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1), \quad (57)$$

using Lemmas 6 and 7, for  $\gamma(z, z)$  defined in (43). We thus have

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_1(z)(m^2(z)\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A} + c\tau\eta(z, z)\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})) dz + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \gamma(z, z) \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_3(z)\mathbf{P}) dz + o(1),$$

for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_1(z)(m^2(z)\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{A} + c\tau\eta(z, z)\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})) dz &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_1(z)\mathbf{T}_3(z, z)) dz \\ &= \frac{1 - c\ell_k^{-2}}{1 + c\ell_k^{-1}} \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{u}_k + \frac{c\tau}{\ell_k^2 + c\ell_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where we define the shortcut

$$\mathbf{T}_3(z_1, z_2) = m(z_1)m(z_2)\mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{U} + c\tau\eta(z_1, z_2)\mathbf{I}_K, \quad (58)$$

for  $\eta(z_1, z_2)$  defined in (42); as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_3(z)\gamma(z, z)\mathbf{P}) dz &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} m(z)\gamma(z, z) \text{tr}(\mathbf{L}^{-1} + (1 + zm(z))\mathbf{I}_K)^{-1} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_k} c\tau \cdot \frac{m(z)(m^2(z) + c\eta(z, z))}{(1 + cm(z))^2(\ell_k^{-1} + 1 + zm(z))} dz \\ &= \frac{c\tau}{\ell_k + c}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together, we thus conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k &= \frac{1 - c\ell_k^{-2}}{1 + c\ell_k^{-1}} \mathbf{u}_k^H \mathbf{J}_1^T \mathbf{J}_1 \mathbf{u}_k + c\tau \frac{1 + \ell_k^{-1}}{c + \ell_k} + o(1), \\ &= g_k[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{kk} + h_k + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

for  $g_k, h_k$  defined in (21) of Theorem 2. This allows us to conclude that

$$[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{kk} - [\bar{\Phi}_1]_{kk} \rightarrow 0, \quad (59)$$

almost surely as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

b) *Off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$* : We now consider the off-diagonal entries, and in particular, those having their indices forming a circle. Consider indices  $1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_m \leq K$  that form a cycle of length  $m$  and

$$\mathbf{M}_{k_j} = \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \text{ or } \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\}. \quad (60)$$

Introducing the matrices  $\mathbf{M}_{k_1}, \dots, \mathbf{M}_{k_m}$  allows us to evaluate, in a unified fashion, off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  as well as their (arbitrary) products. Note in particular that

$$\|\mathbf{M}_k\| \leq 1, \quad (61)$$

and by (54), (57) and Lemma 6 that

$$\mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z_1) \mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{Q}(z_2) \mathbf{V} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{k,1}(z_1, z_2) & \mathbf{0}_K \\ \mathbf{0}_K & \Theta_{k,2}(z_1, z_2) \end{bmatrix} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1), \quad (62)$$

with

$$\Theta_{k,1}(z_1, z_2) = m(z_1)m(z_2)\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{M}_k \mathbf{A} + \eta(z_1, z_2) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_k) \cdot \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A}, \quad (63)$$

and

$$\Theta_{k,2}(z_1, z_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{0}_K & \text{for } \mathbf{M}_k = \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2, \\ \gamma(z_1, z_2)\mathbf{P} & \text{for } \mathbf{M}_k = \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1. \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

Recall that the off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$  are respectively given by

$$[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{k_i k_j} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_i}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_j}, \quad [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k_i k_j} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_i}^H \mathbf{J}_1^H \mathbf{J}_2 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_j}, \quad (65)$$

which can be written as the generic bilinear form involving  $\mathbf{M}_{k_j} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$  defined in (60), as

$$[\hat{\Phi}_1]_{k_i k_j} \text{ or } [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k_i k_j} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_i}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_j} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_j}. \quad (66)$$

In the form of (66), consider now the following product  $\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m}$  involving the off-diagonal entries of both  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$ , with their indices  $1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_m \leq K$  forming a cycle of length  $m$  as

$$\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_m}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_1} \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_1}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_2} \times \dots \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_{m-1}}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_m} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_m}. \quad (67)$$

With the same arguments as for the diagonal entries, we get (68), for  $\Gamma_{k_1}, \dots, \Gamma_{k_m}$  positively (i.e., counterclockwise) oriented contours circling around *only* the  $k_1, \dots, k_m$ th largest eigenvalue of  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ , respectively, where we used the approximation in (52), and the fact that  $\mathbf{Q}(z_i)$  does not *have* pole enclosed by any of the contours  $\Gamma_{k_1}, \dots, \Gamma_{k_m}$ . We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_{k_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_1}^H \times \mathbf{M}_{k_2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_2}^H \dots \mathbf{M}_{k_m} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_m} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{k_m}^H) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{M}_{k_i} \mathbf{Q}(z_i) \mathbf{V} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_i) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_i) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{Q}(z_i) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_1) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_1) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) & \mathbf{0}_K \\ \mathbf{0}_K & \Theta_{k_1,2}(z_m, z_1) \end{bmatrix} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{0}_K \\ \mathbf{0}_K & \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1), \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,2}(z_m, z_1) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,2}(z_m, z_1) \end{bmatrix} \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1), \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

To treat the product of block matrices in (68), we introduce the following result, on the (contour) integration over two  $dz_i$  and  $dz_{i+1}$  *only*.

**Lemma 8.** *Given  $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ , we have, for the following product of three matrices that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \prod_{j=i-1}^{i+1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_1(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) & \mathbf{X}_2(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \\ \mathbf{X}_3(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) & \mathbf{X}_4(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1), \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{X}_1(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{H}_1(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
\mathbf{X}_2(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{H}_1(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
\mathbf{X}_3(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
\mathbf{X}_4(z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 8.* Consider the following product of three (having index  $i-1, i, i+1$ ) two-by-two block matrices, for which we evaluate only the integration with respect to  $z_i$  and  $z_{i+1}$ ,

$$\oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \prod_{j=i-1}^{i+1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1}.$$

This will result in a two-by-two block matrix, each block is the sum of four matrices of the form

$$\oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H} \Theta \cdot \mathbf{H} \Theta \cdot \mathbf{H} \Theta dz_i dz_{i+1}, \tag{70}$$

for  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2, \mathbf{H}_2^H, \mathbf{H}_3$  and  $\Theta = \Theta_1, \Theta_2$ .

As an example, let us consider the following term, as one of the four terms in the sum of the (1, 1) block. By definitions of  $\mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2$  and  $\Theta_{k,1}$  in (53) and (63), respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} \frac{z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1}{m(z_{i+2})} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\
&\times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \underbrace{(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1}}_{\mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1})} \Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1}
\end{aligned}$$

where we introduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} \frac{z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1}{m(z_{i+2})} \\
&\times (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2})$  is a matrix polynomial that does not contain any pole (for  $z_i, z_{i+1}$  under evaluation). We thus have, by Lemma 4 and the (asymptotic) eigendecomposition  $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}^H + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1)$  with diagonal  $\mathbf{L} = \text{diag}\{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_K\} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$  and  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_K] \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times K}$  as in Assumption 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{U} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L} \\
&\times (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1) \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{(1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n) (1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_n)} \\
&\times \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1) \\
&= \lim_{z \rightarrow \lambda_i} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{(z - \lambda_i) \ell_n \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{(1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n) (1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_n)} \\
&\times \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_{i+1} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1) = o_{\|\cdot\|}(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used residue calculus in the last line, with  $\lambda_i \equiv 1 + \ell_i + c \frac{1+\ell_i}{\ell_i}$  the asymptotic position of the isolated eigenvalue circled by  $\Gamma_{k_i}$ , and the crucial observation that when integrating over  $z_{i+1}$ , the integrand does *not* contain pole circled by the contour  $\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}$ . This is due to the fact that  $\Gamma_1(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2})$  does not contain pole and the only pole  $\lambda_i$  is already enclosed by  $\Gamma_{k_i}$  and cannot be enclosed by  $\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}$ .

Similarly, other terms containing  $\mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1})$ , including

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
& \mathbf{H}_1(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
& \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}),
\end{aligned}$$

lead to matrices of vanishing spectral norm after contour integration.

Following the same idea, we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\
&\times \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \underbrace{(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1}}_{\mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1})} \\
&\times \mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A},
\end{aligned}$$

is a matrix polynomial that does not contain any pole (for  $z_i$  and  $z_{i+1}$ ). We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \left( \frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\
&\mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1)(z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \left( \frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)^2 \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1)(z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) m(z_{i+1}) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{U} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L}^2 \\
&(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} (z_i m(z_i) + 1)(z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) m(z_{i+1}) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n^2 \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{(1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n)(1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_n)} \mathbf{\Gamma}_2(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} = o_{\|\cdot\|}(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows the same line of arguments as for  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_1$  above. Similarly, other terms containing  $\mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1})$ , including

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_1(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
& \mathbf{H}_2(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
& \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,1}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}),
\end{aligned}$$

again lead to matrices of vanishing spectral norm after contour integration.

We then consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} \frac{z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1}{m(z_{i+2})} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\
&\times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \underbrace{m(z_i) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1}}_{\mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1})} \\
&\times \mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) &= \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A} \frac{z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1}{m(z_{i+2})} \\
&\times (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \left( m(z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \mathbf{A}
\end{aligned}$$

is a matrix polynomial that does not contain any pole (for  $z_i$  and  $z_{i+1}$ ). We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P})^{-1} \\
&\times \mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{L} \\
&\times (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n^2 \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{(1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n)(1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_n)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{\Gamma}_3(z_i, z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} = o_{\|\cdot\|}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, other terms containing  $\mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1})$ , including

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}), \\
& \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},1}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}),
\end{aligned}$$

lead to matrices of vanishing spectral norm after contour integration.

It remains to evaluate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \mathbf{H}_3(z_i) \Theta_{k_i,2}(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+2}) \Theta_{k_{i+2},2}(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) \mathbf{P} m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \\
&\times \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) \mathbf{P} m(z_{i+2}) \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \gamma(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \mathbf{P} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \gamma(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) \mathbf{A}^H (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&(\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \\
&\times (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \gamma(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \\
&\times \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L}^2 (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} dz_i dz_{i+1} \\
&= - \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} m(z_i) \gamma(z_{i-1}, z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \gamma(z_i, z_{i+1}) m(z_{i+2}) \gamma(z_{i+1}, z_{i+2}) (z_i m(z_i) + 1) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \\
&\times \mathbf{A}^H \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n^4 \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{(1 + (z_{i+2} m(z_{i+2}) + 1) \ell_n) (1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n) (1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_n)} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} dz_i dz_{i+1} = o_{\|\cdot\|}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Ignoring items of vanishing spectral norms in the resulting two-by-two block matrix, we conclude the proof of Lemma 8.  $\square$

In the following, we ignore, for the sake of notational convenience, the arguments of  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \mathbf{X}_3, \mathbf{X}_4$ .

In Lemma 8 we treat the product of three matrices and the integral over  $z_i, z_{i+1}$ . Consider now the product of four matrices and its integral over  $z_i, z_{i+1}$  and  $z_{i+2}$ . It thus follows from Lemma 8 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+2}}} \prod_{j=i-1}^{i+2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},1}(z_j, z_{j+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{j+1}) \Theta_{k_{j+1},2}(z_j, z_{j+1}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1} dz_{i+2} \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+2}}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{X}_2 \\ \mathbf{X}_3 & \mathbf{X}_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},1}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},2}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},1}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},2}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1} dz_{i+2} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1) \\
&= \oint_{\Gamma_{k_i}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+1}}} \oint_{\Gamma_{k_{i+2}}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},1}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) & \mathbf{X}_1 \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},2}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) \\ \mathbf{X}_3 \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},1}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) & \mathbf{X}_3 \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+3}) \Theta_{k_{i+3},2}(z_{i+2}, z_{i+3}) \end{bmatrix} dz_i dz_{i+1} dz_{i+2} + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where, similar to the proof of Lemma 8, we ignore all block matrices of vanishing spectral norm.

Repeating the above approximating procedure on (68), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} &= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi l} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,2}(z_m, z_1) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,2}(z_m, z_1) \end{bmatrix} \right. \\
&\times \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \left. \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_2(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \\ \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) & \mathbf{H}_3(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},2}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi l} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_1 & \Xi_2 \\ \Xi_3 & \Xi_4 \end{bmatrix} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_1 &= \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right), \\
\Xi_2 &= \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) \mathbf{H}_2(z_m) \Theta_{k_m,2}(z_{m-1}, z_m), \\
\Xi_3 &= \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right), \\
\Xi_4 &= \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \Theta_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \Theta_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) \mathbf{H}_2(z_m) \Theta_{k_m,2}(z_{m-1}, z_m).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} &= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Xi}_1 + \mathbf{\Xi}_4) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) \mathbf{H}_2(z_m) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_m,2}(z_{m-1}, z_m) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\
&+ \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) \mathbf{H}_2(z_m) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_m,2}(z_{m-1}, z_m) \mathbf{H}_2^H(z_1) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \mathbf{H}_1(z_1) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_1,1}(z_m, z_1) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{H}_1(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{\Theta}_{k_{i+1},1}(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last line the similar approximation as in the proof of Lemma 8.

Expanding this product, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} &= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{z_1 m(z_1) + 1}{m(z_1)} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (m(z_1) m(z_1) \mathbf{M}_{k_1} + \right. \\
&\eta(z_m, z_1) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N) \mathbf{A} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1}{m(z_{i+1})} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \\
&+ \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N) \mathbf{A} \Big) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{z_1 m(z_1) + 1}{m(z_1)} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (m(z_m) m(z_1) \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \right. \\
&+ \eta(z_m, z_1) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N) \times \mathbf{A} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1}{m(z_{i+1})} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}^H (m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \\
&+ \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N) \mathbf{A} \Big) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{z_1 m(z_1) + 1}{m(z_1)} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{I}_K + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}^H \left( m(z_m) m(z_1) \mathbf{M}_{k_1} + \eta(z_m, z_1) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right. \\
&\times \left. \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1}{m(z_{i+1})} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{I}_K + z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1 \mathbf{L})^{-1} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{U}^H \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right) \\
&dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{z_1 m(z_1) + 1}{m(z_1)} \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n^2 \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{1 + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \ell_n} \left( m(z_m) m(z_1) \mathbf{M}_{k_1} + \eta(z_m, z_1) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right. \\
&\times \left. \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{(z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1)^2}{m(z_{i+1})} \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{\ell_n^2 \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{u}_n^H}{1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_n} \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{(z_1 m(z_1) + 1)^2}{m(z_1)} \frac{\ell_1^2 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^H}{1 + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \ell_1} \left( m(z_m) m(z_1) \mathbf{M}_{k_1} + \eta(z_m, z_1) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right. \\
&\times \left. \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{(z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1)^2}{m(z_{i+1})} \frac{\ell_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^H}{1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_i} \left( m(z_i) m(z_{i+1}) \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} + \eta(z_i, z_{i+1}) \frac{1}{T} \text{tr} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \cdot \mathbf{I}_N \right) \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi\iota} \right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \text{tr} \left( \frac{m(z_m) (z_1 m(z_1) + 1)^2 \ell_1^2 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1^H}{1 + (z_1 m(z_1) + 1) \ell_1} \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{m(z_i) (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1)^2 \ell_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^H}{1 + (z_{i+1} m(z_{i+1}) + 1) \ell_i} \mathbf{M}_{k_{i+1}} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\right)^m \oint_{\Gamma_{k_1}} \dots \oint_{\Gamma_{k_m}} \operatorname{tr} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{m(z_i)(z_i m(z_i) + 1)^2 \ell_i^2}{1 + (z_i m(z_i) + 1) \ell_i} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^H \mathbf{M}_{k_i} \right) dz_1 \dots dz_m + o(1) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^m \lim_{z \rightarrow \lambda_i} \frac{m(z_i)(z_i m(z_i) + 1)^2 \ell_i}{\ell_i + z_i m(z_i) + 1} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^H \mathbf{M}_{k_i}) + o(1) \\
&= (g_1 \dots g_m) \mathbf{u}_{k_m}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_1} \mathbf{u}_{k_1} \times \mathbf{u}_{k_1}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_2} \mathbf{u}_{k_2} \times \dots \times \mathbf{u}_{k_{m-1}}^H \mathbf{M}_{k_m} \mathbf{u}_{k_m} = \bar{\psi}_{k_1, \dots, k_m} + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

by residue calculus. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

#### D. Proof of Lemma 1

Define the set of indices  $\mathcal{I}_m : 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq K$ , and the permutations of  $\mathcal{I}_m$  as  $\sigma : \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \rightarrow \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ . Then, any off-diagonal entry  $[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2}$  of  $\hat{\Phi}$  can be rewritten as the following combination involving the product of the entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  as

$$[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} = \sum_{k=1}^K [\hat{\Phi}_1^{-1}]_{i_1 k} [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k i_2} \quad (71)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_1+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}) \prod_{p \in \mathcal{I}'_k, q \in \mathcal{I}'_{i_1}} [\hat{\Phi}_1]_{pq} [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k i_2}, \quad (72)$$

where we use the adjugate matrix to represent the inverse  $\hat{\Phi}_1^{-1}$  in the second line, with  $\mathcal{I}'_k \equiv \mathcal{I}_m \setminus \{k\}, \mathcal{I}'_{i_1} \equiv \mathcal{I}_m \setminus \{i_1\}$ .

Note that the map  $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathcal{I}'_k \rightarrow \mathcal{I}'_{i_1}$  can be obtained from  $\sigma$  by deleting the vertex from node  $k$  to  $i_1$ , and can thus be decomposed into the product of several cycles and the open path from  $i_1$  to  $k$ . See Example 1 in Section A for a concrete example of such decomposition. Under the same notations of Theorem 5, Equation (71) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_1+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}) \prod_{p \in \mathcal{I}'_k, q \in \mathcal{I}'_{i_1}} [\hat{\Phi}_1]_{pq} [\hat{\Phi}_2]_{k i_2} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_1+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}) \hat{\psi}^{\text{cl}} \cdot \hat{\psi}_{(i_1, i_2)}^{\text{op}},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\psi}^{\text{cl}}$  represents the product of off-diagonal entries of  $\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_2$  whose indices can form several disjoint circles, and  $\hat{\psi}_{(i_1, i_2)}^{\text{op}}$  represents the product of entries whose indices start from  $i_1$  and end at  $i_2$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_2 i_3} \dots [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_m i_1} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_1+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}_1} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \dots \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_m+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}_m} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}_m) \hat{\psi}^{\text{cl}} \cdot \hat{\psi}_{(i_1, i_2)}^{\text{op}} \hat{\psi}_{(i_2, i_3)}^{\text{op}} \dots \hat{\psi}_{(i_m, i_1)}^{\text{op}} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_1+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}_1} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \dots \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{(-1)^{i_m+k}}{\det(\hat{\Phi}_1)} \sum_{\tilde{\sigma}_m} \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{\sigma}_m) \prod \hat{\psi}_i^{\text{cl}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the indices of the elements in these open paths are connected end to end, forming again circles. At this point, we conclude that  $[\hat{\Phi}]_{i_1 i_2} [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_2 i_3} \dots [\hat{\Phi}]_{i_m i_1}$  can be expressed as a sum of products of a finite number of pairwise disjoint cycles composed of elements of  $\hat{\Phi}_1$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_2$ . This, combined with Theorem 5, concludes the proof of Lemma 1.

#### E. Proof of Remark 9

Note that in the case of  $K = 2$  DoAs, the two complex eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Phi}^G$  can be explicitly and compactly given by its trace and determinant as  $\lambda_{\pm}(\hat{\Phi}^G) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \operatorname{tr}(\hat{\Phi}^G) \pm \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}^2(\hat{\Phi}^G) - 4 \det(\hat{\Phi}^G)} \right)$ . It is known (see, for example [9, Section 2.7] and Lemma 6 in Section B) that for random matrix  $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times T}$  having i.i.d.  $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$  entries, its expected resolvent  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}(z)] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^H/T - z\mathbf{I}_N)^{-1}]$  can be well approximated by the deterministic equivalent  $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}$  in a spectral norm sense  $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}] - \bar{\mathbf{Q}}\| = O(N^{-1/2})$ . This, together with Theorem 3, yields that  $\operatorname{tr}(\hat{\Phi}^G) = \operatorname{tr}(\Phi) + O(N^{-1/2}), \det(\hat{\Phi}^G) = \det(\Phi) + O(N^{-1/2})$ , so that

$$\lambda_{\pm}(\hat{\Phi}^G) = \lambda_{\pm}(\Phi) + O(N^{-1/2}). \quad (73)$$

Recall that  $\Delta \hat{\theta}_k^G = \arctan(\Im[\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}^G)]/\Re[\lambda_k(\hat{\Phi}^G)])$ , a Taylor expansion allows us to conclude that  $\Delta \theta_k^G = \Delta \theta_k + O(N^{-1/2})$ , so that

$$\hat{\theta}_k^G - \theta_k = O(N^{-3/2}), \quad (74)$$

for a distance  $\Delta$  of order  $N$  and  $K = 2$ .