

A Appendix - Supplemental Material

Proof of Lemma 2.1. By the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality,

$$\|VV^T\|_{1,1} = \sum_{ijk} |V_{ik}| |V_{jk}| \leq \sum_{ij} \left[\sum_k |V_{ik}|^2 \right]^{1/2} \left[\sum_k |V_{jk}|^2 \right]^{1/2} = \|V\|_{2,1}^2.$$

Since the norms of the row of $V/\|V\|_{2,2}$ are ≤ 1 ,

$$\|V\|_{2,1} = \|V/\|V\|_{2,2}\|_{2,1} \|V\|_{2,2} \leq \|V\|_{2,0} \|V\|_{2,2}.$$

Using the identity $\|V\|_{2,2}^2 = \text{tr}(VV^T)$ and the preceding inequalities,

$$\|VV^T\|_{1,1} \leq \|V\|_{2,1}^2 \leq \|V\|_{2,0}^2 \|V\|_{2,2}^2 = \|V\|_{2,0}^2 \text{tr}(VV^T). \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We first assume that $A \succeq 0$. Using the spectral decomposition of A and the assumptions that $0 \preceq F \preceq I$ and $\text{tr}(F) \leq d$, it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A, E - F \rangle &= \langle EA, I - F \rangle - \langle (I - E)A, F \rangle \\ &\geq \lambda_d \langle E, I - F \rangle - \lambda_{d+1} \langle I - E, F \rangle \\ &= \delta(d - \langle E, F \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Now $0 \preceq E \preceq I$ and $0 \preceq F \preceq I$. So

$$\begin{aligned} 2(d - \langle E, F \rangle) &= \text{tr}(E) + \text{tr}(F) - 2\langle E, F \rangle \\ &\geq \|E\|_2^2 + \|F\|_2^2 - 2\langle E, F \rangle \\ &= \|E - F\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

If A is not positive semidefinite, then we may choose $c > 0$ sufficiently large so that $A + cI \succeq 0$. Note that $A + cI$ has the same spectral gap as A and $\langle A + cI, E - F \rangle = \langle A, E - F \rangle$. So the indefinite case follows from the positive semidefinite case. \blacksquare

Proof of Corollary 3.2. The definition of the Fantope ensures that $\text{rank}(\widehat{X}) \geq d$, so \widehat{X} does have a principal d -dimensional subspace (though not necessarily unique). Since Π is a rank- d projection matrix, $\lambda_d(\Pi) - \lambda_{d+1}(\Pi) = 1$. Now apply Corollary 3.1. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since \widehat{X} is optimal and Π is feasible for (1),

$$0 \leq \langle S, \Delta \rangle - \lambda(\|\Pi + \Delta\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi\|_{1,1}).$$

On the otherhand, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\frac{\delta}{2} \|\Delta\|_2^2 \leq -\langle \Sigma, \Delta \rangle.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{2} \|\Delta\|_2^2 &\leq \langle W, \Delta \rangle - \lambda(\|\Pi + \Delta\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi\|_{1,1}) \\ &\leq \|W\|_{\infty, \infty} \|\Delta\|_{1,1} - \lambda(\|\Pi + \Delta\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi\|_{1,1}) \\ &\leq \lambda(\|\Delta\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi + \Delta\|_{1,1} + \|\Pi\|_{1,1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let J be the subset of indices of the nonzero entries of Π . For a symmetric matrix B , we write B_J for the matrix equal to B on J and zero off of J . Then $\|B\|_{1,1} = \|B_J\|_{1,1} + \|B - B_J\|_{1,1}$ and $\Pi = \Pi_J$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi + \Delta\|_{1,1} + \|\Pi\|_{1,1} &= \|\Delta_J\|_{1,1} - \|\Pi_J + \Delta_J\|_{1,1} + \|\Pi_J\|_{1,1} \\ &\leq 2\|\Delta_J\|_{1,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line is the triangle inequality. Since Δ_J has at most s^2 nonzero entries,

$$\|\Delta_J\|_{1,1} \leq s \|\Delta_J\|_2 \leq s \|\Delta\|_2. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} D_0 &:= \{j : \Pi_{jj} = 0, \widehat{X}_{jj} \geq t\} \subseteq \{j : |\Delta_{jj}| \geq t\}, \\ D_1 &:= \{j : \Pi_{jj} \geq 2t, \widehat{X}_{jj} < t\} \subseteq \{j : |\Delta_{jj}| \geq t\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $D_0 \cap D_1 = \emptyset$. Then by Markov's Inequality,

$$|D_0| + |D_1| \leq |\{j : |\Delta_{jj}| \geq t\}| \leq \frac{1}{t^2} \sum_j |\Delta_{jj}|^2 \leq \frac{\|\Delta\|_2^2}{t^2}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We have by (3) and the union bound that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|W\|_{\infty, \infty} \geq \lambda) \leq 2 \exp(-4 \log p + 2 \log p) = 2/p^2,$$

and Theorem 3.1 yields the desired result. \blacksquare

Proof of Corollary 3.3. Note that $\|\Sigma^{1/2}u\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_1 \|u\|_2^2$. Under assumption (5), it can be shown by Bernstein's Inequality [see 1, Lemma 2.2.11] that $S - \Sigma$ satisfies (3) with $\sigma = c\lambda_1$ where $c > 0$ is a constant depending only on L . The assumption that $\log p \leq n$ in (4) ensures that only the moderate sub-Gaussian deviation in Bernstein's Inequality is active. \blacksquare

Proof of Corollary 3.4. Liu et al. [2, Theorem 4.2] use Hoeffding's Inequality for U-statistics to show that

$$\max_{ij} \mathbb{P}(|S_{ij} - \Sigma_{ij}| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-4nt^2/\sigma^2). \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let V denote the matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of X . Since the Frobenius norm and Fantope are orthogonally invariant,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{F}^d}(X) = \arg \min_{Y \in \mathcal{F}^d} \frac{1}{2} \|X - Y\|_2^2 = V \left[\arg \min_{0 \leq y \leq 1, \langle y, \mathbf{1} \rangle = d} \frac{1}{2} \|\gamma - y\|_2^2 \right] V^T.$$

The Lagrangian associated with the problem above is

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\gamma - y\|_2^2 + \langle y - \mathbf{1}, \tau_1 \rangle - \langle y, \tau_0 \rangle + \theta(\langle y, \mathbf{1} \rangle - d),$$

which upon differentiation with respect to y and comparing to 0 yields the optimality condition

$$y - \gamma + \tau_1 - \tau_0 + \theta \mathbf{1} = 0.$$

By complementary slackness, if $0 < y_i < 1$ then $\tau_{0i} = \tau_{1i} = 0$ and $y_i = \gamma_i - \theta$. Thus, the optimal value of y must satisfy

$$\sum_i \min(\max(y_i - \theta, 0), 1) = d. \quad \blacksquare$$

Additional references

- [1] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [2] H. Liu et al. "High-dimensional semiparametric gaussian copula graphical models ". In: *Ann. Statist.* 40.4 (2012), pp. 2293–2326.