

On eigenvalues of sample covariance matrices based on high-dimensional compositional data*

Qianqian Jiang[†] Jiabin Qiu[‡] Zeng Li[§]

(v1.0: 2023-Dec-22; v2.0: 2024-Dec-17; v3.0: 2025-Jun-11;
v4.0: 2026-May-19; v5.0: 2026-Oct-22.)

Abstract

This paper studies the asymptotic spectral properties of the sample covariance matrix for high-dimensional compositional data, including the limiting spectral distribution, the limit of extreme eigenvalues, and the central limit theorem for linear spectral statistics. All asymptotic results are derived under the high-dimensional regime where the data dimension increases to infinity proportionally with the sample size. The findings reveal that the limiting spectral distribution is the well-known Marčenko-Pastur law. The largest (or smallest non-zero) eigenvalue converges almost surely to the left (or right) endpoint of the limiting spectral distribution, respectively. Moreover, the linear spectral statistics demonstrate a Gaussian limit. Based on our CLT result, we investigate a test problem on the population covariance structure of the basis data. Simulation experiments demonstrate the accuracy of theoretical results.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Main Results	5
2.1	Preliminaries and notations	5
2.2	Limiting spectral distribution and extreme eigenvalues	5
2.3	CLT for LSS	8
3	Application	9
3.1	Test statistic and its limiting null distribution	10
3.2	Power analysis and discussion	12
4	Numerical experiments	14
4.1	Limiting spectral distribution	14
4.2	CLT for LSS	15
4.3	Covariance testing for basis data	17

*arXiv: [2312.14420](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.14420)

[†]Southern University of Science and Technology, email: jq172515@gmail.com. Co-first author.

[‡]The University of Hong Kong, email: jxqiu@hku.hk. Co-first author.

[§]Southern University of Science and Technology, email: liz9@sustech.edu.cn. Corresponding author.

5	Proof of Theorem 2.5	20
5.1	Substitution principle	22
5.2	Truncation and some important lemmas	22
5.2.1	Truncation	22
5.2.2	Some important Lemmas	23
5.3	CLT for LSS of the centralized sample covariance matrix B_p^0	24
5.3.1	Step 1: Finite dimensional convergence of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ in distribution	24
5.3.2	Step 2: Tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$	27
5.3.3	Step 3: Convergence of $M_p^{(2)}(z)$	27
S1	Auxiliary lemmas	29
S2	Proofs	30
S2.1	Proof of Proposition 2.4	30
S2.2	Proof of Lemma 5.2	34
S2.3	Proof of Lemma 5.3	35
S2.4	Proof of Lemma 5.4	39
S2.5	Proof of Lemma 5.5	42
S2.6	Proof of Lemma 5.7	47
S2.7	Proof of Lemma S2.1	50
S2.8	Proof of Lemma S2.2	51
S2.9	Tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$	54
S2.10	Proof of Lemma 5.8	55
S2.11	Proof of Lemma S2.3	57
S2.12	Proof of Lemma S2.4	59
S2.13	Proof of Lemma S1.5	61
S2.14	Proof of Corollary 2.6	63
S2.14.1	Calculation of expectation	63
S2.14.2	Calculation of variance	66
S2.15	Proof of Theorem 3.1	67
S2.16	Proof of Theorem 3.2	68
S2.17	Proof of Lemma S2.5	70
S2.18	Proof of Example 1	70
S3	Simulation of CLT for $M_p(z)$	78

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in the analysis of high-dimensional compositional data (HCD), which arise in various fields including genomics, ecology, finance, and social sciences. Compositional data refers to observations whose sum is a constant, such as proportions or percentages. HCD often involve a large number of variables or features measured for each sample, posing unique challenges for analysis. In the field of genomics, HCD analysis plays a crucial role in studying the composition and abundance of microbial communities, such as the human gut microbiome. Understanding the microbial composition and its relationship with health and disease has significant implications for personalized medicine and therapeutic interventions.

Statistical inference in HCD involves microbial mean tests, covariance matrix structural tests, and linear regression hypothesis testing. These inferences are intricately linked to the statistical properties of the sample covariance matrix. Mean tests typically utilize sum-of-squares-type and maximum-type statistics for dense and sparse alternative hypothesis, respectively. [Cao et al. \[2018\]](#) extended the maximum test framework by [Cai et al. \[2014\]](#) for compositional data. However, there’s a gap in having a suitable sum-of-squares-type statistic for dense alternatives in HCD mean tests. Many sum-of-squares-type statistics, like Hotelling’s T^2 -statistic, rely on the sample covariance matrix. For bacterial species correlation, [Faust et al. \[2012\]](#) introduced the permutation-renormalization bootstrap (ReBoot), directly calculating correlations from compositional components. Shuffling is suggested due to compositional data’s closure constraint, introducing negative correlations. Yet, compositional data’s unique properties require an additional normalization step within the same sample post-shuffling, potentially impacting the theoretical validity of permutation and resampling methods. Additionally, resampling increases computational complexity for p-value calculation and confidence interval construction. Related methods infer latent basis correlation or covariance under sparsity assumptions, including SparCC [[Friedman and Alm, 2012](#)], CCLasso [[Fang et al., 2015](#)], and COAT [[Cao et al., 2019](#)]. All these studies are closely related to the sample covariance matrix of HCD.

Current research predominantly focuses on sparse compositional data. In dense scenarios, researchers often turn to the spectral properties of sample covariance matrices. Despite this, there is a notable gap in the field of random matrices where specific attention to structures resembling compositional data, where the row sum of the data matrix is constant, is lacking. Statistical inference for HCD encounters challenges arising not only from constraints but also from high dimensionality. Recognizing the crucial role of spectral theory in sample covariance matrices is also vital for addressing statistical challenges associated with high-dimensional data. Importantly, while previous research on statistical inference for HCD has overlooked studies under the spectral theory of sample covariance matrices, our work takes on these challenges from a Random Matrix Theory perspective. Existing literature extensively covers spectral properties of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices, but most results rely on the independent component data structure, i.e. $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{X}$, where $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is determined, and $\mathbf{X}$ has independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) components. Seminal works by [Marčenko and Pastur \[1967\]](#) and [Jonsson \[1982\]](#) established the limiting spectral distribution (LSD) of the sample covariance matrix $n^{-1}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'$, where $\mathbf{X}$ is an i.i.d. data matrix with zero mean, leading to the well-known Marčenko-Pastur law. Subsequent research by [Yin and Krishnaiah \[1983\]](#) and [Silverstein and Bai \[1995\]](#) extended these findings to the sample covariance matrix $n^{-1}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'$ for data with a linear dependence structure. [Zhang \[2007\]](#) extended to the general separable product form $n^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}^{1/2}$, where $\mathbf{A}$ is nonnegative definite, and $\mathbf{B}$ is Hermitian. Another important area of interest is the investigation of extreme eigenvalues. [Johnstone \[2001\]](#) explored the fluctuation of the extreme eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix $n^{-1}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'$, proving that the standardized largest eigenvalue follows the Tracy-Widom law. Related extensions include sample covariance matrices with linear dependence structures [[El Karoui, 2007](#)], Kendall rank correlation coefficient matrices [[Bao, 2019](#)], among others. Considerable attention has also been given to the study of linear functionals of eigenvalues. [Bai and Silverstein \[2004\]](#) established the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for the Linear Spectral Statistics (LSS) of the sample covariance matrix $n^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}^{1/2}$, later extended to sample correlation coefficient matrices [[Gao et al., 2017](#)], and separable product matrices [[Bai et al., 2019](#)]. To summarize, existing results in spectral theory of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices predominantly rely on independent component data structure which, unfortunately, HCD does not fit.

Specifically, current second-order limit theorems do not apply to HCD, making the exploration of spectral theory for HCD with distinct constraints crucial. This paper delves into spectral theory

for sample covariance matrices of HCD, including LSD, extreme eigenvalues, and CLT for LSS. Analyzing HCD faces challenges due to compositional data's specific dependence structure, making existing techniques for i.i.d. observations less applicable. However, we can assume that HCD are generated from unobservable basis data, while the underlying basis data follow independent component model structure. In this way, spectral analysis of the sample covariance matrix of HCD can be approached through the basis data. In fact, the structure of the sample covariance matrix of HCD is similar to that of the Pearson sample correlation matrix in basis data. Therefore, we leverage the analysis methods of the spectral theory of the Pearson sample correlation matrix to study the spectral theory of the sample covariance matrix of HCD. In the field of random matrices, research on the spectral theory of the Pearson sample correlation matrix based on independent data is relatively mature. Jiang [2004] demonstrated that the LSD of sample correlation matrix for i.i.d data is the well-known Marčenko-Pastur law. Gao et al. [2017] derive the CLT for LSS of the Pearson sample correlation matrix. The derivation of spectral theory for the sample covariance matrix of HCD can benefit from methods in this context. The LSD of the sample covariance matrix for HCD in Theorem 2.3 is established following the strategy in Jiang [2004], and we further investigate the extreme eigenvalues in Proposition 2.4. The proof strategy of CLT for LSS in Theorem 2.5 follows the methodologies outlined in Bai and Silverstein [2004] for the sample covariance matrix and Gao et al. [2017] for the sample correlation matrix. However, due to the dependence inherent in HCD, certain tools from these works cannot be directly applied to the sample covariance matrix of HCD. In response, we introduce new techniques. Specifically, we establish concentration inequalities for compositional data. One of the central ideas of the paper, grounded in concentration phenomena, permeates the entire proof (details in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3), where we develop three crucial technique lemmas (see Lemmas 5.3 – 5.5) essential for the proof. Finally, it is noteworthy that the mean and variance-covariance in Theorem 2.5 differ from those in Bai and Silverstein [2004], and additional terms are present in both the mean and variance-covariance.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2.2 investigates the LSD and extreme eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix for HCD. Section 2.3 establishes the CLT for LSS of the sample covariance matrix for HCD. Section 3 studies a test problem on the population covariance structure of the basis data based on our CLT result. Section 4 reports numerical studies. To facilitate reproducibility, the source code for the simulation studies is available online¹. Section 5 presents the sketch of proof of our CLT for LSS. Auxiliary lemmas and some technical proofs are relegated to the supplementary material.

Before proceeding, we introduce some notations that will be used throughout this paper. We adopt the convention of using regular letters for scalars and boldface letters for vectors or matrices. For any matrix $\mathbf{A}$, we denote its (i, j) -th entry by A_{ij} , its transpose by $\mathbf{A}'$, its trace by $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$, its j -th largest eigenvalue by $\lambda_j(\mathbf{A})$, its spectral norm by $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')}$. For a set of random variables $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and a corresponding set of nonnegative real numbers $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we write $X_n = O_P(a_n)$ if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ and $N > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|X_n/a_n| \geq C) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N$. We write $X_n = o_P(a_n)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|X_n/a_n| \geq \varepsilon) = 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, we write $X_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} X$ ($X_n \xrightarrow{P} X$, $X_n \xrightarrow{D} X$ respectively) if X_n converges almost surely (in probability, in distribution, respectively) to X . We denote by C and K as constants which may vary from line to line.

¹Code available at: <https://github.com/jxqiu77/scm-coda>.

2 Main Results

2.1 Preliminaries and notations

Let $\mathbf{X}_n = (x_{ij})_{n \times p}$ denote the $n \times p$ observed data matrix, and each row $(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})$ represents compositions that lie in the $(p-1)$ -dimensional simplex $\mathcal{S}^{p-1} = \{(y_1, \dots, y_p) : \sum_{j=1}^p y_j = 1, y_j \geq 0\}$. We assume that the compositional variables arise from a vector of latent variables, which we call the basis. Let $\mathbf{W}_n = (w_{ij})_{n \times p}$ denote the $n \times p$ matrices of unobserved bases, where w_{ij} 's are positive and i.i.d. with mean $\mu > 0$ and variance σ^2 . The observed compositional data is generated via the normalization:

$$x_{ij} = \frac{w_{ij}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p. \quad (1)$$

The unbiased sample covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}_n$ is defined by $\mathbf{S}_{n,N} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n$, where $\mathbf{C}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n'$, $\mathbf{1}_n$ is a n -dimensional vector of all ones, and $N = n - 1$ is the adjusted sample size. To match the orders of the numerator and denominator in (1), we introduce the rescaled sample covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{B}_{p,N} = p^2 \mathbf{S}_{n,N} = \frac{1}{N} (p \mathbf{X}_n)' \mathbf{C}_n (p \mathbf{X}_n).$$

For any $p \times p$ Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{A}_p$, its *empirical spectral distribution* (ESD) is defined by

$$F^{\mathbf{A}_p}(x) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p I_{\{\lambda_i(\mathbf{A}_p) \leq x\}},$$

where $I_{\{\cdot\}}$ denotes the indicator function. If $F^{\mathbf{A}_p}(x)$ converges to a non-random limit $F(x)$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, we call $F(x)$ the *limiting spectral distribution* of $\mathbf{A}_p$. The LSD of $\mathbf{A}_p$ is described in terms of its Stieltjes transform. The Stieltjes transform of any cumulative distribution function F is defined by

$$m_F(z) = \int \frac{1}{x - z} dF(x), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+ := \{z : \text{Im}(z) > 0\}.$$

Many classes of statistics related to the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ are important for multivariate inference, particularly functionals of the ESD. To explore this, for any function f defined on $[0, \infty)$, we consider the *linear spectral statistics* (LSS) of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ given by

$$\int f(x) dF^{\mathbf{B}_{p,N}}(x) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p f(\lambda_i(\mathbf{B}_{p,N})).$$

In this paper, we study the asymptotic spectral properties of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, including the LSD (see Theorem 2.3), the behavior of extreme eigenvalues (see Proposition 2.4), and the CLT for LSS (see Theorem 2.5).

2.2 Limiting spectral distribution and extreme eigenvalues

Analyzing HCD poses challenges due to its unique dependence structure, making existing techniques for i.i.d. observations less applicable. To overcome this difficulty, we assume that the compositional data is generated from basis data and the basis data follows the commonly used independent component structure. Specifically, the unbiased sample covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}_n$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{S}_{n,N} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{W}_n' \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{W}_n,$$

where $\mathbf{X}_n = \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{W}_n$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n = \text{diag}(1/\sum_{j=1}^p w_{1j}, \dots, 1/\sum_{j=1}^p w_{nj})$. Here, we assume that $\mathbf{W}_n = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_p)$ has i.i.d. components w_{ij} , with $\mathbb{E}(w_{ij}) = \mu > 0$, $\text{Var}(w_{ij}) = \sigma^2$. Recall that the Pearson sample correlation matrix for $\mathbf{W}_n$ is

$$\mathbf{R}_n = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_p \mathbf{W}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{W}_n \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_p,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n = \mathbf{W}_n \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_p$, $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_p = \text{diag}(\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{w}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_1\|_2^{-1}, \dots, \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{w}_p - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_p\|_2^{-1})$, and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{ij} \mathbf{1}_n$ with $\mathbf{1}_n$ being an n -dimensional all-one vector. It can be seen that the normalizing matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n$ of $\mathbf{S}_{n,N}$ is very similar to $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_p$ of $\mathbf{R}_n$. The former uses $(\sum_{j=1}^p w_{ij})^{-1}$ for normalization, while the latter utilizes $\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{w}_j - \bar{\mathbf{w}}_j\|_2^{-1}$. This allows us to leverage the techniques from the spectral theory of the Pearson sample correlation matrix in studying the asymptotic spectral properties of the sample covariance matrix for HCD.

Before diving into the LSS of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, we first explore its LSD and extreme eigenvalues. Specifically, suppose the following assumptions hold:

Assumption 2.1. $\{w_{ij} > 0, i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ are i.i.d. real random variables with $\mathbb{E}w_{11} = \mu > 0$, $\text{Var}(w_{11}) = \sigma^2 > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(w_{11} - \mu)^4 < \infty$. For notational simplicity, we write $\lambda = \sigma^2/\mu^2$ throughout the paper.

Assumption 2.2. $c_N = p/N$ tends to a positive constant c as $p, N \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.3. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, with probability one, the ESD of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ converges weakly to a deterministic probability distribution with a density function

$$f_{\text{MP}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi c \lambda x} \sqrt{[(b-x)(x-a)]_+}, \quad (2)$$

and a point mass $1 - 1/c$ at $x = 0$ if $c > 1$, where $a := \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2$, $b := \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$, and $[y]_+ := \max\{y, 0\}$.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let

$$\mathbf{G}_p = \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p', \quad \mathbf{W}_n^\circ = \frac{\mathbf{W}_n - \mu \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_p'}{\mu}, \quad \mathbf{D}_n = p\mu \mathbf{\Lambda}_n,$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n$ is defined in Section 2.2. The entries of $\mathbf{W}_n^\circ$ are i.i.d. with mean zero, variance λ , and finite fourth moment. Let

$$\mathbf{Y}_n := \frac{p}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{W}_n, \quad \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p.$$

Then $\mathbf{B}_{p,N} = \mathbf{Y}_n' \mathbf{Y}_n$. The identity $\mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{W}_n / \mu = \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_p' + \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p$ implies that

$$\mathbf{Y}_n = \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p / \sqrt{N}.$$

Let $\mathbf{H}_n = (\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ / N$. Then $\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n = \mathbf{G}_p \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{G}_p$ and

$$\mathbf{H}_n - \frac{(\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)' \mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{N} = -\frac{(\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)' \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{nN}, \quad \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n - \mathbf{H}_n = -\frac{\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{G}_p}{p} - \frac{\mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p'}{p}.$$

Each of the three terms on the right-hand sides has rank at most one. Hence the difference between $\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n$ and $(\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)' \mathbf{W}_n^\circ / N$ has rank at most three. The rank inequality [Bai and Silverstein, 2010, Theorem A.43] therefore shows that the two matrices have the same LSD.

Write $p = p_n$ and define

$$\varepsilon_{i,n} := \frac{1}{p_n \mu} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_n} w_{i\ell} - 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Under Assumptions 2.1–2.2, Lemma 2 of Bai and Yin [1993] gives $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\varepsilon_{i,n}| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, and hence

$$\|\mathbf{D}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon_{i,n}} - 1 \right| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

The result in Bai and Yin [1993] gives $\|\mathbf{W}_n^\circ / \sqrt{N}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sqrt{\lambda}(1 + \sqrt{c})$. These two estimates imply that

$$\|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| = \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{C}_n (\mathbf{D}_n - \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p \right\| \leq \|\mathbf{D}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| \left\| \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}} \right\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \quad (3)$$

This, together with Theorem A.47 of Bai and Silverstein [2010], completes the proof. $\square$

We denote the LSD of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ by $F^c(x)$, whose density function is $f_{\text{MP}}(x)$, as defined in (2). The superscript c indicates the dimension-to-sample ratio. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, by our Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 1.1 in Silverstein and Bai [1995], the Stieltjes transform of F^c , denoted $m(z) \equiv m_{F^c}(z)$, is the unique solution to the equation

$$m = \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - c - czm) - z}.$$

in the set $\{m \in \mathbb{C} : -(1 - c)/z + cm \in \mathbb{C}^+\}$. Consider the *companion matrix* $\underline{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N} = \frac{p^2}{N} \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{C}_n$ of size $n \times n$, which differs from $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ only by $|n - p|$ zero eigenvalues; its LSD is $\underline{F}^c(x) = (1 - c)I_{[0, \infty)}(x) + cF^c(x)$ with Stieltjes transform

$$\underline{m}(z) \equiv m_{\underline{F}^c}(z) = cm(z) - \frac{1 - c}{z}$$

with inverse

$$z = z(\underline{m}) = -\frac{1}{\underline{m}(z)} + \frac{c\lambda}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

Proposition 2.4. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, we have*

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N})$ is the largest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N})$ is the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$. Furthermore, for any $\ell > 0$, $\eta_1 > \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$ and $0 < \eta_2 < \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 I_{\{0 < c < 1\}}$, under the truncation condition $|w_{ij} - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$) where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a positive sequence satisfying that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\delta_n n^{1/4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E}|w_{11} - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_{11} - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \eta_1) = o(n^{-\ell}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq \eta_2) = o(n^{-\ell}). \quad (5)$$

The proof of Proposition 2.4 is provided in the Supplementary Material.

Remark 1. The results of extreme eigenvalues are useful in locating eigenvalues of the population covariance matrix and proving the CLT for LSS. Proposition 2.4 demonstrates that, with probability one, there are no eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ outside the support of the LSD under Assumptions 2.1 – 2.2. These results are crucial for applying the Cauchy integral formula (see Equation (12)) and proving tightness.

Remark 2. For the special case when $p = n$, the matrix $\mathbf{X}_n = (w_{ij}/\sum_{\ell=1}^n w_{i\ell})$ is a *random Markov matrix*. The work of Bordenave, Caputo, and Chafaï [Bordenave et al. \[2012\]](#) provided key insights into the first-order properties of both eigenvalues and singular values of the $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{X}_n$, including the limiting distribution of its singular values and the convergence of its extreme singular values. Our first-order results (see Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4) can be viewed as an extension of their findings regarding singular values when $p, n \rightarrow \infty$ and $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$.

In contrast to the scope of [Bordenave et al. \[2012\]](#), our work focuses on a different setting and investigates a different aspect of $\mathbf{X}_n$. Specifically, we examine the centered version $\mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n$ without requiring $p = n$, and we focus on second-order fluctuations of LSS. Beyond first-order limits, we derive the CLT for LSS of the sample covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}_n$ (see Theorem 2.5).

2.3 CLT for LSS

We focus on linear functionals of eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, i.e. $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p f(\lambda_i(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}))$. Naturally, it converges to the functional integration of the LSD of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, that is, $\int f(x) dF^c(x)$. In this section, we explore the second-order fluctuation of $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p f(\lambda_i)$, which describes how such LSS converges to its first-order limit. Define

$$G_{p,N}(f) = p \int f(x) d\{F^{\mathbf{B}_{p,N}}(x) - F^{c_N}(x)\},$$

where $F^{c_N}(x)$ is obtained by substituting c_N for c in $F^c(x)$, the LSD of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$. We show that under Assumptions 2.1 – 2.2 and the analyticity of f , the rate of $\int f(x) d\{F^{\mathbf{B}_{p,N}}(x) - F^{c_N}(x)\}$ approaching zero is essentially $1/n$, and $G_{p,N}(f)$ converges weakly to a Gaussian variable.

Before presenting the main result, we recall some notations. We denote $\lambda = \sigma^2/\mu^2$. Recall that $m(z)$ and $\underline{m}(z)$ are the Stieltjes transforms of the LSD $F^c(x)$ and the companion LSD $\underline{F}^c(x)$, respectively. Furthermore, we define $m'(z)$ as the derivative of $m(z)$ with respect to z throughout the rest of this paper. The main result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k$ be functions on $\mathbb{R}$ and analytic on an open interval containing $[\lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 I_{\{0 < c < 1\}}, \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2]$. Then, the random vector $(G_{p,N}(f_1), \dots, G_{p,N}(f_k))'$ forms a tight sequence in p and converges weakly to a Gaussian vector $(X_{f_1}, \dots, X_{f_k})$ with mean function*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_f &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{f(z)\underline{m}^3(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{f(z)\underline{m}^2(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}\{z(h_1 + \lambda)m(z) + \lambda\}}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{c}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{f(z)z^2\underline{m}^3(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}\{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz, \end{aligned}$$

and covariance function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X_f, X_g) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1)g(z_2)}{\{\underline{m}(z_1) - \underline{m}(z_2)\}^2} d\underline{m}(z_1) d\underline{m}(z_2) \\ &\quad - \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_1} \oint_{\mathcal{C}_2} \frac{f(z_1)g(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z_1)\}^2 \{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z_2)\}^2} d\underline{m}(z_1) d\underline{m}(z_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_1 = \mathbb{E}(w_{11}/\mu - 1)^4 - 3\lambda^2$, $\alpha_2 = -4\lambda\mathbb{E}w_{11}^3/\mu^3 + 4\lambda^3 + 12\lambda^2 + 4\lambda$, $h_1 = -2\mathbb{E}w_{11}^3/\mu^3 + 3\lambda^2 + 5\lambda + 2$. The contours $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are closed and taken in the positive direction in the complex plane, each enclosing the support of LSD, i.e., $[\lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 I_{\{0 < c < 1\}}, \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2]$.

Remark 3. We restrict attention to functions f which are analytic in a region of the complex plane containing the support of LSD. As demonstrated in [Najim and Yao \[2016\]](#), the analyticity requirement for f in the CLT can be relaxed by representing the LSS with the help of Helffer--Sjöstrand's formula instead of the Cauchy integral formula. For now, we focus on analytic cases because analytic functions are sufficient to achieve our current statistical objectives.

Applying Theorem 2.5 to three polynomial functions, we obtain the following corollary. Our test statistic uses the first two CLTs in this corollary, corresponding to $f_1(x) = x$ and $f_2(x) = x^2$. The proof of Theorem 2.5 is postponed to Section 5, and detailed calculations in these applications are postponed to the supplementary material.

Corollary 2.6. *Under the same notations and assumptions as in Theorem 2.5, let $f_r = x^r$ for $r = 1, 2, 3$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} G_{p,N}(f_1) &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) - p\lambda \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, V_1), \\ G_{p,N}(f_2) &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2) - p(1 + c_N)\lambda^2 \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, V_2), \\ G_{p,N}(f_3) &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^3) - p(1 + 3c_N + c_N^2)\lambda^3 \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mu_3, V_3), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_N = p/N$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 &= h_1, \quad \mu_2 = (1 + c)\lambda^2 + 2(1 + c)\lambda h_1 + c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \\ \mu_3 &= (2 + 6c + 3c^2)\lambda^3 + 3(1 + 3c + c^2)\lambda^2 h_1 + 3c(1 + c)\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \\ V_1 &= 2c\lambda^2 + c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \quad V_2 = 4c(2 + c)(1 + 2c)\lambda^4 + 4c(1 + c)^2\lambda^2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \\ V_3 &= 6c(1 + 6c + 3c^2)(3 + 6c + c^2)\lambda^6 + 9c(1 + 3c + c^2)^2\lambda^4(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2). \end{aligned}$$

3 Application

In microbiome sequencing, observed relative abundances are compositional, whereas scientific questions often concern co-occurrence, exclusion, and dependence among latent absolute abundances. Because the constant-sum constraint can produce spurious correlations among the observed components, methods have been developed specifically for microbial association and latent covariance inference from compositional data, including ReBoot [[Faust et al., 2012](#)], SparCC [[Friedman and Alm, 2012](#)], CCLasso [[Fang et al., 2015](#)], and COAT [[Cao et al., 2019](#)]. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\frac{w_1}{w}, \frac{w_2}{w}, \dots, \frac{w_p}{w})' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a random vector, where $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are positive latent variables and $w := \sum_{i=1}^p w_i$. Within this specified basis-data model, we consider the global hypothesis

$$H_0: \{w_i\}_{i=1}^p \text{ are i.i.d.,} \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1: \{w_i\}_{i=1}^p \text{ are not i.i.d.,}$$

based on n samples under the regime $p, n \rightarrow \infty, p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$. Under the null hypothesis H_0 , the vector $\mathbf{x}$ is exchangeable, that is, its distribution is invariant under any permutation of its coordinates, implying identical marginals and symmetric dependence. Its covariance matrix is given by

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\nu_2^\circ}{p(p-1)} \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right) =: \frac{\nu_2^\circ}{p(p-1)} \mathbf{G}_p, \quad (6)$$

where $\nu_2^\circ := \mathbb{E}\{pw_1/(\sum_{k=1}^p w_k) - 1\}^2$. Readers are referred to Section S2.5 of the supplementary material for the proof of (6).

Remark 4. We cannot fully characterize “ $H_0 : \{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are i.i.d.” by $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})$ alone because $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{w})$ do not have a one-to-one correspondence. In fact, the observed data $\mathbf{x}$ may satisfy (6) even when the underlying components $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are not independent. For example, consider the case where $p = 2k$ is even for some integer $k \geq 1$, and let

$$\{w_i\}_{i=1}^k \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Uniform}(0, 1), \quad w_{k+i} = \begin{cases} w_i, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1 - w_i, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are *uncorrelated but dependent*, and therefore do not satisfy H_0 . However, $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})$ still *satisfies* (6).

This example implies that even when $\mathbf{w}$ have entirely different dependency structures, the covariance of $\mathbf{x}$ can still be the same. However, the dependence structure of $\mathbf{w}$ is critical to the behavior of the LSS. When the dependence structure of $\mathbf{w}$ changes, the CLT for the LSS can also change, altering the distribution of the test statistic. In other words, if we were to characterize H_0 in terms of $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})$, the distribution of the test statistic under H_0 would be uncertain and unidentifiable, making valid testing infeasible. Therefore, we must characterize H_0 in terms of $\mathbf{w}$, since its dependence structure directly determines the behavior of the LSS and thus the distribution of the test statistic.

3.1 Test statistic and its limiting null distribution

Given i.i.d. samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, we construct a test statistic based on the rescaled sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, as defined in Section 2.1. We consider the following Frobenius-norm-type test statistic:

$$T := \frac{1}{p} \|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2, \quad \mathbf{B} := \text{Cov}(p\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{(6)}{=} \frac{pv_2^\circ}{p-1} \mathbf{G}_p,$$

where $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F := (\sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix $\mathbf{A}$. The statistic measures the distance between $\text{Cov}(p\mathbf{x})$ and its empirical counterpart. We reject H_0 when T is sufficiently large.

The test statistic T is closely related to LSS of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$, particularly for test functions $f(x) = x^k$, $k = 1, 2$. Specifically,

$$T = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2) - \frac{2v_2^\circ}{p-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) + \frac{p(v_2^\circ)^2}{p-1}.$$

Here, we use the identity $\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{B}_{p,N} \mathbf{1}_p = 0$. Using the CLT for $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N})$ and $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2)$ (see Corollary 2.6) and the Delta method, the limiting null distribution of T is obtained:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, and $\mathbb{E}|w_{11} - \mu|^{6+s} < \infty$ for some $s > 0$, under H_0 , we have*

$$p(T - \mu_T) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_T^2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_T &= \lambda^2 c_N + \frac{\mu_2}{p} - \frac{2\lambda h_1 + \lambda^2}{p-1}, \quad \sigma_T^2 = 4\lambda^2 V_1 - 4\lambda V_{12} + V_2, \\ V_{12} &= 2\lambda c(1+c)(2\lambda^2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

h_1, α_1, α_2 are defined in Theorem 2.5, and μ_2, V_1, V_2 are defined in Corollary 2.6.

The detailed proof of Theorem 3.1 is postponed to the supplementary material. Based on this theorem, we can reject H_0 at a asymptotic significance level α if

$$p(T - \mu_T)/\sigma_T > z_\alpha,$$

where z_α is the upper α -quantile of the standard normal distribution. When the underlying distribution of w_{11} is unknown, the parameters λ , α_1 , α_2 , h_1 , μ_2 , V_1 , and V_2 are also unknown, making the limiting null distribution of T in Theorem 3.1 unidentifiable. In this case, to make the test statistic feasible for testing, we need to estimate the unknown parameters in the limiting null distribution. To make the rescaled sample covariance matrix independent of the estimators of μ_T and ν_2° , which facilitates the derivation of the CLT for $\tilde{T}$, we split $\mathbf{X}$ into two parts:

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{n_1 \times p}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{X}_{n_2 \times p}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{X}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{p}{n_1} \rightarrow c_1 \in (0, \infty), \quad \frac{p}{n_2} \rightarrow c_2 \in (0, \infty),$$

Here, $\mathbf{X}^{(1)}$ is used to form the rescaled sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p, N_1}^{(1)}$, whereas $\mathbf{X}^{(2)}$ is used to estimate μ_T and ν_2° . The new test statistic is defined by

$$\tilde{T} = \frac{1}{p} \left\| \mathbf{B}_{p, N_1}^{(1)} - \frac{p \hat{\nu}_2^\circ}{p-1} \mathbf{G}_p \right\|_F^2,$$

where $N_1 = n_1 - 1$, and

$$\mathbf{B}_{p, N_1}^{(1)} = \frac{p^2}{N_1} (\mathbf{X}^{(1)})' \mathbf{C}_{n_1} \mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \quad \hat{\nu}_2^\circ = \frac{1}{pn_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^p (pX_{ij}^{(2)} - 1)^2.$$

Moreover, we estimate μ_T by $\hat{\mu}_T$. Because the covariance statistic is formed from $\mathbf{X}^{(1)}$, the ratio in its centering uses $N_1 = n_1 - 1$; the unknown moment parameters are estimated from $\mathbf{X}^{(2)}$. Thus $\hat{\mu}_T$ is obtained by replacing N in μ_T with N_1 and substituting λ , $\mathbb{E}(w_{11}/\mu)^3$, and $\mathbb{E}(w_{11}/\mu - 1)^4$ with $\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\nu}_2^\circ$ and

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\mu}\right)^3 = \frac{1}{pn_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^p (pX_{ij}^{(2)})^3, \quad \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\mu} - 1\right)^4 = \frac{1}{pn_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^p (pX_{ij}^{(2)} - 1)^4.$$

The consistency of $\hat{\lambda}$, $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}(w_{11}/\mu)^3$, and $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}(w_{11}/\mu - 1)^4$ follows from the law of large numbers. Using these newly defined notations, we derive the CLT for $\tilde{T}$ as follows:

Theorem 3.2. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, and $\mathbb{E}|w_{11} - \mu|^{6+s} < \infty$ for some $s > 0$, under H_0 , we have

$$p(\tilde{T} - \hat{\mu}_T) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mu_\lambda, \sigma_T^2 + \sigma_\lambda^2),$$

where σ_T^2 is defined similarly to σ_T^2 in (7), with c replaced by c_1 , and

$$\mu_\lambda = -2c_1 \lambda h_1, \quad \sigma_\lambda^2 = 4\lambda^2 c_1^2 c_2 \left\{ \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\mu} - 1\right)^4 - \lambda^2 + h_2 - 2\lambda h_1 \right\}.$$

Here, h_1 and h_2 are defined in Lemma 5.3.

The detailed proof of this theorem is postponed to the supplementary material. Based on Theorem 3.2, the procedure for testing H_0 is as follows:

$$\text{Reject } H_0 \text{ if } p(\bar{T} - \hat{\mu}_T) - \hat{\mu}_\lambda > z_\alpha \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{T}}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_\lambda^2}, \quad (8)$$

where z_α represents the upper α -quantile of the standard normal distribution corresponding to the nominal level α . The quantities $\hat{\mu}_\lambda$, $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{T}}^2$, and $\hat{\sigma}_\lambda^2$ are finite-sample plug-in estimates of μ_λ , $\sigma_{\bar{T}}^2$, and σ_λ^2 , respectively. Unlike $\hat{\mu}_T$ and $\hat{\nu}_2^2$, these remaining plug-in estimators do not need to be independent of $\bar{T}$ and are computed using the full data matrix $\mathbf{X}$. Their consistency and Slutsky's theorem are sufficient for the feasible testing rule, so no additional data split is required.

3.2 Power analysis and discussion

In this section, we analyze the power of the test statistic T (see Theorem 3.1) under the alternative hypothesis where $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are not i.i.d. in the sense that they have the same mean but different covariance structures. We first give a sufficient condition (see (9)) under which the power of T exceeds α against a specified alternative, and then give two examples in which this condition holds asymptotically.

For the alternatives below, we write the basis data matrix as $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{Z}_n \Sigma = (w_{ij})_{n \times p}$, where the entries of $\mathbf{Z}_n = (z_{ij})_{n \times p}$ satisfy the distributional and moment conditions in Assumption 2.1 and Σ is normalized by $\text{tr}(\Sigma) = p$. This normalization is without loss of generality, as the observed compositional data $x_{ij} = w_{ij} / \sum_{k=1}^p w_{ik}$ is invariant under scaling of the basis data $\mathbf{W}_n$. Under either H_0 or H_1 , we use the same deterministic rescaling

$$\mathbf{B}_{p,N} := \frac{p^2}{N} \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n,$$

where $\mathbf{C}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n'$ and $N = n - 1$. We distinguish the probability law generating $\mathbf{X}_n$ by writing $\mathbb{E}_{H_r}$, Var_{H_r} , and $\mathbb{P}_{H_r}$ for $r \in \{0, 1\}$.

In the following proposition, we present a sufficient condition for the oracle test based on T to have power exceeding α against a specified alternative.

Proposition 3.3. *Consider a specified alternative hypothesis H_1 where $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^p$ are not i.i.d. but have the same mean. Suppose that the entries of $\mathbf{Z}_n$ satisfy Assumptions 2.1–2.2, and*

$$\Delta_{p,n}^{\mathbb{E}} := \mathbb{E}_{H_1} \|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 - p\mu_T > z_\alpha \sigma_T + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \text{Var}_{H_1}(\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2)}. \quad (9)$$

Then, the power of the test based on T exceeds α against this alternative, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_1} \{p(T - \mu_T) > z_\alpha \sigma_T\} > \alpha.$$

Moreover, if as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\Delta_{p,n}^{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}_{H_1}(\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2) = o((\Delta_{p,n}^{\mathbb{E}})^2), \quad (10)$$

then the asymptotic power of the test is one, that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_1} \{p(T - \mu_T) > z_\alpha \sigma_T\} = 1.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Using Cantelli's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{H_1}\{p(T - \mu_T) > z_\alpha \sigma_T\} &= 1 - \mathbb{P}_{H_1}\left(\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 - \mathbb{E}_{H_1}\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 \leq -\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E} + z_\alpha \sigma_T\right) \\ &\geq \frac{(\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E} - z_\alpha \sigma_T)^2}{(\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E} - z_\alpha \sigma_T)^2 + \text{Var}_{H_1}(\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2)} \stackrel{(9)}{>} \alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if (10) holds, then the right hand side of the above inequality converges to one, and therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{H_1}\{p(T - \mu_T) > z_\alpha \sigma_T\} = 1$. $\square$

We consider two examples to verify that condition (9) or (10) holds asymptotically for specific classes of alternatives. In the first example, we consider a class of alternatives where Σ is *diagonal* with non-identical entries, and in the second example, we consider a specific alternative where Σ is *non-diagonal*.

Example 1. Assume that the matrix Σ has the form $\Sigma = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_p)$ with

$$\sum_{k=1}^p d_k = p, \quad \max_k d_k = O(1), \quad \sum_{k=1}^p (d_k^2 - 1)^2 \asymp p.$$

Moreover, we assume that the random variables z_{ij} satisfy Assumption 2.1 and the following moment conditions:

$$\mathbb{E}|z_{11}|^{32} < \infty, \quad \sup_p \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^p d_\ell z_{1\ell} / p \right|^{-32} < \infty.$$

Under these assumptions, we have

$$\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E} = \frac{\lambda^2 \{(\sum_{k=1}^p d_k^2)^2 - p^2\}}{n} + \lambda^2 \sum_{k=1}^p (d_k^2 - 1)^2 + o(p) \asymp p, \quad \text{Var}_{H_1}(\|\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2) = O(1).$$

The detailed proofs are provided in the Supplementary Material. Hence, both conditions (9) and (10) hold, and the test is asymptotically powerful against this class of alternatives. This is confirmed by the simulation results in Table 3 of Section 4.3, where the power of the test approaches one as p becomes large.

Example 2. Assume that the matrix Σ has the following form

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \gamma \\ \gamma & 1 & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \gamma & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma > -1.$$

In this non-diagonal case, the leading-order comparison in condition (9) reduces asymptotically to

$$n > \frac{2(\gamma^2 + \gamma + 1)}{3\gamma} \frac{(p+1)^2}{p}. \quad (11)$$

This leading-order relation explains the non-diagonal power settings in Section 4.3: it uses $\psi_2 = \gamma \in \{-0.2, -0.25, -0.3, -0.35\}$, with $p \in \{150, 300, 450, 600\}$ and $c = p/n \in \{0.5, 1, 1.5\}$. For these negative values of γ , the right-hand side of (11) is negative for every positive p , so (11) holds throughout these non-diagonal power settings. Moreover, for the full sufficient condition (9), we can verify that the leading order of $\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E}$ dominates the leading term on the right hand side. Hence, Proposition 3.3 implies that the oracle statistic T has power against this alternative under these settings. The empirical results in Table 4 in Section 4.3 are consistent with this conclusion.

4 Numerical experiments

4.1 Limiting spectral distribution

In this section, simulation experiments are conducted to verify the LSD of the sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ from compositional data, as stated in Theorem 2.3. Compositional data $\{x_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p}$ is generated by the normalization $x_{ij} = w_{ij} / \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}$. We generate basis data w_{ij} from three populations, drawing histograms of eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ and comparing them with theoretical densities. Specifically, three types of distributions for w_{ij} are considered:

1. w_{ij} follows the exponential distribution with rate parameter 5;
2. w_{ij} follows the truncated standard normal distribution lying within the interval (0,10), denoted by $TN(0,1;0,10)$, where the first two parameters (0 and 1) represent the mean and variance of the standard normal distribution;
3. w_{ij} follows the Poisson distribution with parameter 10.

The dimension and sample size pair, (p, n) , is set to (500,500) or (500,800). We display histograms of eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ generated by three populations under various (p, n) combinations and compare them with their respective limiting densities in Figures 1 – 2. The figures reveal that all histograms align with their theoretical limits, affirming the accuracy of our theoretical results.




Figure 1: Histograms of sample eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ with $(p, n) = (500, 500)$. The curves are density functions of their corresponding limiting spectral distribution.




Figure 2: Histograms of sample eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ with $(p, n) = (500, 800)$. The curves are density functions of their corresponding limiting spectral distribution.

4.2 CLT for LSS

In this section, we implement some simulation studies to examine finite-sample properties of some LSS for $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ by comparing their empirical means and variances with theoretical limiting values, as stated in Corollary 2.6.

First, we compare the empirical mean and variance of $G_{p,N}(x^r)$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, with their corresponding theoretical limits derived in Corollary 2.6. Two types of data distribution of w_{ij} are considered:

1. w_{ij} follows the exponential distribution with rate parameter 5;
2. w_{ij} follows the Chi-squared distribution with degree of freedom 1.


Empirical mean and variance of $G_{p,N}(x^r)$, are calculated for various combinations of (p, n) with $p/n = 3/4$ or $p/n = 1$. For each pair of (p, n) , 2000 independent replications are used to obtain the empirical values. Tables 1 – 2 report the empirical results for Exp(5) population and $\chi^2(1)$ population, respectively. As shown in Tables 1 – 2, the empirical mean and variance of $G_{p,N}(x^r)$ closely match their respective theoretical limits under all scenarios. To verify the asymptotic normality of LSS, we draw the histogram of normalized LSS, $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^r) = \{G_{p,N}(x^r) - \mu_r\}/\sqrt{V_r}$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, where μ_r and V_r are defined in Corollary 2.6, and compare them with the standard normal density. Figures 3 and 4 depict the histograms of $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^r)$ for Exp(5) population with $p/n = 1$ and $\chi^2(1)$ population with $p/n = 3/4$, respectively. The histograms for the cases of Exp(5) population with $p/n = 3/4$ and $\chi^2(1)$ population with $p/n = 1$ exhibit similar patterns and are omitted for brevity. It can be seen from Figures 3 – 4 that all the histograms conform to the standard normal density, which fully supports our theoretical results.

Table 1: Empirical mean and variance of $G_{p,N}(x^r)$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, with $w_{ij} \sim \text{Exp}(5)$.


	p/n	n	$G_{p,N}(x)$		$G_{p,N}(x^2)$		$G_{p,N}(x^3)$	
			mean	var	mean	var	mean	var
Emp	3/4	100	-2.01	2.63	-4	36.54	-7.82	463.32
		200	-1.99	2.93	-3.85	39.73	-7.23	485.05
		300	-1.93	3.03	-3.57	40.3	-6.32	483.76
		400	-2.04	2.95	-3.98	38.78	-7.67	460.01
Theo			-2	3	-3.75	39	-6.81	457
Emp	1	100	-1.91	3.61	-3.83	64.09	-6.56	1064.75
		200	-1.96	3.89	-3.96	68.37	-6.91	1090.14
		300	-2.01	3.97	-4.06	68.7	-7.16	1082.72
		400	-1.98	3.71	-3.99	64.22	-7.07	1010.09
Theo			-2	4	-4	68	-7	1050

Table 2: Empirical mean and variance of $G_{p,N}(x^r)$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, with $w_{ij} \sim \chi^2(1)$.


	p/n	n	$G_{p,N}(x)$		$G_{p,N}(x^2)$		$G_{p,N}(x^3)$	
			mean	var	mean	var	mean	var
Emp	3/4	100	-5.79	15.53	-24.19	888.99	-97.31	46790.03
		200	-5.96	16.74	-24.39	920.63	-96.17	45375.75
		300	-5.94	16.6	-23.75	882.92	-90.59	42487.68
		400	-5.88	17.51	-22.68	912.28	-81.2	42922.06
Theo			-6	18	-23	918	-83	41806.12
Emp	1	100	-5.92	20.81	-26.15	1563.02	-102.73	107846.2
		200	-5.98	23.01	-25.15	1639.95	-90.25	105467.9
		300	-5.81	21.82	-23.16	1526.34	-74.54	96864.11
		400	-6.13	23.18	-25.41	1599.96	-90.31	99475.82
Theo			-6	24	-24	1600	-80	96000



(a) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x)$




(b) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^2)$




(c) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^3)$


Figure 3: Histograms of normalized LSS $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^r)$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, with $w_{ij} \sim \text{Exp}(5)$ and $(p, n) = (400, 400)$. The curves are density functions of the standard normal distribution.



(a) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x)$



(b) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^2)$



(c) $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^3)$

Figure 4: Histograms of normalized LSS $\bar{G}_{p,N}(x^r)$, $r = 1, 2, 3$, with $w_{ij} \sim \chi^2(1)$ and $(p, n) = (300, 400)$. The curves are density functions of the standard normal distribution.

4.3 Covariance testing for basis data

We conduct numerical simulations to determine the empirical size and power of the proposed test statistic. The nominal significant level is set to be $\alpha = 0.05$. To evaluate the finite-sample performance, we consider a range of (p, n) settings and perform 2000 independent replications for each. To assess empirical size, we consider two scenarios for the basis data matrix $\mathbf{W}_n = (w_{ij})_{n \times p}$:

- Exponential model: $w_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\text{rate} = 5)$;
- Chi-squared model: $w_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \chi^2(1)$.

To examine empirical power, we consider two types of alternatives. For both, an $n \times p$ matrix $\mathbf{Z}_n$ with i.i.d. entries (from either distribution above) is first generated, and then the data matrix is constructed as $\mathbf{W}_n = \mathbf{Z}_n \Sigma$, with two choices of the matrix Σ :

- $\Sigma = \Sigma_1$: The first diagonal entry is ψ_1 , the other diagonal entries are 1, and all other entries are zero, with $\psi_1 \in \{1, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5\}$.
- $\Sigma = \Sigma_2$: Ones on the main diagonal, ψ_2 on the first subdiagonal (below the diagonal), and zeros elsewhere, with $\psi_2 \in \{0, -0.2, -0.25, -0.3, -0.35\}$.

Simulation results are reported in Tables 3 – 4. We conduct simulations under both the estimated and known distribution scenarios for $\{w_{ij}\}$, with the latter (benchmark) results reported in parentheses. In the unknown distribution scenario, the total sample is evenly split, with $n_1 = n_2 = n/2$, where n_2 is used for parameter estimation and n_1 for computing the test statistic.

The empirical power is close to the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ when (p, n) is large. The empirical power increases as the strength of ψ_1 and ψ_2 increases, and it also grows with larger values of (p, n) . The power based on estimated parameters is generally lower than that using the true parameters, which is due to the limited precision of the parameter estimation. These results confirm the theoretical properties of the test and demonstrate its effectiveness in detecting alternatives.

Table 3: Empirical size and power (2000 replications) for Σ_1 ; values in parentheses are based on known $\{w_{ij}\}$ distribution and true parameters are used.

c	p	n_1	n_2	Size	Power			
				$\psi_1 = 1$	$\psi_1 = 3$	$\psi_1 = 3.5$	$\psi_1 = 4$	$\psi_1 = 4.5$
0.5				Exp(5) model				
	150	150	150	0.074 (0.0625)	0.83 (1.0)	0.9165 (1.0)	0.9555 (1.0)	0.974 (1.0)
	300	300	300	0.0655 (0.0425)	0.9585 (1.0)	0.995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)
	450	450	450	0.0595 (0.0575)	0.989 (1.0)	0.999 (1.0)	0.9995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)
	600	600	600	0.048 (0.0495)	0.994 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)
	1							
1	150	75	75	0.093 (0.0535)	0.3895 (0.999)	0.503 (1.0)	0.602 (1.0)	0.668 (1.0)
	300	150	150	0.0595 (0.05)	0.482 (1.0)	0.6855 (1.0)	0.8195 (1.0)	0.8845 (1.0)
	450	225	225	0.0585 (0.054)	0.5605 (1.0)	0.797 (1.0)	0.9145 (1.0)	0.9635 (1.0)
	600	300	300	0.06 (0.061)	0.604 (1.0)	0.857 (1.0)	0.9555 (1.0)	0.984 (1.0)
1.5	150	50	50	0.0875 (0.0495)	0.2355 (0.968)	0.32 (0.9985)	0.3865 (1.0)	0.437 (1.0)
	300	100	100	0.065 (0.049)	0.2795 (0.996)	0.4125 (1.0)	0.549 (1.0)	0.6385 (1.0)
	450	150	150	0.061 (0.0475)	0.2815 (0.9975)	0.4615 (1.0)	0.62 (1.0)	0.7465 (1.0)
	600	200	200	0.063 (0.0585)	0.2955 (1.0)	0.5165 (1.0)	0.709 (1.0)	0.823 (1.0)
0.5				$\chi^2(1)$ model				
	150	150	150	0.092 (0.053)	0.7675 (1.0)	0.8825 (1.0)	0.934 (1.0)	0.9675 (1.0)
	300	300	300	0.0675 (0.0525)	0.916 (1.0)	0.9805 (1.0)	0.9945 (1.0)	0.998 (1.0)
	450	450	450	0.072 (0.049)	0.966 (1.0)	0.997 (1.0)	0.9995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)
	600	600	600	0.0575 (0.0545)	0.984 (1.0)	0.9995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)
	1							
1	150	75	75	0.09 (0.0565)	0.4165 (0.9805)	0.5405 (0.999)	0.6255 (1.0)	0.6855 (1.0)
	300	150	150	0.0705 (0.0535)	0.4705 (0.9995)	0.647 (1.0)	0.7645 (1.0)	0.841 (1.0)
	450	225	225	0.058 (0.0505)	0.57 (1.0)	0.777 (1.0)	0.884 (1.0)	0.925 (1.0)
	600	300	300	0.059 (0.047)	0.5855 (1.0)	0.803 (1.0)	0.9245 (1.0)	0.9705 (1.0)
1.5	150	50	50	0.085 (0.05)	0.265 (0.876)	0.3445 (0.971)	0.4235 (0.9965)	0.485 (0.9995)
	300	100	100	0.073 (0.047)	0.2905 (0.959)	0.433 (0.997)	0.546 (1.0)	0.6455 (1.0)
	450	150	150	0.0565 (0.0495)	0.3295 (0.986)	0.5025 (0.9995)	0.6375 (1.0)	0.747 (1.0)
	600	200	200	0.0605 (0.044)	0.334 (0.9935)	0.5235 (1.0)	0.699 (1.0)	0.804 (1.0)

Table 4: Empirical size and power (2000 replications) for Σ_2 ; values in parentheses are based on known $\{w_{ij}\}$ distribution and true parameters are used.

c	p	n_1	n_2	Size	Power				
				$\psi_2 = 0$	$\psi_2 = -0.2$	$\psi_2 = -0.25$	$\psi_2 = -0.3$	$\psi_2 = -0.35$	
0.5				Exp(5) model					
	150	150	150	0.074 (0.0625)	0.5125 (1.0)	0.7375 (1.0)	0.8825 (1.0)	0.959 (1.0)	
	300	300	300	0.0655 (0.0425)	0.962 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
	450	450	450	0.0595 (0.0575)	0.9995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
	600	600	600	0.048 (0.0495)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
1	150	75	75	0.093 (0.0535)	0.1895 (1.0)	0.2325 (1.0)	0.2745 (1.0)	0.29 (1.0)	
	300	150	150	0.0595 (0.05)	0.341 (1.0)	0.5145 (1.0)	0.704 (1.0)	0.8225 (1.0)	
	450	225	225	0.0585 (0.054)	0.581 (1.0)	0.829 (1.0)	0.9585 (1.0)	0.9935 (1.0)	
	600	300	300	0.06 (0.061)	0.798 (1.0)	0.9735 (1.0)	0.9985 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
	1.5	150	50	50	0.0875 (0.0495)	0.113 (1.0)	0.126 (1.0)	0.127 (1.0)	0.117 (1.0)
300		100	100	0.065 (0.049)	0.181 (1.0)	0.242 (1.0)	0.2995 (1.0)	0.3445 (1.0)	
450		150	150	0.061 (0.0475)	0.2625 (1.0)	0.395 (1.0)	0.5425 (1.0)	0.662 (1.0)	
600		200	200	0.063 (0.0585)	0.3775 (1.0)	0.5915 (1.0)	0.783 (1.0)	0.8945 (1.0)	
0.5					$\chi^2(1)$ model				
	150	150	150	0.092 (0.053)	0.384 (1.0)	0.548 (1.0)	0.6875 (1.0)	0.7585 (1.0)	
	300	300	300	0.0675 (0.0525)	0.844 (1.0)	0.982 (1.0)	0.999 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
	450	450	450	0.072 (0.049)	0.995 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
	600	600	600	0.0575 (0.0545)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	
1	150	75	75	0.09 (0.0565)	0.1465 (1.0)	0.162 (1.0)	0.16 (1.0)	0.1415 (1.0)	
	300	150	150	0.0705 (0.0535)	0.2495 (1.0)	0.353 (1.0)	0.457 (1.0)	0.5095 (1.0)	
	450	225	225	0.058 (0.0505)	0.4265 (1.0)	0.654 (1.0)	0.819 (1.0)	0.896 (1.0)	
	600	300	300	0.059 (0.047)	0.6225 (1.0)	0.872 (1.0)	0.971 (1.0)	0.9955 (1.0)	
	1.5	150	50	50	0.085 (0.05)	0.0995 (1.0)	0.096 (1.0)	0.082 (1.0)	0.053 (1.0)
300		100	100	0.073 (0.047)	0.1335 (1.0)	0.1575 (1.0)	0.172 (1.0)	0.159 (1.0)	
450		150	150	0.0565 (0.0495)	0.1885 (1.0)	0.2525 (1.0)	0.321 (1.0)	0.3545 (1.0)	
600		200	200	0.0605 (0.044)	0.274 (1.0)	0.4135 (1.0)	0.546 (1.0)	0.6525 (1.0)	

5 Proof of Theorem 2.5

In this section, we first present the difference between the CLT for centralized sample covariance $\mathbf{B}_p^0$ and unbiased sample covariance $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ by substitution principle in Section 5.1, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{B}_p^0 &= p^2 \mathbf{S}_n^0 = \frac{p^2}{n} (\mathbf{X}_n - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_n)' (\mathbf{X}_n - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Y}_n' \mathbf{Y}_n, \\ \mathbf{B}_{p,N} &= p^2 \mathbf{S}_{n,N} = \frac{p^2}{N} \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}_n,\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbf{Y}_n = (y_{ij})_{n \times p}$, $y_{ij} = \frac{w_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1$ and $\bar{w}_i = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}$. By substituting the adjusted sample size $N = n-1$ for the actual sample size n in the centering term, the unbiased sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ and the centralized sample covariance $\mathbf{B}_p^0$ share the same CLT (see, Section 5.1). The general strategy of the main proof of Theorem 2.5 is explained in the following and three major steps of the general strategy are presented in Section 5.3.

The general strategy of the proof follows the method established in Bai and Silverstein [2004] and Gao et al. [2017], with necessary adjustments for handling the sample covariance matrix of HCD, where conventional tools are not directly applicable. Our novel techniques play a pivotal role in overcoming these challenges. To begin with, we follow the strategy in Jiang [2004] to establish the LSD of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ in Theorem 2.3. Then, we develop Proposition 2.4 to find the extreme eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$. Notably, these extreme eigenvalues are highly concentrated around two edges of the support, a crucial aspect for applying the Cauchy integral formula (12) and proving tightness. Given that compositional data $x_{ij} = w_{ij} / \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}$ are not i.i.d., dealing with the CLT for LSS of the unbiased sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ presents challenges. To address this, we employ the substitution principle [Zheng et al., 2015] to reduce the problem to the CLT for LSS of the centralized sample covariance $\mathbf{B}_p^0$. By substituting the adjusted sample size $N = n-1$ for the actual sample size n in the centering term, both the unbiased sample covariance matrix $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ and the centralized sample covariance $\mathbf{B}_p^0$ share the same CLT (see Section 5.1). We then leverage the independence of samples to further study the CLT for LSS of $\mathbf{B}_p^0$. Specifically, we exploit the independence of samples to establish independence for $\mathbf{r}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{w_{i1}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1, \dots, \frac{w_{ip}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1 \right)'$, $\bar{w}_i = p^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and express $\mathbf{B}_p^0$ as $\mathbf{B}_p^0 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Y}_n' \mathbf{Y}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i'$. The ultimate goal is to establish the CLT for LSS of $\mathbf{B}_p^0$.

By the Cauchy integral formula, we have

$$\int f(x) dG(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C f(z) m_G(z) dz \quad (12)$$

valid for any cumulative distribution function G and any analytic function f on an open set containing the support of G , where $\oint_C$ is the contour integration in the anti-clockwise direction. In our case, $G(x) := G_p^0(x) := p \{F^{\mathbf{B}_p^0}(x) - F^{c_n}(x)\}$, $c_n = p/n$. Therefore, the problem of finding the limiting distribution reduces to the study of $M_p(z)$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}M_p(z) &= p \{m_p(z) - m_p^0(z)\} = n \{\underline{m}_p(z) - \underline{m}_p^0(z)\}, \\ m_p(z) &= m_{F^{\mathbf{B}_p^0}}(z) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_p^0 - z \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}, \quad m_p^0(z) = m_{F^{c_n}}(z), \\ \underline{m}_p(z) &= m_{F^{\mathbf{B}_p^0}}(z) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\underline{\mathbf{B}}_p^0 - z \mathbf{I}_n)^{-1}, \quad \underline{m}_p^0(z) = \underline{m}_{F^{c_n}}(z), \\ \underline{\mathbf{B}}_p^0 &= \frac{p^2}{n} (\mathbf{X}_n - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_n)(\mathbf{X}_n - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{X}_n)'. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the support of $F^{\mathbf{B}_{p,N}}$ is random. Fortunately, we have shown that the extreme eigenvalues of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ are highly concentrated around two edges of the support of the limiting MP law (see, Theorem 2.3, Proposition 2.4). Then the contour $\mathcal{C}$ can be appropriately chosen. Moreover, as in Bai and Silverstein [2004], by Proposition 2.4, we can replace the process $\{M_p(z), z \in \mathcal{C}\}$ by a slightly modified process $\{\widehat{M}_p(z), z \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Below we present the definitions of the contour $\mathcal{C}$ and the modified process $\widehat{M}_p(z)$. Let $v_0 > 0$ be arbitrary. Let x_r be any number greater than $\lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$. Let x_l be any negative number if $\lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 = 0$. Otherwise we choose $x_l \in (0, \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2)$. Now let $\mathcal{C}_u = \{x + iv_0 : x \in [x_l, x_r]\}$. Then we define $\mathcal{C}^+ := \{x_l + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\} \cup \mathcal{C}_u \cup \{x_r + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\}$, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^+ \cup \overline{\mathcal{C}^+}$. Now we define the subsets $\mathcal{C}_n$ of $\mathcal{C}$ on which $M_p(\cdot)$ equals to $\widehat{M}_p(\cdot)$. Choose sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ decreasing to zero satisfying for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon_n \geq n^{-\alpha}$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_l = \begin{cases} \{x_l + iv : v \in [n^{-1}\varepsilon_n, v_0]\}, & \text{if } x_l > 0, \\ \{x_l + iv : v \in [0, v_0]\}, & \text{if } x_l < 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\mathcal{C}_r = \{x_r + iv : v \in [n^{-1}\varepsilon_n, v_0]\}$ for any $v_0 > 0$. Then $\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{C}_l \cup \mathcal{C}_u \cup \mathcal{C}_r$. For $z = x + iv$, we define

$$\widehat{M}_p(z) = \begin{cases} M_p(z), & \text{for } z \in \mathcal{C}_n \\ M_p(x_r + in^{-1}\varepsilon_n), & \text{for } x = x_r, v \in [0, n^{-1}\varepsilon_n], \text{ and if } x_l > 0 \\ M_p(x_l + in^{-1}\varepsilon_n), & \text{for } x = x_l, v \in [0, n^{-1}\varepsilon_n], \end{cases}$$

Most of the paper will deal with proving the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Under the same notations and assumptions as in Theorem 2.5, $\widehat{M}_p(z)$ converges weakly to a two-dimensional Gaussian process $M(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}$, with mean*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}M(z) = & \frac{\underline{m}^2(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} \left[\{z(h_1 + \lambda)m(z) + \lambda\} \right. \\ & \left. + cz^2\underline{m}(z)\{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2m'(z)\} - \frac{c\lambda^2\underline{m}(z)}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and covariance function

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}(M(z_1), M(z_2)) \\ &= 2 \left[\frac{\underline{m}'(z_1)\underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{\underline{m}(z_1) - \underline{m}(z_2)\}^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)^2} \right] + \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\underline{m}'(z_1)\underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z_1)\}^2\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z_2)\}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Now we explain how Theorem 2.5 follows from the above proposition. As in Bai and Silverstein [2004], with probability one, $|\int f(z)\{M_p(z) - \widehat{M}_p(z)\}dz| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Combining this observation with (12), Theorem 2.5 follows from Proposition 5.1. To prove Proposition 5.1, we decompose $M_p(z)$ into a random part $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ and a deterministic part $M_p^{(2)}(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$, that is, $M_p(z) = M_p^{(1)}(z) + M_p^{(2)}(z)$, where

$$M_p^{(1)}(z) = p\{m_p(z) - \mathbb{E}m_p(z)\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_p^{(2)}(z) = p\{\mathbb{E}m_p(z) - m_p^0(z)\}.$$

The random part contributes to the covariance function and the deterministic part contributes to the mean function. By Theorem 8.1 in Billingsley [1968], the proof of Proposition 5.1 is then complete if we can verify the following three steps:

Step 1 Finite-dimensional convergence of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ in distribution on $\mathcal{C}_n$ to a centered multivariate Gaussian random vector with covariance function given by (14).

Step 2 Tightness of the $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$.

Step 3 Convergence of the non-random part $M_p^{(2)}(z)$ to (13) on $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$.

The proof of these steps is presented in the coming sections. Before that, we introduce the substitution principle, truncation and crucial lemmas in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 respectively. The former explains the reduction of problem of the CLT for LSS of $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ to that of $\mathbf{B}_p^0$, while the latter provides truncation and essential lemmas for these three steps in proving the CLT for LSS of $\mathbf{B}_p^0$.

5.1 Substitution principle

By the Cauchy integral formula, we have

$$G_{p,N}(f) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f(z) \{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z) \} dz$$

valid for any function f analytic on an open set containing the support of $p\{F^{\mathbf{B}_{p,N}}(x) - F^{c_N}(x)\}$, where

$$m_N^0(z) \equiv m_{F^{c_N}}(z) = \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - c_N - c_N z m_N^0) - z},$$

with $c_N = p/N$. To obtain the asymptotic distribution of $G_{p,N}(f)$, it is necessary to find the asymptotic distribution of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z)$. To achieve this, we derive the following Lemma 5.2 whose proof is postponed to the supplementary material.

Lemma 5.2. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_p^0 - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_n^0(z) + o_p(1).$$

By Lemma 5.2, the asymptotic distribution of $G_{p,N}(f)$ is identical to that of

$$G_p^0(f) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} f(z) \{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_p^0 - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_n^0(z) \} dz,$$

where $c_n = p/n$, $m_n^0(z) = m_{F^{c_n}}(z)$ (note that we denote $m_n^0(z)$ as $m_p^0(z)$ in other sections except this subsection).

5.2 Truncation and some important lemmas

We begin the proof of Proposition 5.1 by replacing the entries of $\mathbf{W}_n$ with truncated variables. We then introduce three pivotal lemmas that are essential for proving Proposition 5.1.

5.2.1 Truncation

In the following, we will show that the limiting distribution for the LSS remains unchanged before and after truncation. Therefore, it suffices to derive the limiting distribution of the LSS after truncation. Specifically, we can choose a positive sequence of $\{\delta_n\}$ such that

$$\delta_n = o(1), \quad \delta_n n^{1/4} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E}|w_{11} - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_{11} - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} = o(1). \quad (15)$$

Let $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_p^0 = \frac{p^2}{n}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n - \mathbb{E}\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n)'(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n - \mathbb{E}\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n)$, where the (i, j) -th entry of $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}_n$ is normalized using truncated variables $\hat{w}_{ij} = w_{ij}I_{\{|w_{ij}-\mu|<\delta_n\sqrt{n}\}}$, as described in (1). We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{B}_p^0 \neq \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_p^0) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i \leq n, j \leq p} \{|w_{ij} - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}\right) \leq np \cdot \mathbb{P}(|w_{11} - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}) \\ &\leq K \delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E}|w_{11} - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_{11}-\mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} = o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Define $\widehat{G}_p^0(x)$ analogously to $G_p^0(x) := p\{F^{\mathbf{B}_p^0}(x) - F^{c_n}(x)\}$, but with $\mathbf{B}_p^0$ replaced by $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_p^0$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{G}_p^0(x) \neq G_p^0(x)) = o(1)$. In view of the above, we obtain

$$\int f(x) dG_p^0(x) = \int f(x) d\widehat{G}_p^0(x) + o_p(1).$$

Therefore, in the remaining part of the proof of the CLT for LSS, we assume that the underlying variables are truncated at $\delta_n \sqrt{n}$.

5.2.2 Some important Lemmas

In this section, we introduce three pivotal lemmas, which are crucial for proving the CLT for LSS. These lemmas represent novel contributions of this paper and unveil the concentration phenomena. Lemma 5.3 is crafted to estimate essential parameters, facilitating the derivation of estimates of any order. Concerning ν_2 and ν_{12} (see Lemma 5.3 for their definitions), the terms h_1/p and h_2/p emerge as non-negligible due to the multiplication by p in the CLT. To address these parameters, we establish that the probability of the event $B_p^c(\varepsilon)$ decays polynomially to 0 and leverage Taylor expansion on the event $B_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w}_i - \mu| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w}_i = \sum_{j=1}^p w_{ij}/p\}$ to handle the issue of dependence. The proof of the CLT for LSS relies on two pivotal steps: the moment inequality for random quadratic forms and the precise estimation of the expectation of the product of two random quadratic forms. Lemma 5.4 establishes the former step, essential for converting them into the corresponding traces, while Lemma 5.5 establishes the latter step, enabling the application of CLT for martingale differences. The proof of Lemmas 5.3 – 5.5 are postponed to the supplementary material. In the following, we write $p \asymp n$ if and only if there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $C_1 n \leq p \leq C_2 n$ for all sufficiently large n .

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)'$ has positive i.i.d. entries with $\mathbb{E}w_1 = \mu > 0$, $\mathbb{E}(w_1 - \mu)^2 = \sigma^2$, and $\mathbb{E}|w_1 - \mu|^4 < \infty$, and that $p \asymp n$. Then for the truncated data $\hat{w}_j = w_j I_{\{|w_j - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$) where δ_n satisfies condition (15), we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_2 &:= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1\right)^2 = \lambda + \frac{h_1}{p} + o(p^{-1}), \\ \nu_{12} &:= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1\right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\hat{w}} - 1\right)^2 = \lambda^2 + \frac{h_2}{p} + o(p^{-1}), \\ \nu_4 &:= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1\right)^4 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\mu} - 1\right)^4 + o(1),\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{w} = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_j$, $\lambda = \sigma^2/\mu^2$, and

$$h_1 = -2 \frac{\mathbb{E}w_1^3}{\mu^3} + 3\lambda^2 + 5\lambda + 2, \quad h_2 = -8\lambda \frac{\mathbb{E}w_1^3}{\mu^3} + 10\lambda^3 + 22\lambda^2 + 8\lambda.$$

Lemma 5.4. Suppose that $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)'$ has positive i.i.d. entries with $\mathbb{E}w_1 = \mu > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(w_1 - \mu)^2 = \sigma^2$, and that $p \asymp n$. For any $p \times p$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and $q \geq 2$, then there is a positive constant K_q depending on q such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(w_1/\bar{w} - 1)^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right|^q \\ & \leq K_q \left\{ n^{-q} \left[\left(\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}') \right)^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + n^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \|\mathbf{A}\|^q + |\mathbb{E}(w_1/\bar{w} - 1)^2 - \lambda|^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{r} = n^{-1/2}(w_1/\bar{w} - 1, \dots, w_p/\bar{w} - 1)'$, $\lambda = \sigma^2/\mu^2$, $B_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w} - \mu| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w} = \sum_{j=1}^p w_j/p\}$, and

$$\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq C_t \varepsilon^{-t} \{p^{-t/2} (\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^2)^{t/2} + p^{-t+1} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^t\},$$

in which ε , t , C_t (which depends on t) are positive constants. Furthermore, if $\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ is bounded, then for the truncated data $\hat{w}_j = w_j I_{\{|w_j - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$) where δ_n satisfies condition (15), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(\hat{w}_1/\bar{\hat{w}} - 1)^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right|^q \leq K_q n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}, \quad \text{for any } q \geq 2,$$

where $\mathbf{r} = n^{-1/2}(\hat{w}_1/\bar{\hat{w}} - 1, \dots, \hat{w}_p/\bar{\hat{w}} - 1)'$, and $\bar{\hat{w}} = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_j$.

Lemma 5.5. Suppose that $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)'$ has positive i.i.d. entries with $\mathbb{E}w_1 = \mu > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(w_1 - \mu)^2 = \sigma^2$, $p \asymp n$, $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are $p \times p$ matrices, if $\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 < \infty$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ and $\|\mathbf{B}\|$ are bounded, then for the truncated data $\hat{w}_j = w_j I_{\{|w_j - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$) where δ_n satisfies condition (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right) \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \right) \\ & = \frac{\nu_4 - 3\nu_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii} B_{ii} + \frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2} \{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}) \} + \frac{\nu_{12} - \nu_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} + o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{r} = n^{-1/2}(\hat{w}_1/\bar{\hat{w}} - 1, \dots, \hat{w}_p/\bar{\hat{w}} - 1)'$, $\nu_2 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\bar{\hat{w}}} - 1 \right)^2$, $\nu_4 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\bar{\hat{w}}} - 1 \right)^4$, $\nu_{12} = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\bar{\hat{w}}} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\bar{\hat{w}}} - 1 \right)^2$, and $\bar{\hat{w}} = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_j$.

5.3 CLT for LSS of the centralized sample covariance matrix B_p^0

Recall that in the following, we assume that the underlying variables are truncated at $\delta_n \sqrt{n}$. To simplify notation, we suppress the superscripts on the variables $\hat{w}_{ij}$; that is, we use w_{ij} in place of $\hat{w}_{ij}$ below.

5.3.1 Step 1: Finite dimensional convergence of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ in distribution

Lemma 5.6. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, as $p \rightarrow \infty$, for any finite set of points $z_1, \dots, z_r \in \mathcal{C}$, the random vector $(M_p^{(1)}(z_1), \dots, M_p^{(1)}(z_r))$ converges weakly to an r -dimensional centered Gaussian vector with covariance function (14).

We now proceed to the proof of this lemma. By the fact that a random vector is multivariate normally distributed if and only if every linear combination of its components is normally distributed, we need only show that, for any positive integer r and any complex sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^r$, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j M_p^{(1)}(z_j)$ converges weakly to a Gaussian random variable. To this end, we first approximate $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ by a sum of martingale difference, which is given in (17). Then, we apply the martingale CLT (Theorem 35.12 in Billingsley [1995]) to obtain the asymptotic distribution of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$. Details of these two steps are provided in the following two parts.

Part 1: Martingale difference decomposition of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$.

First, we introduce some notations. In the following proof, we assume that $v = \text{Im} z \geq v_0 > 0$. Moreover, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let $\bar{w}_j = p^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{j\ell}$, $v_2 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1\right)^2$, $v_{12} = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1\right)^2 \left(\frac{w_{12}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1\right)^2$, $v_4 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1\right)^4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_j &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{w_{j1}}{\bar{w}_j} - 1, \dots, \frac{w_{jp}}{\bar{w}_j} - 1 \right)', \quad \mathbf{D}(z) = \mathbf{B}_p^0 - z\mathbf{I}_p, \\ \mathbf{D}_j(z) &= \mathbf{D}(z) - \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j', \quad \beta_j(z) = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j}, \\ \bar{\beta}_j(z) &= \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1} v_2 \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)}, \quad b_p(z) = \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1} v_2 \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)}, \\ \varepsilon_j(z) &= \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z), \\ \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) &= \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{r}_j - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) = \frac{d}{dz} \varepsilon_j(z). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.4, we have, for any $q \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_j(z)|^q \leq \frac{K}{v^{2q}} n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z)|^q \leq \frac{K}{v^{2q}} n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}. \quad (16)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) = -\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \beta_j(z),$$

where we use the resolvent identity $\mathbf{A}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{A}_2^{-1} = \mathbf{A}_2^{-1}(\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_1)\mathbf{A}_1^{-1}$. Note that $|\beta_j(z)|$, $|\bar{\beta}_j(z)|$ and $|b_n(z)|$ are bounded by $\frac{|z|}{v}$. Let $\mathbb{E}_j(\cdot)$ denote conditional expectation with respect to the σ -field generated by $\{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_j\}$, where $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. By convention, we use $\mathbb{E}_0 = \mathbb{E}$ to denote expectation. By using the above identity, we write

$$M_p^{(1)}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr} \left\{ (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \right\} = - \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{r}_j.$$

From the identity $\beta_j(z) = \bar{\beta}_j(z) - \beta_j(z) \bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z) = \bar{\beta}_j(z) - \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z)$ and the definition of $\tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{r}_j \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\left\{ \bar{\beta}_j(z) - \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) + \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \right\} \left\{ \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) + \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \right\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= -Y_j(z) + \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z) - (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \left[\bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \{ \varepsilon_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) - \beta_j(z) \varepsilon_j^2(z) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{r}_j \} \right],$$

where

$$Y_j(z) := -\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \bar{\beta}_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) - \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \right\},$$

and the second equality follows from $(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) = 0$. By using (16), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) \right|^2 \leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) \right|^2 = o(1),$$

here we use the martingale difference property of $(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z)$. Thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \varepsilon_j(z) \tilde{\varepsilon}_j(z) = o_P(1).$$

By the same argument, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \bar{\beta}_j^2(z) \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{r}_j \varepsilon_j^2(z) = o_P(1).$$

The estimates above imply that

$$M_p^{(1)}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n \{Y_j(z) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z)\} + o_P(1), \quad (17)$$

where $\{Y_j(z) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z)\}_{j=1}^n$ is a sequence of martingale difference.

Part 2: Application of martingales CLT to (17).

To prove finite-dimensional convergence of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$, $z \in \mathcal{C}$, we need only to consider the limit of the following martingale difference decomposition:

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i M_p^{(1)}(z_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \{Y_j(z_i) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_i)\} + o_P(1), \quad (18)$$

where $\text{Im}(z_i) \neq 0$, and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^r$ are constants. We apply the martingale CLT [Billingsley, 1995, Theorem 35.12] to this martingale difference decomposition (18). To this end, we need to check two conditions: as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \{Y_j(z_i) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_i)\} \right|^2 I_{\{\|\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i (Y_j(z_i) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_i))\| \geq \varepsilon\}} = o(1), \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[\left\{ Y_j(z_1) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_1) \right\} \left\{ Y_j(z_2) - \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_2) \right\} \right] \xrightarrow{P} (14). \quad (20)$$

First, we verify (19). By Lemma 5.4, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_j(z)|^4 \leq K \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_j(z)|^4 = o(p^{-1}),$$

which, together with Jensen's inequality, implies that

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z)|^4 \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_{j-1} |Y_j(z)|^4) = \mathbb{E}|Y_j(z)|^4 = o(p^{-1}).$$

It follows from the above two equations that

$$\text{LHS of (19)} \leq \frac{K}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i Y_j(z_i) \right|^4 + \frac{K}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \mathbb{E}_{j-1} Y_j(z_i) \right|^4 \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, we verify (20). Since $Y_j(z) = -\mathbb{E}_j \frac{d}{dz} \{\bar{\beta}_j(z) \varepsilon_j(z)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (20)} &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \{\mathcal{Y}_1(z_1, z_2) - \mathcal{Y}_2(z_1, z_2)\}, \\ \mathcal{Y}_1(z_1, z_2) &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \{\bar{\beta}_j(z_1) \varepsilon_j(z_1)\} \mathbb{E}_j \{\bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2)\} \right], \\ \mathcal{Y}_2(z_1, z_2) &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{\bar{\beta}_j(z_1) \varepsilon_j(z_1)\} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{\bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Thus, it is enough to consider the limits of $\mathcal{Y}_i(z_1, z_2)$, $i = 1, 2$, which are provided in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \mathcal{Y}_1(z_1, z_2) \xrightarrow{P} (14), \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \mathcal{Y}_2(z_1, z_2) = o_P(1).$$

The proof of Lemma 5.7 is postponed to the supplementary material. This lemma and Equation (21) complete the proof of (20).

5.3.2 Step 2: Tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$

Tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ can be established by Theorem 12.3 of Billingsley [1968]. It is sufficient to prove the moment condition of Billingsley [1968], i.e., $\sup_{n; z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{\mathbb{E}|M_p^{(1)}(z_1) - M_p^{(1)}(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2}$ is finite. Its proof exactly follows Bai and Silverstein [2004], and is postponed to the supplementary material.

5.3.3 Step 3: Convergence of $M_p^{(2)}(z)$

Recalling that $M_p^{(2)}(z) = p\{\mathbb{E}m_p(z) - m_p^0(z)\} = n\{\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z) - \underline{m}_p^0(z)\}$, where $m_p(z) = m_{F^{c_n}}(z)$, $m_p^0(z) = m_{F^{c_n}}(z)$, $\underline{m}_p(z) = m_{F^{c_n}}(z)$, $\underline{m}_p^0(z) = \underline{m}_{F^{c_n}}(z)$, $c_n = p/n$. From

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} + z - \frac{c_n \lambda}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \left\{ 1 - c_n + z \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z) + \frac{c_n}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \right\},$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z) = \left\{ -z + \frac{\lambda c_n}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)} + \frac{A_p(z)}{\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)} \right\}^{-1},$$

where $A_p(z) := \frac{c_n}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)} + z c_n \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)$. From this equation and the identity $\underline{m}_p^0 = (-z + \frac{\lambda c_n}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}_p^0})^{-1}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z) - \underline{m}_p^0(z) = -\underline{m}_p^0(z) A_p(z) \left[1 - \frac{c_n \lambda^2 \underline{m}_p^0(z) \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)}{\{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}_p^0(z)\}} \right]^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z) \rightarrow \underline{m}(z)$, $\underline{m}_p^0(z) \rightarrow \underline{m}(z)$. It suffices to derive the limit of $n A_p(z)$, which is provided in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} n A_p(z) \rightarrow & -\frac{\underline{m}(z) \{z(\lambda + h_1) \underline{m}(z) + \lambda\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)} - \frac{c z^2 \underline{m}^2(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \underline{m}^2(z) + 2 \lambda^2 \underline{m}'(z)\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)} \\ & + \frac{c \lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\} [\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c \lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)]}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.8 is postponed to supplementary material. By (22) and Lemma 5.8, we have $M_p^{(2)}(z) \rightarrow (13)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Combining two parts above yields Lemma 5.6.

Supplementary Material for “On eigenvalues of sample covariance matrices based on high-dimensional compositional data”

S1 Auxiliary lemmas

This section introduces several auxiliary lemmas used in the technical proofs of our theoretical results. Lemmas S1.1 – S1.4 are from existing literature, while Lemma S1.5 is our original contribution, and its proof is provided in Section S2.13.

Lemma S1.1 (Weyl’s inequality, Corollary 7.3.5 of [Horn and Johnson \[2012\]](#)). *Let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ be two $p \times n$ matrices and let $r = \min\{p, n\}$. Let $s_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq s_r(\mathbf{A})$ and $s_1(\mathbf{B}) \geq \dots \geq s_r(\mathbf{B})$ be the nonincreasingly ordered singular values of $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, respectively. Then*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} |s_i(\mathbf{A}) - s_i(\mathbf{B})| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|,$$

where $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|$ denotes the spectral norm of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$.

Lemma S1.2 (Burkholder’s inequality, [Burkholder \[1973\]](#)). *Let $\{X_k\}$ be a complex martingale difference sequence with respect to the increasing σ -field $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$, and let $\mathbb{E}_k$ denote conditional expectation with respect to $\mathcal{F}_k$. Then, for $q > 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum X_k \right|^q \leq K_q \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum \mathbb{E}_{k-1} |X_k|^2 \right)^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \sum |X_k|^q \right\}.$$

Lemma S1.3 (Martingale CLT, Theorem 35.12 of [Billingsley \[1995\]](#)). *Suppose that for each n , the sequence $\{Y_{n1}, \dots, Y_{nr_n}\}$ is a real martingale difference sequence with respect to the increasing σ -field $\{\mathcal{F}_{nj}\}$ having second moments. If as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{nj}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,j-1}) \xrightarrow{P} \sigma^2,$$

where σ^2 is positive constant, and for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{nj}^2 I_{\{|Y_{nj}| \geq \varepsilon\}}) \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} Y_{nj} \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2).$$

Lemma S1.4 (Rosenthal’s inequality, [Ledoux and Talagrand \[1991\]](#)). *If $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$ are a sequence of independent random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^k$ with $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_i = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^r < \infty$ for some $r \geq 2$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right\|^r \leq C_r \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^r + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \right)^{r/2} \right\},$$

where C_r is a constant depending only on r .

Lemma S1.5. *Suppose that $\mathbf{x}_p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}(1, 1, \dots, 1)'$ is a p -dimensional normalized all-one vector, then for the random variables $\{w_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ satisfying Assumptions 2.1 – 2.2 and the truncation condition $|w_{ij} - \mu| \leq \delta_n \sqrt{n}$, where δ_n satisfies condition (15), we have*

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}_p' \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p + 1/z|^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

for $z = u + iv$, $v > 0$, where $\mathbf{D}(z)$ is defined in the main text.

S2 Proofs

S2.1 Proof of Proposition 2.4

Throughout this proof, eigenvalues are ordered nonincreasingly, including zeros, whereas $\lambda_{\min}$ denotes the smallest nonzero eigenvalue, as in the proposition. We set $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and extend the singular-value sequence of an $n \times p$ matrix by zeros when $p > n$. Recall that $N = n - 1$, and write $r_n = \min\{n - 1, p - 1\}$. Write $a = \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2$ and $b = \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$, and set

$$\mathbf{G}_p = \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p', \quad \mathbf{W}_n^\circ = \frac{\mathbf{W}_n - \mu \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_p'}{\mu}, \quad \mathbf{D}_n = p\mu \mathbf{\Lambda}_n.$$

The entries w_{ij}° of $\mathbf{W}_n^\circ$ are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}w_{11}^\circ = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(w_{11}^\circ)^2 = \lambda$, and $\mathbb{E}|w_{11}^\circ|^4 < \infty$. Define

$$\mathbf{Y}_n = \frac{\mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p}{\sqrt{N}} = \frac{p \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{\Lambda}_n \mathbf{W}_n}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n = \frac{\mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N} = \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n,$$

so that $\mathbf{B}_{p,N} = \mathbf{Y}_n' \mathbf{Y}_n$. Using Theorem 2.3, we have

$$\limsup_n \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq a, \quad \liminf_n \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq b \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{S2.1})$$

Lemma S1.1 and the inequality $\|\mathbf{Y}_n\| \leq \|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| + \|\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\|$ give

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n &:= \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) - \lambda_i(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N})| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |s_i(\mathbf{Y}_n)^2 - s_i(\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n)^2| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| \cdot (\|\mathbf{Y}_n\| + \|\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\|) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| \|\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.2})$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{Y}_n - \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| \leq \|\mathbf{D}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| \left\| \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}} \right\|. \quad (\text{S2.3})$$

By Lemma 2 of Bai and Yin [1993], the row averages $\bar{w}_i = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p w_{ij}$ satisfy

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\bar{w}_i / \mu - 1| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Since $(\mathbf{D}_n)_{ii} = \mu / \bar{w}_i$, this and Theorem 2 and Remark 1 of Bai and Yin [1993] yield

$$\|\mathbf{D}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad \|\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n\| \leq \left\| \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}} \right\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} \sqrt{b}.$$

Hence

$$\Delta_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad (\text{S2.4})$$

and

$$b \leq \liminf_n \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq \limsup_n \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq \lim_n \left(\left\| \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}} \right\|^2 + \Delta_n \right) = b \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For $c < 1$, let $\mathbf{H}_n = (\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{W}_n^\circ / N$. Choose $\mathbf{Q}$ with orthonormal columns such that $\mathbf{G}_p = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}'$, and define $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{1}_p / \sqrt{p}]$. Then

$$\mathbf{U}' \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_p, \quad \mathbf{U}' \check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N} \mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0}' & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Theorem 1.4 of [Xiao and Zhou \[2010\]](#), applied to the $p \times n$ matrix $(\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)'/\sqrt{\lambda}$, gives $\lambda_p(\mathbf{H}_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} a$, since $n/N \rightarrow 1$. Cauchy interlacing applied to $\mathbf{U}'\mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{U}$ then gives

$$\lambda_{p-1}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}) = \lambda_{p-1}(\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{Q}) \geq \lambda_p(\mathbf{H}_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} a. \quad (\text{S2.5})$$

For $c > 1$, apply the same theorem to the $n \times p$ matrix $\mathbf{W}_n^\circ/\sqrt{\lambda}$, whose aspect ratio n/p tends to $1/c < 1$. Thus,

$$\mathbf{L}_n = \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p (\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)'}{N} = \frac{p}{N} \frac{\mathbf{W}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p (\mathbf{W}_n^\circ)'}{p}, \quad \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} c\lambda(1 - c^{-1/2})^2 = a.$$

Choose $\mathbf{P}$ with $\mathbf{P}'\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_{n-1}$ and $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{C}_n$, and define $\mathbf{O} = [\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{1}_n/\sqrt{n}]$. Since $\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' = \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{L}_n \mathbf{C}_n$, using Cauchy interlacing yields

$$\lambda_{n-1}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}) = \lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{P}'\mathbf{L}_n\mathbf{P}) \geq \lambda_n(\mathbf{O}'\mathbf{L}_n\mathbf{O}) = \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} a. \quad (\text{S2.6})$$

The factors $\mathbf{C}_n$ and $\mathbf{G}_p$ imply $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq r_n$. Thus, for $c \neq 1$, (S2.4) – (S2.6) yields

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq r_n, \quad \liminf_n \lambda_{r_n}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) = \liminf_n \lambda_{r_n}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}) \geq a > 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{S2.7})$$

Combining (S2.7) with (S2.1) gives

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} a.$$

For $c = 1$, we have $a = 0$. The inequality $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq 0$ and (S2.1) give $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} a = 0$.

For the probability bounds, fix $\ell > 0$ and retain $\mathbf{B}_{p,N}$ and $\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}$ for the matrices constructed from the truncated variables defined below. Set

$$\hat{w}_{ij} = w_{ij} I_{\{|w_{ij} - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}, \quad \mu_n = \mathbb{E} \hat{w}_{11}, \quad \bar{\hat{w}}_i = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_{ij}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ = \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n - \mu_n \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_p'}{\mu}.$$

Writing $\hat{w}_{ij}^\circ = (\hat{w}_{ij} - \mu_n)/\mu$ for the entries of $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ$, we have

$$\mu_n \rightarrow \mu, \quad \mathbb{E} \hat{w}_{11}^\circ = 0, \quad \mathbb{E} (\hat{w}_{11}^\circ)^2 \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \sup_n \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_{11}^\circ|^4 < \infty.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \left\{ \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bar{\hat{w}}_i > 0 \right\}, \quad q_n = \mathbb{P}(|w_{11} - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}).$$

For all sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n^c) = 1 - (1 - q_n^p)^n \leq n q_n^p \leq n 2^{-p} = o(n^{-\ell}). \quad (\text{S2.8})$$

Define

$$\check{\mathbf{Y}}_n = \frac{\mathbf{C}_n \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N} = \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \check{\mathbf{Y}}_n.$$

On $\mathcal{G}_n$, the compositions are $\hat{x}_{ij} = \hat{w}_{ij}/(\bar{\hat{w}}_i)$, and we set

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_n)_{ii} = \frac{\mu}{\hat{w}_i}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{Y}}_n = \frac{\mathbf{C}_n \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_n \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ \mathbf{G}_p}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \mathbf{B}_{p,N} = \widehat{\mathbf{Y}}_n' \widehat{\mathbf{Y}}_n.$$

On $\mathcal{G}_n^c$, define $\mathbf{B}_{p,N} = \mathbf{0}$; by (S2.8), this convention does not affect the asserted probability bounds. With Δ_n defined on $\mathcal{G}_n$ as in (S2.2), the same perturbation bound holds on $\mathcal{G}_n$. For $u > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{A}_n(u) = \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{\bar{w}_i}{\mu} - 1 \right| \leq u \right\}.$$

Fix $u > 0$. Since $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$, we have $|\mu_n - \mu| \leq \mu u/2$ for all sufficiently large n . Bernstein's inequality therefore gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n(u)^c) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\bar{w}_i - \mu_n| > \frac{\mu u}{2}\right) \leq 2n \exp\left\{-\frac{C_u p}{1 + \delta_n \sqrt{n}}\right\} = o(n^{-\ell}), \quad (\text{S2.9})$$

where $C_u > 0$ is independent of n . For $0 < u < 1$, on $\mathcal{A}_n(u)$ we have $\bar{w}_i/\mu \geq 1 - u > 0$ for every i . Hence $\mathcal{A}_n(u) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_n$, and on this event

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| = \max_i \frac{|\bar{w}_i/\mu - 1|}{\bar{w}_i/\mu} \leq \frac{u}{1 - u}.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $d > \sqrt{b}$, and then choose $u \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small that

$$d^2 \left[\left(\frac{u}{1 - u} \right)^2 + 2 \frac{u}{1 - u} \right] < \varepsilon.$$

Since $\mathbf{C}_n$ and $\mathbf{G}_p$ are orthogonal projections, (S2.2) and (S2.3) give, on $\mathcal{G}_n$,

$$\Delta_n \leq \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\|^2 + 2\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{I}_n\| \right) \left\| \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}} \right\|^2.$$

Consequently, on $\mathcal{A}_n(u) \cap \{\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\| \leq d\}$, we have $\Delta_n < \varepsilon$. Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n > \varepsilon\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_n(u)^c \cup \{\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\| > d\}.$$

Using Equation (1.9a) of Bai and Silverstein [2004], we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\| \geq d) = o(n^{-\ell})$ for every fixed $d > \sqrt{b}$. This bound and (S2.9) yield

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n > \varepsilon\}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n(u)^c) + \mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\| > d) = o(n^{-\ell}), \quad \varepsilon > 0. \quad (\text{S2.10})$$

To obtain the upper tail bound, fix $\eta_1 > b$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \eta_1 - b$. On $\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n \leq \varepsilon\}$, the definition of Δ_n gives

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}) + \varepsilon \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\|^2 + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \eta_1\} \cap \{\Delta_n \leq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\|^2 \geq \eta_1 - \varepsilon\}. \quad (\text{S2.11})$$

Partition $\{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \eta_1\}$ according to the three disjoint cases $\mathcal{G}_n^c$, $\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n > \varepsilon\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n \leq \varepsilon\}$. Using (S2.8), (S2.10) – (S2.11), and Equation (1.9a) of Bai and Silverstein [2004] yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \eta_1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n^c) + \mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/\sqrt{N}\|^2 \geq \eta_1 - \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n > \varepsilon\}) = o(n^{-\ell}).$$

It remains to prove the lower tail bound, for which the proposition assumes $0 < c < 1$. Fix $0 < q < a$. For fixed $M > 0$ and $\delta_n \sqrt{n} > M$, write $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ = \mathbf{U}_n^{(M)} + \mathbf{R}_n^{(M)}$, where

$$U_{ij}^{(M)} = \frac{w_{ij} I_{\{|w_{ij} - \mu| \leq M\}} - \mathbb{E}[w_{11} I_{\{|w_{11} - \mu| \leq M\}}]}{\mu},$$

$$R_{ij}^{(M)} = \frac{w_{ij} I_{\{M < |w_{ij} - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} - \mathbb{E}[w_{11} I_{\{M < |w_{11} - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}}]}{\mu}.$$

The entries of $\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)}$ are i.i.d. and centered with a bounded distribution independent of n for fixed M , and

$$s_M^2 := \text{Var}(U_{11}^{(M)}) \rightarrow \lambda,$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(R_{11}^{(M)}) = \tau_M^2 := \frac{\text{Var}(w_{11} I_{\{|w_{11} - \mu| > M\}})}{\mu^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad (M \rightarrow \infty).$$

The limits $s_M \rightarrow \sqrt{\lambda}$ and $\tau_M \rightarrow 0$ allow us to choose M large, with $s_M > 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(|w_{11} - \mu| \leq M) > 0$, and $t, d > 0$ such that

$$d > \tau_M(1 + \sqrt{c}), \quad \sqrt{q} + d < \sqrt{t} < s_M(1 - \sqrt{c}). \quad (\text{S2.12})$$

We keep M, t, d fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so $\delta_n \sqrt{n} > M$ for all sufficiently large n .

For the bounded matrix $\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)}$, set

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{(\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})' \mathbf{U}_n^{(M)}}{n}, \quad \mathbf{A} = \frac{\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)} (\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})'}{n}, \quad \mathbf{e} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_n}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \frac{(\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})' \mathbf{e}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Define $\mathcal{E}_{n,t} = \{\mathbf{S} - t\mathbf{I}_p > 0\}$. Equation (1.9b) of [Bai and Silverstein \[2004\]](#) gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n,t}^c) = o(n^{-\ell}). \quad (\text{S2.13})$$

Set

$$c_n = \frac{p}{n}, \quad \mathcal{X}_n = \frac{(\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})'}{s_M(np)^{1/4}}, \quad \mathbf{A} = s_M^2 \sqrt{c_n} \mathcal{X}_n^* \mathcal{X}_n, \quad z_n = \frac{t}{s_M^2 \sqrt{c_n}}.$$

Define $R_n(z) = (\mathcal{X}_n^* \mathcal{X}_n - z\mathbf{I}_n)^{-1}$. On $\mathcal{E}_{n,t}$, the resolvent identity gives

$$\mathbf{b}'(\mathbf{S} - t\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{b} = 1 + t\mathbf{e}'(\mathbf{A} - t\mathbf{I}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{e} = 1 + z_n \mathbf{e}' R_n(z_n) \mathbf{e}. \quad (\text{S2.14})$$

By Theorem 2.5 and Remark 2.7 of [Bloemendal et al. \[2014\]](#), for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n,t} \cap \{|\mathbf{e}' R_n(z_n) \mathbf{e} - m_{c_n}(z_n)| > \varepsilon\}) = o(n^{-\ell}), \quad (\text{S2.15})$$

where

$$m_{c_n}(z_n) = \frac{c_n - 1 - t/s_M^2 - \sqrt{(1 + c_n - t/s_M^2)^2 - 4c_n}}{2z_n}.$$

Since $c_n \rightarrow c < 1$ and $z_n \rightarrow t/(s_M^2 \sqrt{c}) > 0$, the limit of $m_{c_n}(z_n)$ is negative, so there is a fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $m_{c_n}(z_n) \leq -2\varepsilon_0$ for all sufficiently large n . On $\mathcal{E}_{n,t}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} (\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{(M)} - t\mathbf{I}_p = \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}' - t\mathbf{I}_p > 0 \iff \mathbf{b}'(\mathbf{S} - t\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{b} < 1 \stackrel{(\text{S2.14})}{\iff} \mathbf{e}' R_n(z_n) \mathbf{e} < 0.$$

On $\mathcal{E}_{n,t}$, $\mathbf{e}'R_n(z_n)\mathbf{e} \geq 0$ implies $|\mathbf{e}'R_n(z_n)\mathbf{e} - m_{c_n}(z_n)| > \varepsilon_0$. The bounds (S2.13) and (S2.15) and $n/N > 1$ therefore yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_p\left(\frac{1}{N}(\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)})'\mathbf{C}_n\mathbf{U}_n^{(M)}\right) \leq t\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n,t}^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n,t} \cap \{\mathbf{e}'R_n(z_n)\mathbf{e} \geq 0\}) = o(n^{-\ell}). \quad (\text{S2.16})$$

For fixed M , the residual entries are i.i.d. and centered, with $\sup_n \mathbb{E}|R_{11}^{(M)}|^4 < \infty$ and $|R_{ij}^{(M)}| \leq K_M \delta_n \sqrt{n}$ for all sufficiently large n . Thus, when $\tau_M > 0$, using Equation (1.9a) of [Bai and Silverstein \[2004\]](#) gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\mathbf{R}_n^{(M)}\right\|/\sqrt{N} \geq d\right) = o(n^{-\ell}), \quad d > \tau_M(1 + \sqrt{c}). \quad (\text{S2.17})$$

If $\tau_M = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(|w_{11} - \mu| \leq M) > 0$, then

$$\mathbf{R}_n^{(M)} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{S2.18})$$

Using (S2.12), (S2.16)–(S2.18), and Lemma S1.1, with probability $1 - o(n^{-\ell})$, we have

$$s_p\left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_n \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ}{\sqrt{N}}\right) \geq s_p\left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{(M)}}{\sqrt{N}}\right) - \left\|\frac{\mathbf{R}_n^{(M)}}{\sqrt{N}}\right\| > \sqrt{t} - d > \sqrt{q}.$$

Thus, for $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_n = (\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ)'\mathbf{C}_n\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_n^\circ/N$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_p(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_n) \leq q) = o(n^{-\ell}). \quad (\text{S2.19})$$

On $\mathcal{G}_n$, since $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq p-1$, Cauchy interlacing and (S2.2) give

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \lambda_{p-1}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \geq \lambda_{p-1}(\check{\mathbf{B}}_{p,N}) - \Delta_n \geq \lambda_p(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_n) - \Delta_n.$$

For $0 < \varepsilon < a - \eta_2$, (S2.8), (S2.10), and (S2.19) yield

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) \leq \eta_2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n^c) + \mathbb{P}(\lambda_p(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_n) \leq \eta_2 + \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n \cap \{\Delta_n > \varepsilon\}) = o(n^{-\ell}).$$

This completes the proof.

S2.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

The proof of this lemma is quite similar to Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.5 of [Zheng et al. \[2015\]](#); the details are therefore omitted. For readers' convenience, we present the outline of the proof for this lemma. In this situation, $\mathbf{B}_p^0 = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{Y}_n'\mathbf{Y}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i'$, $\mathbf{r}_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\frac{w_{i1}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1, \dots, \frac{w_{ip}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1)' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})'$, $\bar{w}_i = p^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}$. As for moments of y_{ij} , by Lemma 5.4, for any $q > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}y_{ij}^q = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{w_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1\right)^q I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{w_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} - 1\right)^q I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)}\right] \leq K \mathbb{E}(w_{ij} - \mu)^q,$$

where $B_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w}_i - \mu| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w}_i = p^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{i\ell}\}$, in which $\varepsilon > 0$ is a constant. Therefore, in the following proof, the requirement of truncation of y_{ij} reduces to truncation of w_{ij} . First, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z) \\ &= \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\} - pm_n^0(z) + p\{m_n^0(z) - m_N^0(z)\} + \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-2}(z)\Delta\} \\ & \quad + \text{tr}\left[\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\{\Delta\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\}^2\right] + \text{tr}\left[\{\mathbf{A}(z) - \Delta\}^{-1}\{\Delta\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\}^3\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A}(z) = \mathbf{B}_p^0 - z\mathbf{I}_p$ and $\Delta = \mathbf{B}_p^0 - \mathbf{B}_{p,N}$. Moreover, after truncation and normalization, for every $z \in \mathbb{C}^+ = \{z : \text{Im} z > 0\}$,

$$p\{m_n^0(z) - m_N^0(z)\} = \{1 + z\underline{m}(z)\} \frac{\underline{m}(z) + z\underline{m}'(z)}{z\underline{m}(z)} + o_P(1), \quad \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-2}(z)\Delta\} = o_P(1), \quad (\text{S2.20})$$

$$\text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-2}(z)\Delta\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\Delta\} = \{\underline{m}(z) + z\underline{m}'(z)\}\{1 + z\underline{m}(z)\} + o_P(1), \quad (\text{S2.21})$$

$$\text{tr}\left[\{\Delta\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\}^3\{\mathbf{A}(z) - \Delta\}^{-1}\right] = \frac{\{1 + z\underline{m}(z)\}^2\{\underline{m}(z) + z\underline{m}'(z)\}}{-z\underline{m}(z)} + o_P(1). \quad (\text{S2.22})$$

Note that we also need to check the tightness of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_N^0(z) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\} + \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\} - pm_n^0(z) + p\{m_n^0(z) - m_N^0(z)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the tightness of $\text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\} - pm_n^0(z)$ is proved in Section 5.3.2, it suffices to prove tightness of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N} - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - \text{tr}\{\mathbf{A}^{-1}(z)\}$. It can be obtained from similar arguments in Section 5.3.2 of [Zheng et al. \[2015\]](#), and we omit the details. Finally, the proof is completed.

S2.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Note that, by Taylor expansion, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that, for any $-1/2 \leq x \leq 1/2$,

$$\frac{1}{(1+x)^2} = 1 - 2x + 3x^2 + a(x), \quad |a(x)| \leq C_1|x|^3.$$

Hence, there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, on the event $\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w} - \mu_n| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w} = \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_j/p, \mu_n = \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{\bar{w}^2} = \frac{1}{\mu_n^2(\frac{\bar{w}-\mu_n}{\mu_n} + 1)^2} = \frac{1}{\mu_n^2} \left[1 - \frac{2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n} + \frac{3(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^2} + a\left(\frac{\bar{w} - \mu_n}{\mu_n}\right) \right],$$

where $|a((\bar{w} - \mu_n)/\mu_n)| < C_1\varepsilon^3$. Hence, we have

$$\frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\bar{w}^2} I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} = \left\{ \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} - \frac{2\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} + \frac{3\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} \right\} I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} + \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} a\left(\frac{\bar{w} - \mu_n}{\mu_n}\right) I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{S2.23})$$

This, together with the fact $I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} = 1 - I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\bar{w}^2} - \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} &= -\frac{2\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} + \frac{3\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} \\ &\quad - \left\{ \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} - \frac{2\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} + \frac{3\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} \right\} I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} + a + \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\bar{w}^2} I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.24})$$

where $a := \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} a\left(\frac{\bar{w} - \mu_n}{\mu_n}\right) I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)}$ and $|a| \leq C_1 \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} \varepsilon^3$. Taking expectation for (S2.24) yields that

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\bar{w}^2} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} = -\frac{2\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} + \frac{3\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} - \mathbb{E}b + \mathbb{E}a + \mathbb{E}c. \quad (\text{S2.25})$$

where $b := \{\hat{w}_1^2/\mu_n^2 - 2\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)/\mu_n^3 + 3\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2/\mu_n^4\}I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}$ and $c := (\hat{w}_1^2/\bar{w}^2)I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}$. Note that

$$|\mathbb{E}c| \leq p^2 \mathbb{P}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)). \quad (\text{S2.26})$$

Next, we derive a bound for $\mathbb{E}b$. For notational simplicity, we denote by

$$y_1 = \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2}, \quad y_2 = \frac{2\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3}, \quad y_3 = \frac{3\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4}.$$

It is obvious that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(y_1 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}) \right| \leq C_2 \left| \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right| \leq C_2 \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)), \quad (\text{S2.27})$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is a constant. Note that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} = \frac{1}{p} \frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3}, \quad (\text{S2.28})$$

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} = \frac{1}{p^2} \frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} + \frac{p-1}{p^2} \frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2 \mathbb{E}(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4}. \quad (\text{S2.29})$$

By (S2.28), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}(y_2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}) \right| &= \frac{2}{p\mu_n^3} \left| \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n) I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C_3}{p} \left(\left| \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^3 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C_3}{p} \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \left| (\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^4)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)})^{1/2} \right| \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{C_3}{p} \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \mathbb{P}^{1/4}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.30})$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is a constant. By (S2.29), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}(y_3 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)}) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{p^2 \mu_n^4} \left| \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n)^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right| + \frac{p-1}{p^2 \mu_n^4} \left| \left\{ \mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right\} \left\{ \mathbb{E}(\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n)^2 I_{\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C_4}{p^2} + \frac{C_4}{p} \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) \cdot \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) \right\} \\ &\leq C_4 \left\{ \frac{1}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.31})$$

where $C_4 > 0$ is a constant. By (S2.27) – (S2.31), we have

$$|\mathbb{E}b| \leq C_5 \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P}^{1/4}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{p^2} \right\}, \quad (\text{S2.32})$$

where $C_5 > 0$ is a constant. Now, we provide an estimate for $\mathbb{P}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon))$. By Markov's inequality and Burkholder's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon)) = \mathbb{P}(|\bar{w} - \mu_n| \geq \varepsilon)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \varepsilon^{-t} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p (\hat{w}_j - \mu_n) \right|^t \\
&\leq C_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |\hat{w}_j - \mu_n|^2 \right)^{t/2} + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p |\hat{w}_j - \mu_n|^t \right\} \\
&= C_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_j - \mu_n|^2 \right)^{t/2} + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p |\hat{w}_j - \mu_n|^t \right\} \\
&= C_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ \left(p \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n|^2 \right)^{t/2} + p \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n|^t \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where ε , t , and C_t (which depends on t) are positive constants. Since $\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 < \infty$, and the truncation $|w_j - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}$, where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a positive sequence satisfying $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\delta_n n^{1/4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_1 - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\sup_n \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n|^4 < \infty$ and $|\hat{w}_j - \mu_n| < 4\delta_n \sqrt{n}$ for sufficiently large n (note that $\mu \leq \delta_n \sqrt{n}$ for sufficiently large n). Based on the estimate for $\mathbb{P}(\hat{B}_p^c(\varepsilon))$, $\sup_n \mathbb{E} |\hat{w}_1 - \mu_n|^4 < \infty$ and $|\hat{w}_j - \mu_n| < 4\delta_n \sqrt{n}$ where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a positive sequence satisfying $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\delta_n n^{1/4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_1 - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathbb{E}a - \mathbb{E}b + \mathbb{E}c = o(p^{-1})$. From (S2.25), (S2.26) and (S2.32), we get

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\hat{w}^2} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} = -\frac{2\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)}{\mu_n^3} + \frac{3\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu_n)^2}{\mu_n^4} + o(p^{-1}). \quad (\text{S2.33})$$

Plugging (S2.28) – (S2.29) into (S2.33), we get

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\hat{w}^2} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\mu_n^2} = \frac{h_{1,n}}{p} + o(p^{-1}), \quad h_{1,n} = -2\frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^3}{\mu_n^3} + 3\lambda_n^2 + 5\lambda_n + 2, \quad \lambda_n = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2,$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\hat{w}_1^2}{\hat{w}^2} - \mathbb{E} \frac{w_1^2}{\mu^2} = \frac{h_1}{p} + o(p^{-1}), \quad h_1 = -2\frac{\mathbb{E}w_1^3}{\mu^3} + 3\lambda^2 + 5\lambda + 2,$$

which implies the first equation in Lemma 5.3.

Similar to the previous calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} \\
&= \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} + \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) f_1(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) I_{\hat{B}_p(\varepsilon)} + \tilde{a},
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathbb{E}\tilde{a}| = o(p^{-1})$,

$$f_1(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) = -\frac{2\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 - \frac{2\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) &= 4 \frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} \frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left\{ \frac{\hat{w}_1^2/\mu_n^2}{(\hat{w}_1/\mu_n - 1)^2} + \frac{2\hat{w}_1/\mu_n}{\hat{w}_1/\mu_n - 1} \right\} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left\{ \frac{\hat{w}_2^2/\mu_n^2}{(\hat{w}_2/\mu_n - 1)^2} + \frac{2\hat{w}_2/\mu_n}{\hat{w}_2/\mu_n - 1} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.34}$$

Similar to (S2.23) – (S2.33), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{\mu_n} - 1 \right) f_1(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\bar{w}}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) + o(p^{-1}) \\
&=: T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + o(p^{-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.35}$$

Similar to (S2.28) and (S2.29), we obtain

$$T_2 = \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} + \frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 2 \right) f_1(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) \tag{S2.36}$$

and

$$T_3 = \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) + \frac{p-2}{p^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \mathbb{E} f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n). \tag{S2.37}$$

Thus, by (S2.35) – (S2.37), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} + \frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 2 \right) f_1(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_n}{p} \mathbb{E} f_2(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \mu_n) + o(p^{-1}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\mu_n} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{p} h_{2,n} + o(p^{-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.38}$$

where $h_{2,n} = -8\lambda_n \frac{\mathbb{E}\hat{w}_1^3}{\mu_n^3} + 10\lambda_n^3 + 22\lambda_n^2 + 8\lambda_n$, and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{w}_2}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^2 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\mu} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{w_2}{\mu} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{p} h_2 + o(p^{-1}),$$

where $h_2 = -8\lambda \frac{\mathbb{E}w_1^3}{\mu^3} + 10\lambda^3 + 22\lambda^2 + 8\lambda$, which implies the second equation in Lemma 5.3.

Similarly, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\hat{w}_1}{\hat{w}} - 1 \right)^4 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\mu} - 1 \right)^4 + o(1),$$

which implies the third equation in Lemma 5.3.

S2.4 Proof of Lemma 5.4

First, we establish an estimate for $\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon))$, where $B_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w} - \mu| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w} = \sum_{j=1}^p w_j/p\}$. By Markov's inequality and Burkholder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) &= \mathbb{P}(|\bar{w} - \mu| \geq \varepsilon) \\
&\leq \varepsilon^{-t} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p (w_j - \mu) \right|^t \\
&\leq K_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}_{j-1} |w_j - \mu|^2 \right)^{t/2} + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j - \mu|^t \right\} \\
&= K_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} |w_j - \mu|^2 \right)^{t/2} + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j - \mu|^t \right\} \\
&= K_t \varepsilon^{-t} \left\{ p^{-t/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^2 \right)^{t/2} + p^{-t+1} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^t \right\}, \tag{S2.39}
\end{aligned}$$

where ε , t , and K_t (which depends on t) are positive constants. We aim to derive an estimate for the q -th moment of $\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1\right)^2 \text{tr}\mathbf{A}$. For any $q \geq 2$, there exists a positive constant K_q such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1\right)^2 \text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q \leq K_q \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1\right)^2 \text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q \right).$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1\right)^2 \text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q \leq K_q \left| \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1\right)^2 - \lambda \right|^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q. \tag{S2.40}$$

Now, we consider $\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q$. There exists a positive constant K_q such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right|^q \leq K_q \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right) I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right|^q + \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right) I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \right\}. \tag{S2.41}$$

Estimating $\mathbb{E} |(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - n^{-1}\lambda \text{tr}\mathbf{A}) I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)}|^q$: Since $|\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A}| \leq \|\mathbf{r}\| \|\mathbf{A}\| + C \|\mathbf{A}\| \leq C \cdot p \|\mathbf{A}\|$, where C is a positive constant. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right) I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \leq C_q p^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)), \tag{S2.42}$$

where C_q denotes a positive constant depending on q .

Estimating $\mathbb{E} |(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - n^{-1}\lambda \text{tr}\mathbf{A}) I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q$: Write

$$\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} = \frac{\sigma^2}{n\bar{w}^2} \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \bar{w}\mathbf{1}_p)' \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{w} - \bar{w}\mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma^2} - \text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right\} + \frac{\sigma^2/\bar{w}^2 - \lambda}{n} \text{tr}\mathbf{A} =: v_1 + v_2, \tag{S2.43}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_p = (1, 1, \dots, 1)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, there exists a positive constant K_q such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{A} \right) I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \leq K_q \left(\mathbb{E} |v_1 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q + \mathbb{E} |v_2 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q \right).$$

On the event $B_p(\varepsilon)$, we have $-\varepsilon \leq \bar{w} - \mu \leq \varepsilon$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|v_2 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q &= \sigma^{2q} \left| \frac{\text{tr} \mathbf{A}}{n} \right|^q \mathbb{E} \left| \left(\frac{1}{\bar{w}^2} - \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right) I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\leq \sigma^{2q} \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{(\bar{w} - \mu)(\bar{w} + \mu)}{\bar{w}^2 \mu^2} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\leq K_q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{E} |\bar{w} - \mu|^q \\
&\leq K_q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \left(p^{-q/2} + p^{-q+1} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^q \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.44}$$

where the last inequality follows from the same argument in the proof of (S2.39). By using $\mathbf{w} - \bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p = \mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p - (\bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|v_1 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q &\leq K_q n^{-q} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{A} \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} - \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\leq K_q n^{-q} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{A} \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} - \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\quad + K_q n^{-q} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{(\bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{A} \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\quad + K_q n^{-q} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{A} \frac{(\bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\quad + K_q n^{-q} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{(\bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{A} \frac{(\bar{w} \mathbf{1}_p - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&=: K_q n^{-q} (V_{11} + V_{12} + V_{13} + V_{14}).
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.45}$$

By Lemma 2.2 in [Bai and Silverstein \[2004\]](#), we have

$$V_{11} \leq K_q \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right]. \tag{S2.46}$$

From $(\bar{w} - \mu) \mathbf{1}_p' = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' (\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)$ and $p^{-1} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A}) = p^{-2} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p') \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{12} &= \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{1}{p} \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} \right\} I_{B_p(\varepsilon)} \right|^q \\
&\leq K_q \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \right) \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} - \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \right) \right|^q + \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \right) \right|^q \right\} \\
&\leq K_q \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)'}{\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \right) \frac{(\mathbf{w} - \mu \mathbf{1}_p)}{\sigma} - \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \right) \right|^q + \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \right\} \\
&\leq K_q \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right) \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right)^{q/2} \right] + K_q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \\
&\leq V_{11}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.47}$$

Similarly, we get

$$V_{13} \leq V_{11}, \quad V_{14} \leq V_{11}. \tag{S2.48}$$

By (S2.45) – (S2.48), we get

$$\mathbb{E}|v_1 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}|^q \leq K_q n^{-q} \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right]. \quad (\text{S2.49})$$

From (S2.41) – (S2.44) and (S2.49), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\lambda}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right|^q \\ & \leq K_q \left\{ n^{-q} \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \left(p^{-q/2} + p^{-q+1} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^q \right) + p^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \right\} \\ & \leq K_q \left(n^{-q} \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right] + n^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By this inequality and (S2.40), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1 \right)^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right|^q & \leq K_q \left(n^{-q} \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + n^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1 \right)^2 - \lambda \right|^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove the last inequality in Lemma 5.4. If $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ is bounded, $\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 < \infty$, $|w_j - \mu| < \delta_n \sqrt{n}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$) where $\{\delta_n\}$ is a positive sequence satisfying $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\delta_n n^{1/4} \rightarrow \infty$, $\delta_n^{-4} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^4 I_{\{|w_1 - \mu| \geq \delta_n \sqrt{n}\}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then, for any $q \geq 2$,

$$n^{-q} \left[\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^4 \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \right\}^{q/2} + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{w_1 - \mu}{\sigma} \right|^{2q} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')^{q/2} \right] \leq K_q n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1 \right)^2 - \lambda \right|^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \leq K_q n^{-q} \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \leq K_q n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}.$$

Taking $\varepsilon = n^{-\alpha}$, $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, and $t > \frac{3q}{1-2\alpha}$ yields that

$$n^q \|\mathbf{A}\|^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq K_q n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}.$$

In fact, from (S2.39), we write

$$\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq K_t \varepsilon^{-t} \left\{ p^{-t/2} \left(\mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^2 \right)^{t/2} + p^{-t+1} \mathbb{E} |w_1 - \mu|^t \right\} =: P_1 + P_2.$$

Since $P_2 \leq K_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t+1} (n^{1/2} \delta_n)^{t-4} \leq K_t \delta_n^{t-4} \varepsilon^{-t} n^{-t/2-1} \leq P_1$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq 2P_1. \quad (\text{S2.50})$$

Substituting $\varepsilon = n^{-\alpha}$ ($0 < \alpha < 1/2$) and $t > \frac{3q}{1-2\alpha}$ into (S2.50), we have

$$n^q \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq K_q n^q n^{-(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha)t} \leq K_q n^{-q/2} \leq K_q n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}.$$

Combining all these estimates, we obtain the last inequality in the Lemma.

S2.5 Proof of Lemma 5.5

First, we denote $R_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left(\frac{\hat{w}_j}{\hat{w}} - 1\right)$ and derive some identities that will be used in the proof. It is obvious that $\sum_{j=1}^p R_j = 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^p R_j^2 + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} R_{j_1} R_{j_2} = 0$. Since $\{\hat{w}_j\}_{j=1}^p$ are i.i.d., taking expectation on the above two identities yields that, for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq p$,

$$\mathbb{E}R_j = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}R_j^2 = \frac{\nu_2}{n}, \quad \mathbb{E}R_i R_j = -\frac{\nu_2}{n(p-1)}, \quad \mathbb{E}R_j^4 = \frac{\nu_4}{n^2}, \quad \mathbb{E}R_i^2 R_j^2 = \frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2}. \quad (\text{S2.51})$$

Recall that $\mathbf{r} = (R_1, \dots, R_p)'$. From (S2.51), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}') = \frac{p\nu_2}{n(p-1)} \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right), \quad (\text{S2.52})$$

where $\mathbf{1}_p = (1, 1, \dots, 1)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$. It is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right) \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} \right) - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right) - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \right) - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \text{tr} \mathbf{B}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.53})$$

We first estimate each terms in the RHS of the identity above, and finally prove the equation given in Lemma 5.5. The details are provided in the following three steps.

Step 1: Estimate the first term. It follows from (S2.51) and the identity $\sum_{j=1}^p R_j = 0$ that

$$\mathbb{E}R_1^3 R_2 = \frac{1}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[R_1^3 \left(\sum_{j=1}^p R_j - R_1 \right) \right] = -\frac{\nu_4}{n^2(p-1)}, \quad (\text{S2.54})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}R_1^2 R_2 R_3 &= \frac{1}{p-2} \mathbb{E} \left[R_1^2 R_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^p R_j - R_1 - R_2 \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{p-2} \mathbb{E}(R_1^3 R_2) - \frac{1}{p-2} \mathbb{E}(R_1^2 R_2^2) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{S2.54})}{=} -\frac{\nu_4}{n^2(p-1)(p-2)} - \frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2(p-2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.55})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}R_1 R_2 R_3 R_4 &= \frac{1}{p-3} \mathbb{E} \left[R_1 R_2 R_3 \left(\sum_{j=1}^p R_j - R_1 - R_2 - R_3 \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{3}{p-3} \mathbb{E}(R_1^2 R_2 R_3) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{S2.55})}{=} -\frac{3\nu_4}{n^2(p-1)(p-2)(p-3)} + \frac{3\nu_{12}}{n^2(p-2)(p-3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.56})$$

To calculate $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r})$, we expand it as

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i,j} R_i A_{ij} R_j \sum_{k,\ell} R_k B_{k\ell} R_\ell \right) = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} \mathbb{E}(R_i R_j R_k R_\ell A_{ij} B_{k\ell}). \quad (\text{S2.57})$$

To calculate (S2.57), we split it into the following 11 cases:

1. $i = j = k = \ell, \sum_i (R_i^4) A_{ii} B_{ii};$
2. $i = j, k = \ell, i \neq k, \sum_{\substack{i,k \\ i \neq k}} (R_i^2 R_k^2) A_{ii} B_{kk};$
3. $i = j, k \neq \ell, \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ k \neq \ell}} (R_i^2 R_k R_\ell) A_{ii} B_{k\ell};$
4. $i \neq j, k = \ell, \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j}} (R_i R_j R_k^2) A_{ij} B_{kk};$
5. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, i = k, j = \ell, \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} (R_i^2 R_j^2) A_{ij} B_{ij};$
6. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, i = \ell, j = k, \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} (R_i^2 R_j^2) A_{ij} B_{ji};$
7. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, i = k, \ell \neq j, \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} (R_i^2 R_j R_\ell) A_{ij} B_{i\ell};$
8. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, \ell = j, i \neq k, \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} (R_i R_j^2 R_k) A_{ij} B_{kj};$
9. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, k = j, i \neq \ell, \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} (R_i R_j^2 R_\ell) A_{ij} B_{j\ell};$
10. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, i = \ell, k \neq j, \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} (R_i^2 R_j R_k) A_{ij} B_{ki};$
11. $i \neq j, k \neq \ell, \ell \neq j, i \neq k, \sum_{\substack{i,j,k,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell}} (R_i R_j R_k R_\ell) A_{ij} B_{k\ell}.$

For ease of presentation, we still keep v_4 in the expectations although we have obtained its value. The expectations of all cases are listed as follows.

Case 1: From (S2.51), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_i R_i^4 A_{ii} B_{ii} = \frac{v_4}{n^2} \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii}.$$

Case 2: From (S2.51), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,k \\ i \neq k}} R_i^2 R_k^2 A_{ii} B_{kk} = \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{i,k \\ i \neq k}} A_{ii} B_{kk} = \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{A} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} - \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} \right).$$

Case 3: Note that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ k \neq \ell}} R_i^2 R_k R_\ell A_{ii} B_{k\ell} = \mathbb{E} R_1^2 R_2 R_3 \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} + \mathbb{E} R_1^3 R_2 \left(\sum_{\substack{i,\ell \\ \ell \neq i}} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,k \\ k \neq i}} A_{ii} B_{ki} \right). \quad (\text{S2.58})$$

Now, we estimate the magnitude of the summation terms on the RHS of (S2.58). Recall that for any $p \times p$ matrix, we have $\mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}) \leq p \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{M}\|$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} M_{ii} \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|$. By using these facts and Hölder's inequality, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i,k,\ell} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} \right| = \mathbb{E} \left| (\text{tr} \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p \right| \leq p \mathbb{E} (\|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p\|) \leq p^2 \mathbb{E} (\|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\|) = O(p^2), \quad (\text{S2.59})$$

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{i,l} A_{ii} B_{\ell\ell} = \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \leq p^2 \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\|) = O(p^2), \quad (\text{S2.60})$$

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} \leq p \mathbb{E} \|\text{diag}(\mathbf{A}) \text{diag}(\mathbf{B})\| \leq p \mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\|) = O(p). \quad (\text{S2.61})$$

Let $\mathbf{1}_p^i$ be the p -dimensional vector with all components being 0 except for the i -th component being 1, then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i,\ell} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} \right| = \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_i A_{ii} (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_i A_{ii}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_i (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p^i \right\}^{1/2} = O(p^{3/2}). \quad (\text{S2.62})$$

From (S2.59) – (S2.61), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i,k,\ell} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} - \sum_{i,\ell} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} - \sum_{i,k} A_{ii} B_{ki} - \sum_{i,\ell} A_{ii} B_{\ell\ell} + 2 \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} \right) = O(p^2). \quad (\text{S2.63})$$

It follows from (S2.54), (S2.55), (S2.58), (S2.62), and (S2.63), that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ k \neq \ell}} (R_i^2 R_k R_\ell) A_{ii} B_{k\ell} = -\frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2(p-2)} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} + o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 4: Similarly to Case 3, one can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j}} R_i R_j R_k^2 A_{ij} B_{kk} = -\frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2(p-2)} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} A_{ij} B_{kk} + o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 5:

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} R_i^2 R_j^2 A_{ij} B_{ij} = \mathbb{E} (R_1^2 R_2^2) \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} A_{ij} B_{ij} = \frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}') - \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} \right\}.$$

Case 6:

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} R_i^2 R_j^2 A_{ij} B_{ji} = \mathbb{E} (R_1^2 R_2^2) \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} A_{ij} B_{ji} = \frac{\nu_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}) - \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} \right\}.$$

Case 7: By (S2.55), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} R_i^2 R_j R_\ell A_{ij} B_{i\ell} = O(n^{-3}) \times \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} A_{ij} B_{i\ell}. \quad (\text{S2.64})$$

Note that, $\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p \leq p \|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\| = O(p)$, $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}' \mathbf{B}) \leq p \|\mathbf{A}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{B}\| = O(p)$, and by (S2.61) and (S2.62), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{i \neq \ell} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i,\ell} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} - \mathbb{E} \sum_i A_{ii} B_{ii} = O(p^{3/2}), \quad (\text{S2.65})$$

thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} A_{ij} B_{i\ell} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p - \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}' \mathbf{B}) - \sum_{i \neq \ell} A_{ii} B_{i\ell} - \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} B_{ii} \right\} = O(p^{3/2}). \quad (\text{S2.66})$$

It follows from (S2.64) and (S2.66) that

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} R_i^2 R_j R_\ell A_{ij} B_{i\ell} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 8: Similarly to Case 7, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} R_i R_j^2 R_k A_{ij} B_{kj} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 9: Similarly to Case 7, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} R_i R_j^2 R_\ell A_{ij} B_{j\ell} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 10: Similarly to Case 7, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} (R_i^2 R_j R_k) A_{ij} B_{ki} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 11: By (S2.56), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell}} R_i R_j R_k R_\ell A_{ij} B_{k\ell} = O(n^{-4}) \sum_{\substack{i,j,k,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ij} B_{k\ell}.$$

Note that, by (S2.66) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ij} B_{k\ell} \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{1}_p - \text{tr} \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_p - \text{tr} \mathbf{B}) - \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq \ell}} A_{ij} B_{i\ell} - \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} A_{ij} B_{ki} - \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ i \neq j}} A_{ij} B_{ij} \\ &= O(p^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i,j,k,\ell \\ i \neq j \neq k \neq \ell}} R_i R_j R_k R_\ell A_{ij} B_{k\ell} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Combining (S2.57) and Cases 1 – 11 gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{r}) &= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}B_{ii} + \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{v_{12}}{n^2(p-2)} \left(\sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii}B_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} A_{ij}B_{kk} \right) + o(n^{-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{S2.67}$$

Step 2: Estimate the second and third terms. From (S2.52) and (S2.65), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v_2 \text{tr} \mathbf{B}}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right) &= \frac{v_2 \text{tr} \mathbf{B}}{n} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}') - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right\} = -\frac{v_2^2 \text{tr} \mathbf{B}}{n^2(p-1)} \sum_{k \neq \ell} A_{k\ell} \\ &= -\frac{v_2^2}{n^2(p-1)} \left(\sum_{\substack{k,\ell \\ k \neq \ell}} B_{kk} A_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{k,\ell \\ k \neq \ell}} B_{\ell\ell} A_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} B_{ii} A_{k\ell} \right) \\ &= -\frac{v_2^2}{n^2(p-1)} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} B_{ii} A_{k\ell} + o(n^{-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{S2.68}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\frac{v_2 \text{tr} \mathbf{A}}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \right) = -\frac{v_2^2}{n^2(p-1)} \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii} B_{k\ell} + o(n^{-1}).\tag{S2.69}$$

Step 3: From (S2.53) and (S2.67) – (S2.69), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{r} - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \right) \left(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{r} - \frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} \right) \\ &= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}B_{ii} + \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{v_{12}}{n^2(p-2)} \left(\sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii}B_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} A_{ij}B_{kk} \right) + \frac{v_2^2}{n^2(p-1)} \left(\sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} B_{ii}A_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii}B_{k\ell} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{v_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}) + o(n^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}B_{ii} + \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) \right\} + \frac{v_{12} - v_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}) \\ &\quad + \frac{v_2^2 - v_{12}}{n^2(p-2)} \left(\sum_{\substack{i,k,\ell \\ i \neq k \neq \ell}} A_{ii}B_{k\ell} + \sum_{\substack{i,j,k \\ i \neq j \neq k}} A_{ij}B_{kk} \right) + o(n^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii}B_{ii} + \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) \right\} + \frac{v_{12} - v_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'\mathbf{B}) + O\left(\frac{v_2^2 - v_{12}}{n}\right) + o(n^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^p A_{ii} B_{ii} + \frac{v_{12}}{n^2} \{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{AB}') + \text{tr}(\mathbf{AB}) \} + \frac{v_{12} - v_2^2}{n^2} \text{tr} \mathbf{A} \text{tr} \mathbf{B} + o(n^{-1}),$$

where in the third “=” we use Equation (S2.63), and in the last “=” we use Lemma 5.3.

S2.6 Proof of Lemma 5.7

Limit of $\partial^2 \mathcal{Y}_1(z_1, z_2) / (\partial z_1 \partial z_2)$:

Since $\mathbb{E} |\bar{\beta}_j(z) - b_p(z)|^2 \leq K|z|^4 / (nv_0^6)$, it is enough to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \left[b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{ \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \varepsilon_j(z_2) \} \right] \\ & \xrightarrow{P} 2 \left[\frac{\underline{m}'(z_1) \underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{ \underline{m}(z_1) - \underline{m}(z_2) \}^2} - \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)^2} \right] + \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \underline{m}'(z_1) \underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\}^2 \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.70})$$

By Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\text{LHS of (S2.70)} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \left\{ \mathcal{Y}_{11}(z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{Y}_{12}(z_1, z_2) + \mathcal{Y}_{13}(z_1, z_2) \right\} + o_P(1), \quad (\text{S2.71})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_{11}(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{v_4 - 3v_{12}}{n^2} b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)]_{ii}, \\ \mathcal{Y}_{12}(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{2v_{12}}{n^2} b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr} \{ \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \}, \\ \mathcal{Y}_{13}(z_1, z_2) &= \frac{v_{12} - v_2^2}{n^2} b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \sum_{j=1}^n \text{tr} \{ \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \} \text{tr} \{ \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_2 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1 \right)^2$, $v_4 = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1 \right)^4$, $v_{12} = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_{11}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1 \right)^2 \left(\frac{w_{12}}{\bar{w}_1} - 1 \right)^2$, $\bar{w}_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^p w_{1\ell} / p$. We claim that the following statements hold true as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ (to be proven later):

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{Y}_{11}(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{c \alpha_1 \underline{m}'(z_1) \underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\}^2 \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}^2}, \quad (\text{S2.72})$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{Y}_{12}(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{2 \underline{m}'(z_1) \underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{ \underline{m}(z_1) - \underline{m}(z_2) \}^2} - \frac{2}{(z_1 - z_2)^2}, \quad (\text{S2.73})$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{Y}_{13}(z_1, z_2)}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{c \alpha_2 \underline{m}'(z_1) \underline{m}'(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\}^2 \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}^2}. \quad (\text{S2.74})$$

By (S2.70) – (S2.74), we obtain the limit of $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_2} \mathcal{Y}_1(z_1, z_2)$.

Now, we provide the proofs of (S2.72) – (S2.74) as follows:

Proof of (S2.72): It is enough to find the limit of

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)]_{ii}.$$

By calculations similar to those in Gao et al. [2017], we get the following lemma and its proof is postponed to Section S2.7.

Lemma S2.1. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have as $p \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)]_{ii} \xrightarrow{P} m(z_1)m(z_2).$$

By $\mathbb{E} |\frac{v_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \frac{v_2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)|^q \leq K_q n^{-q/2} v_0^{-q}$ (K_q is a positive constant), the formula (2.2) of Silverstein [1995], $\underline{m}_p(z) = -\frac{1}{zn} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j(z)$, and Lemma 5.4, we have

$$|b_p(z) - \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z)| \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad \mathbb{E} \beta_1(z) = -z \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z), \quad |b_p(z) + z \underline{m}_p^0(z)| \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (\text{S2.75})$$

Thus, by (S2.75), Lemmas 5.3 and S2.1, we have as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{11}(z_1, z_2) \xrightarrow{P} c \alpha_1 z_1 z_2 m(z_1) m(z_2) \underline{m}(z_1) \underline{m}(z_2) = \frac{c \alpha_1 \underline{m}(z_1) \underline{m}(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}},$$

where the equality above follows from $m(z) = -z^{-1} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^{-1}$. This implies (S2.72).

Proof of (S2.73): By similar calculation of Bai and Silverstein [2004], we get the following lemma and its proof is postponed to Section S2.8.

Lemma S2.2. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for any $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \left[1 - \frac{\frac{j-1}{n} c_n v_2^2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1) \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)}{\{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1)\} \{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)\}} \right] \\ &= \frac{n c_n}{z_1 z_2} \frac{1}{\{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1)\} \{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)\}} + O_P(n^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By using (S2.75) and this lemma, $\mathcal{Y}_{12}(z_1, z_2)$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{12}(z_1, z_2) = \frac{a_p(z_1, z_2) v_{12}}{n v_2^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{2}{1 - \frac{j-1}{n} a_p(z_1, z_2)} + O_P(n^{-1/2}),$$

where

$$a_p(z_1, z_2) = \frac{v_2^2 c_n \underline{m}_p^0(z_1) \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)}{\{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1)\} \{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)\}}.$$

By Lemma 5.3, the limit of $a_p(z_1, z_2)$ is

$$a(z_1, z_2) = \frac{c \lambda^2 \underline{m}(z_1) \underline{m}(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}}.$$

These estimates imply (S2.73).

Proof of (S2.74): We have $\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - m_p^0(z_1) m_p^0(z_2) \right| = o(1)$. By Lemma 5.3, we get $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} p(v_{12} - v_2^2) = \alpha_2$. This, together with (S2.75), implies that as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{13}(z_1, z_2) \xrightarrow{P} \frac{c \alpha_2 \underline{m}(z_1) \underline{m}(z_2)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_1)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z_2)\}}.$$

This implies (S2.74).

Limit of $\partial^2 \mathcal{Y}_2(z_1, z_2)/(\partial z_1 \partial z_2)$:

For any $p \times p$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$, we have

$$\left| \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \right\} \mathbf{A} \right| \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|}{\text{Im}(z)}. \quad (\text{S2.76})$$

By Lemma S1.2 and (S2.76), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \right|^q \leq \frac{K_q}{n^{q/2} \nu_0^q}, \quad (\text{S2.77})$$

where $K_q > 0$ is a constant depending on q , which implies that

$$\mathbb{E} |\bar{\beta}_j(z) - b_p(z)|^2 \leq \frac{K|z|^4}{n \nu_0^6}. \quad (\text{S2.78})$$

The above inequalities will be used in the following proof.

Denoting $\mathcal{Y}_{2,j}(z_1, z_2) := \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) \varepsilon_j(z_1) \} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2) \}$. To prove the second part of the lemma, it is enough to show that, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{2,j}(z_1, z_2) - b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \varepsilon_j(z_1) \} \{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \varepsilon_j(z_2) \} = o_P(n^{-1}), \quad (\text{S2.79})$$

and

$$b_p(z_1) b_p(z_2) \{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \varepsilon_j(z_1) \} \{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \varepsilon_j(z_2) \} = o_P(n^{-1}). \quad (\text{S2.80})$$

Proof of (S2.79): We write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (S2.79)} &= \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[\left\{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) - b_p(z_1) \right\} \varepsilon_j(z_1) \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2) \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\{ b_p(z_1) \varepsilon_j(z_1) \right\} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left[\left\{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) - b_p(z_2) \right\} \varepsilon_j(z_2) \right] \\ &=: \Delta \mathcal{Y}_{2,j}^{(1)}(z_1, z_2) + \Delta \mathcal{Y}_{2,j}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for any $q_1, q_2 \geq 1$ with $1/q_1 + 1/q_2 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\Delta \mathcal{Y}_{2,j}^{(1)}(z_1, z_2)| &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \{ \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) - b_p(z_1) \} \varepsilon_j(z_1) \right|^{q_1} \right)^{1/q_1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2) \right|^{q_2} \right)^{1/q_2} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) - b_p(z_1) \right|^{q_1} \right)^{1/q_1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2) \right|^{q_2} \right)^{1/q_2} \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 5.4 and (S2.78), for any $1 < q_1 < 2$ and $q_2 > 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) - b_p(z_1) \right|^{q_1} &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j(z_1) - b_p(z_1) \right|^{q_1 \frac{2}{q_1}} \right)^{q_1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \varepsilon_j(z_1) \right|^{q_1 \frac{2}{2-q_1}} \right)^{\frac{2-q_1}{2}} \\ &\leq K n^{-\frac{q_1}{2}} n^{-\frac{2-q_1}{2}} \delta_n^{4q_1-4} \\ &= K n^{-1} \delta_n^{4q_1-4}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\beta}_j(z_2) \varepsilon_j(z_2) \right|^{q_2} \leq K \frac{|z|^{q_2}}{\nu_0^{q_2}} n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q_2-4}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}|\Delta\mathcal{Y}_{2,j}^{(1)}(z_1, z_2)| \leq K n^{-1} \delta_n^{\frac{4q_1-4}{q_1} + \frac{2q_2-4}{q_2}} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Similarly, we can obtain $\mathbb{E}|\Delta\mathcal{Y}_{2,j}^{(2)}(z_1, z_2)| = o(n^{-1})$. Thus, we complete the proof of (S2.79).

Proof of (S2.80): By (S2.52), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \varepsilon_j(z) &= \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\{ \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \right\} \\ &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j' \right\} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \\ &= \frac{p\nu_2}{n(p-1)} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right) \right\} - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \\ &= \frac{\nu_2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E}_{j-1} \left\{ \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.3 in Bai and Silverstein [2004] and our Lemma S1.5, we have as $p \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \xrightarrow{P} m(z), \quad \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \xrightarrow{P} -\frac{1}{z}.$$

By (S2.77) and the identity $\underline{m}_p(z) = -\frac{1}{zn} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j(z)$, we have

$$|b_p(z) + \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z)| \leq K n^{-1/2}.$$

This, together with Lemma 5.4, yields that

$$|b_p(z) + z \underline{m}_p^0(z)| \leq K n^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{S2.81})$$

Equation (S2.80) follows from the above estimates.

S2.7 Proof of Lemma S2.1

By Lemma S1.2, the inequality $|\beta_{ij}(z)| \leq \frac{|z|}{v_0}$, and Lemma 5.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} |(\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \} \mathbf{1}_p^i|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1}(z_1) \} \mathbf{1}_p^i \right|^2 \\ &\leq K \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_{1j}(z_1) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p^i (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j|^2 \\ &\leq K \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |\beta_{1j}(z_1) \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p^i (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \mathbf{D}_{1j}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_j|^2 \\ &\leq K n^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.82})$$

where $\mathbf{1}_p^i$ is the p -dimensional vector with all components being 0 except for the i -th component being 1. Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j [\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2)]_{ii} \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{nK}{n^2 v_0} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbf{1}_p^i)' \{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z_1) \} \mathbf{1}_p^i \right| \leq K n^{-1/2},$$

and thus

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right]_{ii} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_j \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right]_{ii} \mathbb{E}_j \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right]_{ii} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

With the above two inequalities, it remains to find the limit of

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right]_{ii} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right]_{ii}. \quad (\text{S2.83})$$

It is easy to see that the sum of expectations in (S2.83) is exactly the same for any j . Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right]_{ii} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right]_{ii} \xrightarrow{P} m(z_1) m(z_2), \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma S2.1.

S2.8 Proof of Lemma S2.2

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_{ij}(z) &= \mathbf{D}(z) - \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j', \quad b_1(z) = \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1} v_2 \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}(z)}, \\ \beta_{ij}(z) &= \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_i}. \end{aligned}$$

We have the equality

$$\mathbf{D}_j(z_1) + z_1 \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 b_1(z_1) \mathbf{I}_p = \sum_{i \neq j}^n \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 b_1(z_1) \mathbf{I}_p.$$

Multiplying by $\mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) := \{z_1 \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{n-1}{n} v_2 b_1(z_1) \mathbf{I}_p\}^{-1}$ on the LHS and $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1)$ on the RHS, and using $\mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) = \beta_{ij}(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1)$, we get

$$\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) = -\mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) + b_1(z_1) \mathbf{A}(z_1) + \mathbf{B}(z_1) + \mathbf{C}(z_1), \quad (\text{S2.84})$$

where

$$\mathbf{A}(z_1) = \sum_{i \neq j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{v_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{B}(z_1) &= \sum_{i \neq j}^n \left\{ \beta_{ij}(z_1) - b_1(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1), \\ \mathbf{C}(z_1) &= \frac{v_2}{n} b_1(z_1) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \sum_{i \neq j}^n \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $|1 - t b_1(z)/z|^{-1} \leq \frac{|z/b_1(z)|}{\text{Im}\{z/b_1(z)\}} \leq \frac{|z|\{1+p/(nv_0)\}}{v_0}$. Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_p(z_1)\| \leq \frac{1 + p/(nv_0)}{v_0}. \quad (\text{S2.85})$$

For any random matrix $\mathbf{M}$, denote its nonrandom bound on the spectrum norm of $\mathbf{M}$ by $\|\mathbf{M}\|$. Since the same argument in (S2.77) holds for $\mathbf{D}_{12}^{-1}$, and from (S2.85), Lemma 5.4, we get

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr} \mathbf{B}(z_1) \mathbf{M}| \leq K \|\mathbf{M}\| \frac{|z_1|^2 \{1 + p/(nv_0)\}}{v_0^5} n^{1/2}. \quad (\text{S2.86})$$

From (S2.76), we have

$$|\text{tr} \mathbf{C}(z_1) \mathbf{M}| \leq \|\mathbf{M}\| \frac{|z_1| \{1 + p/(nv_0)\}}{v_0^3}. \quad (\text{S2.87})$$

From (S2.85) and Lemma 5.4, we get, for $\mathbf{M}$ nonrandom,

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr} \mathbf{A}(z_1) \mathbf{M}| \leq K \|\mathbf{M}\| \frac{1 + p/(nv_0)}{v_0^2} n^{1/2}. \quad (\text{S2.88})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}& \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{A}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{v_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \\ &+ \text{tr} \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{v_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \} \\ &+ \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \sum_{i > j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{v_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2),\end{aligned}$$

thus, by using $\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z) = -\beta_{ij}(z) \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z)$, we can write

$$\text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{A}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] = A_1(z_1, z_2) + A_2(z_1, z_2) + A_3(z_1, z_2) + R(z_1, z_2), \quad (\text{S2.89})$$

where

$$A_1(z_1, z_2) = - \sum_{i < j}^n \beta_{ij}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i, \quad (\text{S2.90})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2(z_1, z_2) &= -\frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) - \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right\}, \\
A_3(z_1, z_2) &= \text{tr} \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2), \\
R(z_1, z_2) &= \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \sum_{i > j}^n \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \left(\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbf{I}_p \right) \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2). \tag{S2.91}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $R(z_1, z_2) = O_P(1)$. We get from (S2.76) and (S2.85) that $|A_2(z_1, z_2)| \leq \frac{1+p/(nv_0)}{v_0^2}$. Similar to (S2.88), we have $\mathbb{E}|A_3(z_1, z_2)| \leq \frac{1+p/(nv_0)}{v_0^3} n^{1/2}$. It remains to derive the limit of $A_1(z_1, z_2)$. By using Lemma 5.4 and similar argument in (S2.101), we have, for $i < j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_{ij}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n^2} b_1(z_2) \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_{ij}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n^2} \beta_{ij}(z_2) \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\nu_2^2}{n^2} \left\{ \beta_{ij}(z_2) - b_1(z_2) \right\} \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \beta_{ij}(z_2) \left(\mathbf{r}_i' \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \right) \mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\nu_2}{n} \beta_{ij}(z_2) \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \left[\mathbf{r}_i' \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right] \right| \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\nu_2^2}{n^2} \left\{ \beta_{ij}(z_2) - b_1(z_2) \right\} \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \\
& \leq K n^{-1/2}. \tag{S2.92}
\end{aligned}$$

By (S2.76), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \leq K n. \tag{S2.93}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (S2.92) and (S2.93) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| A_1(z_1, z_2) + \frac{j-1}{n^2} \nu_2^2 b_1(z_2) \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right| \leq K n^{1/2}. \tag{S2.94}$$

By using (S2.84) – (S2.89), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] &= \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ -\mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) + b_1(z) \mathbf{A}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] + O_P(n^{1/2}) \\
&= -\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right\} + b_1(z_1) \text{tr} \mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{A}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) + O_P(n^{1/2}) \\
&= -\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right\} + b_1(z_1) A_1(z_1, z_2) + O_P(n^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (S2.94), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \left[1 + \frac{j-1}{n^2} \nu_2^2 b_1(z_1) b_1(z_2) \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right] \\ &= -\text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right\} + O_P(n^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

By using (S2.84) – (S2.88) and (S2.76), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \left[1 - \frac{j-1}{n^2} \nu_2^2 b_1(z_1) b_1(z_2) \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_p(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_p(z_2) \mathbf{Q}_p(z_1) \right\} + O_P(n^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.95})$$

From (S2.76), we have $|b_1(z) - b_p(z)| = O(n^{-1})$. This, together with (S2.81) and (S2.95), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E}_j \left\{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_1) \right\} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z_2) \right] \left[1 - \frac{\frac{j-1}{n} c_n \nu_2^2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1) \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)}{\{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} \nu_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1)\} \{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} \nu_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)\}} \right] \\ &= \frac{nc_n}{z_1 z_2} \frac{1}{\{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} \nu_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_1)\} \{1 + \frac{n-1}{n} \nu_2 \underline{m}_p^0(z_2)\}} + O_P(n^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma S2.2.

S2.9 Tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$

The proof of the tightness of $M_p^{(1)}(z)$ is similar to that provided in Bai and Silverstein [2004]. It is sufficient to prove the moment condition (12.51) of Billingsley [1968], i.e.

$$\sup_{n; z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{C}_n} \frac{\mathbb{E} |M_p^{(1)}(z_1) - M_p^{(1)}(z_2)|^2}{|z_1 - z_2|^2} \quad (\text{S2.96})$$

is finite.

Before proceeding, we provide some results needed in the proof later. First, moments of $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\|$, $\|\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)\|$ and $\|\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z)\|$ are bounded in p and $z \in \mathcal{C}_n$. It is easy to see that it is true for $z \in \mathcal{C}_u$ and for $z \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ if $x_\ell < 0$. For $z \in \mathcal{C}_r$ or, if $x_\ell > 0$, $z \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$, we have from Proposition 2.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)\|^m &\leq K_1 + v^{-m} P(\|\mathbf{B}_{(j)}\| \geq \eta_r \text{ or } \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}_{(j)}) \leq \eta_\ell) \\ &\leq K_1 + K_2 n^m \varepsilon^{-m} n^{-\ell} \leq K \end{aligned}$$

for large ℓ , where $\mathbf{B}_{(j)} = \mathbf{B}_p^0 - \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}_j'$, K_1, K_2, K are positive constants. Here η_r is any number between $\lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2$ and x_r ; if $x_\ell > 0$, η_ℓ is any number between x_ℓ and $\lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2$ and if $x_\ell < 0$, η_ℓ can be any negative number. So for any positive integer m ,

$$\max \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\|^m, \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)\|^m, \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{D}_{ij}^{-1}(z)\|^m \right) \leq K. \quad (\text{S2.97})$$

By the argument above, we can extend Lemma 5.4 and get

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(a(v) \prod_{\ell=1}^q \left(\mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{B}_{(\ell)}(v) \mathbf{r}_1 - n^{-1} \text{tr} \mathbf{B}_{(\ell)}(v) \right) \right) \right| \leq K n^{-1} \delta_n^{2q-4}, \quad (\text{S2.98})$$

where $\mathbf{B}_\ell(v)$ is independent of $\mathbf{r}_1$ and

$$\max(|a(v)|, \|\mathbf{B}_\ell(v)\|) \leq K \left(1 + n^s I_{\{\|\mathbf{B}_p^0\| \geq \eta_r \text{ or } \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}) \leq \eta_\ell\}} \right),$$

for some positive s , with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ being $\mathbf{B}_{(j)}$ or $\mathbf{B}_p^0$. By (S2.98), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_j(z)|^m \leq K_m n^{-1} \delta_n^{2m-4}. \quad (\text{S2.99})$$

where K_m is a positive constant. Let $\gamma_j(z) = \mathbf{r}_j' \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j - n^{-1} \nu_2 \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)$. By Lemma S1.2, (S2.98) and Hölder's inequality, with similar derivation on page 580 of Bai and Silverstein [2004], we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\gamma_j(z) - \varepsilon_j(z)|^m \leq \frac{K_m}{n^{m/2}}. \quad (\text{S2.100})$$

It follows from (S2.99) and (S2.100) that

$$\mathbb{E}|\gamma_j(z)|^m \leq K_m n^{-1} \delta_n^{2m-4}, \quad m \geq 2. \quad (\text{S2.101})$$

Next, we prove that $b_p(z)$ is bounded. With (S2.98), we have for any $m \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\beta_1(z)|^m \leq K_m. \quad (\text{S2.102})$$

Since $b_p(z) = \beta_1(z) + \beta_1(z)b_p(z)\gamma_1(z)$, it is derived from (S2.101) and (S2.102) that $|b_p(z)| \leq K_1 + K_2|b_p(z)|n^{-1/2}$. Hence, we have

$$|b_p(z)| \leq \frac{K_1}{1 - K_2 n^{-1/2}} \leq K. \quad (\text{S2.103})$$

With (S2.98) – (S2.103) and the same approach on Page 581 – 583 of Bai and Silverstein [2004], we can obtain that (S2.96) is finite.

S2.10 Proof of Lemma 5.8

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p(z) = \mathbf{I}_p + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{\mathbf{m}}_p(z) \mathbf{I}_p$, then

$$nA_p = \frac{p}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{\mathbf{m}}_p(z)} + p z \mathbb{E} \underline{\mathbf{m}}_p(z) = \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\} + \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \mathcal{P}_2(z)\}, \quad (\text{S2.104})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1(z) &= n \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 - \lambda \text{tr}\{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}, \\ \mathcal{P}_2(z) &= \lambda \text{tr}\{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\} - \lambda \text{tr}\{\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta_1 = b_p - b_p^2 \gamma_1 + \beta_1 b_p^2 \gamma_1^2$, where $\gamma_1 \equiv \gamma_1(z) := \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 - n^{-1} \nu_2 \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\} = b_p(z) \mathbb{E} \mathcal{P}_1(z) - b_p^2(z) \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\} + b_p^2(z) \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\}. \quad (\text{S2.105})$$

The estimates for $\mathbb{E} \mathcal{P}_1(z)$, $\mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\}$, $\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z)\}$, and $\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z) \mathcal{P}_2(z)\}$ are provided in the following lemma, and its proof is postponed to Section S2.11.

Lemma S2.3. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{P}_1(z) = \frac{n}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) + \frac{\nu_2 - \lambda}{n} \mathbb{E}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\}, \quad (\text{S2.106})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(z)\mathcal{P}_1(z)\} \\ &= n\mathbb{E}\left(\left\{\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\}\left[\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\right) \\ & \quad + \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}_p'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{1}_p\right\}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right] \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \mathbb{E}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.107})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z)\mathcal{P}_1(z)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{n\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z)\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1\right\} - \mathbb{E}\left[\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z)\text{tr}\{\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\right] \\ & \quad + \text{Cov}\left(\beta_1(z)\gamma_1^2(z), \text{tr}\{\lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\right) \\ &= O(\delta_n^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.108})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\mathcal{P}_2(z)\} = \frac{p\nu_2\lambda b_p^2(z)}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E}\text{tr}\left\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\} + O(n^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{S2.109})$$

where δ_n is as defined in the truncation condition 15.

From this lemma and (S2.104), (S2.105), we get

$$nA_p = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + o(1), \quad (\text{S2.110})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \frac{nb_p(z)}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) + \frac{\nu_2 - \lambda}{n} \mathbb{E}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} + \frac{b_p^2(z)\lambda \text{tr}\{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z)}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)} \\ & \quad - \frac{b_p^2(z)\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}_p'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{1}_p\right\}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right], \\ J_2 &= -nb_p^2(z)\mathbb{E}\left(\left\{\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\}\left[\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\right), \\ J_3 &= \frac{pb_p^2(z)\lambda\nu_2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The limits of J_1 , J_2 and J_3 are provided in the following lemma, whose proof is postponed to Section S2.12.

Lemma S2.4. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$,

$$J_1 \rightarrow -\frac{\underline{m}(z)\{z(\lambda + h_1)m(z) + \lambda\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)},$$

$$J_2 \rightarrow -\frac{cz^2 \underline{m}^2(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)},$$

$$J_3 \rightarrow \frac{c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}[\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)]}.$$

By this Lemma and (S2.110), we get the limit of nA_p .

S2.11 Proof of Lemma S2.3

Proof of (S2.106): this equation follows from the definition of $\gamma_1(z)$.

Proof of (S2.107): For $\mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(z)\mathcal{P}_1(z)\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(z)\mathcal{P}_1(z)\} \\ &= n\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\{\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) + \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\mathbb{E}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\}\right. \\ & \quad \times \left[\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\} + \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\Bigg\} \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)}\mathbb{E}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) \\ &= n\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\{\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\}\left[\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{1}_p\right\}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right] \\ & \quad + \frac{p\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)}\text{Cov}\left(\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right) \\ & \quad - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)}\text{Cov}\left(\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{1}_p\right) \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)}\mathbb{E}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) \\ &= n\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\{\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\}\left[\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{1}_p\right\}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right] \\ & \quad - \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)}\mathbb{E}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}\mathbb{E}\gamma_1(z) + O(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

which is the second equation in Lemma S2.3. Below are some interpretations of the above equalities:

1. The second equality uses the following derivation: By (S2.52), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & n\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\} \cdot \frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right] \\ & \quad + n\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\frac{\nu_2}{n}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \frac{\nu_2}{n}\mathbb{E}\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\right\} \cdot \mathbf{r}'_1 \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1\right] \\ &= \nu_2 \text{tr}\left(\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}'_1)\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right]\right) - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\text{tr}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\}\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \nu_2 \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_1') \right] - \nu_2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_1') \right] \\
& = \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\
& + \frac{p\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)} \text{Cov} \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \right) \\
& - \frac{\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)} \text{Cov} \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right).
\end{aligned}$$

2. The last equality is due to

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Cov} \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \right) = O(n^{-1}), \quad (\text{S2.111})$$

$$- \frac{1}{n(p-1)} \text{Cov} \left(\text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right) = O(n^{-1}). \quad (\text{S2.112})$$

The equation (S2.111) follows from the inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} - \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{M} \right|^2 \leq K \|\mathbf{M}\|^2, \quad (\text{S2.113})$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ is any deterministic $p \times p$ matrix. The proof of (S2.113) is similar to Equation (4.7) of Bai and Silverstein [2004]. The equation (S2.112) follows from (S2.113) and Lemma S1.5.

Proof of (S2.108): For $\mathbb{E} \{ \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z) \}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \{ \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathcal{P}_1(z) \} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ n \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} - \mathbb{E} \{ \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda \text{tr} \left\{ \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ n \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left[\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\
& \quad + \text{Cov} \left(\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z), \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 5.4 and equation (S2.113), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ n \beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left[\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z) \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\
& \leq n \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \gamma_1^2(z) \beta_1(z) \right|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left[\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\lambda}{n} \text{tr} \left\{ \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq K n (n^{-1} \delta_n^4)^{1/2} n^{-1/2} = K \delta_n^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} \left(\beta_1(z) \gamma_1^2(z), \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right) \\
& \leq \left\{ \mathbb{E} |\beta_1(z)|^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left\{ \mathbb{E} |\gamma_1^2(z)|^4 \right\}^{1/4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} - \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \lambda \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq K n^{-1/4} \delta_n^3.
\end{aligned}$$

These estimates yield (S2.108).

Proof of (S2.109): From (S2.52), and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) &= \beta_1(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z), \\ \beta_1(z) &= b_p(z) - b_p(z)\gamma_1(z)\beta_1(z), \\ \mathbb{E}\beta_1(z) &= b_p(z) + o(n^{-1/2}),\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\mathcal{P}_2(z)\} \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\} \text{tr} \left[\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ b_p(z) - b_p(z)\beta_1(z)\gamma_1(z) \right\} \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right] \\ &= \lambda b_p(z) \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \beta_1(z)\gamma_1(z) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} \right] \\ &= \lambda b_p^2(z) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} + O(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \lambda b_p^2(z) \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_1') \right] + O(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{\lambda b_p^2(z) p \nu_2}{n(p-1)} \text{tr} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right) \right] + O(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{\lambda b_p^2(z) p \nu_2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} + O(n^{-1/2}),\end{aligned}$$

which is (S2.109). Below are some interpretations of the above equalities:

1. The fourth equality follows from

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \beta_1(z) \gamma_1(z) \mathbf{r}_1' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_1 \right\} = O(n^{-1/2}),$$

which can be proved by using Lemma 5.4.

2. The last equality follows from

$$\frac{\lambda b_p^2(z) \nu_2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right\} = O(n^{-1}).$$

This can be proved by using Lemma 5.3 and Lemma S1.5.

S2.12 Proof of Lemma S2.4

Step 1: Consider J_1 . By Lemma 2.3 in Bai and Silverstein [2004], we have

$$\frac{1}{p} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \xrightarrow{P} m(z).$$

By this estimate, Equation (S2.52) and Lemma S1.5, we get

$$n \mathbb{E} \gamma_1(z) = \frac{p \nu_2}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p' \right) \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right\} - \nu_2 \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{\nu_2}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right\} + \frac{\nu_2}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \\
&\rightarrow \lambda \{m(z) + 1/z\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma S1.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{b_p^2(z)\nu_2^2}{n(p-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{1}_p' \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \mathbf{1}_p \right\} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \right] \\
&\rightarrow -\frac{cz^2 \underline{m}^2(z) \lambda^2}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)} \left\{ m^2(z) + \frac{m(z)}{z} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.3, Equation (S2.75) and the above estimates, we have

$$J_1 \rightarrow -\frac{z \underline{m}(z)}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)} \left\{ (\lambda + h_1) m(z) + \frac{\lambda}{z} \right\} = -\frac{\underline{m}(z) \{z(\lambda + h_1) m(z) + \lambda\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

Step 2: Consider J_2 . By Lemma 5.5, we have

$$J_2 = J_{21} + 2J_{22} + J_{23} + o(1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{21} &= -\frac{(\nu_4 - 3\nu_{12})b_p^2(z)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right]_{ii} \left[\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right]_{ii} \right), \\
J_{22} &= -\frac{\nu_{12} b_p^2(z)}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-2}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\}, \\
J_{23} &= -\frac{(\nu_{12} - \nu_2^2) b_p^2(z)}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \right]_{ii} \left[\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \right]_{ii} \right) \rightarrow \frac{m^2(z)}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}$, we have

$$J_{21} \rightarrow \frac{-c\alpha_1 z^2 m^2(z) \underline{m}^2(z)}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

Note that $\frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \mathbf{D}_1^{-2}(z) \rightarrow m'(z)$, thus we get

$$J_{22} \rightarrow -\frac{c\lambda^2 z^2 m'(z) \underline{m}^2(z)}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

By Lemma 5.3, we get

$$J_{23} \rightarrow -\frac{c\alpha_2 z^2 m^2(z) \underline{m}^2(z)}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

From these estimates, we have

$$J_2 \rightarrow -\frac{cz^2 \underline{m}^2(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\}}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)}.$$

Step 3: Consider J_3 . To calculate the limit of J_3 , we can expand $\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)$ like (S2.84) and find the limit of J_3 using the method similarly to Bai and Silverstein [2004]. The limit of J_3 is

$$\frac{c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\} [\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)]}.$$

S2.13 Proof of Lemma S1.5

By Lemma 5.4, we obtain, for any $2 \leq q \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there exists a positive constant K_q such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j|^q \\
& \leq K_q \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j - \frac{\nu_2}{n} \text{tr} \{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \} \right|^q \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left| \frac{\nu_2}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \} \right|^q \right) \\
& \leq K_q \left(n^{-2} \delta_n^{2q-4} + n^{-q} \right) = O(n^{-2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.114}$$

where $\frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \{ \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \} = \frac{1}{np} \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-2}(z) \mathbf{1}_p = O(n^{-1})$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{x}'_p \{ (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \} \mathbf{x}_p \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{x}'_p \left[(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \{ \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \} \right] \mathbf{x}_p \\
& = - \sum_{j=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma S1.2, (S2.114), and $|\beta_j(z)| \leq |z|/\nu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \right|^2 \\
& \leq K \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |(\mathbb{E}_j - \mathbb{E}_{j-1}) \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j|^2 \\
& \leq K \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} |\beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j|^2 \\
& \leq K n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}'_p \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}'_p \mathbb{E} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \mathbf{x}_p|^2 \rightarrow 0. \tag{S2.115}$$

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p(z) = \mathbf{I}_p + \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z) \mathbf{I}_p$. From $\underline{m}_p(z) = -\frac{1}{nz} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j(z)$ and $\mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) = \beta_j(z) \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{ -z \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p(z) \}^{-1} - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \\
& = -\frac{1}{z} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \{ \mathbf{D}(z) + z \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p(z) \} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \\
& = -\frac{1}{z} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}'_j + z \lambda \mathbb{E} \underline{m}_p(z) \mathbf{I}_p \right\} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \\
& = -\frac{1}{z} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j(z) \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{r}_j \mathbf{r}'_j \mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z) + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E} \{ \beta_1(z) \}}{z} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z) \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation of the above identity yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{-z\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p(z)\}^{-1} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) \\ &= -\frac{n}{z}\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_j^{-1}(z)\} + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\}}{z}\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by $-\mathbf{x}'_p$ on the left and $\mathbf{x}_p$ on the right, we have

$$\mathbf{x}'_p\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p + \frac{1}{z\{1 + \lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}_p(z)\}} = \rho_1(z) + \rho_2(z) + \rho_3(z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(z) &:= \frac{n}{z}\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\rho_{11}(z)\}, \\ \rho_{11}(z) &:= \mathbf{x}'_p\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_1'\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p - \frac{\lambda}{n}\mathbf{x}'_p\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p, \\ \rho_2(z) &:= \frac{\lambda}{z}\mathbb{E}\left[\beta_1(z)\mathbf{x}'_p\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\}\mathbf{x}_p\right], \\ \rho_3(z) &:= \frac{\lambda}{z}\mathbb{E}\left[\beta_1(z)\mathbf{x}'_p\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}_p^{-1}(z)\{\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\}\mathbf{x}_p\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the notations defined above and the following equalities:

$$\rho_1(z) = \frac{n}{z}\mathbb{E}\{\bar{\beta}_1(z)\rho_{11}(z)\} - \frac{n}{z}\mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(z)\bar{\beta}_1(z)\varepsilon_1(z)\rho_{11}(z)\}, \quad (\text{S2.116})$$

$$\bar{\beta}_1(z) = b_p(z) - \frac{\nu_2}{n}b_p(z)\bar{\beta}_1(z)\text{tr}\{\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z) - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\}. \quad (\text{S2.117})$$

From (S2.116) – (S2.117), Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4, it is easy to see that

$$\rho_1(z) = \frac{n\mathbb{E}\rho_{11}(z)}{z}\left\{\frac{1}{1 + c\lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z)} + o(1)\right\}. \quad (\text{S2.118})$$

From (S2.52) and Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\rho_{11}(z) = -\frac{1}{\lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z) + 1}\frac{\lambda}{n}\{\mathbf{x}'_p\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p + o(1)\}. \quad (\text{S2.119})$$

Therefore, by (S2.118) – (S2.119), and Lemma 5.3 we have

$$\rho_1(z) = \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z)}{\lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z) + 1}\mathbf{x}'_p\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}_1^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p + o(1).$$

Similarly to Bai et al. [2007], one may have $\rho_2(z) = o(1)$ and $\rho_3(z) = o(1)$. Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbf{x}'_p\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p}{1 + \lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z)} + \frac{1}{z\{1 + \mathbb{E}\lambda\mathbb{E}\underline{m}(z)\}} = o(1),$$

which implies that

$$\mathbf{x}'_p\mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}^{-1}(z)\mathbf{x}_p \rightarrow -\frac{1}{z}.$$

This, together with (S2.115), completes the proof of Lemma S1.5.

S2.14 Proof of Corollary 2.6

We begin by presenting some expressions that will be used in the subsequent calculations:

$$z = -\frac{1}{\underline{m}} + \frac{c\lambda}{1 + \lambda\underline{m}}, \quad (\text{S2.120})$$

$$dz = \frac{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2}{\underline{m}^2(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2} d\underline{m}, \quad (\text{S2.121})$$

$$m = \frac{-\underline{m}}{-1 - \lambda\underline{m} + c\lambda\underline{m}'}, \quad (\text{S2.122})$$

$$\frac{dm}{dz} = \frac{\underline{m}^2(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2}{\{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2\}(-1 - \lambda\underline{m} + c\lambda\underline{m}')^2}. \quad (\text{S2.123})$$

As their derivations are straightforward, the proofs are omitted.

S2.14.1 Calculation of expectation

The contour $\mathcal{C}$ is closed and taken in the positive direction in the complex plane, enclosing the support of F^c . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ denote the image of $\mathcal{C}$ under the mapping $\underline{m}$, that is, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{\underline{m}(z) : z \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

For $f_1 = x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_x &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z\underline{m}^3(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^2\underline{m}^2(z)\{h_1 m(z) + \lambda m(z) + \lambda/z\}\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{c}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^3\underline{m}^3(z)\{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\}\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz, \\ &=: I_1(f_1) + I_2(f_1) + I_3(f_1). \end{aligned}$$

For $I_1(f_1)$, by using (S2.120) and (S2.121), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(f_1) &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z\underline{m}^3(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \frac{\underline{m}^3(1 + \lambda\underline{m})}{\{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2\}^2} \frac{(-1 - \lambda\underline{m} + c\lambda\underline{m}')\{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2\}}{\underline{m}^3(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^3} d\underline{m} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \frac{c\lambda^2(1 + \lambda\underline{m} - c\lambda\underline{m}')}{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2\{c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2 - (1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2\}} d\underline{m}. \end{aligned}$$

The poles of $I_1(f_1)$ are $-\lambda^{-1}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_1(f_1) = \lambda(1 + c) - \frac{\lambda}{2}(1 + \sqrt{c})^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 = 0.$$

For the second integral $I_2(f_1)$, by using (S2.120) – (S2.122), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(f_1) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^2\underline{m}^2(z)\{1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)\}\{h_1 m(z) + \lambda m(z) + \lambda/z\}}{[1 + \lambda\underline{m}(z)]^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \frac{\underline{m}^2(1 + \lambda\underline{m})}{(1 + \lambda\underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2\underline{m}^2} \frac{1}{c} \left\{ (h_1 + \lambda)\underline{m} + (h_1 + \lambda - h_1 c) \frac{\underline{m}(1 + \lambda\underline{m})}{-1 - \lambda\underline{m} + c\lambda\underline{m}'} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \frac{(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^2 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}}{\underline{m}^4 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^4} d\underline{m} \\
& = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \frac{(\lambda^2 \underline{m} - h_1)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})}{\underline{m}(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^3} d\underline{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

The pole of $I_2(f_1)$ is $-\lambda^{-1}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_2(f_1) = h_1.$$

For $I_3(f_1)$, by using (S2.120) – (S2.123), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3(f_1) &= -\frac{c}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{z^3 \underline{m}^3(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \left[(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \left(\frac{-\underline{m}}{-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m}} \right)^2 + \frac{2\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2}{\{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^2} \right] \\
&\quad \times \frac{c \underline{m}^3 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2} \times \frac{(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^3 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}}{\underline{m}^5 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^5} d\underline{m} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \left\{ \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^4} d\underline{m} + \frac{2\lambda^2 c(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}} \right\} d\underline{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

The poles of $I_3(f_1)$ are $-\frac{1}{\lambda}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_3(f_1) = -2\lambda(1 + c) + \lambda(1 + \sqrt{c})^2 + \lambda(1 - \sqrt{c})^2 = 0.$$

Thus, we get

$$\mathbb{E}X_x = h_1.$$

For $f_2 = x^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}X_{x^2} &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{z^2 \underline{m}^3(z) \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{[\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)]^2} dz \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{z^3 \underline{m}^2(z) \{h_1 m(z) + \lambda m(z) + \lambda/z\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\
&\quad - \frac{c}{2\pi i} \oint_C \frac{z^4 \underline{m}^3(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)m^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 m'(z)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \frac{c\lambda^2 (-c\lambda \underline{m} + \lambda \underline{m} + 1)^2}{\underline{m}(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^3 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}} d\underline{m} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \frac{(\lambda^2 \underline{m} - h_1)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^2}{\underline{m}^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^4} d\underline{m} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{C}} \left\{ \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^2}{\underline{m}(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^5} d\underline{m} + \frac{2\lambda^2 c(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^2}{\underline{m}(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^3 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}} \right\} d\underline{m} \\
&=: I_1(f_2) + I_2(f_2) + I_3(f_2).
\end{aligned}$$

For the first integral $I_1(f_2)$, the poles are $-\lambda^{-1}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem,

$$I_1(f_2) = -c\lambda^2.$$

For the second integral $I_2(f_2)$, the pole is $-\lambda^{-1}$, we have by the residue theorem,

$$I_2(f_2) = \lambda(\lambda + 2ch_1 + 2h_1).$$

For the third integral $I_3(f_2)$, the poles are $-\lambda^{-1}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem,

$$I_3(f_2) = c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + 2\lambda^2 c.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{x^2} = (c+1)\lambda^2 + 2(c+1)\lambda h_1 + c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2).$$

For $f_3 = x^3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_{x^3} &= \frac{c\lambda^2}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^3 \underline{m}^3(z) \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{[\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)]^2} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^4 \underline{m}^2(z) \{h_1 \underline{m}(z) + \lambda \underline{m}(z) + \lambda/z\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &\quad - \frac{c}{2\pi i} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{z^5 \underline{m}^3(z) \{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \underline{m}^2(z) + 2\lambda^2 \underline{m}'(z)\} \{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}}{\{1 + \lambda \underline{m}(z)\}^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2(z)} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \frac{c\lambda^2 (-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^3}{\underline{m}^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^4 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}} d\underline{m} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \frac{(\lambda^2 \underline{m} - h_1)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^3}{\underline{m}^3 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^5} d\underline{m} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}} \left\{ \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^3}{\underline{m}^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^6} d\underline{m} + \frac{2\lambda^2 c(-1 - \lambda \underline{m} + c\lambda \underline{m})^3}{\underline{m}^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m})^4 \{(1 + \lambda \underline{m})^2 - c\lambda^2 \underline{m}^2\}} \right\} d\underline{m} \\ &=: I_1(f_3) + I_2(f_3) + I_3(f_3). \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral $I_1(f_3)$, the poles are $-\lambda^{-1}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_1(f_3) = -3c(1+c)\lambda^3.$$

For the second integral $I_2(f_3)$, the pole is $-\lambda^{-1}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_2(f_3) = \lambda^2 \{(2+3c)\lambda + 3(1+3c+c^2)h_1\}.$$

For the third integral $I_3(f_3)$, the poles are $-\lambda^{-1}$, $-\frac{1}{(1 \pm \sqrt{c})\lambda}$, we have by the residue theorem

$$I_3(f_3) = 3c(1+c)\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + 6c(1+c)\lambda^3.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{x^3} = (3c^2 + 6c + 2)\lambda^3 + 3(c^2 + 3c + 1)\lambda^2 h_1 + 3c(c+1)\lambda(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2).$$

S2.14.2 Calculation of variance

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}(X_{x^{r_1}}, X_{x^{r_2}}) \\ &= 2(\lambda c)^{r_1+r_2} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{r_2} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \binom{r_2}{k_2} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1+k_2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{r_1-k_1} \ell \binom{2r_1-1-k_1-\ell}{r_1-1} \binom{2r_2-1-k_2+\ell}{r_2-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.124})$$

$$+ \frac{c}{\lambda^2} (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) (\lambda c)^{r_1+r_2} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{r_2} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \binom{r_2}{k_2} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1+k_2} \binom{2r_1-k_1}{r_1-1} \binom{2r_2-k_2}{r_2-1}, \quad (\text{S2.125})$$

where $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}^+$. By using this result, we obtain the variances in Corollary 2.6. It suffices to prove the above equation. The contours $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are closed and taken in the positive direction in the complex plane, each enclosing the support of F^c . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_i$ be $\underline{m}(\mathcal{C}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. From Theorem 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X_{x^{r_1}}, X_{x^{r_2}}) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_2} \frac{z_1^{r_1} z_2^{r_2}}{(\underline{m}_1 - \underline{m}_2)^2} d\underline{m}_1 d\underline{m}_2 \\ &\quad - \frac{c(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)}{4\pi^2} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_2} \frac{z_1^{r_1} z_2^{r_2}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_2)^2} d\underline{m}_1 d\underline{m}_2, \\ &=: \text{Cov}_{r_1, r_2, 1} + \text{Cov}_{r_1, r_2, 2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of “ $\text{Cov}_{r_1, r_2, 1} = (\text{S2.124})$ ” is exactly analogous to Bai and Silverstein [2004], it is then omitted. Now, we prove that “ $\text{Cov}_{r_1, r_2, 2} = (\text{S2.125})$ ”. Note that

$$\oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_2} \frac{z_1^{r_1} z_2^{r_2}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2 (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_2)^2} d\underline{m}_1 d\underline{m}_2 = \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \frac{z_1^{r_1}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2} d\underline{m}_1 \times \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_2} \frac{z_2^{r_2}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_2)^2} d\underline{m}_2.$$

By (S2.120), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \frac{z_1^{r_1}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2} d\underline{m}_1 \\ &= \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \frac{\left(-\frac{1}{\underline{m}_1} + \frac{c\lambda}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1}\right)^{r_1}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2} d\underline{m}_1 \\ &= (\lambda c)^{r_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1} + \frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{r_1} \{1 - (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)\}^{-r_1} (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^{-2} d\underline{m}_1 \\ &= (\lambda c)^{r_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1} (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^{k_1-r_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{r_1+j-1}{j} (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^j (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^{-2} d\underline{m}_1 \\ &= (\lambda c)^{r_1} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{r_1+j-1}{j} (1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^{k_1-r_1+j-2} d\underline{m}_1, \end{aligned}$$

by substitution $\widetilde{m}_1 = \lambda \underline{m}_1$, we get

$$\oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \frac{z_1^{r_1} d\underline{m}_1}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2} = \frac{(\lambda c)^{r_1}}{\lambda} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1} \oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{r_1+j-1}{j} (1 + \widetilde{m}_1)^{k_1-r_1+j-2} d\widetilde{m}_1,$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1$ is the $\tilde{m}_1$ contour. For this integral, the pole is -1 , we have by residual theorem

$$\oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_1} \frac{z_1^{r_1}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_1)^2} d\underline{m}_1 = \frac{2\pi i}{\lambda} (\lambda c)^{r_1} \sum_{k_1=0}^{r_1} \binom{r_1}{k_1} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_1} \binom{2r_1-k_1}{r_1-1}.$$

Similarly, we get

$$\oint_{\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_2} \frac{z_2^{r_2}}{(1 + \lambda \underline{m}_2)^2} d\underline{m}_2 = \frac{2\pi i}{\lambda} (\lambda c)^{r_2} \sum_{k_2=0}^{r_2} \binom{r_2}{k_2} \left(\frac{1-c}{c}\right)^{k_2} \binom{2r_2-k_2}{r_2-1}.$$

Using the two equations above, we derive (S2.125).

S2.15 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Before moving to the proof of Theorem 3.1, we first establish a lemma of $\nu_2^\circ := \mathbb{E}\{pw_1/(\sum_{k=1}^p w_k) - 1\}^2$ as follows. The proof of this lemma is provided in Section S2.17.

Lemma S2.5. Suppose that $p \asymp n$ and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)'$ has positive i.i.d. entries with $\mathbb{E}w_1 = \mu > 0$, $\mathbb{E}(w_1 - \mu)^2 = \sigma^2$, and $\mathbb{E}|w_1 - \mu|^{6+s} < \infty$ for some $s > 0$, then we have

$$\nu_2^\circ = \lambda + \frac{h_1}{p} + o(p^{-1}),$$

where $\lambda = \sigma^2/\mu^2$, and $h_1 = -2\mathbb{E}w_1^3/\mu^3 + 3\lambda^2 + 5\lambda + 2$.

Recall that

$$T = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2) - \frac{2\nu_2^\circ}{p-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) + \frac{p(\nu_2^\circ)^2}{p-1}.$$

Taking $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 = 2$ in (S2.124) – (S2.125), we obtain that

$$V_{12} := \text{Cov}(\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2)) = 2\lambda c(1+c)(2\lambda^2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2).$$

From Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6, we have the following joint CLT:

$$p \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2) - \lambda^2(1+c_N) - \frac{\mu_2}{p} \\ \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}) - \lambda - \frac{\mu_1}{p} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} V_2 & V_{12} \\ V_{12} & V_1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Define a function $f(x, y) = x - \frac{2p\nu_2^\circ}{p-1}y + \frac{p(\nu_2^\circ)^2}{p-1}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} T &= f\left(\frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N}^2), \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p,N})\right), \\ \nabla f\left(\lambda^2(1+c_N) + \frac{\mu_2}{p}, \lambda + \frac{\mu_1}{p}\right) &= \left(1, -\frac{2p\nu_2^\circ}{p-1}\right)', \\ f\left(\lambda^2(1+c_N) + \frac{\mu_2}{p}, \lambda + \frac{\mu_1}{p}\right) &= \underbrace{\lambda^2 c_N + \frac{\mu_2}{p} - \frac{2\lambda h_1 + \lambda^2}{p-1}}_{=:\mu_T} + O(p^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equation we use Lemma S2.5. By the Delta method, we obtain that $p(T - \mu_T)$ is asymptotically Gaussian with mean zero and variance

$$\sigma_T^2 = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \left(1, -\frac{2pv_2^\circ}{p-1} \right) \begin{pmatrix} V_2 & V_{12} \\ V_{12} & V_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\frac{2pv_2^\circ}{p-1} \end{pmatrix} \right\} = 4\lambda^2 V_1 - 4\lambda V_{12} + V_2.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

S2.16 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Define

$$T^* = \frac{1}{p} \left\| \mathbf{B}_{p, N_1}^{(1)} - \frac{pv_2^\circ}{p-1} \mathbf{G}_p \right\|_F^2,$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{T} - T^* &= \frac{2(\hat{v}_2^\circ - v_2^\circ)}{p-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{p, N_1}^{(1)}) + \frac{p\{(\nu_2^\circ)^2 - (\hat{v}_2^\circ)^2\}}{p-1} \\ &= \frac{2\{\hat{\lambda} - \lambda - h_1/p - o(p^{-1})\}}{p-1} \{p\lambda + O_P(1)\} + \frac{p\{\lambda^2 + 2\lambda h_1/p + O(p^{-2}) - \hat{\lambda}^2\}}{p-1} \\ &= -\frac{p(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2}{p-1} + o_P(p^{-1}) \\ &= O_P(p^{-2}) + o_P(p^{-1}) = o_P(p^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Corollary 2.6 and Lemma S2.5, and the fourth equality follows from the CLT of $\hat{\lambda}$ as shown in (S2.127). Let

$$\tilde{\mu}_T = \frac{p\lambda^2}{n_1 - 1} + \frac{\hat{\mu}_2}{p} - \frac{2\hat{\lambda}\hat{h}_1 + \hat{\lambda}^2}{p-1},$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(\widetilde{T} - \hat{\mu}_T) &= p(\widetilde{T} - T^*) + p(T^* - \tilde{\mu}_T) + \frac{p^2(\lambda^2 - \hat{\lambda}^2)}{n_1 - 1} \\ &= p(T^* - \tilde{\mu}_T) + pc_1(\lambda^2 - \hat{\lambda}^2) + o_P(1). \end{aligned} \tag{S2.126}$$

The two leading terms in (S2.126) are independent, so we consider their asymptotic distributions separately. From Theorem 3.1, we obtain the asymptotic distribution of the first term in (S2.126) as follows:

$$p(T^* - \tilde{\mu}_T) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_T^2),$$

where σ_T^2 is defined similarly to σ_T^2 in Theorem 3.1, with the limiting value c replaced by c_1 . We claim that the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\lambda}$ (will be proven later) is

$$p(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(h_1, c_2\{\mathbb{E}(\tilde{w}_{11} - 1)^4 - \lambda^2 + h_2 - 2\lambda h_1\}), \tag{S2.127}$$

where $\tilde{w}_{11}$ is defined below in (S2.128). Using the Delta method again, we have

$$pc_1(\hat{\lambda}^2 - \lambda^2) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(2c_1\lambda h_1, 4\lambda^2 c_1^2 c_2\{\mathbb{E}(\tilde{w}_{11} - 1)^4 - \lambda^2 + h_2 - 2\lambda h_1\}).$$

This, together with (S2.126), Theorem 3.1, and the fact that $\tilde{T}$ and $\hat{\lambda}$ are independent, implies the asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{T}$.

Finally, we prove (S2.127). Let

$$\tilde{w}_{ij} := \frac{w_{ij}}{\mu}, \quad w_i^{[k]} \equiv w_i^{[k,p]} := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{w}_{ij}^k, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (\text{S2.128})$$

By the Lindeberg's CLT, we have

$$\sqrt{p} \begin{pmatrix} w_i^{(2)} - (\lambda + 1) \\ w_i^{(1)} - 1 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^4 - (\lambda + 1)^2 & \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 - \lambda - 1 \\ \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 - \lambda - 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

By Taylor's theorem and Lindeberg's CLT, we have the following approximation:

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \hat{\lambda}_i + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p^{3/2}} \right),$$

where

$$\hat{\lambda}_i := w_i^{[2]} - 2w_i^{[1]} + 1 - 2(w_i^{[2]} - w_i^{[1]})(w_i^{[1]} - 1) + (3w_i^{[2]} - 2w_i^{[1]})(w_i^{[1]} - 1)^2.$$

Define a function $f(x, y) = x - 2y + 1 - 2(x - y)(y - 1) + (3x - 2y)(y - 1)^2$. Then we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_i = f(w_i^{[2]}, w_i^{[1]}), \quad f(\lambda + 1, 1) = \lambda, \quad \nabla f(\lambda + 1, 1) = (1, -2\lambda - 2)'. \quad (\text{S2.129})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\nabla f(\lambda + 1, 1)\}' \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^4 - (\lambda + 1)^2 & \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 - \lambda - 1 \\ \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 - \lambda - 1 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \nabla f(\lambda + 1, 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^4 - 4(\lambda + 1)\mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 + (\lambda + 1)^2(4\lambda + 3) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{w}_{11} - 1)^4 - \lambda^2 + h_2 - 2\lambda h_1. \end{aligned}$$

By the Delta method, we have

$$\sqrt{p}(\hat{\lambda}_i - \lambda) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{E}(\tilde{w}_{11} - 1)^4 - \lambda^2 + h_2 - 2\lambda h_1). \quad (\text{S2.129})$$

Since

$$p(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \sqrt{p}(\hat{\lambda}_i - \lambda) + o_P(1), \quad (\text{S2.130})$$

it is necessary to expand the expectation of $\hat{\lambda}_i$ up to the order $O(p^{-1})$. From direct calculations, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_i^{[1]} &= 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_i^{[2]} = \lambda + 1, \\ \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{w}_i^{[1]}(\tilde{w}_i^{[1]} - 1)\} &= \frac{\lambda}{p}, \quad \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{w}_i^{[2]}(\tilde{w}_i^{[1]} - 1)\} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 - \lambda - 1}{p}, \\ \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{w}_i^{[1]}(\tilde{w}_i^{[1]} - 1)^2\} &= \frac{\lambda}{p} + O(p^{-2}), \quad \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{w}_i^{[2]}(\tilde{w}_i^{[1]} - 1)^2\} = \frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{p} + O(p^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{\lambda}_i = \lambda + \frac{-2\mathbb{E}\tilde{w}_{11}^3 + 3\lambda^2 + 5\lambda + 2}{p} + o_P(p^{-1}) = \lambda + \frac{h_1}{p} + o_P(p^{-1}). \quad (\text{S2.131})$$

From (S2.129), (S2.130), (S2.131) and the fact that $\{\hat{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_2}$ are independent, we obtain (S2.127). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

S2.17 Proof of Lemma S2.5

Similar to the derivation of equation (S2.33), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{w_1^2}{\bar{w}^2} - \mathbb{E} \frac{w_1^2}{\mu^2} = -\frac{2\mathbb{E}w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)}{\mu^3} + \frac{3\mathbb{E}w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)^2}{\mu^4} + \mathbb{E}a^\circ - \mathbb{E}b^\circ + \mathbb{E}c^\circ, \quad (\text{S2.132})$$

where $\bar{w} = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p w_j$, $a^\circ := \frac{w_1^2}{\mu^2} a\left(\frac{\bar{w} - \mu}{\mu}\right) I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}$ with $|a\left(\frac{\bar{w} - \mu}{\mu}\right)| \leq C_1 \left|\frac{\bar{w} - \mu}{\mu}\right|^3$, $b^\circ := \{w_1^2/\mu^2 - 2w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)/\mu^3 + 3w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)^2/\mu^4\} I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)}$, $c^\circ := (w_1^2/\bar{w}^2) I_{B_p^c(\varepsilon)}$, $B_p(\varepsilon) = \{\omega : |\bar{w} - \mu| \leq \varepsilon, \bar{w} = \sum_{j=1}^p w_j/p, \mu = \mathbb{E}w_1\}$, and the probability of its complement admits the following bound

$$\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) \leq C_t \varepsilon^{-t} p^{-t} \left\{ (p\mathbb{E}|w_1 - \mu|^2)^{t/2} + p\mathbb{E}|w_1 - \mu|^t \right\}, \quad (\text{S2.133})$$

where ε , t , and C_t (which depends on t) are positive constants. By straightforward calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|a^\circ| &\leq C\varepsilon \mathbb{E}|w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)^2 I_{B_p(\varepsilon)}| \leq C\varepsilon \mathbb{E}|w_1^2(\bar{w} - \mu)^2| = \frac{C\varepsilon}{p^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^p \mathbb{E}w_1^2(w_i - \mu)(w_j - \mu) \\ &= \frac{C\varepsilon}{p^2} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}w_1^2(w_i - \mu)^2 = \frac{C\varepsilon}{p^2} \mathbb{E}w_1^2(w_1 - \mu)^2 + \frac{C\varepsilon(p-1)}{p^2} \mathbb{E}w_1^2 \mathbb{E}(w_1 - \mu)^2 \leq C\varepsilon p^{-1}, \\ |\mathbb{E}b^\circ| &\leq C \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{P}^{1/4}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{p^2} \right\}, \\ |\mathbb{E}c^\circ| &\leq p^2 \mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant. Given that $\mathbb{E}|w_1 - \mu|^{6+s} < \infty$ for some $s > 0$, we use this moment condition to estimate $\mathbb{P}(B_p^c(\varepsilon))$ by taking $t = 6 + s$ in (S2.133). Consequently, we obtain $\mathbb{E}a^\circ - \mathbb{E}b^\circ + \mathbb{E}c^\circ = o(p^{-1})$. Combining this with equation (S2.132), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{w_1}{\bar{w}} - 1 \right)^2 = \lambda + \frac{h_1}{p} + o(p^{-1}),$$

which corresponds to the result stated in Lemma S2.5.

S2.18 Proof of Example 1

In this section, we aim to prove

$$\Delta_{p,n}^\mathbb{E} = \frac{\lambda^2 \{ (\sum_{k=1}^p d_k^2)^2 - p^2 \}}{n} + \lambda^2 \sum_{k=1}^p (d_k^2 - 1)^2 + o(p) \asymp p. \quad (\text{S2.134})$$

Recall the assumptions in Example 1:

Assumption S2.6.

$$\sum_{k=1}^p d_k = p, \quad \max_k d_k = O(1), \quad \sum_{k=1}^p (d_k^2 - 1)^2 \asymp p.$$

Assumption S2.7. The positive random variables $\{z_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ are i.i.d. with

$$\mathbb{E}z_{11} = \mu > 0, \quad \text{Var}(z_{11}) = \sigma^2, \quad \lambda = \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2},$$

$$\mathbb{E}|z_{11}|^{32} < \infty, \quad \sup_p \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^p d_\ell z_{1\ell} / p \right|^{-32} < \infty.$$

We claim that under the above assumptions, we have the following estimates:

$$\mathbb{E}_{H_1} \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 = \frac{\lambda^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^p d_j^2 \right)^2}{n} + \lambda^2 \sum_{j=1}^p (d_j^2 - 1)^2 + o(p), \quad (\text{S2.135})$$

$$\text{Var}_{H_1}(\|\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2) = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.136})$$

By the definition of μ_T , since $N = n - 1$ and $p/N \rightarrow c$, we have

$$p\mu_T = \frac{\lambda^2 p^2}{N} + \mu_2 - \frac{p}{p-1} (2\lambda h_1 + \lambda^2) = \frac{\lambda^2 p^2}{n} + O(1).$$

Subtracting this expression from (S2.135) gives the expansion in (S2.134). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Assumption S2.6 then imply $\Delta_{p,n}^{\mathbb{E}} \asymp p$.

We first introduce some notations. Let

$$\varepsilon_{ij} := \frac{z_{ij}}{\mu} - 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\varepsilon_{ij} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}\varepsilon_{ij}^2 = \lambda.$$

Under the null hypothesis, define

$$x_{ij} = \frac{z_{ij}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^p z_{i\ell}}.$$

Under the diagonal alternative in Example 1, define

$$y_{ij} = \frac{d_j z_{ij}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^p d_\ell z_{i\ell}}.$$

Let

$$\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij})_{n \times p}, \quad \mathbf{Y} = (y_{ij})_{n \times p}, \quad N = n - 1,$$

and

$$\mathbf{B}_0 = \frac{p^2}{N} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{X}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1 = \frac{p^2}{N} \mathbf{Y}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{Y}, \quad \mathbf{C}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n'.$$

The null target matrix is

$$\mathbf{B} = \text{Cov}(p\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p\nu_2^\circ}{p-1} \mathbf{G}_p, \quad \mathbf{G}_p := \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p', \quad \nu_2^\circ = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{pz_{11}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^p z_{1\ell}} - 1 \right)^2.$$

For the alternative, put

$$U_i = (U_{i1}, \dots, U_{ip})', \quad U_{ij} := py_{ij} = \frac{d_j z_{ij}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^p d_\ell z_{i\ell} / p}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n (U_i - \bar{U})(U_i - \bar{U})', \quad \bar{U} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n U_i.$$

Define

$$\xi_i := U_i - \mathbb{E}U_i, \quad \Gamma_p := \mathbb{E}\xi_i \xi_i', \quad \Delta_p := \Gamma_p - \mathbf{B}.$$

The symbol Δ_p is used only in this proof and should not be confused with the main-text quantity $\Delta_{p,n}^{\mathbb{E}}$. Let

$$\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_p)', \quad \mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_p), \quad S_2 := \sum_{j=1}^p d_j^2, \quad \mathbf{K}_p := \mathbf{D} - \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{d} \mathbf{d}'.$$

Since $\sum_j d_j = p$ and $\max_j d_j = O(1)$, we have

$$S_2 = O(p), \quad \sum_{j=1}^p d_j^4 = O(p), \quad \|\mathbf{K}_p\| = O(1), \quad \|\mathbf{K}_p\|_F = O(\sqrt{p}).$$

For each row i , define

$$a_i := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{\ell=1}^p d_{\ell} \varepsilon_{i\ell}, \quad \varepsilon_i = (\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{ip})', \quad L_i := \mathbf{K}_p \varepsilon_i.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{\ell=1}^p d_{\ell} z_{i\ell} = \mu(1 + a_i),$$

and hence

$$U_i = \mathbf{d} + \eta_i, \quad \eta_i := \frac{L_i}{1 + a_i}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\eta_i = L_i + r_i, \quad r_i := -\frac{a_i}{1 + a_i} L_i, \quad \xi_i = L_i + s_i, \quad s_i := r_i - \mathbb{E}r_i.$$

We shall repeatedly use the following elementary bounds. For $2 \leq q \leq 32$, Rosenthal's inequality (Lemma S1.4) gives

$$\mathbb{E}|a_i|^q = O(p^{-q/2}). \quad (\text{S2.137})$$

Moreover, since $\|\mathbf{K}_p\| = O(1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\|L_i\|^q = O(p^{q/2}), \quad 2 \leq q \leq 32. \quad (\text{S2.138})$$

Using (S2.137), (S2.138), Assumption S2.7 and Hölder's inequality, for $2 \leq q \leq 8$,

$$\mathbb{E}\|r_i\|^q = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{|a_i|^q \|L_i\|^q}{|1 + a_i|^q} \right\} = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.139})$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\xi_i\|^8 = O(p^4). \quad (\text{S2.140})$$

We next consider the population covariance expansion. Since

$$\mathbb{E}L_i L_i' = \lambda \mathbf{K}_p^2,$$

it remains to control the terms involving s_i . For fixed j, k ,

$$\mathbb{E}(L_{ij} r_{ik}) = -\mathbb{E}\left\{L_{ij} L_{ik} \frac{a_i}{1+a_i}\right\} = -\mathbb{E}(L_{ij} L_{ik} a_i) + \mathbb{E}\left\{L_{ij} L_{ik} \frac{a_i^2}{1+a_i}\right\}.$$

The first term is $O(p^{-1})$ by independence and Assumption S2.6. The second term is $O(p^{-1})$ by Hölder's inequality, the bound (S2.137), and Assumption S2.7. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}(r_{ij} r_{ik}) = O(p^{-1}), \quad \mathbb{E}r_{ij} = O(p^{-1}),$$

uniformly in j, k . Therefore

$$\Gamma_p = \lambda \mathbf{K}_p^2 + \mathbf{R}_p, \quad \max_{1 \leq j, k \leq p} |R_{p,jk}| = O(p^{-1}), \quad \|\mathbf{R}_p\|_F = O(1), \quad \|\mathbf{R}_p\| = O(1).$$

Thus,

$$\|\Gamma_p\| = O(1). \tag{S2.141}$$

Taking $d_1 = \dots = d_p = 1$ gives the corresponding null expansion

$$\mathbf{B} = \lambda \mathbf{G}_p + \mathbf{R}_p^{(0)}, \quad \|\mathbf{R}_p^{(0)}\|_F = O(1), \quad \|\mathbf{R}_p^{(0)}\| = O(1).$$

Hence

$$\Delta_p = \Gamma_p - \mathbf{B} = \lambda(\mathbf{K}_p^2 - \mathbf{G}_p) + O_F(1), \quad \|\Delta_p\| = O(1). \tag{S2.142}$$

Here, $O_F(1)$ denotes a matrix whose Frobenius norm is $O(1)$. For the diagonal entries,

$$(\mathbf{K}_p^2)_{jj} = d_j^2 - \frac{2d_j^3}{p} + \frac{d_j^2 S_2}{p^2} = d_j^2 + O(p^{-1}),$$

whereas

$$(\mathbf{G}_p)_{jj} = 1 - \frac{1}{p} = 1 + O(p^{-1}).$$

For $j \neq k$,

$$(\mathbf{K}_p^2)_{jk} = -\frac{d_j d_k (d_j + d_k)}{p} + \frac{d_j d_k S_2}{p^2} = O(p^{-1}), \quad (\mathbf{G}_p)_{jk} = -\frac{1}{p}.$$

Thus

$$\|\mathbf{K}_p^2 - \mathbf{G}_p\|_F^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p (d_j^2 - 1)^2 + O(1),$$

and therefore

$$\|\Delta_p\|_F^2 = \lambda^2 \sum_{j=1}^p (d_j^2 - 1)^2 + o(p). \tag{S2.143}$$

By Assumption S2.6, we have

$$\|\Delta_p\|_F^2 = O(p). \tag{S2.144}$$

We now prove (S2.135). Let

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \xi_i'.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_n - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \|\xi_1 \xi_1' - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 = \frac{1}{n} (\mathbb{E} \|\xi_1\|^4 - \|\Gamma_p\|_F^2). \quad (\text{S2.145})$$

Since $\xi_1 = L_1 + s_1$, (S2.138), and (S2.139),

$$\mathbb{E} \|\xi_1\|^4 = \mathbb{E} \|L_1\|^4 + o(p^2).$$

Furthermore,

$$\|L_1\|^2 = \varepsilon_1' \mathbf{K}_p^2 \varepsilon_1.$$

The standard quadratic-form identity for independent entries gives

$$\mathbb{E} \|L_1\|^4 = \lambda^2 \{\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^2)\}^2 + 2\lambda^2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^4) + (\mathbb{E} \varepsilon_{11}^4 - 3\lambda^2) \sum_{j=1}^p \{(\mathbf{K}_p^2)_{jj}\}^2.$$

Because

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^2) = S_2 + O(1), \quad \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^4) = O(p), \quad \sum_{j=1}^p \{(\mathbf{K}_p^2)_{jj}\}^2 = O(p),$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \|\xi_1\|^4 = \lambda^2 S_2^2 + o(p^2).$$

This, together with (S2.144) and (S2.145), gives

$$\mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_n - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 = \frac{\lambda^2 S_2^2}{n} + o(p). \quad (\text{S2.146})$$

The actual unbiased sample covariance satisfies

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \frac{n}{N} \widehat{\Gamma}_n - \frac{n}{N} \overline{\xi} \overline{\xi}', \quad \overline{\xi} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i.$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \|\overline{\xi} \overline{\xi}'\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\overline{\xi}\|^4 = O(1), \quad \frac{n}{N} - 1 = O(n^{-1}),$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_n - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 + o(p).$$

Combining this with (S2.146) gives

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 = \frac{\lambda^2 S_2^2}{n} + o(p). \quad (\text{S2.147})$$

Because $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{B}_1 = \Gamma_p$,

$$\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{B}_1 - \Gamma_p\|_F^2 + \|\Gamma_p - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2.$$

Using (S2.143) and (S2.147), we obtain (S2.135).

Finally, we prove (S2.136). We first collect the row-wise moment bounds needed below. Define

$$\mathbf{A}_i := \xi_i \xi_i' - \Gamma_p.$$

Under the Assumptions S2.6 and S2.7, we have

$$\text{Var}(\xi_i' \mathbf{M} \xi_i) = O(p) \quad \text{for every deterministic } \mathbf{M} \text{ with } \|\mathbf{M}\| = O(1), \quad (\text{S2.148})$$

$$\mathbb{E}(\xi_i' \xi_j)^4 = O(p^2), \quad i \neq j, \quad (\text{S2.149})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{A}_j \rangle^2 = O(p^2), \quad i \neq j, \quad (\text{S2.150})$$

$$\text{Var}(\|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2) = O(p^3). \quad (\text{S2.151})$$

Here, $\langle \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{A}_j \rangle := \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{A}_j')$.

To prove (S2.148), first assume $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}'$. Then

$$L_i' \mathbf{M} L_i = \varepsilon_i' \mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{M} \mathbf{K}_p \varepsilon_i,$$

and the usual variance formula for quadratic forms gives

$$\text{Var}(L_i' \mathbf{M} L_i) = O(\|\mathbf{K}_p \mathbf{M} \mathbf{K}_p\|_F^2) = O(p).$$

Moreover,

$$\xi_i' \mathbf{M} \xi_i - L_i' \mathbf{M} L_i = 2s_i' \mathbf{M} L_i + s_i' \mathbf{M} s_i,$$

whose second moment is $O(p)$ by Cauchy's inequality, (S2.139), and (S2.138). This proves (S2.148). If $\mathbf{M}$ is not symmetric, replace it by $(\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}')/2$.

For (S2.149), first note that for deterministic $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\mathbb{E}|v' \xi_i|^4 \leq C\|v\|^4.$$

This follows from $v' \xi_i = v' \mathbf{K}_p \varepsilon_i + v' s_i$, Rosenthal's inequality for $v' \mathbf{K}_p \varepsilon_i$, and the same Hölder bound for $v' s_i$. Conditioning on ξ_i , we get

$$\mathbb{E}\{(\xi_i' \xi_j)^4 \mid \xi_i\} \leq C\|\xi_i\|^4.$$

Taking expectation and using (S2.140) gives (S2.149).

The estimate (S2.150) follows from $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_i = 0$, (S2.148) and (S2.149).

For (S2.151), first observe that

$$Q_i := \|L_i\|^2 = \varepsilon_i' \mathbf{K}_p^2 \varepsilon_i, \quad \|\xi_i\|^2 = Q_i + R_i, \quad R_i = 2L_i' s_i + \|s_i\|^2$$

Applying the quadratic-form fourth-moment bound to Q_i , we have

$$\mathbb{E}|Q_i - \mathbb{E}Q_i|^4 = \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_i' \mathbf{K}_p^2 \varepsilon_i - \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_i' \mathbf{K}_p^2 \varepsilon_i)|^4 \leq C \left[\left\{ \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^4) \right\}^2 + \text{tr}(\mathbf{K}_p^8) \right] = O(p^2).$$

By Cauchy's inequality, (S2.139), and (S2.138), $\mathbb{E}|R_i - \mathbb{E}R_i|^4 \leq C\mathbb{E}|R_i|^4 = O(p^2)$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}|\|\xi_i\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|\xi_i\|^2|^4 \leq C\mathbb{E}|Q_i - \mathbb{E}Q_i|^4 + C\mathbb{E}|R_i - \mathbb{E}R_i|^4 = O(p^2).$$

Let

$$m_i := \mathbb{E}\|\xi_i\|^2, \quad Z_i := \|\xi_i\|^2 - m_i.$$

Then

$$\|\xi_i\|^4 - \mathbb{E}\|\xi_i\|^4 = 2m_i Z_i + (Z_i^2 - \mathbb{E}Z_i^2).$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Var}(\|\xi_i\|^4) \leq C m_i^2 \mathbb{E}|Z_i|^2 + C \mathbb{E}|Z_i|^4 = O(p^2)O(p) + O(p^2) = O(p^3). \quad (\text{S2.152})$$

Finally,

$$\|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2 = \|\xi_i\|^4 - 2\xi_i' \Gamma_p \xi_i + \text{tr}(\Gamma_p^2),$$

(S2.152) and (S2.148) with $\mathbf{M} = \Gamma_p$ give (S2.151).

Now decompose

$$\bar{\xi} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \quad R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{A}_i, \quad M_n = \bar{\xi} \bar{\xi}', \quad a_n = \frac{n}{N}, \quad H_n = \Delta_p + \frac{1}{N} \Gamma_p.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{B} = a_n R_n - a_n M_n + H_n.$$

Using (S2.141) and (S2.142), we have $\|H_n\| = O(1)$. It is enough to prove that the following five random quantities have variance of order $O(1)$:

$$\|R_n\|_F^2, \quad \|M_n\|_F^2, \quad \langle R_n, M_n \rangle, \quad \langle R_n, H_n \rangle, \quad \langle M_n, H_n \rangle.$$

First,

$$\|R_n\|_F^2 = D_R + U_R,$$

where

$$D_R := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2, \quad U_R := \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} h_{ij}, \quad h_{ij} := \langle \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{A}_j \rangle.$$

Using (S2.151),

$$\text{Var}(D_R) = \frac{1}{n^4} \sum_{i=1}^n O(p^3) = O(1),$$

because $p/n \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, by independence and $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_i = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}h_{ij}h_{k\ell} = 0 \quad \text{unless} \quad \{i, j\} = \{k, \ell\}.$$

Using (S2.150),

$$\text{Var}(U_R) = \frac{4}{n^4} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbb{E}h_{ij}^2 = \frac{4}{n^4} \binom{n}{2} O(p^2) = O(1).$$

Thus

$$\text{Var}(\|R_n\|_F^2) = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.153})$$

Second, by the Rosenthal inequality and (S2.140),

$$\mathbb{E}\|\bar{\xi}\|^8 = O\left(\frac{p^4}{n^4}\right) + O\left(\frac{p^4}{n^7}\right) = O(1).$$

Hence

$$\text{Var}(\|M_n\|_F^2) \leq \mathbb{E}\|M_n\|_F^4 = \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\xi}\|^8 = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.154})$$

Also, since $\|H_n\| = O(1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\langle M_n, H_n \rangle^2 = \mathbb{E}(\bar{\xi}' H_n \bar{\xi})^2 \leq C \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\xi}\|^4 = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.155})$$

Third, using $R_n = n^{-1} \sum_i \mathbf{A}_i$,

$$\langle R_n, H_n \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \xi_i' H_n \xi_i - \text{tr}(\Gamma_p H_n) \right\}.$$

By (S2.148),

$$\text{Var}(\langle R_n, H_n \rangle) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\xi_i' H_n \xi_i) \leq \frac{Cp}{n} = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.156})$$

Finally, consider $\langle R_n, M_n \rangle$. Let

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \xi_i'.$$

Then

$$\langle R_n, M_n \rangle = \bar{\xi}' R_n \bar{\xi} = \bar{\xi}' \widehat{\Gamma}_n \bar{\xi} - \bar{\xi}' \Gamma_p \bar{\xi}.$$

The second term satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{\xi}' \Gamma_p \bar{\xi})^2 \leq C \mathbb{E}\|\bar{\xi}\|^4 = O(1).$$

For the first term,

$$\bar{\xi}' \widehat{\Gamma}_n \bar{\xi} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\xi_i' \bar{\xi})^2,$$

so Jensen's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{\xi}' \widehat{\Gamma}_n \bar{\xi})^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(\xi_1' \bar{\xi})^4.$$

Since $\xi_1' \bar{\xi} = \frac{1}{n} \|\xi_1\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^n \xi_1' \xi_j$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\xi_1' \bar{\xi})^4 \leq \frac{C}{n^4} \mathbb{E}\|\xi_1\|^8 + \frac{C}{n^4} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=2}^n \xi_1' \xi_j \right)^4.$$

Conditional on ξ_1 , the variables $\{\xi_1' \xi_2, \dots, \xi_1' \xi_n\}$ are conditionally independent and conditionally mean zero. Rosenthal's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=2}^n \xi_1' \xi_j \right)^4 \leq C \left[n^2 \mathbb{E}(\xi_1' \Gamma_p \xi_1)^2 + n \mathbb{E}(\xi_1' \xi_2)^4 \right].$$

Using (S2.140), (S2.141), and (S2.149),

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j=2}^n \xi_1' \xi_j \right)^4 = O(n^2 p^2),$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{\xi}' \widehat{\Gamma}_n \bar{\xi})^2 = O(1).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\langle R_n, M_n \rangle^2 = O(1). \quad (\text{S2.157})$$

Combining (S2.153), (S2.154), (S2.155), (S2.156), and (S2.157), and using Cauchy's inequality for the covariances among the five terms yields (S2.136).

S3 Simulation of CLT for $M_p(z)$

In this section, we compare the empirical mean and covariance of

$$M_p(z) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_p^0 - z\mathbf{I}_p)^{-1} - pm_{F^{c_n}}(z)$$

with their theoretical limits as stated in Proposition 5.1. This proposition is a key step for the proof of our main result, Theorem 2.5. We consider two types of data distribution of w_{ij} as follows:

- Exponential model: $w_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\text{rate} = 5)$;
- Chi-squared model: $w_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \chi^2(1)$.

Empirical values of $\mathbb{E}M_p(z)$ and $\text{Cov}(M_p(z_1), M_p(z_2))$ are calculated for various combinations of (p, n) with $p/n = 3/4$ or $p/n = 5/4$. For each pair of (p, n) , 2000 independent replications are used to obtain the empirical values. Table S.1 reports the empirical mean of $M_p(z)$ with $z = \pm 3 + 2i$ for both $\text{Exp}(5)$ population and $\chi^2(1)$ population. The empirical results of $\text{Cov}(M_p(z_1), M_p(z_2))$ are reported in Table S.2. As shown in Tables S.1 – S.2, the empirical values of $\mathbb{E}M_p(z)$ and $\text{Cov}(M_p(z_1), M_p(z_2))$ closely match their respective theoretical limits under all scenarios.

Table S.1: Empirical mean of $M_p(z)$ with $z = \mp 3 + 2i$.

	p/n	n	Exp(5)		$\chi^2(1)$	
			-3+2i	3+2i	-3+2i	3+2i
Empirical	3/4	100	0.0586+0.0857i	-0.0373-0.249i	0.1405+0.1628i	-0.55-0.2732i
		200	0.0582+0.0858i	-0.0311-0.2526i	0.1459+0.1697i	-0.5761-0.3089i
		300	0.0567+0.0844i	-0.0336-0.2566i	0.1465+0.1712i	-0.5705-0.3212i
		400	0.0596+0.0878i	-0.0352-0.2528i	0.1463+0.172i	-0.5631-0.3465i
Theoretical			0.0587+0.0872i	-0.029-0.2529i	0.15+0.1768i	-0.5792-0.3764i
Empirical	5/4	100	0.0547+0.0766i	-0.1069-0.2671i	0.1366+0.1473i	-0.5458-0.1545i
		200	0.0572+0.0793i	-0.1109-0.2757i	0.1395+0.1518i	-0.5847-0.1787i
		300	0.0587+0.0808i	-0.1074-0.2752i	0.1382+0.1511i	-0.5747-0.1934i
		400	0.0559+0.0778i	-0.0949-0.2733i	0.1434+0.1553i	-0.5751-0.1933i
Theoretical			0.0578+0.0804i	-0.0919-0.2764i	0.1432+0.1569i	-0.6025-0.2149i

Table S.2: Empirical covariance between $M_p(z_1)$ and $M_p(z_2)$.

	p/n	n	Exp(5)		$\chi^2(1)$	
			$(-3+2i, -1+1i)^\dagger$	$(3+2i, 5+1i)$	$(-3+2i, -1+1i)$	$(3+2i, 5+1i)$
Empirical	3/4	100	-0.0038+0.0147i	-0.04+0.0035i	0+0.0304i	0.089+0.014i
		200	-0.0041+0.0163i	-0.0418+0.0022i	0.0004+0.0326i	0.117+0.0284i
		300	-0.0043+0.0171i	-0.0446+0.0011i	0+0.0335i	0.1372+0.0294i
		400	-0.0043+0.0168i	-0.0465-0.0003i	0.0002+0.0356i	0.1273+0.036i
Theoretical			-0.0044+0.0172i	-0.0448-0.0002i	0.0006+0.0363i	0.1491+0.0524i
Empirical	5/4	100	-0.0032+0.0197i	-0.0483+0.0765i	0.0025+0.0349i	0.0931-0.0373i
		200	-0.0032+0.0196i	-0.0545+0.0763i	0.0032+0.035i	0.0991-0.0406i
		300	-0.0036+0.0212i	-0.0566+0.0708i	0.0026+0.0336i	0.0955-0.0209i
		400	-0.0032+0.02i	-0.0594+0.0742i	0.0038+0.0374i	0.1138-0.0297i
Theoretical			-0.0034+0.0206i	-0.0624+0.0743i	0.0035+0.0388i	0.1099-0.0323i

† This row denotes different combinations of (z_1, z_2) .

References

- Zhidong Bai and Jack W. Silverstein. CLT for linear spectral statistics of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(1A):553–605, 2004. doi: [10.1214/aop/1078415845](https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1078415845).
- Zhidong Bai and Jack W. Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2010.
- Zhidong Bai and Yongquan Yin. Limit of the smallest eigenvalue of a large dimensional sample covariance matrix. *The Annals of Probability*, 21(3):1275–1294, 1993. doi: [10.1214/aop/1176989118](https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176989118).
- Zhidong Bai, Baiqi Miao, and Guangming Pan. On asymptotics of eigenvectors of large sample covariance matrix. *The Annals of Probability*, 35(4):1532 – 1572, 2007. doi: [10.1214/009117906000001079](https://doi.org/10.1214/009117906000001079).
- Zhidong Bai, Huiqin Li, and Guangming Pan. Central limit theorem for linear spectral statistics of large dimensional separable sample covariance matrices. *Bernoulli*, 25(3):1838–1869, 2019. doi: [10.3150/18-bej1038](https://doi.org/10.3150/18-bej1038).
- Zhigang Bao. Tracy-widom limit for kendall’s tau. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(6):3504–3532, 2019. doi: [10.1214/18-aos1786](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-aos1786).
- Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and Measure*. New York: Wiley, 1995.
- Alex Bloemendal, László Erdős, Antti Knowles, Horng-Tzer Yau, and Jun Yin. Isotropic local laws for sample covariance and generalized Wigner matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 19(33): 1–53, 2014. doi: [10.1214/EJP.v19-3054](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v19-3054).
- Charles Bordenave, Pietro Caputo, and Djalil Chafaï. Circular law theorem for random markov matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(3):751–779, 2012. doi: [10.1007/s00440-010-0336-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-010-0336-1).

- Donald L. Burkholder. Distribution function inequalities for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, 1(1):19–42, 1973. doi: [10.1214/aop/1176997023](https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1176997023).
- Tony Cai, Weidong Liu, and Yin Xia. Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(2):349 – 372, 2014. doi: [10.1111/rssb.12034](https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12034).
- Yuanpei Cao, Wei Lin, and Hongzhe Li. Two-sample tests of high-dimensional means for compositional data. *Biometrika*, 105(1):115 – 132, 2018. doi: [10.1093/biomet/asx060](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asx060).
- Yuanpei Cao, Wei Lin, and Hongzhe Li. Large covariance estimation for compositional data via composition-adjusted thresholding. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(526): 759–772, 2019. doi: [10.1080/01621459.2018.1442340](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2018.1442340).
- Nouredine El Karoui. Tracy–widom limit for the largest eigenvalue of a large class of complex sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 35(2):470 – 490, 2007. doi: [10.1214/009117906000000917](https://doi.org/10.1214/009117906000000917).
- Huaying Fang, Chengcheng Huang, Hongyu Zhao, and Minghua Deng. CCLasso: Correlation inference for compositional data through lasso. *Bioinformatics*, 31(19):3172–3180, 2015. doi: [10.1093/bioinformatics/btv349](https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv349).
- Karoline Faust, Jarupon Fah Sathirapongsasuti, Jacques Izard, N. Segata, Dirk Gevers, Jeroen Raes, and Curtis Huttenhower. Microbial co-occurrence relationships in the human microbiome. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 8(7):e1002606, 2012. doi: [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002606](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002606).
- Jonathan Friedman and Eric J. Alm. Inferring correlation networks from genomic survey data. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 8(9):e1002687, 2012. doi: [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002687](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002687).
- Jiti Gao, Xiao Han, Guangming Pan, and Yanrong Yang. High dimensional correlation matrices: The central limit theorem and its applications. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(3):677–693, 2017. doi: [10.1111/rssb.12189](https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12189).
- Roger A Horn and Charles R Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Tiefeng Jiang. The limiting distributions of eigenvalues of sample correlation matrices. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, 66(1):35–48, 2004. doi: [10.2307/25053330](https://doi.org/10.2307/25053330).
- Iain M. Johnstone. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(2):295 – 327, 2001. doi: [10.1214/aos/1009210544](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1009210544).
- Dag Jonsson. Some limit theorems for the eigenvalues of a sample covariance matrix. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 12(1):1–38, 1982. doi: [10.1016/0047-259x\(82\)90080-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-259x(82)90080-x).
- Michel Ledoux and Michel Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991. doi: [10.1007/978-3-642-20212-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20212-4).
- V. A. Marčenko and L. A. Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues in certain sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457–483, 1967. doi: [10.1070/sm1967v001n04abeh001994](https://doi.org/10.1070/sm1967v001n04abeh001994).
- Jamal Najim and Jianfeng Yao. Gaussian fluctuations for linear spectral statistics of large random covariance matrices. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 26(3), 2016. doi: [10.1214/15-aap1135](https://doi.org/10.1214/15-aap1135).

- Jack W. Silverstein. Strong convergence of the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of large dimensional random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 55(2):331–339, 1995. doi: [10.1006/jmva.1995.1083](https://doi.org/10.1006/jmva.1995.1083).
- Jack W. Silverstein and Zhidong Bai. On the empirical distribution of eigenvalues of a class of large dimensional random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 54(2):175–192, 1995. doi: [10.1006/jmva.1995.1051](https://doi.org/10.1006/jmva.1995.1051).
- Han Xiao and Wang Zhou. Almost sure limit of the smallest eigenvalue of some sample correlation matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 23(1):1–20, 2010. doi: [10.1007/s10959-009-0270-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10959-009-0270-2).
- Yongquan Yin and Paruchuri R. Krishnaiah. A limit theorem for the eigenvalues of product of two random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 13(4):489–507, 1983. doi: [10.1016/0047-259x\(83\)90035-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-259x(83)90035-0).
- Lixin Zhang. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*. Phd thesis, National University of Singapore, 2007.
- Shurong Zheng, Zhidong Bai, and Jianfeng Yao. Substitution principle for CLT of linear spectral statistics of high-dimensional sample covariance matrices with applications to hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(2):546–591, 2015. doi: [10.1214/14-AOS1292](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1292).