

Lecture 8: Random Matrices II: ε -net

Lecturer: Yudong Chen

Scribe: Liwei Jiang

References:

- R. Vershynin, High dimensional Probability, Sections 4.2, 4.4, 4.6.
- M. J. Wainwright, High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint, Sections 6.1, 6.3.

1 ε -net Argument

This argument contains three steps:

- Discretize \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .
- Bound $\|Xu\|_2$ for each fixed $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.
- Union Bound.

Definition 1 (ε -net). $T_\varepsilon \subset T$ is called an ε -net of T (w.r.t. ℓ_2 norm) if

$$\forall u \in T \quad \exists u_0 \in T_\varepsilon : \|u - u_0\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Definition 2 (Covering Number). The smallest cardinality of an ε -net of T is called the covering number of T and denoted by $N(\varepsilon, T)$. The quantity $\log N(\varepsilon, T)$ is called the metric entropy of T .

Now we have a lemma about covering number of unit sphere.

Lemma 1 (Covering the l_2 ball and sphere). Recall that

$$B^n = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|u\| \leq 1\}, \quad \mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|u\| = 1\}.$$

We have

$$N(\varepsilon, \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq N\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, B^n\right) \leq \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon} + 1\right)^n$$

Proof Exercise. □

Remark We also have $N(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}, B^n) \geq (\frac{2}{\varepsilon})^n$, so the upper bound is quite tight.

Lemma 2. For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$ and ε -net \mathbb{S}_ε of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , we have

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \|Xu\|_2$$

Proof By compactness of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , we can choose $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\|X\|_{\text{op}} = \|Xu\|_2$. By definition of ε -net, we can find $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $\|u - u_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X\|_{\text{op}} &= \|Xu\|_2 \\ &\leq \|Xu_0\|_2 + \|Xu - Xu_0\|_2 \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \|Xu\|_2 + \varepsilon \|X\|_{\text{op}} \end{aligned}$$

Rearrange it, we get

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \|Xu\|_2$$

□

With a slight modification of the proof of Lemma 2, we can get

Lemma 3. *Suppose $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric. For any $\varepsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ and ε -net \mathbb{S}_ε of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , we have*

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\varepsilon} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} |u^T Xu|.$$

Proof Since X is symmetric, we can find $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\|X\|_{\text{op}} = |u^T Xu|$. By definition of ε -net, we can find $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$ such that $\|u - u_0\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X\|_{\text{op}} &= |u^T Xu| \\ &= |u_0^T Xu_0 + (u - u_0)^T X(u + u_0)| \\ &\leq |u_0^T Xu_0| + |(u - u_0)^T X(u + u_0)| \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} |u^T Xu| + 2\varepsilon \|X\|_{\text{op}} \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we used the fact that $u, u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $\|u - u_0\| \leq \varepsilon$. Rearranging, we get

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{1-2\varepsilon} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} |u^T Xu|.$$

□

With all the lemmas above, we have the following theorem about operator norm of random matrix with independent sub-Gaussian columns.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, whose columns $X_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are independent, zero-mean, isotropic ($\mathbb{E}[X_j X_j^T] = I_m$) and sub-Gaussian with parameter σ^2 . Then*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} X X^T - I_m \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sigma^2 \max\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}, \frac{m}{n} \right\}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-m}$. Consequently,

$$\sqrt{n} - c\sigma\sqrt{m} \leq s_m(X) \leq s_1(X) \leq \sqrt{n} + c\sigma\sqrt{m}.$$

Here $s_1(X)$ and $s_m(X)$ are largest and smallest singular values of X , respectively. c is some constant.

Proof Fix $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, let \mathbb{S}_ε be the smallest ε -net of \mathbb{S}^{m-1} . By lemma 1, we know $|\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon| \leq 17^m$. By lemma 3, we know

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} X X^T - I_m \right\|_{\text{op}} &\leq 2 \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} |u^T (\frac{1}{n} X X^T - I_m) u| \\ &= 2 \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \left| \frac{1}{n} \|X^T u\|_2^2 - 1 \right| \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

For fixed $u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon$,

$$\|X^T u\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_j, u \rangle^2.$$

Let $Z_j = \langle X_j, u \rangle$, note that Z_j 's are independent of each other, σ^2 sub-Gaussian by definition and $\mathbb{E}[Z_j^2] = 1$, and since the square of a sub-Gaussian random variable is sub-Exponential, we have

$$\|Z_j^2 - 1\|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \sigma^2.$$

By Bernstein Inequality, for $t = c\sigma^2 \max\{\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}, \frac{m}{n}\}$ with sufficient large c , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\frac{1}{n}\|X^T u\|_2^2 - 1\right| \geq \frac{t}{2}\right] &\leq 2 \exp(-c'n \min\{\frac{t^2}{\sigma^4}, \frac{t}{\sigma^2}\}) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-c''n \frac{m}{n}) \\ &= 2 \exp(-c''m) \end{aligned}$$

Here c' and c'' are other constants which we don't specify. c'' can be sufficiently large as long as c is sufficiently large. Now, by Union bound and *, we know

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left\|\frac{1}{n}XX^T - I_m\right\|_{\text{op}} \geq t\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\max_{u \in \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon} \left|\frac{1}{n}\|X^T u\|_2^2 - 1\right| \geq \frac{t}{2}\right] \\ &\leq 2 \cdot 17^m \exp(-c''m) \\ &\leq 2e^{-m} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds for sufficient large c'' .

The proof of "Consequently" part is left as an exercise. So we are done. \square

Remark

- In this proof, we only require independent columns (rather than entries) of X .
- We get two-sided bounds on largest/smallest singular values.
- If $m \ll n$, in which case the matrix is very "rectangular", then

$$s_m(X) \geq \sqrt{n} - c\sigma\sqrt{m} > 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\left\|\frac{1}{n}XX^T - I_m\right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} < 1 \tag{2}$$

The first inequality says X is non-singular, and the second one implies XX^T is invertible. Both statements are true with high probability.

- If $X_{ij} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $n = m$, then

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq c\sqrt{n} \quad \text{w.p.} \geq 1 - 2e^{-n}$$

This recovers the Gaussian matrix result from last lecture, but with worse constant. Note that the previous bound is:

$$\|X\|_{\text{op}} \leq (2 + \varepsilon)\sqrt{n} \quad \text{w.p.} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{2}}$$

- If X_{ij} 's are sub-Exponential, what can you derive using ε -net?

2 Applications to Covariance Estimation

Suppose we observe $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ sampled i.i.d. from $N(0, \Sigma)$.

Goal: to estimate the covariance matrix Σ .

We use the empirical covariance:

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Y_i^T.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Sigma}] = \Sigma$, so it's unbiased. We want to bound $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\text{op}}$. By change of variables, let

$$Y_i = \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} X_i, \text{ where } X_i \sim N(0, I_m)$$

Let $X \triangleq (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$, then $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has isotropic, independent, sub-Gaussian columns. By Theorem 1, we know

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} X X^T - I_m \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} + \frac{m}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-m}$. Consequently, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-m}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\text{op}} &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} Y Y^T - \Sigma \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} X X^T \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} - \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \left\| \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\text{op}}^2 \left\| \frac{1}{n} X X^T - I_m \right\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\lesssim \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} + \frac{m}{n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Remark

- Sample complexity: $n \gtrsim \frac{m}{\varepsilon^2} \Rightarrow \frac{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}} \leq \varepsilon$. So when $n \gg \frac{m}{\varepsilon^2}$, $\frac{\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}} \rightarrow 0$ (consistency.)
- It can be generalized to the case in which Y_i 's are sub-Gaussian.