

**Structured Correlation Detection with Application to
Colocalization Analysis in Dual-Channel Fluorescence
Microscopic Imaging**

Shulei Wang^{*}, Jianqing Fan[†], Ginger Pocock[§], Ellen T. Arena[§],
Kevin W. Eliceiri[§] and Ming Yuan^{*,‡}

Morgridge Institute for Research^{,§} and University of Wisconsin-Madison^{*,§}
and Princeton University[†]*

Supplementary Material

**S1 Structured Correlation Detection Algorithms and Auxiliary
Figures**

S1.1 Structured Correlation Detection Algorithms

In this section, we present two algorithms of structured correlation detection.

S1.2 Auxiliary Figures

In this section, we show some auxiliary figures.

Algorithm S1 Structured Correlation Detection by T^*

Require: Dual-channel Image $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and significance level α .**Ensure:** Decision on if colocalization happens. $T^* = 0$ **for** $R \in \mathcal{R}$ **do** Calculate $T_R := \frac{1}{\log \log(n/A)} [\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}: |R|=A} L_R - 2 \log(n/A)]$. **if** $T_R > T^*$ **then** $T^* = T_R$. **end if****end for****return** If $T^* > q_\alpha$, return “yes”, else, return “no”.

Algorithm S2 Fast Structured Correlation Detection by \tilde{T}^*

Require: Dual-channel Image $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and significance level α .**Ensure:** Decision on if colocalization happens. $\tilde{T}^* = 0$ **for** $k = 1$ to $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1$ **do** **if** $k > k_*$ **then** $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}_k$. **else** $\mathcal{R}' = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_k$. **end if** **for** $R \in \mathcal{R}'$ **do** Calculate $T_R := \frac{1}{\log \log(n/A)} [\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}: |R|=A} L_R - 2 \log(n/A)]$. **if** $T_R > \tilde{T}^*$ **then** $\tilde{T}^* = T_R$. **end if** **end for****end for****return** If $\tilde{T}^* > \tilde{q}_\alpha$, return “yes”, else, return “no”.

S2 Proofs of Main Results

In this section, we present the proofs to our main results, namely Theorems 1, 2 and 3.

Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2, as well as a number of auxiliary results, will be given

in next section. To distinguish from the constants appeared in the previous sections, we

shall use the capital letter C to denote a generic positive constant that may take different

values at each appearance.




Figure S1: Simulated Distribution of $\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R$

Proof of Theorem 1. We first prove the upper bound (2.7) under conditions (2.4) and (2.6). To this end, we shall establish a stronger result that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $0 < t < (\log n)^3$.

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R > 2 \log n + C(\log \log n + t) \right\} \leq \exp(-t). \quad (\text{S2.1})$$

It is clear that (2.7) follows immediately from (S2.1).

We now proceed to prove (S2.1). We shall consider the cases where $A \leq (\log n)^5$ and $A \geq (\log n)^5$ separately. First consider the situation when $A \leq (\log n)^5$. By Lemma 6,

there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any fixed $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$

$$\mathbb{P} \{L_R > x\} \leq C \exp(-x/2).$$

Applying union bound yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R > x \right\} &\leq C |\mathcal{R}(A)| \exp(-x/2) \\ &\leq c_1 C n A^{c_2} \exp(-x/2) \\ &\leq c_1 C n (\log n)^{5c_2} \exp(-x/2), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (2.4). Equation (S2.1) then follows by taking

$$x = 2 \log(c_1 C) + 2 \log n + 10c_2 \log \log n + 2t.$$

The treatment for $A \geq (\log n)^5$ is more involved and we apply a chaining argument.

Let $\mathcal{R}_{\text{app}}(A, e^{-s})$ be an e^{-s} covering set of $\mathcal{R}(A)$ so that

$$|\mathcal{R}_{\text{app}}(A, e^{-s})| = N(A, e^{-s}).$$

For any segment $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, denote by

$$\pi_s(R) = \operatorname{argmin}_{R' \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{app}}(A, e^{-s})} d(R, R').$$

Of course, the minimizer on the right hand side may not be uniquely defined, in which case, we take $\pi_s(R)$ to be an arbitrarily chosen minimizer.

Write

$$L_R = \sum_{s=s_*}^{s^*-1} (L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)} - L_{\pi_s(R)}) + (L_R - L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)}) + L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)},$$

where $s^* > s_* \geq \log \log(n/A)$ are to be specified later. It is clear that

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R \leq \sum_{s=s_*}^{s^*-1} \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)} - L_{\pi_s(R)}| + \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_R - L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)}| + \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)}|. \quad (\text{S2.2})$$

We now bound the three terms on the right hand side of (S2.2) separately.

By definition,

$$d(R, \pi_s(R)) \leq e^{-s}, \quad \text{and} \quad d(R, \pi_{s+1}(R)) \leq e^{-(s+1)}.$$

Hence there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\pi_s(R) \cap \pi_{s+1}(R)| \geq (1 - Ce^{-s})|R|, \quad \text{and} \quad d(\pi_s(R), \pi_{s+1}(R)) \leq Ce^{-s}.$$

Now by Lemma 7, for any fixed $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$,

$$|L_{\pi_s(R)} - L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)}| \leq C (e^{-s/2}x + |R|^{-1/2}x^{3/2})$$

with probability at least $1 - Ce^{-x}$. An application of the union bound yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)} - L_{\pi_s(R)}| > C \left(e^{-s/2}x + \sqrt{2}A^{-1/2}x^{3/2} \right) \right\} \\
 & \leq CN(A, e^{-s})N(A, e^{-(s+1)})e^{-x} \\
 & \leq C[N(A, e^{-(s+1)})]^2 e^{-x} \\
 & \leq c_4^2 C \left(\frac{n}{A} \right)^2 \left(\log \frac{n}{A} \right)^{2c_5} e^{2c_6(s+1)} e^{-x},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.6). In particular, taking

$$x = t + 2 \log s + \log(c_4^2 C) + 2 \log(n/A) + 2c_5 \log \log(n/A) + 2c_6(s + 1)$$

yields, with probability at least $1 - s^{-2}e^{-t}$,

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)} - L_{\pi_s(R)}| \leq C \left((s + t + \log(n/A))e^{-s/2} + A^{-1/2}(s + t + \log(n/A))^{3/2} \right).$$

Here we used the fact that $s \geq s_* \geq \log \log(n/A)$. Now applying the union bound over all $s_* \leq s < s^*$, we get, with probability at least $1 - s_*^{-1}e^{-t} \geq 1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{s=s_*}^{s^*-1} \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_{\pi_{s+1}(R)} - L_{\pi_s(R)}| & \leq C \sum_{s=s_*}^{s^*-1} \left((s + t + \log(n/A))e^{-s/2} + A^{-1/2}(s + t + \log(n/A))^{3/2} \right) \\
 & \leq C \left(s_* e^{-s_*/2} + A^{-1/2}(s^*)^{5/2} \right) \\
 & \quad + C \left(e^{-s_*/2}(t + \log(n/A)) + A^{-1/2}s^*(t + \log(n/A))^{3/2} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

To bound the second term on the right hand side of (S2.2), we again apply Lemma

7. For any fixed $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ |L_R - L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)}| \geq C \left(e^{-s^*/2} x + \sqrt{2} A^{-1/2} x^{3/2} \right) \right\} \leq C e^{-x}.$$

Another application of the union bound yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} |L_R - L_{\pi_{s^*}(R)}| &\leq C \left(e^{-s^*/2} \log |\mathcal{R}(A)| + A^{-1/2} (\log |\mathcal{R}(A)|)^{3/2} + e^{-s^*/2} t + A^{-1/2} t^{3/2} \right) \\ &\leq c_2 C \left(e^{-s^*/2} \log n + A^{-1/2} (\log n)^{3/2} + e^{-s^*/2} t + A^{-1/2} t^{3/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - C e^{-t}$, where we used (2.4) in the last inequality.

Finally, for the third term on the right hand side of (S2.2), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{app}}(A, e^{-s^*})} |L_R| \geq x \right\} \leq C N(A, e^{-s^*}) e^{-x/2} \leq c_4 C \left(\frac{n}{A} \right) \left(\log \frac{n}{A} \right)^{c_5} e^{c_6 s^*} e^{-x/2}.$$

Taking

$$x = 2 \log(c_4 C) + 2 \log \frac{n}{A} + c_5 \log \log \frac{n}{A} + 2c_6 s^* + t$$

yields, with probability at least $1 - C e^{-t}$,

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{app}}(A, e^{-s^*})} |L_R| \leq 2 \log(c_4 C) + 2 \log \frac{n}{A} + c_5 \log \log \frac{n}{A} + 2c_6 s^* + t.$$

In summary, we get, with probability at least $1 - Ce^{-t}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R &\leq C \left(s_* e^{-s_*/2} + A^{-1/2} (s^*)^{5/2} + e^{-s_*/2} t + A^{-1/2} s^* t^{3/2} + e^{-s^*/2} \log n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A^{-1/2} (\log n)^{3/2} + e^{-s^*/2} t + A^{-1/2} t^{3/2} + e^{-s_*/2} \log \frac{n}{A} + A^{-1/2} s^* (\log(n/A))^{3/2} \right) \\ &\quad + 2 \log(c_4 C) + 2 \log \frac{n}{A} + c_5 \log \log \frac{n}{A} + 2c_6 s_* + t. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $A \geq (\log n)^5$. If we take $s^* = 2 \log n$ and $s_* = 2 \log \log(n/A)$, then for any $t \leq (\log n)^3$, we can deduce from the above inequality that

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R \leq 2 \log \frac{n}{A} + C \left(\log \log \frac{n}{A} + t \right), \quad (\text{S2.3})$$

which implies (S2.1).

We now prove (2.8) if in addition, (2.5) holds. In the light of (2.6), we can find a subset $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$ of $\mathcal{R}(A)$ such that for any $R_1, R_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$, $R_1 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$ and

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)| \geq c_3 \frac{n}{A}.$$

Obviously,

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R \geq \max_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} L_R.$$

If $A \leq (\log n)^5$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} L_R \leq x \right\} &= \prod_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} \mathbb{P}\{L_R \leq x\} \\
&\leq \prod_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} (1 - C|R|^{-1/2}e^{-x/2}) \\
&\leq [1 - CA^{-1/2}e^{-x/2}]^{c_3n/A} \\
&\leq [1 - C(\log n)^{-5/2}e^{-x/2}]^{c_3n/A},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the lower bound given by Lemma 6. It can then be derived that

$$\max_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} L_R \geq 2 \log n + O_p(\log \log n). \tag{S2.4}$$

Together with (2.7), (S2.4) implies the desired claim when $A \leq (\log n)^5$.

Next we consider the case when $A \geq (\log n)^5$. We proceed in a similar fashion as before but rely on the following tail bound of L_R : if $A \geq 24$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $0 < x < \sqrt{A}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_R \geq x\} \leq Cx^{-1/2} \exp(-x/2). \tag{S2.5}$$

If (S2.5) holds, then

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} L_R \leq x \right\} \geq (1 - Cx^{-1/2}e^{-x/2})^{c_3n/A},$$

which yields

$$\max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(A)} L_R \geq \max_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} L_R \geq 2 \log(n/A) + O_p(\log \log(n/A)).$$

Together with (2.7), this concludes the proof.

It now remains to prove (S2.5). Write

$$T_R = (|R| - 2)r_R^2.$$

Note that $\log(1 + x) > x - x^2/2$ for any $x > 0$. We get

$$L_R \geq (|R| - 2) \log(1 + r_R^2) \geq T_R^2 - \frac{T_R^4}{2(|R| - 2)} \geq T_R^2 - \frac{T_R^4}{A - 4},$$

for any $A \geq 5$, where in the last inequality we used the fact that $|R| > A/2$ for any $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. This can be further lower bounded by $T_R^2 - 3T_R^4/A$ for any $A \geq 6$. Thus, for any $0 < x < A/24$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{L_R \geq x\} &\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{T_R^2 - \frac{3T_R^4}{A} \geq x\right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{T_R^2 - \frac{3T_R^4}{A} \in [x, 2x]\right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{T_R^2 \in [x + 12x^2/A, 2x + 3x^2/A]\right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left\{T_R \in [\sqrt{x + 12x^2/A}, \sqrt{2x + 3x^2/A}]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $T_R \sim t_{|R|-2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ T_R \in [\sqrt{x + 12x^2/A}, \sqrt{2x + 3x^2/A}] \right\} \\
& \geq C \int_{\sqrt{x+12x^2/A}}^{\sqrt{2x+3x^2/A}} \left(1 + \frac{u^2}{|R|-2} \right)^{-\frac{|R|-1}{2}} du \\
& \geq C \int_{\sqrt{x+12x^2/A}}^{\sqrt{2x+3x^2/A}} \exp \left[-\frac{|R|-1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{u^2}{|R|-2} \right) \right] du \\
& \geq C \int_{\sqrt{x+12x^2/A}}^{\sqrt{2x+3x^2/A}} \exp \left(-\frac{|R|-1}{2(|R|-2)} u^2 \right) du,
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\log(1+x) \leq x$ for all $x \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ T_R \in [\sqrt{x + 12x^2/A}, \sqrt{2x + 3x^2/A}] \right\} \\
& \geq C(2x + 3x^2/A)^{-1/2} \int_{\sqrt{x+12x^2/A}}^{\sqrt{2x+3x^2/A}} u \exp \left(-\frac{|R|-1}{2(|R|-2)} u^2 \right) du \\
& = C(2x + 3x^2/A)^{-1/2} (1 - (|R|-1)^{-1}) \left[\exp \left(-\frac{|R|-1}{2(|R|-2)} (x + 12x^2/A) \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \exp \left(-\frac{|R|-1}{2(|R|-2)} (2x + 3x^2/A) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $0 < x < A/24$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} \left\{ T_R \in [\sqrt{x + 12x^2/A}, \sqrt{2x + 3x^2/A}] \right\} \\
 & \geq Cx^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{|R| - 1}{2(|R| - 2)}(x + 12x^2/A) \right) \\
 & \geq Cx^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{A - 1}{2(A - 2)}(x + 12x^2/A) \right) \\
 & \geq Cx^{-1/2} \exp(-x/2),
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used the fact that $x \leq \sqrt{A}$. The proof is then completed. □

Proof of Theorem 2 (Consistency of T^).* We first show that the claim is true for T^* . To this end, we begin by arguing that $q_\alpha = O(1)$, and then show that under H_1 , $T^* \rightarrow \infty$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 T^* &= \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\log \log(n/|R|)} \left[L_R - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \right] \right\} \\
 &= \max_{1 \leq k \leq \log n} \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(e^{-k+1}n)} \left\{ \frac{1}{\log \log(n/|R|)} \left[L_R - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \right] \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $0 < t < (\log n)^3$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(e^{-k+1}n)} L_R \geq 2k + C(\log k + t) \right\} \leq \exp(-t).$$

Taking $t = x + \log(2k^2)$ yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}(e^{-k+1}n)} \left\{ \frac{1}{\log \log(n/|R|)} \left[L_R - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \right] \right\} \geq C(x+1) \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2k^2} \exp(-x).$$

Applying union bound over all k , we get

$$\mathbb{P} \{T^* \geq C(x+1)\} \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \log n} \frac{1}{2k^2} \exp(-x) \leq \exp(-x),$$

which implies that $q_\alpha \leq C(1 - \log(1 - \alpha))$.

It now suffices to show that if (4.9) holds for some $R \in \mathcal{R}$, then $T^* \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, note that

$$T^* \geq \frac{1}{\log \log(n/|R|)} \left[L_R - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \right].$$

We treat the case $|R| \geq \log n$ and $|R| \leq \log n$ separately.

Consider first the situation when $|R| \leq \log n$. By Lemma 3,

$$\left(\frac{1 - r_R^2}{1 - \rho^2} \right) \sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 \sim \chi_{|R|-2}^2.$$

Applying the χ^2 tail bounds of ?, we get, with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-x}$,

$$\left(\frac{1 - r_R^2}{1 - \rho^2} \right) \sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 \leq (|R| - 2) + 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 2)} + 2x$$

and

$$\sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 \geq (|R| - 1) - 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 1)}.$$

Under this event,

$$\frac{1 - r_R^2}{1 - \rho^2} \leq \frac{(|R| - 2) + 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 2)} + 2x}{(|R| - 1) - 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 1)}}.$$

Assuming that $x = o(|R|)$, this can be further simplified as

$$\frac{1 - r_R^2}{1 - \rho^2} \leq 1 + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{|R|}}\right).$$

If in addition, $x \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} -(|R| - 2) \log(1 - r_R^2) &\geq -|R| \log(1 - \rho^2) + o\left(\sqrt{x|R|}\right) \\ &\geq 2 \log(n/|R|) + \delta_n \log(n/|R|) + o\left(\sqrt{x|R|}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which diverges with n because

$$\delta_n \log(n/|R|) \gg \sqrt{\log(n/|R|)} \gg |R| \gg \sqrt{x|R|}.$$

Since

$$\delta_n \log(n/|R|) \gg \sqrt{\log(n/|R|)} \gg \log \log(n/|R|),$$

this immediately suggests that

$$T^* \geq \frac{1}{\log \log(n/|R|)} \left[L_R - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \right] \rightarrow_p \infty.$$

Next consider the case when $|R| \geq \log n$. Assume without loss of generality that $\rho > 0$. The treatment for $\rho < 0$ is identical. Following an argument similar to that for

Lemma 4, we get

$$\sum_{i \in R} (X_i - \bar{X}_R)^2, \sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 \leq (|R| - 1) + 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 1)} + 2x$$

and

$$\sum_{i \in R} (X_i - \bar{X}_R)(Y_i - \bar{Y}_R) \geq (|R| - 1)\rho - 2\sqrt{x(|R| - 1)} - 2x.$$

with probability at least $1 - 6e^{-x}$. Denote this event by $\mathcal{E}(x)$. We shall now proceed under $\mathcal{E}(x)$ with an appropriately chosen $x \rightarrow \infty$.

$$r_R \geq \frac{\rho - 2\sqrt{x/(|R| - 1)} - 2[x/(|R| - 1)]}{1 + 2\sqrt{x/(|R| - 1)} + 2[x/(|R| - 1)]}. \quad (\text{S2.6})$$

It is not hard to see that under the condition (4.9), $|R|\rho^2 \rightarrow \infty$. Assuming that $x \rightarrow \infty$ such that $x = o(|R|\rho^2)$, we get

$$r_R \geq \rho + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{|R|}}\right)$$

Then,

$$L_R \geq -(|R| - 2) \log \left[1 - \left(\rho + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{|R|}}\right) \right)^2 \right] \quad (\text{S2.7})$$

Recall that

$$-|R| \log(1 - \rho^2) \geq (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right).$$

Denote by $\rho_* > 0$ the solution to

$$-|R| \log(1 - y^2) = (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right).$$

It is clear that $\rho \geq \rho_*$. Together with the fact that the right hand side of (S2.7) is an increasing function of ρ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_R &\geq -(|R| - 2) \log \left[1 - \left(\rho_* + o\left(\sqrt{\frac{x}{|R|}}\right) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= -(|R| - 2) \log(1 - \rho_*^2) + o(\sqrt{x|R|}\rho_*) \\ &= (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) + o(\sqrt{x|R|}\rho_*^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|R|\rho_*^2 \leq 2|R| \log(1 + \rho_*^2) \leq -2|R| \log(1 - \rho_*^2) = 2(2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right).$$

It is not hard to see that

$$\frac{\delta_n^2}{2 + \delta_n} \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \rightarrow \infty$$

if (4.9) holds. Assuming that

$$x = o\left(\frac{\delta_n^2}{2 + \delta_n} \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right)\right),$$

we get

$$T^* \geq (\log \log(n/|R|))^{-1} (L_R - 2 \log(n/|R|)) \rightarrow \infty.$$

This concludes the proof of consistency of T^* under (4.9). □

Proof of Theorem 2 (Consistency of \tilde{T}^).* We now consider the computationally efficient test based on \tilde{T}^* is also consistent. As before, we begin by arguing that $\tilde{q}_\alpha = O(1)$, and

then show that under H_1 , $\tilde{T}^* \rightarrow \infty$. To show that $\tilde{q}_\alpha = O(1)$, it suffices to note that

$$\begin{aligned} T^* &= \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \{(\log \log(n/|R|))^{-1} (L_R - 2 \log(n/|R|))\} \\ &\geq \max_{R \in \cup_k \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_k} \{(\log \log(n/|R|))^{-1} (L_R - 2 \log(n/|R|))\} \\ &= \tilde{T}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tilde{q}_\alpha \leq q_\alpha = O(1)$ following the argument before.

Next we show that under the alternative hypothesis where X_i and Y_i are correlated on a set $R \in \mathcal{R}_k$ for some k , $\tilde{T}^* \rightarrow \infty$. By definition, there exists a $\tilde{R} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_k$ such that

$$d(R, \tilde{R}) \leq \frac{1}{4k^2}. \tag{S2.8}$$

Observe that

$$\tilde{T}^* \geq \tilde{T}_k^* \geq (\log \log(n/|\tilde{R}|))^{-1} (L_{\tilde{R}} - 2 \log(n/|\tilde{R}|)).$$

It now suffices to show that the rightmost hand side is unbounded with probability approaching to 1 when $k \leq k_*$. To this end, we first consider the case when $\tilde{R} \subseteq R$.

Note that if $\tilde{R} \subseteq R$, then (1.2) holds for any $i \in \tilde{R}$. Following an identical argument for consistency of T^* , it suffices to show that there exists a $\tilde{\delta}_n > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \sqrt{\log(n/|\tilde{R}|)} \rightarrow \infty \tag{S2.9}$$

and

$$-|\tilde{R}| \log(1 - \rho^2) \geq (2 + \tilde{\delta}_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|} \right). \tag{S2.10}$$

Observe that (S2.8) implies that

$$|\tilde{R}| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right) |R|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{R}| \log \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right) |R| \log \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right) (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\log \left(\frac{n}{|R|}\right) = \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right) + \log \left(\frac{|\tilde{R}|}{|R|}\right) \geq \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right) + \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right) \geq \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right) - \frac{1}{4k^2},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{R}| \log \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right) (2 + \delta_n) \left[\log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right) - \frac{1}{4k^2} \right] \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right)^2 (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k^2}\right) (2 + \delta_n) \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\tilde{\delta}_n = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k^2}\right) \delta_n - \frac{1}{k^2}.$$

Then (S2.10) holds. We now verify (S2.9). Recall that

$$\delta_n^2(k-1)\log 2 \leq \delta_n^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \rightarrow \infty,$$

we get, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \geq \frac{1}{4}\delta_n.$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{\delta}_n^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|} \right) \geq \tilde{\delta}_n^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \geq \frac{1}{16}\delta_n^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) \rightarrow \infty,$$

which completes the proof for the case $\tilde{R} \subseteq R$.

Now consider the case when $\tilde{R} \not\subseteq R$. By definition,

$$\frac{|\tilde{R} \cap R|}{\sqrt{|R||\tilde{R}|}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}.$$

Because $\tilde{R} \cap R \subseteq \tilde{R}$, we get

$$\frac{|\tilde{R}|}{|R|} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right)^2. \quad (\text{S2.11})$$

Thus,

$$|\tilde{R} \cap R| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2}\right)^{3/2} |R| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3k^2}\right) |R|.$$

Similarly, we can derive that

$$|\tilde{R} \cap R| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{3k^2}\right) |\tilde{R}|. \quad (\text{S2.12})$$

Following the same treatment as for the previous case, we can derive that

$$\frac{1}{\log \log(n/|\tilde{R} \cap R|)} \left[L_{\tilde{R} \cap R} - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R} \cap R|} \right) \right] \rightarrow_p \infty.$$

Since $|\tilde{R} \cap R| \leq |\tilde{R}|$,

$$\frac{1}{\log \log \frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|}} \left[L_{\tilde{R} \cap R} - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|} \right) \right] \geq \frac{1}{\log \log \frac{n}{|\tilde{R} \cap R|}} \left[L_{\tilde{R} \cap R} - 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R} \cap R|} \right) \right] \rightarrow \infty.$$

It now suffices to show that

$$|L_{\tilde{R} \cap R} - L_{\tilde{R}}| = O_p \left(\log \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|} \right) \right) \quad (\text{S2.13})$$

In the light of (S2.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \log \log \left(\frac{n}{|\tilde{R}|} \right) &\geq \log \left[\log \left(\frac{n}{|R|} \right) + 2 \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \log \left[(k-1) \log 2 - \frac{1}{2k^2} \right] = O(\log k). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 8,

$$|L_{\tilde{R} \cap R} - L_{\tilde{R}}| \leq C \left[\frac{1}{3k^2} x + |\tilde{R}|^{-1/2} x^{3/2} \right],$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-x}$. Observe that

$$|\tilde{R}| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4k^2} \right)^2 |R| \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2k^2} \right) |R| \geq n 2^{-(k+1)}.$$

Equation (S2.13) then follows by taking

$$x = \min \{k^2 \log k, 2^{-k/3} n^{1/3} (\log k)^{2/3}\}.$$

The proof is now completed. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Our argument is similar to those used earlier by ? and ?. We shall outline only the main steps for brevity. Note first that a lower bound for a special case necessarily yields a lower bound for the general case. Thus it suffices to consider the case when $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$ and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$. In the light of (2.5), for any A , we can find $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A) \subset \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)| = c_3(n/A)$, and for any $R_1, R_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$, $R_1 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$. For brevity, we shall assume that $c_3 = 1$ and for any $R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$, $|R| = A$. More general case can be treated in the same fashion albeit the argument becomes considerably more cumbersome.

Denote by \mathbb{P}_0 the joint distribution of $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathbb{I}\}$ under null hypothesis, and by \mathbb{P}_R the joint distribution under alternative hypothesis where X_i and Y_i are correlated on $R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$ so that (1.2) holds for $i \in R$ and (1.1) holds for $i \notin R$. The likelihood ratio between \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_R can be computed:

$$W_R = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_R}{d\mathbb{P}_0} = \frac{1}{(1 - \rho^2)^{A/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\sum_{i \in R} (\rho^2 X_i^2 - 2\rho X_i Y_i + \rho^2 Y_i^2)}{2(1 - \rho^2)} \right\}$$

To prove the first statement, we first show

$$\mathbb{E}_0(W_R^{1+\delta_n/4}) / (\eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)^{\delta_n/4} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for any } 0 < \eta < 1,$$

where \mathbb{E}_0 stands for expectation taken with respect to \mathbb{P}_0 .

It can be computed that

$$\mathbb{E}_0(W_R^{1+\delta_n/4}) = \frac{1}{(1 - \rho^2 \delta_n^2/16)^{A/2} (1 - \rho^2)^{A\delta_n/8}}.$$

Recall that

$$A \log \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \leq (2 - \delta_n) \log \frac{n}{A}.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} & -\log \left[\mathbb{E}_0(W_R^{1+\delta_n/4}) / (\eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)^{\delta_n/4} \right] \\ & \geq \frac{A\delta_n}{8} \log(1 - \rho^2) + \frac{A}{2} \log(1 - \rho^2 \delta_n^2/16) + \frac{\delta_n}{4} \log \frac{n}{A} + \frac{\delta_n}{4} \log \eta \\ & \geq \frac{\delta_n^2}{8} \log \frac{n}{A} - (1 - \delta_n/2) \left(\log \frac{n}{A} \right) \frac{\log(1 - \rho^2 \delta_n^2/16)}{\log(1 - \rho^2)} + \frac{\delta_n}{4} \log \eta \\ & \geq \frac{\delta_n^2}{8} \log \frac{n}{A} - \frac{\delta_n^2}{16} (1 - \delta_n/2) \left(\log \frac{n}{A} \right) + \frac{\delta_n}{4} \log \eta \\ & = \frac{\delta_n^2}{16} (1 + \delta_n/2) \log \frac{n}{A} + \frac{\delta_n}{4} \log \eta \\ & \geq \frac{\delta_n^2}{16} \log \frac{n}{A} \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_0(W_R^{1+\delta_n/4}) / (\eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)^{\delta_n/4} \rightarrow 0.$$

Next, we argue that

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left| |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} W_R - 1 \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

To this end, write

$$\bar{W} = |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} (W_R - 1),$$

$$\bar{W}_1 = |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} (W_R - 1) \mathbf{1}_{(|W_R - 1| > \eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)},$$

and

$$\bar{W}_2 = |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} (W_R - 1) \mathbf{1}_{|W_R - 1| \leq \eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_0 |\bar{W}| \leq \mathbb{E}_0 |\bar{W}_1| + \mathbb{E}_0 |\bar{W}_2| \leq \mathbb{E}_0 |\bar{W}_1| + \eta.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 |\bar{W}_1| \leq \mathbb{E}_0 (W_R \mathbf{1}_{(W_R > \eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)}) \leq \mathbb{E}_0 (W_R^{1+\delta_n/4}) / (\eta |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|)^{\delta_n/4} \rightarrow 0.$$

We can take $\eta \downarrow 0$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left| |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} W_R - 1 \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally, let \mathbb{P}_1 be the uniform mixture of \mathbb{P}_R for $R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)$, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_1 = |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} \mathbb{P}_R.$$

Then for any test Δ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_0(\Delta = 1) + \mathbb{P}_1(\Delta = 0) &= \mathbb{E}_0(\Delta) + 1 - \min_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} \mathbb{E}_R(\Delta) \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_0(\Delta) + 1 - |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)| \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} \mathbb{E}_R(\Delta) \\
&\geq 1 - \mathbb{E}_0(\Delta(1 - |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} W_R)) \\
&\geq 1 - \mathbb{E}_0 \left| 1 - |\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)|^{-1} \sum_{R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(A)} W_R \right| \rightarrow 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the first statement.

To show the second statement, we assume the contrary that c_n is bounded from above. Then $\{c_n\}$ must have a convergent subsequence. Without loss of generality, assume c_n itself converges to some $b \in [0, \infty)$. Then

$$\log W_R \rightarrow_d N\left(-\frac{b}{2}, b\right),$$

which implies that

$$\limsup \mathbb{P}_R(\Delta = 1) < 1.$$

This contradicts with the fact that the type II error of Δ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The second statement is therefore proven. \square

S3 Auxiliary Results and Proofs

We first state tail bounds for t and F distributions necessary for our derivations.

Lemma 1. *Let X be a random variable following a t distribution with degree of freedom $n > 1$. There exists a numerical constant $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that*

$$c_1 n^{-1/2} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \leq \mathbb{P}(|X| > x) \leq c_2 \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \quad (\text{S3.14})$$

for any $x \geq 1$. In particular,

$$c_1 n^{-1/2} e^{-u/2} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{n \log\left(1 + \frac{X^2}{n}\right) \geq u\right\} \leq c_2 e^{-u/2}, \quad (\text{S3.15})$$

for any $u \geq 1$.

Proof of Lemma 1. Recall that the density of a t distribution with degree of freedom n is

$$f(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\sqrt{n\pi}\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}},$$

for an absolute constant $C > 0$. Then, for any $u > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X > u) &\leq C \int_u^\infty \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} dx \\ &\leq C \int_u^\infty \frac{x}{u} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} dx \\ &= \frac{nC}{2u} \int_u^\infty \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} d\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right) \\ &= \frac{nC}{(n-1)u} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \Big|_u^\infty \\ &\leq 2C \frac{1}{u} \left(1 + \frac{u^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound in (S3.14) follows immediately by taking $c = 4\sqrt{2}C$, by symmetry of t distribution. On the other hand, observe that

$$f(x) \geq C \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}},$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X > u) &\geq C \int_u^\infty \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} dx \\ &\geq C \int_u^\infty \frac{x}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} dx \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}C}{2} \int_u^\infty \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}-1} d\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{n}C}{(n-1)} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \Big|_u^\infty \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{n}C}{(n-1)} \left(1 + \frac{u^2}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound in (S3.14) then follows immediately.

Now, taking

$$x = \sqrt{n(e^{u/n} - 1)}$$

in (S3.14) yields (S3.15). □

Lemma 2. *Let $U_1 \sim \chi_{n_1}^2$ and $U_2 \sim \chi_{n_2}^2$ be two independent random variables. Then for*

any $-1 < x < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1} \frac{U_1}{U_1 + U_2} - 1 \right| \geq x \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{n_1 x^2}{12} \right).$$

Proof of Lemma 2. As shown by ?, for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1} \frac{U_1}{U_1 + U_2} \leq 1 - x \right\} \leq \exp \left(\frac{n_1}{2} (x + \log(1 - x)) \right),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1} \frac{U_1}{U_1 + U_2} \geq 1 + x \right\} \leq \exp \left(\frac{n_1}{2} (-x + \log(1 + x)) \right).$$

The claim then follows from the fact that

$$\log(1 + x) \leq x - \frac{x^2}{6}$$

for all x such that $|x| < 1$. □

The following observation on the sample correlation coefficient is useful:

Lemma 3. Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R\}$ are iid copies of $(X, Y) \sim N((\mu_1, \mu_2)^\top, \Sigma)$

where

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 (1 - r_R^2) \sim (1 - \rho^2) \chi_{|R|-2}^2.$$

Proof of Lemma 3. Consider a linear regression of Y over X :

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \epsilon.$$

Recall that

$$\hat{\beta} = \frac{\sum_{i \in R} (X_i - \bar{X}_R)(Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)}{\sum_{i \in R} (X_i - \bar{X}_R)^2}$$

and $\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{Y}_R - \hat{\beta}\bar{X}_R$ are the least squares estimate of Y over X where

$$\bar{X}_R = \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{i \in R} X_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Y}_R = \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{i \in R} Y_i.$$

The residual sum of squares of the regression can then be written as

$$\sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}X_i)^2 = \sum_{i \in R} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_R)^2 (1 - r_R^2)$$

Conditioned on X_i , the residual sum of squares will follow $(1 - \rho^2)\chi_{|R|-2}^2$. Thus the margin distribution of the residual sum of squares is also $(1 - \rho^2)\chi_{|R|-2}^2$. \square

Next we derive a tail bound for the sample correlation coefficient. For brevity, we work with the case when (X, Y) are known to be centered so that

$$r_R = \frac{\sum_{i \in R} X_i Y_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in R} X_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in R} Y_i^2}} \tag{S3.16}$$

where (X_i, Y_i) s are independent copies of (X, Y) . Treatment for the more general case is completely analogous, yet this simplification allows us to avoid lengthy discussions about

the smaller order effects due to centering by sample means, and repeatedly switching between $|R| - 1$ or $|R| - 2$ as the appropriate degrees of freedom.

Lemma 4. *Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R\}$ are iid copies of $(X, Y) \sim N(0, I_2)$. Then for any $x > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} X_i Y_i \right| \geq 2\sqrt{x|R|} + 2x \right\} \leq 4e^{-x}.$$

If in addition, $0 < x < |R|/16$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{|r_R| \geq x\} \leq 6 \exp(-|R|x^2/64).$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Write

$$\sum_{i \in R} X_i Y_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in R} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_i + Y_i) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in R} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_i - Y_i) \right)^2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} X_i Y_i \right| \geq 2\sqrt{u|R|} + 2u \right\} &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_i + Y_i) \right)^2 - |R| \right| \geq 2\sqrt{u|R|} + 2u \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X_i - Y_i) \right)^2 - |R| \right| \geq 2\sqrt{u|R|} + 2u \right\} \\ &\leq 4e^{-u}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the χ^2 upper and lower tail bound of ?. Applying

the χ^2 lower tail bound from ?, we can also derive that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} X_i^2 \right| \leq |R| - 2\sqrt{u|R|} \right\} \leq e^{-u} \quad (\text{S3.17})$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R} Y_i^2 \right| \leq |R| - 2\sqrt{u|R|} \right\} \leq e^{-u} \quad (\text{S3.18})$$

Therefore, for any $u < |R|/16$,

$$|r_R| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{u|R|} + 2u}{|R| - 2\sqrt{u|R|}} \leq \frac{2}{|R|} \left(2\sqrt{u|R|} + 2u \right) \leq 8\sqrt{\frac{u}{|R|}}.$$

with probability at least $1 - 6e^{-u}$. The claim follows immediately. \square

We are also interested in the difference in correlation coefficients between two different regions. The following lemma provides a useful probabilistic tool for such purposes.

Lemma 5. *Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R_1 \cup R_2\}$ are iid copies of $(X, Y) \sim N(0, I_2)$, and $2|R_1 \cap R_2| \geq |R_1 \cup R_2|$. Then there exist numerical constants $c_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $x < c_0|R_1|$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_2|r_{R_2}^2| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ \left(\frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{|R_1 \cup R_2| - |R_1 \cap R_2|} \right)^{1/2} x, |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3} x^{2/3} \right\} \right).$$

In particular, if

$$\zeta := \frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{\sqrt{|R_1||R_2|}} \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

then there exists a numerical constant $c_3 > 0$ such that for any $x < c_0|R_1|$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_2|r_{R_2}^2| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_3 \min\{(1-\zeta)^{-1/2}x, |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3}x^{2/3}\}).$$

Proof of Lemma 5. We first consider the case when $R_2 \subseteq R_1$. Recall that

$$r_{R_1} = \frac{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2}}, \quad \text{and} \quad r_{R_2} = \frac{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_2|r_{R_2}^2 - |R_1|r_{R_1}^2 &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2|}} \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \left(\frac{|R_2|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2} - \frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left[\frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

We now bound the terms on the right hand side separately.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|R_2|}} \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \left(\frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} - \frac{|R_2|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2} \right) \right| \\ &= |R_2|r_{R_2}^2 \left| 1 - \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \right)^{-1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2} - 1 \right| \geq x \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{|R_2|}{12} x^2 \right),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} - 1 \right| \geq x \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{|R_2|}{12} x^2 \right).$$

We get, for any $x < 1/2$,

$$\left| 1 - \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \right)^{-1} \right| \leq 4x$$

with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-|R_2|x^2/12)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4,

$$\mathbb{P}\{|r_{R_2}| \geq x\} \leq 6 \exp(-|R_2|x^2/64).$$

Thus, by taking $u = 4|R_2|x^3$,

$$|R_2| r_{R_2}^2 \left| 1 - \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} X_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{|R_1| \sum_{i \in R_2} Y_i^2}{|R_2| \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \right)^{-1} \right| \leq u$$

with probability at least

$$1 - 10 \exp \left(-\frac{|R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3}}{64 \cdot 4^{2/3}} \right).$$

Denote by $\mathcal{E}_1(u)$ the event that the above inequality holds.

To bound the second term, first note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{|R_2|} - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \right) \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{2}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right) \left(\sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4,

$$\frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left(\frac{1}{|R_2|} - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \right) \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 = \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right) |R_1| r_{R_1}^2 \leq \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right) |R_1| x^2,$$

with probability at least $1 - 6 \exp(-|R_1|x^2/64)$. On the other hand, again by Lemma 4,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right| \geq 2\sqrt{x(|R_1| - |R_2|)} + 2x \right\} \leq 4e^{-x},$$

Recall that, by χ^2 lower tail bounds from ?, we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \leq |R_1| - 2\sqrt{x|R_1|} \right\} \leq e^{-x},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2 \leq |R_1| - 2\sqrt{x|R_1|} \right\} \leq e^{-x}.$$

Thus, for any $x < |R_1|/16$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|R_1|^2/|R_2|}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 &\leq \frac{|R_1|^2/|R_2|}{\left(|R_1| - 2\sqrt{x|R_1|} \right)^2} \left(2\sqrt{x(|R_1| - |R_2|)} + 2x \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{16}{|R_2|} \left(\sqrt{x(|R_1| - |R_2|)} + x \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 6e^{-x}$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|R_1|^2/|R_2|}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 &\leq \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\frac{1}{2} x \sqrt{|R_1|(|R_1| - |R_2|)} + \frac{|R_1|x^2}{16} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right) |R_1|x^2 + \frac{|R_1|^2 x^4}{128|R_2|}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 6 \exp(-|R_1|x^2/64)$ for any $x < 2$. Following a similar argument, we can also show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2|R_1|^2/|R_2|}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right) \left(\sum_{i \in R_1 \setminus R_2} X_i Y_i \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\frac{1}{2} x \sqrt{|R_1||R_2|} + \frac{|R_1|x^2}{16} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} x \sqrt{|R_1|(|R_1| - |R_2|)} + \frac{|R_1|x^2}{16} \right), \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 10 \exp(-|R_1|x^2/64)$ for any $x < 2$. Note $2|R_2| \geq |R_1|$. In summary, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left| \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right)^{1/2} |R_1|x^2 + \frac{|R_1|x^3}{16} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 22 \exp(-|R_1|x^2/64)$ for any $x < 2$. Hence, with probability at least

$$1 - 22 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{256} \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right)^{-1/2} u \right) - 22 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{16} |R_1|^{1/3} u^{2/3} \right)$$

we have

$$\frac{|R_1|^2}{\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R_1} Y_i^2} \left| \frac{1}{|R_2|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_2} X_i Y_i \right)^2 - \frac{1}{|R_1|} \left(\sum_{i \in R_1} X_i Y_i \right)^2 \right| \leq u.$$

Denote this event by $\mathcal{E}_2(u)$.

In summary, for any $u < |R_1|/256$,

$$||R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_2|r_{R_2}^2| \leq 2u$$

with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_1(u) \cap \mathcal{E}_2(u) \right\} &\geq 1 - 22 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{256} \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right)^{-1/2} u \right) - 22 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{16} |R_1|^{1/3} u^{2/3} \right) \\ &\quad - 10 \exp \left(-\frac{|R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3}}{64 \cdot 4^{2/3}} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - 22 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{256} \left(\frac{|R_1|}{|R_2|} - 1 \right)^{-1/2} u \right) - 32 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{128} |R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The statement, when $R_2 \subseteq R_1$, then follows.

Now consider the general case when $R_2 \not\subseteq R_1$. In this case,

$$||R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_2|r_{R_2}^2| \leq ||R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_1 \cap R_2|r_{R_1 \cap R_2}^2| + ||R_2|r_{R_2}^2 - |R_1 \cap R_2|r_{R_1 \cap R_2}^2|.$$

We can now appeal to the bounds we derived for nested sets before to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|R_1|r_{R_1}^2 - |R_1 \cap R_2|r_{R_1 \cap R_2}^2| \geq x) &\leq 22 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{256} \left(\frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{|R_1| - |R_1 \cap R_2|}\right)^{1/2} u\right) \\ &\quad + 32 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{128} |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|R_2|r_{R_2}^2 - |R_1 \cap R_2|r_{R_1 \cap R_2}^2| \geq x) &\leq 22 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{256} \left(\frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{|R_2| - |R_1 \cap R_2|}\right)^{1/2} u\right) \\ &\quad + 32 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{128} |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The first claim then follows from an application of the union bound.

To show the second statement, assume that $|R_1| \geq |R_2|$ without loss of generality.

Observe that

$$\rho = \frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{\sqrt{|R_1||R_2|}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|R_2|}{|R_1|}},$$

which implies that $|R_2| \geq \rho^2|R_1|$. Therefore,

$$|R_1 \cap R_2| = \rho\sqrt{|R_1||R_2|} \geq \rho^2|R_1|,$$

and

$$|R_1 \cap R_2| = \rho\sqrt{|R_1||R_2|} \geq \rho|R_2|.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{|R_1 \cup R_2| - |R_1 \cap R_2|} \geq \frac{1}{\rho^{-2} + \rho^{-1} - 2} = \frac{1}{1 - \rho} \frac{\rho^2}{2\rho + 1} \geq \frac{1}{48} (1 - \rho)^{-1},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $1/4 \leq \rho \leq 1$. \square

We are now in position to derive bounds for the likelihood ratio statistic L_R . Since we work with centered random variables as stated earlier, it is natural to redefine L_R as:

$$L_R = -(|R| - 1) \log(1 - r_R^2).$$

where r_R is given by (S3.16).

Lemma 6. *Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R\}$ are iid copies of $(X, Y) \sim N(0, I_2)$ for some $|R| > 1$. Then there exists numerical constants $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that for any $x > 1$,*

$$c_1 |R|^{-1/2} e^{-x/2} \leq \mathbb{P}(L_R > x) \leq c_2 e^{-x/2}.$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Observe that

$$L_R = (|R| - 1) \log \left(1 + \frac{T_R^2}{|R| - 1} \right)$$

where

$$T_R = r_R \sqrt{\frac{|R| - 1}{1 - r_R^2}}$$

and

$$r_R = \frac{\sum_{i \in R} X_i Y_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in R} X_i^2 \sum_{i \in R} Y_i^2}}$$

It is well known that, under the null hypothesis,

$$T_R \sim t_{|R|-1}.$$

See, e.g., ?. By Lemma 1,

$$c_1 |R|^{-1/2} e^{-x/2} \leq \mathbb{P}(L_R > x) \leq c_2 e^{-x/2},$$

for any $x > 1$. □

The following lemma bounds the change in the likelihood ration statistic due to a perturbation of the index set.

Lemma 7. *Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R_1 \cup R_2\}$ are iid copies of $(X, Y) \sim N(0, I_2)$, and $2|R_1 \cap R_2| \geq |R_1 \cup R_2|$. Then there exist numerical constants $c_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $x < c_0 |R_1|$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|L_{R_1} - L_{R_2}| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ \left(\frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{|R_1 \cup R_2| - |R_1 \cap R_2|} \right)^{1/2} x, |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3} x^{2/3} \right\} \right).$$

In particular, if

$$\zeta := \frac{|R_1 \cap R_2|}{\sqrt{|R_1||R_2|}} \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

then there exists a numerical constant $c_3 > 0$ such that for any $x < c_0|R_1|$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|L_{R_1} - L_{R_2}| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp(-c_3 \min\{(1 - \zeta)^{-1/2}x, |R_1 \cap R_2|^{1/3}x^{2/3}\}).$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Similar to Lemma 5, it suffices to prove the first statement when $R_2 \subseteq R_1$. By the convexity of $-\log(1 - x)$, we can ensure

$$L_{R_1} = -|R_1| \log(1 - r_{R_1}^2) \geq -|R_1| \log(1 - r_{R_2}^2) + \frac{|R_1|(r_{R_1}^2 - r_{R_2}^2)}{1 - r_{R_2}^2}$$

and

$$L_{R_2} = -|R_2| \log(1 - r_{R_2}^2) \geq -|R_2| \log(1 - r_{R_1}^2) + \frac{|R_2|(r_{R_2}^2 - r_{R_1}^2)}{1 - r_{R_1}^2}$$

Therefore,

$$|L_{R_1} - L_{R_2}| \leq (|R_2| - |R_1|) \log(1 - \max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\}) + \frac{|R_2||r_{R_2}^2 - r_{R_1}^2|}{1 - \max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\}}. \quad (\text{S3.19})$$

We now bound the two terms on the right hand side separately.

Denote by $\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ the event that

$$\max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\} < \alpha.$$

By Lemma 4,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}(\alpha)\} \geq 1 - 12 \exp(-|R_2|\alpha/64).$$

Note that, for any $0 < x < \alpha$,

$$-\log(1 - x) \leq \frac{x}{1 - \alpha}.$$

We can upper bound the first term on the right hand side of (S3.19) by

$$\frac{1}{1 - \alpha} (|R_1| - |R_2|) \max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\{(|R_2| - |R_1|) \log(1 - \max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\}) \geq u\} \leq 12 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{64}|R_2| \min\left\{\alpha, \frac{(1 - \alpha)u}{|R_1| - |R_2|}\right\}\right). \quad (\text{S3.20})$$

The second term of (S3.19) can be upper bounded by

$$\frac{1}{1 - \alpha} (||R_2|r_{R_2}^2 - |R_1|r_{R_1}^2| + (|R_1| - |R_2|)r_{R_1}^2),$$

under the event $\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$. By Lemma 5, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\{||R_2|r_{R_2}^2 - |R_1|r_{R_1}^2| \geq x\} \leq c_1 \exp\left(-c_2 \min\left\{\left(\frac{|R_2|}{|R_1| - |R_2|}\right)^{1/2} x, |R_2|^{1/3} x^{2/3}\right\}\right).$$

And by Lemma 4,

$$\mathbb{P}\{(|R_1| - |R_2|)r_{R_1}^2 \geq x\} \leq 6 \exp\left(-\frac{|R_1|x}{64(|R_1| - |R_2|)}\right)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{|R_2| |r_{R_2}^2 - r_{R_1}^2|}{1 - \max\{r_{R_1}^2, r_{R_2}^2\}} \geq u \right\} \leq 1 - 12 \exp(-|R_2|\alpha/64) - 6 \exp \left(-\frac{(1-\alpha)|R_1|u}{128(|R_1| - |R_2|)} \right) - c_1 \exp \left(-\frac{1-\alpha}{2} c_2 \min \left\{ \left(\frac{|R_2|}{|R_1| - |R_2|} \right)^{1/2} u, |R_2|^{1/3} u^{2/3} \right\} \right).$$

Together with (S3.20), this implies the desired statement for $R_2 \subseteq R_1$. \square

A careful inspection of the derivation of Lemma 7 suggests that it can be extended to a more general situation where X and Y are correlated for some indices.

Lemma 8. *Let $R_1 \subset R_2$ be two index sets. Assume that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in R_1\}$ are independent observations so that $(X_i, Y_i) \sim N(0, I_2)$ for $i \in R_1$, and X_i, Y_i are standard normal random variables with correlation coefficient ρ for $i \notin R_1$. Then there exist numerical constants $c_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $x < c_0|R_1|$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|L_{R_1} - L_{R_2}| \geq x) \leq c_1 \exp \left(-c_2 \min \left\{ (1 - \zeta)^{-1/2} x, |R_1|^{1/3} x^{2/3} \right\} \right).$$

provided that $\zeta := |R_1|/|R_2| \geq 1/4$.

Finally we derive a perturbation bounds for a polygon which is useful for our discussion in Section 3.1.

Lemma 9. *Let K_1 and K_2 be two polygons with vertices u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k and v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k*

respectively. Denote by e_j the length of the edge between u_j and $u_{(j \bmod k)+1}$. Then

$$|K_1 \cap K_2^c| \leq r \sum_{j=1}^k (e_j + 2r),$$

where r is maximum distance between u_j and v_j .

Proof. Denote by Q_i the polygon whose first i vertices are the same with K_2 and whose remaining vertices are the same with K_1 . In particular, $Q_0 = K_1$ and $Q_k = K_2$. It is not hard to see that the j th edge of Q_i is no longer than $e_j + 2r$. If we compare Q_0 and Q_1 , then only the first vertex might be different, as illustrated in Figure S2.




Figure S2: Effect of perturbation of vertices of a polygon.

Because Q_0 and Q_1 are different only in the first vertex, they can only be different in the two edges linked with the first index. It can then be computed that

$$|Q_0 \cap Q_1^c| \leq \frac{1}{2}r(e_1 + e_k + 4r)$$

Similarly,

$$|Q_i \cap Q_{i+1}^c| \leq \frac{1}{2}r(e_i + e_{i+1} + 4r), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1,$$

It is clear that

$$K_1 \cap K_2^c = Q_0 \cap Q_k^c \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} (Q_i \cap Q_{i+1}^c)$$

Therefore,

$$|K_1 \cap K_2^c| \leq r \sum_{i=1}^k (e_i + 2r),$$

which completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1. Write

$$\mathcal{C}_{p_1, \dots, p_k} = \{K(\{(a_i, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}) : 2^{p_i} \leq r_i < 2^{p_i+1}, i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

It is clear that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{C}_{p_1, \dots, p_k}| \leq Cn2^{2(\sum_{i=1}^k p_i)}.$$

Note that there are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending on k and M only such that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{polygon}}(A; k, M) \subset \{K \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{polygon}}(k, M) : c_1 A^{1/2} \leq r_i \leq c_2 A^{1/2}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{polygon}}(A; k, M) \leq cnA^k$$

which completes the proof because $A \asymp r_i^2$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Note that $\pi_s(K(\{(a_i, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}))$ is also a polygon. For brevity, we shall hereafter denote it by $K(\{(\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\})$. By Lemma 9, we get

$$|K(\{(a_i, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}) \setminus K(\{(\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\})| \leq C2^s \sum_i r_i \leq Ck2^s r_1.$$

Hence

$$\rho\left(K(\{(a_i, b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}), K(\{(\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\})\right) \geq 1 - \frac{Ck2^s r_1}{\pi r_1^2} \geq 1 - \frac{C2^s}{r_1},$$

which completes the proof. \square