

## A SAMPLE AUGMENTATION: PROOFS

In this section we give the proofs omitted in Section 2.

**Proof of Lemma 7** First, suppose that  $k = d$ , in which case  $\det(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B}) = \det(\mathbf{A}) \det(\mathbf{B})$ . Recall that by definition the determinant can be written as:

$$\det(\mathbf{C}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_d} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^d c_{i, \sigma_i},$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_d$  is the set of all permutations of  $(1..d)$ , and  $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = \text{sgn}((1..d), \sigma) \in \{-1, 1\}$  is the parity of the number of swaps from  $(1..d)$  to  $\sigma$ . Using this formula and denoting  $c_{ij} = (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{ab}^\top])_{ij}$ , we can rewrite the expectation as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\det(\mathbf{A}) \det(\mathbf{B})] &= \sum_{\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_d} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \text{sgn}(\sigma') \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[a_{i\sigma_i} b_{i\sigma'_i}] \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_d} \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_d} \text{sgn}(\sigma, \sigma') \prod_{i=1}^d c_{\sigma_i, \sigma'_i} \\ &= d! \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_d} \text{sgn}(\sigma') \prod_{i=1}^d c_{i, \sigma'_i} \\ &= d! \det(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{ab}^\top]), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof for  $k = d$ . The case of  $k > d$  follows by induction via a standard determinantal formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\det(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B})] &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{k-d} \sum_{i=1}^k \det(\mathbf{A}_{-i}^\top \mathbf{B}_{-i})\right] \\ &= \frac{k}{k-d} \mathbb{E}[\det(\mathbf{A}_{-k}^\top \mathbf{B}_{-k})], \end{aligned}$$

where  $(*)$  follows from the Cauchy-Binet formula and  $\mathbf{A}_{-i}$  denotes matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  with the  $i$ th row removed. ■

Next, we state a formula which we used in the proof of Theorem 2. This lemma is an immediate implication of a result shown by [8].

**Lemma 15** *Given full rank  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , we have:*

$$\mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\det(\mathbf{X}_{-i}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-i})}{(k-d) \det(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})} \mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}),$$

where  $\mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{X}^+ \mathbf{y}$  is the least squares solution for  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ , and  $\mathbf{X}^+$  is the pseudoinverse of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Proof** Let  $\mathbf{I}_{-i}$  denote the identity matrix with  $i$ th diagonal entry set to zero. Note that we can write

$\mathbf{w}^*(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}) = (\mathbf{I}_{-i} \mathbf{X})^+ \mathbf{y}$ . Moreover, by Sylvester's theorem we have

$$\frac{\det(\mathbf{X}_{-i}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-i})}{\det(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})} = 1 - \mathbf{x}_i^\top (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbf{X}^+ = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_i^\top (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i}{k-d} (\mathbf{I}_{-i} \mathbf{X})^+,$$

which is in fact precisely the formula shown in [8] (see proof of Theorem 5). ■

## B VOLUME-RESCALED GAUSSIAN: PROOFS

In this section we give the proofs omitted in Section 3.

**Proof of Lemma 9** Since we are conditioning on an event which may have probability 0, this requires a careful limiting argument. Let  $A$  be any measurable event over the random matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  and let

$$C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \|\mathbf{B} - \Sigma\| \leq \epsilon\}$$

be an  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\Sigma$  w.r.t. the matrix 2-norm. We write the conditional probability of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A$  given that  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon) &= \frac{\Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon)}{\Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}} \det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}})]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}} \det(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}})]} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in E\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}} \det(\Sigma)(1+\epsilon)^d]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}} \det(\Sigma)(1-\epsilon)^d]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}}]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon\}}]} \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right)^d \\ &= \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon) \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\right)^d \\ &\stackrel{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}{\rightarrow} \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \Sigma). \end{aligned}$$

We can obtain a lower-bound analogous to the above upper-bound, namely  $\Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon) \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\right)^d$ , which also converges to  $\Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \Sigma)$ . Thus, we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \Sigma) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in C_{\Sigma}^\epsilon) \\ &= \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in A \mid \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \Sigma), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. ■

## C GENERAL ALGORITHM: PROOFS

In this section we give proofs omitted in Section 4.

**Proof of Lemma 12** The distribution  $\text{Lev}_{\widehat{\Sigma}, \mathcal{X}}$  integrates to one because for  $\mathbf{x} \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})] = \text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}).$$

Next, we use the geometric-arithmetic mean inequality for the eigenvalues of matrix  $\widetilde{\Sigma}$  to show that:

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\widetilde{\Sigma} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}) &\leq \left( \frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\widetilde{\Sigma} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}) \right)^d \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{d}{l_{\widehat{\Sigma}}(\mathbf{x}_i)} \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i \right)^d = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we use the formula for the normalization constant in Theorem 1 but with a modified random vector. Specifically, let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})}{l_{\widehat{\Sigma}}(\mathbf{x}_i)}} \mathbf{x}_i$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top] = \Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}}$  and

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{d}{l_{\widehat{\Sigma}}(\mathbf{x}_i)} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top = \frac{d}{\text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top.$$

So, using Lemma 7 on the vectors  $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\det(\widetilde{\Sigma} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})] &= \left( \frac{d}{\text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})} \right)^d \frac{\mathbb{E}[\det(\sum_i \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top)]}{t^d \det(\widehat{\Sigma})} \\ &= \frac{d! \binom{t}{d} \det(\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_1^\top])}{t^d (\frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}))^d \det(\widehat{\Sigma})} \\ &= \left( \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \frac{t-i}{t} \right) \frac{\det(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})}{(\frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}))^d} \\ &\geq \left( 1 - \frac{d}{t} \right)^d \frac{\det(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1})}{(\frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\Sigma_{D_{\mathcal{X}}} \widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}))^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Bernoulli's inequality concludes the proof. ■

**Proof of Lemma 13** Let  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$  be the matrix with rows  $\mathbf{x}_i^\top$  and let  $q_i(\mathbf{X})$  denote the sampling probability in line 4 of Algorithm 2, given the set of row vectors. We will show that if  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k \sim \text{VS}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}}^k$ , then after one step of the algorithm, the remaining vectors are distributed according to  $\text{VS}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}}^{k-1}$ . Let  $A$  denote a measurable event over the space  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k-1}$ , and let  $A' = A \times \mathbb{R}^d$  be that event marginalized over the space  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ . We wish to compute the probability  $\Pr(A)$  over the sample returned by the algorithm given input set  $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}$  and sampling size  $k-1$ . Note that since the sample  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$  is symmetric under

permutations, the probability of  $A$  should not depend on which index  $i$  is selected in line 5 of Algorithm 2, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A) &= k \Pr(A \mid \text{Alg. 2 selected } i=k) \\ &\propto \mathbb{E}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}^k} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{A'} q_k(\mathbf{X}) \det(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ &\propto \mathbb{E}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}^k} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{A'} \frac{\det(\mathbf{X}_{-k}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-k})}{\det(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})} \det(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}^k} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{A'} \det(\mathbf{X}_{-k}^\top \mathbf{X}_{-k}) \right] \\ &\propto \text{VS}_{D_{\mathcal{X}}}^{k-1}(A), \end{aligned}$$

where in the above we skipped constant factors, since they fall into the normalization constant. The lemma now follows by induction over increasing  $k$ . ■