arXiv:1609.06806v2 [math.ST] 24 Oct 2016

Asymptotic properties of adaptive group Lasso for sparse reduced rank regression

Kejun He*[1] and Jianhua Z. Huang[1]

[1]Department of Statistics,
Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA

Abstract

This paper studies the asymptotic properties of the penalized least squares estimator using an adaptive group Lasso penalty for the reduced rank regression. The group Lasso penalty is defined in the way that the regression coefficients corresponding to each predictor are treated as one group. It is shown that under certain regularity conditions, the estimator can achieve the minimax optimal rate of convergence. Moreover, the variable selection consistency can also be achieved, that is, the relevant predictors can be identified with probability approaching one. In the asymptotic theory, the number of response variables, the number of predictors, and the rank number are allowed to grow to infinity with the sample size.

Keywords: high dimensional regression; large sample theory; minimax; multivariate regression; oracle property; variable selection

*Email: kejun@stat.tamu.edu

1 The Model

Suppose there are q multiple response variables $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_q$, and p multiple predictors $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_p$. The linear model assumes that

$$Y_k = \sum_{j=1}^{p} X_j c_{jk} + e_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, q.$$

Without loss of generality, we omit the intercept term in the linear model, since this term can be removed by assuming the response variables and the predictors have mean zero. We also assume that the q error terms e_k, $k = 1, \ldots, q$, are random variables with mean zero. Suppose that we have an independent sample of size n from this model. Let $\mathbf{Y}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq q$, and $\mathbf{X}_j$, $1 \leq j \leq p$ denote the n-dimensional response vector and predictor vector respectively. Let $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{Y}_q)$ and $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_p)$ be the $n \times q$ and $n \times p$ data matrices respectively. The model for the observed data can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{C}$ is the $p \times q$ matrix of regression coefficients and $\mathbf{E}$ is the $n \times q$ error matrix. Reduced rank regression (Izenman, 1975) is an effective way of taking into account the possible interrelationships between the response variables by imposing a constraint on the rank of $\mathbf{C}$ to be less than or equal to r, $r \leq \min(p, q)$. We can estimate the rank-constraint coefficient matrix by solving the optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{C}:\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{C}) \leq r} ||\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}||^2.$$

Let $\mathbf{C}_j^T$ denote the j-th row of $\mathbf{C}$, which is the coefficient vector corresponding to X_j. Note that $\mathbf{C}_j$ being a zero vector indicates that the X_j is irrelevant in predicting the

responses. An estimation method that can simultaneously select relevant predictors has the property that it may produce some zero coefficient vectors. Chen and Huang (2012) considered solving the following optimization problem for variable selection and estimation:

$$\min_{\mathbf{C}:\text{rank}(\mathbf{C})\le r} ||\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}||^2 + n\sum_{j=1}^{p}\lambda_j||\mathbf{C}_j||, \tag{2}$$

where $||\cdot||$ represents the Frobenius norm and $\lambda_j \ge 0$ is a penalty parameter, $1 \le j \le p$. The resulting estimator worked well in simulation studies and real data applications. To study the asymptotic properties, Chen and Huang (2012) only considered the asymptotic behavior of one "local minimum" of (2) when $n \to \infty$ and $p\,, q\,, r$ are fixed constants. The purpose of this paper is to further the asymptotic theory of Chen and Huang (2012) in two aspects: (i) we consider the asymptotic behavior of the global minimum of (2); (ii) we allow p, q, r tend to infinity with the sample size n and, in particular, the number of predictors can tend to infinity at a rate faster than that of the number of observations.

If we remove the rank constraint, vectorize the coefficient matrix $\mathbf{C}$ by rows, and suppose $\lambda_j = \lambda$, $1 \le j \le p$, then the penalty term in (2) is the same as the group Lasso penalty (Yuan and Lin, 2006). The asymptotic behavior of linear regression with the group Lasso penalty and its variations, like the adaptive group Lasso penalty, have been discussed by Lounici et al. (2011); Wei and Huang (2010). However, the techniques and results in these articles cannot be directly applied in reduced rank regression, since the low rank assumption introduces a manifold structure that will make the domain of coefficient matrix non-convex and invalidate the application of the KarushKuhnTucker condition, an essential tool used in these work.

In a related paper with a broader scope of that also discussed rank selection, Bunea et al. (2012) studied the rate of convergence for prediction based on the estimator that solves the

penalized least squares problem (2) with all λ_j being equal; they showed that the estimator achieves, with a logarithmic factor $\log(p)$, the optimal rate of convergence for prediction. We improves this earlier result by showing that when using an adaptive Lasso penalty, our estimator can achieve the optimal rate of convergence for prediction, without the extra logarithmic factor. We are able to show that the variable selection is consistent and that the convergence rate of the coefficient matrix $\mathbf{C}$ can be the same as when we know a priori which predictors are relevant. These issues were not considered in the previous work.

2 Main Results

Let s denote the number of relevant predictors, i.e., the number of $\mathbf{C}_j$'s that are not zero vectors. We allow p, q, s, and r ($r \leq \min(p, q)$) to grow with n. Without loss of generality, let the first s predictors be the relevant ones. Let $\mathbf{X}_{(1)}$, $\mathbf{X}_{(2)}$ contain the columns of $\mathbf{X}$, and $\mathbf{C}_{(1)}$, $\mathbf{C}_{(2)}$ contain the rows of $\mathbf{C}$ associated with relevant predictors and irrelevant predictors, respectively. We also denote $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as the Gram matrix of $\mathbf{X}/\sqrt{n}$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X}}{n}.$$

Analogously, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(2)}$ are Gram matrices for $\mathbf{X}_{(1)}/\sqrt{n}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{(2)}/\sqrt{n}$ respectively. We use C to refer to a generic constant that may change values from context to context, and let $a \ll b$ and $a \lesssim b$ mean $a = o(b)$ and $a = O(b)$ respectively. When $p > n$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a degenerate matrix, in the sense that the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is 0. Clearly, the ordinary least squares estimator does not work in this case.

We need the following regularity conditions on the design matrix, the error matrix, and the tuning parameters.

Condition (C1) There exists a positive constant C such that

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{M}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{M}) \geq C \sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,s\}} ||\mathbf{m}_j||^2 \tag{3}$$

for all $p \times q$ matrices $\mathbf{M}$ (with rows $\mathbf{m}_j$) whenever $\sum_{j\in\{s+1,\ldots,p\}} ||\mathbf{m}_j|| \leq 2\sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,s\}} ||\mathbf{m}_j||$.

Condition (C2) The greatest eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is bounded away from ∞.

Condition (C3) The noise matrix $\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{E}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{E}_n)^T$ has independent and identically distributed rows, with the vector $\mathbf{E}_i$ being sub-Gaussian in the sense that $\mathbb{E}\exp(t\mathbf{E}_i^T\boldsymbol{\eta}) \leq \exp(Ct^2||\boldsymbol{\eta}||^2)$ for any $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^q$.

Condition (C4) For $\lambda_{(1)} = \max_{1\leq j\leq s}\lambda_j$ and $\lambda_{(2)} = \min_{(s+1)\leq j\leq p}\lambda_j$, we have that $\lambda_{(1)} \lesssim \sqrt{r(q+s-r)/ns}$ and $\lambda_{(2)} \gg \sqrt{\{q\log(p) + r(q+s-r)\}/n}$.

Condition (C1) is similar to but slightly different from the "restricted eigenvalue" (RE) condition introduced by Bickel et al. (2009) for studying the asymptotic properties of Lasso regression. This condition implies that (i) the number of relevant predictors is less than the number of observations and, (ii) the least eigenvalue of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}$ is greater than or equal to C by letting $\mathbf{m}_j = \mathbf{0}$, $s+1 \leq j \leq p$, which is a necessary condition to identify $\mathbf{C}_{(1)}$ if we have known which variables are relevant. From the proofs of the theorems, it can be shown that the constant 2 of the assumption $\sum_{j\in\{s+1,\ldots,p\}} ||\mathbf{m}_j|| \leq 2\sum_{j\in\{1,\ldots,s\}} ||\mathbf{m}_j||$ in Condition (C1) can be replaced by any constant $C > 1$.

Condition (C2) and (C3) are commonly seen in the regression literature (Chen and Huang, 2012; Izenman, 2008; Wei and Huang, 2010). In particular, Condition (C2) implies that all the diagonal elements in $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ are bounded away from ∞ and also the greatest singular value of $(\mathbf{X}_{(1)}^T\mathbf{X}_{(2)}/n)$ is bounded away from ∞. Condition (C3) is used to control the stochastic error. For Condition (C4), the upper bound of $\lambda_{(1)}$ is used to identify the relevant predictors, and the lower bound of $\lambda_{(2)}$ is used to annihilate the irrelevant predictors.

Let $\mathbf{C}^0$ be the true value of the coefficient matrix of $\mathbf{C}$.

Theorem 1 (Oracle Properties of the Estimator). *Assume Conditions* (C1) – (C4) *are satisfied. Then the solution* $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$ *of* (2) *has the following properties:*

1. *the* L_2 *norm of prediction error* $\|\mathbf{X}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}-\mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}^0\|$ *is upper bounded by* $O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)})$*;*
2. $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j = \mathbf{0},\ s+1 \le j \le p) \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$*;*
3. $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$ *is converging to* $\mathbf{C}^0$ *with the rate upper bounded by* $O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)/n})$.

Remark 1. With a straightforward modification of Theorem 5 in Koltchinskii et al. (2011), the minimax lower bound of L_2 norm of prediction error for this model is $O_p(\sqrt{r(q \vee s)}) \asymp O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)})$, where $q \vee s = \max\{q, s\}$. The first result of Theorem 1 says that our estimator achieves the minimax optimal rate of convergence for prediction. The L_2 norm of prediction error obtained in Bunea et al. (2012) is $O_p(\sqrt{r\{q+s\log(p)\}})$, which has an extra logarithmic factor.

Remark 2. The second result of Theorem 1 says that the penalized estimator can consistently identify the relevant predictors. The proof of this theorem also shows that the estimator with the knowledge of which predictors are relevant has the same convergence rate given in the third result.

One drawback of Theorem 1 is that the p penalty parameters λ_j's have to be specified to satisfy Condition (C4). Using the idea of adaptive (group) Lasso (Zou, 2006; Wei and Huang, 2010), we now specify these p penalty parameters using a single penalty parameter multiplied by a power of a certain pilot estimator. More precisely, we first solve problem (2) with a single penalty parameter to get a pilot estimator of $\mathbf{C}$, i.e., denote that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}} = \min_{\mathbf{C}:\text{rank}(\mathbf{C})\le r} ||\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}||^2 + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda^{\text{Lasso}}\, ||\mathbf{C}_j||. \tag{4}$$

Then let the p penalty parameters be

$$\lambda_j = \begin{cases} \lambda^{\text{Adap}} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}}||^{-\beta}, & \text{if} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}} \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ +\infty, & \text{if} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}} = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

with a penalty parameter λ^{Adap} and some fixed $\beta > 0$. Denote $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}$ as the penalized estimator that is the solution of (2) with λ_j defined in (5), $1 \leq j \leq p$.

We now show that the penalty parameters as defined in (5) satisfy Condition (C4) and so the resulting estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}$ enjoys the nice asymptotic properties as stated in Theorem 1. We need the following regularity conditions.

Condition (C5) $\sqrt{q \log(p)/n} \ll \lambda^{\text{Lasso}} \lesssim n^{-\epsilon}/s$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Condition (C6) $\|\mathbf{C}_j^0\|$ has a positive lower bound, i.e., $\min_{j \in \{1,\ldots,s\}} \|\mathbf{C}_j^0\| \geq C > 0$ for some C.

Condition (C7) For λ^{Adap}, we have that $\sqrt{\{q \log(p) + r(q+s-r)\}/n^{1+2\,\epsilon\beta}} \ll \lambda^{\text{Adap}} \lesssim \sqrt{r(q+s-r)/ns}$.

Condition (C5) is similar to one of the regularity conditions in Wei and Huang (2010). It implies that $p = o(\exp(n))$, i.e., the number of predictors cannot tend to infinity faster than the exponential of the sample size. Conditions (C5) and (C6) guarantee the pilot estimator defined in (4) has a certain convergence rate and the relevant predictors can be identified. Similar regularity condition on λ^{Adap} in Condition (C7) was first seen in Zou (2006). As a special case, if we restrict $\beta = 1$, then Condition (C7) can be replaced by order requirements on n, r, p and q, similar to Condition (C3)* in Wei and Huang (2010). In particular, the first, second and forth requirement of Condition (C3)* in Wei and Huang (2010) implied the lower bound of λ^{Adap}, while its third requirement indicated the upper bound.

Lemma 1. *Assume Conditions* (C1) – (C3) *and* (C5) *hold. Then the solution* $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}$ *of* (4) *satisfies* $||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}^0|| \leq O_p(n^{-\epsilon})$. *If we further assume that Condition* (C6) *is satisfied, then* $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}}\| \neq 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$, *with probability approaching 1.*

Theorem 2. *Assume Conditions* (C1) – (C3) *and* (C5) – (C7) *hold. Then the estimator* $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}$ *has the properties stated in Theorem 1. Moreover, the relevant predictors can also be identified with probability approaching* 1, *i.e.,* $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Adap}} \neq \mathbf{0},\ 1 \leq j \leq s) \to 1$.

3 Preliminary Lemmas

The following two lemmas play important roles in the proofs of the main results.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that the eigenvalues of* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}$ *are bounded away from* 0 *and* ∞ *and that the* $n \times q$ *error matrix* $\mathbf{E}$ *satisfies Condition* (C3). *Then*

$$\langle \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\mathbf{C}^1_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^2_{(1)}), \mathbf{E} \rangle \leq \|\mathbf{C}^1_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^2_{(1)}\| \cdot O_p(\sqrt{nr(q+s-r)}), \tag{6}$$

for any $s \times q$ *matrices* $\mathbf{C}^1_{(1)}$ *and* $\mathbf{C}^2_{(1)}$ *with rank less than or equal to* r.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let $\Gamma = \{\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{X}_{(1)}\mathbf{C}_{(1)}/\sqrt{n\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)})} : \|\mathbf{C}_{(1)}\| \leq 1, \text{rank}(\mathbf{C}_{(1)}) \leq r\}$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix. We first show that the covering entropy $\log N(\epsilon, \Gamma, l_2) \leq r(q+s-r)\log(C/\epsilon)$, where l_2 denotes the Frobenius norm. In fact, for $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{X}_{(1)}\mathbf{C}_{(1)}/\sqrt{n\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)})} \in \Gamma$ with $\|\mathbf{C}_{(1)}\| \leq 1, \text{rank}(\mathbf{C}_{(1)}) \leq r$, we can write $\mathbf{C}_{(1)} := \mathbf{D}\mathbf{A}^T$, $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times r}$, $\|\mathbf{D}\| \leq 1$, $\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_r$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{D} : \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}, \|\mathbf{D}\| \leq 1\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{A} : \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{q\times r}, \mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_r\}$. In the following, also let $\mathbf{D}_1$, $\mathbf{D}_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{A}_1$, $\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ respectively. The covering number of $\mathcal{D}$, under the Frobenius norm, is bounded by $(C/\epsilon)^{rs}$. According to Proposition 8 of Szarek (1982), the covering number of $\mathcal{A}$ is bounded by $(C/\epsilon)^{r(q-r)}$ under the distance defined as $d(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2) = \|\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T - \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\|_{op}$, where $\|.\|_{op}$

denotes the operator norm. To obtain the covering number of Γ, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T - \mathbf{D}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\| &\le \|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T - \mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\| + \|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T - \mathbf{D}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\| \\ &\le \|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\|\|\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T - \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{D}_2\| \\ &\le \|\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T - \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{A}_2^T\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{D}_2\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is because $\|\mathbf{D}_1\| \le 1$ and $\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{I}$. Since $\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{s\times r}$ and $\|\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2\| \le 1$, we have $\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{A}_1^T\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. Using the covering numbers of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, it is shown that $N(\epsilon, \Gamma, l_2) \le (C/\epsilon)^{rs}\cdot(C/\epsilon)^{r(q-r)}$, and thus $\log N(\epsilon, \Gamma, l_2) \le r(q+s-r)\log(C/\epsilon)$.

Furthermore, it follows from the sub-Gaussian error assumption of Condition (C3) that

$$\mathbb{E}\exp(t\langle\mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\eta}\rangle) \le \exp(Ct^2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2).$$

Using Dudley's integral entropy bound (for example, see Theorem 3.1 of Koltchinskii, 2011), we get

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}\in\Gamma}\langle\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{E}\rangle \le C\int_0^2 \sqrt{r(q+s-r)\log(\frac{C}{\epsilon})}\, d\epsilon \le C\sqrt{r(q+s-r)}.$$

The above implies that

$$\langle\mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\mathbf{C}^1_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^2_{(1)})/\sqrt{n\,\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)})}, \mathbf{E}\rangle \le \|\mathbf{C}^1{}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^2_{(1)}\| \cdot O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)}),$$

which in turn gives (6) by the assumption on $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}$. □

Lemma 3. *Assume Conditions* (C2) – (C3) *are satisfied. Then*

$$|\langle\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{XC}\rangle| \le O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)})\sum_{j=1}^{p}\|\mathbf{C}_j\|, \tag{7}$$

for any $p \times q$ random matrix $\mathbf{C}$, where $\mathbf{C}_j^T$ is the j-th row of $\mathbf{C}$.

Proof of Lemma 3. To show this result, we first note that

$$|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{XC} \rangle| = |\langle \mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{C} \rangle| \leq \xi \sum_{j=1}^{p} ||\mathbf{C}_j||, \tag{8}$$

where $\xi = \max_j \|\mathbf{X}_j^T\mathbf{E}\|$. Secondly, Condition (C2) and (C3) imply that

$$\|\mathbf{X}_j^T\mathbf{E}\| \leq O_p(\sqrt{nq}) \tag{9}$$

Finally, a direct application of Lemma 2.2.2 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) shows that ξ is upper bounded by

$$\xi \leq O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}). \tag{10}$$

Thus, (8), (9) and (10) complete the proof. □

4 Proof of Main Results

Proof of Theorem 1. We organize the proof in the following order: we first show that $\|\mathbf{X}\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{XC}^0\| \leq O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)})$ and $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| \leq O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)/n})$; we then show $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)} = \mathbf{0}) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$; the third property in the theorem is an immediate result of the above two by noting that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0\|^2 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\|^2 + \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\|^2$.

Let

$$Q(\mathbf{C}) = ||\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{XC}||^2 + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\mathbf{C}_j||.$$

$\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$ is the solution indicating that

$$Q(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) \leq Q(\mathbf{C}^0), \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{C}^0$ is the true parameter matrix with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}^0) \leq r$. Denote $\sum_{j=1}^{s} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j - \mathbf{C}_j^0|| = \delta_1$ and $\sum_{j=s+1}^{p} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| = \delta_2$. Note that we have $\text{rank}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}) \leq \text{rank}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) \leq r$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) - Q(\mathbf{C}^0) \\
&= ||\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}||^2 + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| - ||\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}^0||^2 - n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\mathbf{C}_j^0|| \\
&= ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{C}^{\mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| - n\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j ||\mathbf{C}_j^0|| \\
&= ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle + n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| - n\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j ||\mathbf{C}_j^0||. \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}
$$

(11) and (12) imply that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 \\
&\leq 2\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle + n\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j ||\mathbf{C}_j^0|| - n\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| \\
&\leq 2\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle + n\sum_{j=1}^{s} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j - \mathbf{C}_j^0|| - n\sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| \\
&\leq 2\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle + n\,\lambda_{(1)}\delta_1 - n\,\lambda_{(2)}\delta_2, \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second line is because of the triangular inequality, and $\lambda_{(1)}$, $\lambda_{(2)}$ are defined as in Condition (C4).

We now consider two cases: $\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1$ and $\delta_2 \leq 2\,\delta_1$. We will show that $\mathbb{P}(\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1)$ is approaching 0 and on the event of $\delta_2 \leq 2\,\delta_1$, the rate of $\|\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\|$ is upper bounded by $O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)})$.

To show $\mathbb{P}(\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1) \to 0$, we first note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle| &= 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}) + \langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| \\
&\leq 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)})\rangle| + 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| \\
&\leq O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(s)})\,\delta_1 + O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)})\,\delta_2, \qquad (14)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first part of the third line is by Lemma 3 with the number of predictor variables equal to s, and the second part of the third line is a direct application of Lemma 3.

Therefore, given the event of $\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1$, (13) and (14) imply a contradiction such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 \\
&\leq \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}) - n\,\lambda_{(2)}\}\delta_2 + \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(s)}) + n\,\lambda_{(1)}\}\delta_1 \\
&< \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}) - 2n\,\lambda_{(2)} + O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(s)}) + n\,\lambda_{(1)}\}\delta_1 \\
&< 0 \qquad (15)
\end{aligned}
$$

with conditional probability approaching 1, where the third and forth inequalities in (15) are because of the second part of Condition (C4). This contradiction implies that $\mathbb{P}(\delta_2 < 2\delta_1)$ is approaching 0.

Given the event of $\delta_2 \leq 2\delta_1$, by Condition (C1), we have

$$
||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 = n\,\mathrm{tr}\{(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\} \geq n\,C\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\|^2. \qquad (16)
$$

It is shown by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)\rangle| \\
&= 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}) + \langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle|
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\leq 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)})\rangle| + 2\,|\langle \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}_{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle|$$

$$\leq O_p(\sqrt{nr(q+s-r)})\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| + O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)})\sum_{j=s+1}^{p}||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| \tag{17}$$

Therefore, (13), (16), (17), and the assumptions of this theorem imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
&n\,C\,\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\|^2 \\
&\leq ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 \\
&\leq \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}) - n\,\lambda_{(2)}\}\delta_2 + O_p(\sqrt{nr(q+s-r)})\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| + n\,\lambda_{(1)}\delta_1 \\
&\leq \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}) - n\,\lambda_{(2)}\}\delta_2 + \{O_p(\sqrt{nr(q+s-r)}) + n\sqrt{s}\,\lambda_{(1)}\}\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| \\
&\leq \{O_p(\sqrt{nr(q+s-r)}) + n\sqrt{s}\,\lambda_{(1)}\}\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\|,
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the third inequality in (18) is because

$$\delta_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{s}\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j - \mathbf{C}^0_j\| \leq \sqrt{s}\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| \tag{19}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Thus it can be shown by the first part of Condition (C4) that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| \leq O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{r(q+s-r)}{n}}\right). \tag{20}$$

Plugging this result into (18) implies that

$$||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0)||^2 \leq O_p(r(q+s-r)),$$

which is the first property in Theorem 1.

To show $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)} = \mathbf{0}) \to 1$, denote $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^T_{(1)}, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$ as the thresholding estimator of $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$.

It is obvious that $\text{rank}(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}) \leq \text{rank}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) \leq r$, and $||\widetilde{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}^0|| = ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||$. Moreover,

$$Q(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) - Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}) = ||\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{C}})||^2 - 2\langle \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{C}})\rangle + n \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} \lambda_j ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j||.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \widetilde{\mathbf{C}})\rangle| &= |\langle \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}_{(1)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_{(2)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| \\
&= |\langle \mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}_{(1)}\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}), \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| \\
&\leq |\langle \mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{E}, \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| + |\langle \mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)}(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}), \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}\rangle| \\
&\leq \xi_{(2)} \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| + \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||\,||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}||,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})$ denotes the largest singular value of $\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)}$. Lemma 3 shows that $\xi_{(2)} \leq O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)})$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}) - Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}) &\geq \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} (n\lambda_j - 2\,\xi_{(2)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| - 2\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||\,||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| \\
&\geq (n\lambda_{(2)} - 2\,\xi_{(2)}) \sum_{j=s+1}^{p} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| - 2\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||\,||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| \\
&\geq (n\lambda_{(2)} - 2\,\xi_{(2)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| - 2\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||\,||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| \\
&\geq ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}||\{(n\lambda_{(2)} - 2\,\xi_{(2)}) - 2\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}||\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is because the second part of Condition (C4) implies that $n\,\lambda_{(2)} \gg \xi_{(2)}$ and $\sum_{j=s+1}^{p} ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j|| \geq ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}||$. On the other hand, with the second part of Condition (C4) that $\lambda_{(2)} \gg \sqrt{r(q+s-r)/n}$, $||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}|| \leq O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)/n})$, and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T_{(2)}\mathbf{X}_{(1)}) =$

$O(n)$, we have $n\,\lambda_{(2)} \gg \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}_{(2)}^T\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0||$. Therefore,

$$||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}||\{(n\lambda_{(2)} - 2\,\xi_{(2)}) - 2\,\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}_{(2)}^T\mathbf{X}_{(1)})||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0||\} > 0$$

with conditional probability approaching 1 given the event of $||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| > 0$. In other words, on the event of $||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}|| > 0$, the objective function at $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}$ is smaller than that at $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$, contradicting with the assumption that $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$ is the minimizer of $Q(\mathbf{C})$. This completes the second property stated in the theorem. □

Proof of Lemma 1. The proof of this Lemma is based on a modification of the proof of Theorem 1. We similarly define $\delta_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{s}||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}_j^0||$ and $\delta_2 = \sum_{j=s+1}^{p}||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_j^{\text{Lasso}}||$. When $\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1$, plugging the assumption $\lambda_{(1)} = \lambda_{(2)} = \lambda^{\text{Lasso}} \gg \sqrt{q\log(p)/n}$ in (15), the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 shows that $\mathbb{P}(\delta_2 > 2\,\delta_1) \to 0$ in the current setting. Given the event of $\delta_2 \le 2\,\delta_1$, plugging the same assumption in (13), (14) and (16), it is shown that

$$\begin{aligned} n\,C\,\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0\|^2 &\le \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(p)}) - n\,\lambda^{\text{Lasso}}\}\delta_2 + \{O_p(\sqrt{nq\log(s)}) + n\,\lambda^{\text{Lasso}}\}\delta_1 \\ &\le n\,\lambda^{\text{Lasso}}\delta_1 \\ &\le O\left(\frac{n^{1-\epsilon}}{s}\right)\delta_1 \\ &\le O\left(\frac{n^{1-\epsilon}}{\sqrt{s}}\right)\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0\| \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

with conditional probability approaching 1, where the second and third inequalities in (21) is because of Condition (C5) on λ^{Lasso} and the forth inequality is a direct application of (19). Thus, $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0\| \le O_p(n^{-\epsilon}/\sqrt{s})$. Moreover, on the even of $\delta_2 \le 2\,\delta_1$, $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(2)}^{\text{Lasso}}\| \le \delta_2 \le 2\,\delta_1 \le 2\sqrt{s}\,\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(1)}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}_{(1)}^0\| = O_p(n^{-\epsilon})$ by (19). The combination of these

two results implies that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}} - \mathbf{C}^0\| = \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{C}^0_{(1)}\| + \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_{(2)}\| \leq O_p(n^{-\epsilon}).$$

Finally, with $\epsilon > 0$, Condition (C6) and the upper bound of the convergence rate of $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}$ imply that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_j\| \geq \|\mathbf{C}^0_j\| - \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_j - \mathbf{C}^0_j\| > \|\mathbf{C}^0_j\|/2 \geq C/2 > 0, \quad \forall\, j = 1, \ldots, s$$

for some constant C, with probability approaching 1. □

Proof of Theorem 2. We need to check that Condition (C4) used in Theorem 1 is satisfied. According to Lemma 1, $\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_j\| > C/2$ with some constant $C > 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$. This result, together with the upper bound of λ^{Adap} stated in Condition (C7), imply that $\lambda^{\text{Adap}}\, ||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_j||^{-\beta} \leq O_p(\sqrt{r(q+s-r)/ns})$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$, thus the first part of Condition (C4) holds. It also follows from Lemma 1 that $||\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Lasso}}_j|| \leq O_p(n^{-\epsilon})$, $j = s+1, \ldots, p$. This together with Condition (C7) imply the second part of Condition (C4). Finally, Condition (C6) and the upper bound of the convergence rate of $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}$ stated in Theorem 1 imply that

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}_j\| \geq \|\mathbf{C}^0_j\| - \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{\text{Adap}}_j - \mathbf{C}^0_j\| > \|\mathbf{C}^0_j\|/2 \geq C/2 > 0, \quad \forall\, j = 1, \ldots, s$$

for some constant C, with probability approaching 1. □

Acknowledgement

Huang's work was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1208952.

References

Bickel, P., Ritov, Y., and Tsybakov, A. "Simultaneous analysis of Lasso and Dantzig selector." *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(4):1705–1732 (2009).

Bunea, F., She, Y., and Wegkamp, M. H. "Joint variable and rank selection for parsimonious estimation of high-dimensional matrices." *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2359–2388 (2012).

Chen, L. and Huang, J. Z. "Sparse reduced-rank regression for simultaneous dimension reduction and variable selection." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(500):1533–1545 (2012).

Izenman, A. J. "Reduced-rank regression for the multivariate linear model." *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 5(2):248–264 (1975).

—. *Modern Multivariate Statistical Techniques: regression, classification, and Manifold Learning*. New York: Springer (2008).

Koltchinskii, V. *Oracle inequalities in empirical risk minimization and sparse recovery problems*. New York: Springer (2011).

Koltchinskii, V., Lounici, K., and Tsybakov, A. B. "Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion." *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2302–2329 (2011).

Lounici, K., Pontil, M., van de Geer, S., and Tsybakov, A. B. "Oracle inequalities and optimal inference under group sparsity." *The Annals of Statistics*, 2164–2204 (2011).

Szarek, S. J. "Nets of Grassmann manifold and orthogonal group." In *Proceedings of Research Workshop on Banach Space Theory*, 169–185. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press (1982).

van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. New York: Springer Verlag (1996).

Wei, F. and Huang, J. "Consistent group selection in high-dimensional linear regression." *Bernoulli*, 16(4):1369–1384 (2010).

Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. "Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 68(1):49–67 (2006).

Zou, H. "The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1418–1429 (2006).