

# Tractable Post-Selection Maximum Likelihood Inference for the Lasso

Amit Meir\*

Department of Statistics  
University of Washington

Mathias Drton

Department of Statistics  
University of Washington

April 6, 2024

## Abstract

Applying standard statistical methods after model selection may yield inefficient estimators and hypothesis tests that fail to achieve nominal type-I error rates. The main issue is the fact that the post-selection distribution of the data differs from the original distribution. In particular, the observed data is constrained to lie in a subset of the original sample space that is determined by the selected model. This often makes the post-selection likelihood of the observed data intractable and maximum likelihood inference difficult. In this work, we get around the intractable likelihood by generating noisy unbiased estimates of the post-selection score function and using them in a stochastic ascent algorithm that yields correct post-selection maximum likelihood estimates. We apply the proposed technique to the problem of estimating linear models selected by the lasso. In an asymptotic analysis the resulting estimates are shown to be consistent for the selected parameters and to have a limiting truncated normal distribution. Confidence intervals constructed based on the asymptotic distribution obtain close to nominal coverage rates in all simulation settings considered, and the point estimates are shown to be superior to the lasso estimates when the true model is sparse.

*Keywords:* Stochastic Optimization; Model Selection; Selective Inference; Linear Regression

---

\*To whom correspondence should be addressed: amitmeir@uw.edu

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Inference After Model Selection

Consider the linear regression model

$$y = \mathbf{X} \beta + \varepsilon,$$

where  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a response vector,  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  is a matrix of covariate values and  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a noise vector. When the number of available covariates  $p$  is large, it is often desirable or even necessary to specify a more succinct model for the data. This is commonly done by selecting a subset of the columns of  $\mathbf{X}$  to serve as predictors for  $y$ . Here, we focus on model selection with the lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), which uses an  $\ell_1$  penalty to estimate a sparse coefficient vector.

A well known, yet not as well understood problem, is the problem of performing inference after a model has been selected. In particular, it is known that confidence intervals for parameters in selected models often do not achieve target nominal coverage rates, hypothesis tests tend to suffer from an inflated type-I error rate and point estimates are often biased. A simple Gaussian example serves well to illustrate the issues that may arise when using the same data for selection and inference.

**Example 1.** Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim f$  i.i.d., with  $\mathbb{E}_f(Y_i) = \mu$  and  $\text{Var}_f(Y_i) = 1$ . Furthermore, suppose that estimation of  $\mu$  is of interest only if a statistical test provides evidence that it is nonzero. Specifically, suppose that at a 5%-level, we reject  $H_0 : \mu = 0$  if  $|\bar{y}| > 1.96/\sqrt{n}$ . In this setting, if  $|\mu| < 1.96/\sqrt{n}$ , the uncorrected estimator  $\hat{\mu} = \bar{y}$  will overestimate the magnitude of  $\mu$  whenever we choose to estimate it.

An example of early work emphasizing the fact that data-driven model selection may invalidate standard inferential methods is the article by Cureton (1950), with its aptly

chosen title ‘validity, reliability and baloney’. Subsequently, this problem has been studied in the context of regression modeling. In particular, it has been shown that it is impossible to uniformly approximate the post-selection distribution of linear regression coefficient estimates (Pötscher, 1991; Leeb and Pötscher, 2005, 2006).

The field of post-selection (or selective) inference is concerned with developing statistical methods that account for model selection in inference. The majority of work in selective inference is concerned with constructing confidence intervals and performing tests after model selection; see for example Lee and Taylor (2014), Taylor et al. (2014), Benjamini and Yekutieli (2005), Weinstein et al. (2013), and Rosenblatt and Benjamini (2014). The particular case of model selection with  $\ell_1$  penalization is treated by Lee et al. (2016) and Lockhart et al. (2014). Fithian et al. (2014) consider the general problem of testing after model selection. Estimation after model selection is in the focus of the work of Reid et al. (2014), Benjamini and Meir (2014), and Routtenberg and Tong (2015).

In order to reconcile the aforementioned impossibility results with the recent advances in post-selection inference, we must clearly define the targets of inference.

## 1.2 Targets of Inference

In the context of variable selection in regression, let  $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{P}(\{1, \dots, p\})$  be the set of models under consideration, defined as the power set of the indices of the columns of the design matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ . Further, let  $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be a model selection procedure that selects a model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  based on the observed data  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

When discussing estimation after model selection in linear regression, one may consider two different targets for inference. The first are the ‘true’ parameter values in correct models where all variables with non-zero coefficient are present. An alternative target for

estimation is the vector of regression coefficients in the selected model

$$\beta_0(y) = (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbb{E}(Y). \quad (1)$$

In (1),  $M = S(y)$  is the selected model, and  $\mathbf{X}_M$  is the sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{X}$  made up of the columns indexed by  $M$ . These two targets of estimation coincide when the selected model is true, meaning that it contains all variables that have a non-zero regression coefficient. Indeed, if the observed value  $y$  is such that  $S(y) = M$  for a model  $M$  that contains all covariates with non-zero coefficients, then  $\mathbb{E}(y) = \mathbf{X}_M \beta_0^M$  and  $\beta_0^M = \beta_0(y)$ . Here  $\beta_0^M$  is the vector of non-zero true coefficients padded with zeros to make it a vector of length  $|M|$ .

Pötscher (1991) and Leeb and Pötscher (2003) study the behavior of least squares coefficients as estimators of the true regression coefficients in a sequential testing setting. In contrast, works such as Berk et al. (2013) and Leeb et al. (2015) consider inference with respect to the regression coefficients in the selected model. In this work, we follow the latter point of view, taking the stance that a true model does not necessarily exist or, even if one exists, may be difficult to identify. Thus, the interest is in the parameters of the model the researchers have decided to investigate.

### 1.3 Conditioning on Selection

A data-driven model selection procedure tends to choose models that are especially suited for the observed data rather than the data-generating distribution. In linear regression this would often be in the form of inclusion of variables that are correlated with the dependent variable only due to random variation. A promising approach for correcting for this bias towards the observed data is to condition on the selection of a model.

**Example 2.** Consider once again the univariate normal example, simplified via sufficiency to a single observation. Let  $Y \sim N(\mu, 1)$  and assume that we are interested in estimating  $\mu$




Figure 1: Conditional estimators for the univariate normal distribution exhibiting an adaptive shrinkage behavior. The right panel describes the conditional estimator when selection is two-sided:  $|y| > 1.96$ . The left panel describes one-sided selection:  $y > 1.96$ . The red line plots the value of the conditional estimator as a function of the observed value, the dashed line is the  $x = y$  line and the grey line marks the threshold. In the left plot, the conditional estimate asymptotes to  $-\infty$  as the observed value approaches the threshold.

if and only if  $|Y| > c$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . Standard inferential techniques assume that we observe values from the distribution  $Y \sim N(\mu, 1)$ . However, when inference is preceded by testing we never observe any values  $-c < Y < c$  and the post-selection distribution of the observed value is not normal but truncated normal. Thus, the conditional post-selection maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) is:

$$\hat{\mu} = \arg \max_{\mu} f(y|\{|Y| > c\}) = \arg \max_{\mu} \frac{f_{\mu}(y)}{P(|Y| > c)} I_{\{|Y| > c\}}.$$

The right-hand panel of Figure 1 plots the post-selection MLE (as a function of  $y$ ) for the two-sided case described above. Since this MLE is an even function we show the graph only for  $y > 0$ . The left-hand panel describes the post-selection MLE for the one-sided case where we estimate  $\mu$  if  $y > c$ . In the two-sided case the estimator is an adaptive shrinkage

estimator that shrinks the observed value towards zero when it is close to the threshold and keeps it as it is when its magnitude is far away from the threshold.

More generally, let  $Y \sim f_\theta$  follow a distribution from an exponential family with sufficient statistic  $T(Y) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . The likelihood of  $T(y)$  given that model  $M$  has been selected is

$$\mathcal{L}_M(\theta) = \frac{P(M|T(y))f(T(y))}{P(M)}I_M,$$

where we use the shorthand  $P(M|T(y)) := P(S(Y) = M|T(Y) = T(y))$  for the conditional probability of selecting model  $M$  given  $T(y)$ . Similarly,  $P(M) := P(S(Y) = M)$  is the unconditional probability of selecting  $M$ ,  $f(T(y))$  is the unconditional density function of  $T(y)$ , and  $I_M = I_{\{S(y)=M\}}$  is the indicator function for the selection event.

The main obstacle in performing post-selection maximum likelihood inference is the computation of the probability of model selection  $P(M)$ , which is typically a  $p$  dimensional integral. Such integrals are difficult to compute when  $p$  is large, and much of the work in the field of post-selection inference has been concerned with getting around the computation of these integrals. For example, Lee et al. (2016) propose to condition on the signs of the selected variables as well as some additional information contained in the sub-space orthogonal to the quantity of interest in order to obtain a tractable post-selection likelihood. Panigrahi et al. (2016) approximate  $P(M)$  with a barrier function.

Conditioning on information beyond the selection of the model of interest, while having the benefit of providing tractable solutions to the post-selection inference problem, may drastically change the form of the likelihood. Consider once again the post-selection estimators for the univariate normal problem (Figure 1). Suppose that we observe  $y > 0$ . Then the right-hand panel plots the conditional estimator for the scenario where two-sided testing is performed. On the left-hand side we plot the conditional estimator for  $\mu$  as a function of  $y$  when we condition on the two-sided selection event as well as the sign of  $y$ .

Indeed, since our observed value is positive we condition on  $\{|Y| > c, Y > 0\} = \{Y > c\}$ . This second estimator is close to the observed value  $y$  when  $y$  is far from the threshold but approaches negative infinity as  $y \rightarrow c$ , see Appendix C for details. Thus, even in the univariate normal case, conditioning on the sign of  $y$  in two-sided testing, may drastically alter the resulting conditional estimator.

## 1.4 Outline

In this work, instead of working with the intractable post-selection likelihood, we base our inference on the post-selection score function which can be approximated efficiently even in multivariate problems. The following lemma describes the post-selection score function for exponential family distributions.

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose the observation  $y$  is drawn from a distribution  $f_\theta$  that belongs to an exponential family with natural parameter  $\theta$  and sufficient statistic  $T(y)$ . If the model selection procedure  $S(y)$  satisfies  $P(S(Y) = M | T(y)) \in \{0, 1\}$  for a given model  $M$ , then the conditional (post-selection) score function is given by:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta) = T(y) - \mathbb{E}_\theta(T(Y)|M). \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* This result follows directly from the fact that the conditional distribution of an exponential family distribution is also an exponential family distribution as long as  $P(M|T(y)) \in \{0, 1\}$ . See Fithian et al. (2014) for details.  $\square$

In the specific setup we consider subsequently, the conditional distribution of  $T(Y)$  given  $M$  is a multivariate truncated normal distribution. While it is then difficult to compute  $\mathbb{E}(T(Y)|M)$ , we are able to sample efficiently from the multivariate truncated normal distribution using a Gibbs sampler (Geweke, 1991). The main idea behind the method we

propose is to use the samples from the truncated multivariate normal distribution as noisy estimates of  $\mathbb{E}(T(Y)|M)$  and take small incremental steps in the direction of the estimated score function, resulting in a fast stochastic gradient ascent algorithm. Our framework has similarities with the contrastive divergence method of Hinton (2002).

The rest of the article is structured as follows. In Section 2 we present the proposed inference method in detail and apply it to selective inference on the mean vector of a multivariate normal distribution. In Section 3 we describe how the proposed framework can be adapted for post-selection inference in a linear regression model that was chosen by the lasso. In Section 4 we formulate conditions under which the conditional MLE is consistent. A simulation study in Section 5 demonstrates that the proposed approach yields improved point estimates for the regression coefficients, and that our confidence intervals, despite lacking a rigorous theoretical justification, achieve close to nominal coverage rates. Finally, in Section 6 we conclude with a discussion.

## 2 Inference for Selected Normal Means

Before considering the Lasso, we first discuss the simpler problem of selectively estimating the means of a multivariate normal distribution. Let  $Y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$  with mean vector  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and a *known* covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . Observing  $y$ , we select the model

$$M = \{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : y_j \leq l_j \text{ or } y_j \geq u_j\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $l_1, \dots, l_p, u_1, \dots, u_p \in [-\infty, \infty]$  are predetermined constants with  $l_1 < u_1, \dots, l_p < u_p$ . We then perform inference for the coordinates  $\mu_j$  with  $j \in M$  (or possibly inference for a function of these coordinates).

This seemingly simple problem has garnered much attention. For the univariate case of  $p = 1$ , Weinstein et al. (2013) propose a method for constructing valid confidence intervals,



and Benjamini and Meir (2014) compute the post-selection MLE for  $\mu$ . For  $p \gg 1$ , Lee et al. (2016) develop a recipe for constructing valid confidence intervals for the selected means or linear functions thereof. Reid et al. (2014) discuss ML estimation when  $\Sigma = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$ . To the best of our knowledge, the method we propose below is the first to address the computation of the conditional MLE when  $p \gg 1$  and the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  is of general structure.

Conditionally on selection, the distribution of  $y$  is truncated multivariate normal, as the  $j$ th coordinate of  $y$  is constrained to lie in the interval  $(l_j, u_j)$  if  $j \notin M$  or in its complement if  $j \in M$ . In Section 2.1 we describe the Gibbs sampler we use to sample from a truncated multivariate normal distribution, in Section 2.2 we describe how such samples can be used to compute the post-selection estimator and in Section 2.3 we propose a method for constructing confidence intervals based on the conditional MLE and samples obtained from the truncated normal distribution.

## 2.1 Sampling from a Truncated Normal Distribution

Sampling from the truncated multivariate normal distribution is a well studied problem (Griffiths, 2004; Pakman and Paninski, 2014). We choose to use the Gibbs sampler of Kotecha and Djuric (1999), as it is especially suited to our needs and simple to implement.

Assume we wish to generate a draw from the univariate truncated normal distribution constrained to lie in the interval  $[l, u] \subseteq [-\infty, \infty]$ . This distribution has CDF

$$\Phi(y; \mu, \sigma^2, l, u) := \frac{\Phi(y; \mu, \sigma^2) - \Phi(l; \mu, \sigma^2)}{\Phi(u; \mu, \sigma^2) - \Phi(l; \mu, \sigma^2)},$$

where  $\Phi(y; \mu, \sigma^2)$  denotes the CDF of the (untruncated) univariate normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ . A simple method for sampling from the truncated normal distribution samples a uniform random variable  $U \sim U(0, 1)$  and sets

$$y = \Phi^{-1}(U; \mu, \sigma^2, l, u) = \Phi^{-1}(U(\Phi(u) - \Phi(l)) - \Phi(l); \mu, \sigma^2). \quad (4)$$

Next, consider sampling from the truncated normal constrained to the set  $(-\infty, l] \cup [u, \infty)$ . In this case, we may first sample a region within which to include  $y$  and then sample from a truncated univariate normal distribution constrained to the selected region using the formula given in (4).

Given this preparation, we may implement a Gibbs sampler for a truncated multivariate normal distribution as follows. Let  $y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$ , and let  $f(y|M)$  be the conditional distribution of  $y$  given the selection event. While the marginal distributions of  $f(y|M)$  are not truncated normal, the full conditional distribution  $f(y_j|M, y_{-j})$  for a single coordinate  $y_j$  is truncated normal with parameters

$$\mu_{j,-j} = \mu_j + \Sigma_{j,-j} \Sigma_{-j,-j}^{-1} (y_{-j} - \mu_{-j}), \quad \sigma_{j,-j}^2 = \Sigma_{j,j} - \Sigma_{j,-j} \Sigma_{-j,-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-j,j}.$$

The Gibbs sampler repeatedly iterates over all coordinates of  $y$  and draws a value for  $y_j$  conditional on  $M$  and  $y_{-j}$ . So at the  $t$ th iteration we sample

$$Y_j^t \sim f(y_j|M, y_1^t, \dots, y_{j-1}^t, y_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, y_p^{t-1}), \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

The support of the truncated normal distribution is determined by whether or not  $j \in M$ .

## 2.2 A Stochastic Gradient Ascent Algorithm

The Gibbs sampler described above can be used to closely approximate  $\mathbb{E}(Y|M)$  but computation of the likelihood  $\mathcal{L}_M(\mu)$  remains intractable. However, for optimization of the likelihood, we can simply take steps of decreasing size in the direction of the evaluated gradient

$$\mu^i = \mu^{i-1} + \gamma_i \Sigma^{-1} (y - y^i(\mu^{i-1})), \quad (5)$$




Figure 2: The contours of the conditional log-likelihood of a two-dimensional normal distribution. A selection rule  $|y_j| > 1.65$  was applied to the observed value  $y = (1.45, 1.8)$  marked with ‘O’. The conditional MLE where all coordinates are estimated is marked with ‘C’ at  $(5.4, 2.5)$ , and the plug-in conditional MLE which does not estimate the coordinates that were not selected is marked as ‘P’ at  $(1.45, 0.8)$ . The plug-in estimator, unlike the full conditional MLE, is an adaptive shrinkage estimator as in the univariate case.

where  $y$  is the observed data,  $y^i(\mu^{i-1})$  is a sample from the truncated multivariate normal distribution taken at  $\mu^{i-1}$  and the step size  $\gamma_i$  satisfies:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma_i = \infty, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma_i^2 < \infty. \quad (6)$$

We emphasize that while it is technically possible to compute an MLE for the entire mean vector of the observed random variable, it is not necessarily desirable. To see why, consider once again the left-hand panel of Figure 1 where the estimator tends to  $-\infty$  as the observed value approaches the threshold. Such erratic behavior may arise when we estimate the coordinates of  $\mu$  which were not selected, based on observations that are constrained to lie in a convex set, resulting in poor estimates also for the selected coordinates.




Figure 3: Convergence of the stochastic optimization algorithms. We plot the parameter estimates as a function of the number of gradient steps taken for the post-selection normal means estimation problem (left panel) and the post-selection regression estimation problem (right panel). The algorithms tend to converge to the neighborhood of the MLE in a few hundred iterations.

**Example 3.** We plot the conditional log-likelihood for a two-dimensional normal model in Figure 2. In such a low-dimensional case, the likelihood function can be computed using routines from the ‘mvtnorm’ R package (Genz et al., 2016). Our plot is for a setting where we observe  $y = (1.45, 1.8)$  with  $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.5^{I\{i \neq j\}}$ , and only the first coordinate of  $\mu$  was selected based on the thresholds  $l_1 = l_2 = -1.65$ ,  $u_1 = u_2 = 1.65$ . The point  $y$  is marked in the figure as an ‘O’, and the log-likelihood is maximized at the point marked with ‘C’, which is  $\hat{\mu} = (5.4, 2.5)$ . We see that instead of performing shrinkage on the observed selected coordinate, the selected coordinate was estimated to be far larger than the observed value.

In order to mitigate this behavior, we propose using a plug-in estimator for the coordi-

nates outside of  $M$ . Particularly, we limit ourselves to taking steps of the form

$$\mu_j^i = \begin{cases} \mu^{i-1} + \gamma_i \Sigma_{j,\cdot}^{-1} (y - y^i(\mu^{i-1})) & \text{if } j \in M, \\ y_j & \text{if } j \notin M, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where  $\Sigma_{j,\cdot}^{-1}$  is the  $j$ th row of  $\Sigma^{-1}$ . In other words, we impute the unselected coordinates of  $\mu$  with the corresponding observed values of  $y$ , and maximize the likelihood only with respect to the selected coordinates of  $\mu$ . These plug-in estimates for the coordinates of  $\mu$  which were not selected are consistent, as we show in Section 4. The plug-in conditional MLE for Example 3 is shown as a ‘P’ in Figure 2. It is approximately  $\hat{\mu} = (1.45, 0.8)$ .

Next, we give a convergence statement for the proposed algorithm. Since our gradient steps are based on  $y^i(\mu^{i-1})$ , a noisy estimate of  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu^{i-1}}(Y|M)$ , the resulting algorithm fits into the stochastic optimization framework of Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis (2000). In short, the theory for stochastic optimization guarantees that taking steps in the form of (5) leads to convergence to the MLE as long as the variance of the gradient steps can be bounded.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $Y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$ , and let  $M$  be defined as in (3). Then for all  $j \in M$ :*

$$E_{\mu} (Y_j^i(\mu) - \mathbb{E}_{\mu}(Y_j|M))^2 \leq \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma)}{P \left( \bigcap_{j \notin M} \{l_j < y_j < u_j\} \right) \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(l_j; u_j, \sigma_{j,-j}^2)}.$$

*The algorithm described in (7) converges to the Z-estimator given by the root of the function*

$$\psi(\mu)_j = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{j,\cdot}^{-1} (y_j - \mathbb{E}_{\mu}(Y_j|M)) & \text{if } j \in M, \\ y_j - \mu_j & \text{if } j \notin M. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

A precise description of the optimization algorithm is given in Algorithm 1 in the appendix. Figure 3 shows typical optimization paths for Algorithm 1 as well as the stochastic gradient method for the Lasso described in Section 3.




Figure 4: Post-selection estimates and confidence intervals for the normal means problem. In this example, 15 means were selected for a threshold of 1.65. The observed values are marked by triangles and the conditional estimators are marked by circles. Naive confidence intervals are marked by a dashed blue line and Conditional-Wald confidence intervals are marked by solid red lines. The true values of the parameter are shown as squares.

## 2.3 Conditional Confidence Intervals

In the absence of model selection, the MLE is typically asymptotically normal, and it is common practice to construct Wald confidence intervals based on this limiting distribution:

$$\hat{\mu}^{\text{naive}} = y, \quad \text{CI}_j^{\text{naive}} = (\hat{\mu}_j^{\text{naive}} - z_{j,1-\alpha/2}, \hat{\mu}_j^{\text{naive}} + z_{j,\alpha/2}), \quad (9)$$

where  $z_{j,\alpha}$  denotes the  $(1 - \alpha)$  quantile of the asymptotic normal distribution for the  $j$ th coordinate. The post-selection setting is more complicated, however, because we can no longer rely the asymptotic normality of the estimators. Instead, we propose to construct confidence intervals based on the second order Taylor expansion of the conditional likeli-

hood.

In order to describe our proposed approximation to the distribution of the conditional MLE, we extend the normal means problem to the setting of an  $n$ -sample. So assume that instead of observing a single vector  $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , we have a set of observations  $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and perform model selection and inference based on  $\bar{y}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$ . Our confidence intervals are based on the approximation

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_n^M - \mu_0^M) \approx \sqrt{n} \text{Var}_{\mu_0^M} \left( \sqrt{n} \Sigma^{-1} \bar{Y}_n \mid M \right)^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \left( \bar{y}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0^M}(\bar{Y}_n \mid M) \right). \quad (10)$$

Based on this approximation, we construct confidence intervals

$$\hat{\text{CI}}_j = \left( \hat{\mu}_{j,n}^M - \hat{\text{TN}}_{j,1-\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\mu}_{j,n}^M - \hat{\text{TN}}_{j,\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n} \right). \quad (11)$$

Here,  $\hat{\text{TN}}$  stands for the conditional distribution given selection of

$$\text{Var}_{\hat{\mu}^M} \left( \sqrt{n} \Sigma^{-1} \bar{Y} \mid M \right)^{-1} \Sigma^{-1} \sqrt{n} \left( \bar{y}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mu}^M}(\bar{Y}_n \mid M) \right). \quad (12)$$

We estimate the quantiles  $\hat{\text{TN}}_{j,1-\alpha/2}$  and  $\hat{\text{TN}}_{j,\alpha/2}$  using empirical quantiles of samples from the truncated normal distribution. While we are unable to provide theoretical justification for these confidence intervals, a comprehensive simulation study reveals that they obtain coverage rates that are significantly better than those of the naive confidence intervals, and are surprisingly close to the desired level (Section 5).

**Example 4.** Figure 4 shows point estimates and confidence intervals for selected means in a normal means problems. The figure was generated by sampling  $Y \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$  with  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{20} \sim N(0, 4)$  i.i.d.,  $\mu_{21} = \dots = \mu_{100} = 0$  and  $\Sigma_{i,j} = 0.3I_{i \neq j} + 1I_{i=j}$ . The applied selection rule was  $S(y) = \{j : |y_j| > 1.65\}$ . The plotted estimates are the conditional estimates computed using the algorithm defined by (7) along with the 95% confidence

intervals described in (11). In addition, we plot the estimates and confidence intervals described in (9) which we term *naive*. These were not adjusted for selection.

As we had seen in the univariate case, the conditional estimator acts as an adaptive shrinkage estimator. When the observed value is far away from the threshold, then no shrinkage is performed and when it is relatively close to the threshold then it is shrunk towards zero.

### 3 Maximum Likelihood Estimation for the Lasso

In this section we demonstrate how the ideas from the previous section can be adapted for computing the post-selection MLE in linear regression models selected by the Lasso. The Lasso estimator minimizes the squared error loss augmented by an  $\ell_1$  penalty,

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso}} = \arg \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} \|y - \mathbf{X} \beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1$$

with  $\lambda \geq 0$  being a tuning parameter. Model selection results from the fact that the  $\ell_1$  penalty may shrink a subset of the regression coefficients to zero. As in Lee et al. (2016), we perform inference on the non-zero regression coefficients in the Lasso solution, that is, the selection procedure is  $S(y) = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso},j} \neq 0\}$ .

Given selection of a model  $M$ , we are interested in estimating the unconditional mean of the regression coefficients  $\beta = (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbb{E}(Y)$ . We begin by describing the Lasso selection event (Section 3.1) and then give a Metropolis-Hastings sampler for the post-selection distribution of the least-squares estimates (Section 3.2). In Section 3.3, we describe a practical stochastic ascent algorithm for estimation after model selection with the Lasso.



### 3.1 The Lasso Selection Event

Let  $M \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$  be a given model. In order to develop a sampling algorithm for a normal distribution truncated to the event that  $S(\mathbf{X}, y) := \{j : \hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso},j} \neq 0\} = M$ , we invoke the work of Lee et al. (2016) who provide a useful characterization of this Lasso selection event. Let  $s \in \{-1, 1\}^{|M|}$  be the vector of signs of  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso}}$  over the active set. We will consider two sets

$$A_1(M, s) := \{\mathbf{A}_1(M, s)y < u_1(M, s)\}, \quad (13)$$

$$A_0(M, s) := \{l_0(M, s) < \mathbf{A}_0(M)y < u_0(M, s)\}, \quad (14)$$

where in the first event

$$\mathbf{A}_1(M, s) = -\text{diag}(s)(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T, \quad u_1(M, s) = -\lambda \text{diag}(s)(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} s, \quad (15)$$

and in the second event

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_0(M) &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{X}_{-M}^T (I - \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T), \\ l_0(M, s) &= -\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{X}_{-M}^T \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} s, \quad u_0(M, s) = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{X}_{-M}^T \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} s. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{X}_M$  is the submatrix of the design matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  made up of the columns indexed by the selected model  $M$  and the columns in the submatrix  $\mathbf{X}_{-M}$  correspond to variables which were not selected. It can be shown that

$$\{S(\mathbf{X}, Y) = M \text{ and sign vector equal to } s\} = A_0(M, s) \cap A_1(M, s). \quad (17)$$

Suppose that  $Y \sim (\mathbf{X} \beta, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ , then conditional score function for a model selected by the Lasso is given by

$$\sigma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \mathcal{L}(\beta|M) = \mathbf{X}_M^T y - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}_M^T Y|M) = \mathbf{X}_M^T y - \frac{\sum_s P(M, s) \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}_M^T Y|A_1(M, s))}{\sum_s P(M, s)},$$

where for a given set of signs  $P(M, s) = P(A_0(M, s)) \times P(A_1(M, s))$ .

As in the normal means problem, parameters related to the set of variables excluded from the model play a role in the conditional likelihood. In the normal means problem we advocated excluding those from the optimization of the conditional likelihood. For the Lasso, we similarly must compute a conditional expectation which is a function of  $\mathbf{A}_0(M) \mathbb{E}(Y)$ . We again advocate for avoiding conditional likelihood-based estimation of this quantity. In computational experiments we observed that the value of  $\mathbf{A}_0(M) \mathbb{E}(Y)$  tends to be very small and rather well approximated by a vector of zeros. For more on this and some numerical examples see Appendix B.

In the next subsection, we devise an algorithm for sampling from the post-selection distribution of the regression coefficients selected by the Lasso without conditioning on the sign vector  $s$ . The sampler will operate by updating the two quantities

$$\eta := (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T y, \quad \xi := \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbf{X}_{-M} (I - \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T) y.$$

### 3.2 Sampling from the Lasso Post-Selection Distribution

With a view towards Gibbs sampling, we examine the region where a single regression coefficient may lie given the signs of all other coefficients. Let  $j \in M$  be an arbitrary index. Denote by  $s^{+j}$  and  $s^{-j}$  vectors of signs where the signs for all coordinates but  $j$  are held constant and the  $j$ th coordinates are set to either 1 or  $-1$ , respectively. A necessary condition for the selection of  $M$  is that  $\eta_j \leq \lambda(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)_{j,\cdot}^{-1} s^{-j}$  or  $\eta_j \geq \lambda(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)_{j,\cdot}^{-1} s^{+j}$ . Ideally, we would be able to implement a Gibbs sampler that allows for the change of signs as we have done in Section 2.1 by setting

$$l_j = \lambda(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)_{j,\cdot}^{-1} s^{-j}, \quad u_j = \lambda(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)_{j,\cdot}^{-1} s^{+j}. \quad (18)$$

However, an important way in which the Lasso selection event differs from the one described in Section 2 is that when a single coordinate of  $s$  is changed, the thresholds for all other variables change. Thus, in order for a single coordinate of  $\eta$  to change its sign, all other variables must be in positions that allow for that.

In order to explore the entire sample space (and sign combinations) we propose a delayed rejection Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Tierney and Mira, 1999; Mira, 2001). The algorithm works by attempting to take a Gibbs step for each selected variable in turn. If the proposed Gibbs step for the  $j$ th variable satisfies the constraints induced by the selection event then the proposal is accepted. Otherwise, we keep the proposal for the  $j$ th variable and make a global proposal for all selected variables keeping their signs fixed. We use the notation:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &\sim N_p(\beta, \Sigma_1), & \beta &= (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbb{E}(Y), & \Sigma_1 &= \sigma^2 (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1}, \\ \xi &\sim N(0, \Sigma_0), & \Sigma_0 &= \sigma^2 \mathbf{A}_0(M) \mathbf{A}_0(M)^T.\end{aligned}$$

At some arbitrary iteration  $t$ , our sampler first makes the draw

$$\xi^t \sim f(\xi|M, \eta^{t-1}). \tag{19}$$

This sampling task is quite simple in the sense that  $\xi|M, \eta$  has a multivariate normal distribution constrained to a convex set. Next, we make a proposal for each selected variable. For the  $j$ th selected variable we sample:

$$r_j \sim f(\eta_j | \{\eta_j < l_j\} \cup \{u_j < \eta_j\}, \eta_1^t, \dots, \eta_{j-1}^t, \eta_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, \eta_p^{t-1}),$$

where  $l_j$  and  $u_j$  are as defined in (18). If the sign of  $r_j$  differs from the sign of  $\eta_j^{t-1}$ , then we must verify that  $\xi^t$  from (19) satisfies the constraints imposed by the new set of signs. If the constraints described in (14) are not satisfied, then the proposal is rejected.

If the proposal yields a point that satisfies both (14) and (13) then no further adjustment is necessary and the acceptance probability is 1 because the proposal is full conditional (Chib and Greenberg, 1995). On the other hand, if the proposed point is not in the set from (13), then a sign change has been performed and we must update the values for other coordinates.

Denote by  $\text{TN}(a, b, \mu, \sigma^2)$  a univariate normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  constrained to the interval  $(a, b)$ . For all variables  $k \neq j$  we sample a proposal from the following distribution:

$$r_k \sim \text{TN}(a_k, b_k, \eta_k^t, \sigma_{k,-k}^2), \quad (20)$$

where  $a_k = u_k$  and  $b_k = \infty$  if  $s_k^t = 1$ , and  $a_k = -\infty$  and  $b_k = l_k$  if  $s_k^t = -1$ . Note that in (20)  $l_k$  and  $u_k$  must be recomputed according to the proposed sign change.

The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm in its entirety is described in Algorithm 2 in the Appendix. The following Lemma describes the transitions of the proposed sampler.

**Lemma 2.** *For the  $j$ th variable at the  $t$ th iteration define:*

$$\begin{aligned} r_1^{\rightarrow} &= (\eta_1^t, \dots, \eta_{j-1}^t, r_j, \eta_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, \eta_p^{t-1}, \xi^t), & r_2^{\rightarrow} &= (r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, r_j, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_p, \xi^t), \\ r_1^{\leftarrow} &= (r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, \eta_j^{t-1}, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_p, \xi^t), & r_2^{\leftarrow} &= (\eta_1^t, \dots, \eta_{j-1}^t, \eta_j^{t-1}, \eta_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, \eta_p^{t-1}, \xi^t). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $r_2^{\leftarrow}$  represents the current state of the sampler after the Gibbs step from (19). If  $\xi^t$  from (19) is not in the set from (14), then the proposal for  $r_j$  is rejected and the sampler stays in state  $r_2^{\leftarrow}$ . If  $\xi^t$  is in (14) and  $r_1^{\rightarrow}$  is in the set from (13) then the sampler moves to  $r_1^{\rightarrow}$ . Otherwise, if  $r_1^{\leftarrow}$  is in the set from (13) then the sampler stays in state  $r_2^{\leftarrow}$ . Finally if neither  $r_1^{\rightarrow}$  nor  $r_1^{\leftarrow}$  are in the set from (13) then the sampler either moves to  $r_2^{\rightarrow}$  or stays put at  $r_2^{\leftarrow}$ . In this case, the move to  $r_2^{\rightarrow}$  occurs with probability

$$p_j^t = \min \left( \frac{\varphi(r_2^{\rightarrow}; \beta, \Sigma) q(r_2^{\rightarrow}, r_2^{\leftarrow})}{\varphi(r_2^{\leftarrow}; \beta, \Sigma) q(r_2^{\leftarrow}, r_2^{\rightarrow})}, 1 \right), \quad (21)$$

where

$$q(x, y) = f(y_j | \{Y_j < l_j\} \cup \{u_j < Y_j\}, x_{-j}) \prod_{k \neq j} \frac{\varphi(y_k; x_k, \sigma_{k,-k}^2)}{P(Y_k \in (a_k, b_k); x_k, \sigma_{k,-k}^2)}.$$

### 3.3 A Stochastic Ascent Algorithm for the Lasso

We now propose an algorithm for computing the post-selection MLE when the model is selected via Lasso. We begin by defining the gradient ascent step, which uses samples from the post-selection distribution of the refitted regression coefficients. We give a convergence statement for the resulting algorithm, and we discuss practical implementation for which we address variance estimation and imposing sign constraints.

Let  $M = S(y)$  be the Lasso-selected model. Given a sample  $\eta^i \sim f_{\hat{\beta}^{i-1}}(\eta|M)$  from the post-selection distribution of the least squares estimator, we take steps of the form:

$$\hat{\beta}^i = \hat{\beta}^{i-1} + \gamma_i (\mathbf{X}_M^T y - (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M) \eta^i), \quad (22)$$

where the  $\gamma_i$  satisfy the conditions from (6). In Theorem 2 we give a convergence statement for the algorithm defined by (22). As in Theorem 1, the main challenge is bounding the variance of the stochastic gradient steps.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\eta$  follow the conditional distribution of  $\eta \sim N(\beta, \Sigma)$  given the Lasso selection  $S(y) = M$ . Then there exists a constant  $A$  such that for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}_\beta \left\| (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M) \eta - \mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbb{E}_\beta(Y|M) \right\|_2^2 \leq A.$$

Furthermore, the sequence  $(\hat{\beta}^i)$  from (22) converges, and its limit  $\hat{\beta}^\infty := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}^i$  satisfies  $\psi(\hat{\beta}^\infty) := \mathbf{X}_M^T y - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\beta}^\infty}(\mathbf{X}_M^T Y|M) = 0$ .

Before we exemplify the behavior of the proposed algorithm we first discuss some technicalities. The sampling algorithm proposed in the previous section assumes knowledge




Figure 5: Post-selection estimates and confidence intervals for the Lasso. For simulated data, we plot the conditional MLE (circles), refitted least-squares estimates (triangles) and Lasso estimates (squares). The true coefficient values are marked by plus signs. We also plot three types of confidence intervals, Conditional-Wald (solid red line), Refitted-Wald (dashed green line) and Polyhedral confidence intervals (dashed blue lines).

of the residual standard error  $\sigma$ , a quantity that in practice must be estimated from the data. We find that the cross-validated Lasso variance estimate recommended by Reid et al. (2016) works well for our purposes.

As in the univariate normal case, the post-selection estimator for the Lasso performs adaptive shrinkage on the refitted regression coefficients. However, the asymmetry between the thresholds dictated by different sign sets may cause the sign of the conditional coefficient estimate to be different than the one inferred by the Lasso. Empirically we have found some benefit for constraining the signs of the estimated coefficients to those of the refitted least-squares coefficient estimates.

**Example 5.** We illustrate the proposed method via simulated data that are generated as

follows. We form a matrix of covariates by sampling  $n$  rows independently from  $N_p(0, \Sigma)$  with  $\Sigma_{i,j} = \rho^{|i-j|}$ . We then generate a coefficient vector  $\beta$  by sampling  $k$  coordinates from the  $Laplace(1)$  distribution and setting the rest to zero. Next, we sample a response vector  $Y \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ , where  $\mu = \mathbf{X} \beta$  and  $\sigma^2$  is chosen to obtain a certain signal-to-noise ratio defined as  $\text{snr} := \text{Var}(\mu)/\sigma^2$ . We set  $n = 400$ ,  $p = 1000$ ,  $k = 5$ ,  $\rho = 0.3$  and  $\text{snr} = 0.2$ .

Given a simulated dataset we select a model using the Lasso as implemented in the R package ‘glmnet’ (Friedman et al., 2010). Following common practice and the default of the package, the tuning parameter  $\lambda$  is selected via cross-validation. Strictly speaking, this yields another post-selection problem.

In Figure 5 we plot three types of estimates for the regression coefficients selected by the Lasso. The conditional estimator proposed here, the refitted least-squares estimates and the Lasso estimates. In addition to the point estimates, we also plot three types of confidence intervals. The first are the Conditional-Wald confidence intervals analogous to the ones described in Section 2.3. They are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\text{CI}}_j &= \left( \hat{\beta}_{j,n}^M - \hat{\text{TN}}_{j,1-\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\beta}_{j,n}^M - \hat{\text{TN}}_{j,\alpha/2}/\sqrt{n} \right), \\ \hat{\text{TN}} &=^D \sigma^2 \text{Var}_{\hat{\beta}_n^M} \left( n^{-0.5} \mathbf{X}_M^T Y | M \right)^{-1} n^{-0.5} \left( \mathbf{X}_M^T y - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\beta}_n^M}(\mathbf{X}_M^T Y | M) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second intervals are the Refitted-Wald confidence intervals obtained from fitting a linear regression model to the selected covariates without accounting for selection. Finally, we also include the intervals of Lee et al. (2016) as implemented in the R package ‘selectiveInference’ (Tibshirani et al., 2016). We term these *Polyhedral* confidence intervals.

In Figure 5, black circles mark the conditional estimates, triangles the refitted least squares estimates, squares the lasso estimates and plus signs the true coefficient values. The conditional estimator tends to lie between the refitted and the lasso estimates. When the refitted estimate is far from zero the conditional estimator applies very little shrinkage,

and when the refitted estimator is closer to zero the conditional estimator is shrunk towards the lasso estimate. The conditional confidence intervals also exhibit a behavior that depends on the estimated magnitude of the regression coefficients. When the conditional estimator is far from zero the size of the confidence intervals is similar to the size of the refitted confidence interval. When the conditional estimator is shrunk towards zero, its variance tends to be the smallest. The confidence intervals are the widest when the conditional estimator is just in-between the lasso and refitted estimates. The Polyhedral confidence intervals tend to be the largest in most cases. Section 5 gives a more thorough examination of these estimates and confidence intervals.

## 4 Asymptotics for Conditional Estimators

We now present asymptotic distribution theory that supports the estimation method proposed in the previous sections. Such theory is complicated by the fact that model selection induces dependence between the previously i.i.d. observations. In Section 4.1 we first give a consistency result for naive unconditional estimates, which in particular justifies our plug-in likelihood method for the normal means problem. We then outline conditions under which the conditional MLE is consistent for the parameters of interest in a general exponential family setting. In Section 4.2 we adapt the theory to the Lasso post-selection estimator. We remark that theory on the efficiency of conditional estimators can be found in Routtenberg and Tong (2015). Proofs for this section are deferred to the appendix.

### 4.1 Theory for exponential families

Suppose we have an i.i.d. sequence of observations  $(Y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  drawn from a distribution  $f^*$ . As a base model for the distribution of each observation  $y_i$ , consider a regular exponential



family  $\{p_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$  with sufficient statistic  $T \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and natural parameter  $\theta$ . So,  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ . For the sample  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ , define  $\bar{T}_n := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n T(y_i)$ . Now, let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a countable set of submodels, which we denote by  $M = \{p_{\theta^M} : \theta^M \in \Theta^M\}$  with parameter space  $\Theta_M \subset \Theta$ . We consider a model selection procedure  $S_n : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  that selects a model  $M$  as a function of  $\bar{T}_n$ . Based on the true distribution  $f^*$  the sample is taken from, the selection procedure  $S_n$  induces a distribution  $P_n(M) := P(S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M)$  over  $\mathcal{M}$ . We emphasize that  $f^*$  need not belong to any model in  $\mathcal{M}$  nor the base family  $\{p_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ .

**Example 6.** In the normal means problem,  $p_\theta$  is a normal distribution with mean vector  $\theta$ . The sufficient statistic is  $T(y) = \Sigma^{-1}y$ , where  $\Sigma$  is the known covariance matrix. Each model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  corresponds to a set of mean vectors with a subset of coordinates equal to zero. The selection procedure  $S_n$  is based on comparing the coordinates of  $\bar{T}_n$  to predetermined thresholds  $l_j$  and  $u_j$ , recall (3). In an asymptotic setting  $l_j$  and  $u_j$  will often scale with the sample size to obtain a pre-specified type-I error rate.

We consider estimation of a parameter  $\theta_0^M$  of a fixed model  $M$ , which represents the model selected in the data analysis. If the data-generating distribution  $f^*$  belongs to  $M$ , then  $f^* = p_{\theta_0^M}$  for a parameter value  $\theta_0^M \in \Theta^M$  and consistency can be understood as referring to the true data-generating distribution. If  $f^* \notin M$ , then the parameter in question corresponds to the distribution in  $M$  that minimizes the KL-divergence from  $f^*$ , so

$$\theta_0^M := \arg \inf_{\theta^M \in \Theta^M} -\mathbb{E}_{f^*} [\log p_{\theta^M}(Y) - \log f^*(Y)] = \arg \sup_{\theta^M \in \Theta^M} \mathbb{E}_{f^*} [\ell_{\theta^M}(Y)].$$

Note that even under model misspecification we have  $\mathbb{E}_{f^*}(\bar{T}_n) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n)$  because  $\theta_0^M$  is the solution to the expectation of the score equation.

The post-selection setting is unusual in the sense that we are only interested in a specific model  $M$  if  $S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M$ . Hence, it only makes sense to analyze the asymptotic properties

of an estimator of  $\theta_0^M$  if model  $M$  is selected infinitely often as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This justifies our subsequent focus on conditions that involve the probability of selecting  $M$ .

Our first result applies in particular to the normal means problem and is concerned with the post-selection consistency of the unconditional/naive MLE for  $\theta_0^M$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $M$  be a fixed model with  $P_n(M)^{-1}e^{-\delta n} = o(1)$  for all  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $\tilde{\theta}_n^M = (\tilde{\theta}_{n,j}^M)_{j=1}^p$  be an estimator that unconditionally is unbiased for  $\theta_0^M$ . Suppose there is a constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$  such that for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$  and  $n \geq 1$  the distribution of  $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\theta}_{n,j}^M - \theta_{0,j}^M)$  is sub-Gaussian for parameter  $C$ . Then  $\tilde{\theta}_n^M$  is post-selection consistent, that is,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\|\tilde{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty > \varepsilon \mid S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M) = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Next, we turn to the conditional MLE. Let  $\ell_{\theta^M}(y_i)$  be the log-likelihood of  $y_i$  as a function of  $\theta^M$ , and let  $P_{n,\theta^M}(M)$  be the probability of  $\{S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M\}$  where  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  is an i.i.d. sample from  $p_{\theta^M}$ . Then the conditional MLE is

$$\hat{\theta}_n^M = \arg \max_{\theta^M \in \Theta^M} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{\theta^M}(y_i) \right) - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\theta^M}(M).$$

We now give conditions for its post-selection consistency.

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose the fixed model  $M$  satisfies*

$$P_n(M)^{-1} = o(n), \tag{23}$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\theta^M} P_{n,\theta^M}(M)e^n = \infty. \tag{24}$$

*Furthermore, suppose that for a sufficiently small ball  $U \subset \Theta$  centered at  $\theta_0^M$*

$$\sup_{\theta^M \in U(\theta_0^M)} P_{n,\theta^M}(M)^{-1} = o(n). \tag{25}$$

Then the conditional MLE is post-selection consistent for  $\theta_0^M$ , that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty > \varepsilon \mid S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M) = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Condition (24) concerns the model-based selection probability and ensures that the conditional MLE exists with probability 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Both the plug-in likelihood for the selected means problem and the Lasso likelihood satisfy this condition. We note that this condition excludes examples such as the singly truncated univariate normal distribution, where the probability that an MLE does not exist is positive (del Castillo, 1994). Condition (23) concerns the true probability of selecting the considered model  $M$ , which is required to not decrease too fast. Condition (25) serves to ensure that the conditional score function is well behaved in the neighborhood of the estimand.

## 4.2 Theory for the Lasso

In this section we describe how the theory from the previous section applies to inference in linear regression after model selection with the Lasso. Suppose that we observe an independent sequence of observations

$$(Y_i)_{i=1}^\infty \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2). \quad (26)$$

Each observation  $Y_i$  is accompanied by a vector of covariates  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  which we consider fixed, or equivalently, conditioned upon. The sufficient statistic for the linear regression model is given by  $T_n(\mathbf{X}, y) = \mathbf{X}^T y$  and the model selection function  $S_n(\mathbf{X}, y)$  is the Lasso, which selects a model:

$$S_n(\mathbf{X}, y) = \{j : \hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso}, j} \neq 0\}.$$

For a selected model  $M$ , the conditional MLE for the regression coefficients is given by:

$$\hat{\beta}_n^M = \arg \max_{\beta} \frac{f(\mathbf{A}_1 y)}{P_\beta(M)}, \quad (27)$$

where  $P_\beta(M) = \sum_s P_\beta(\mathbf{A}_1(M, s)) \times P_n(\mathbf{A}_0(M, s))$ . Notice that in our objective function the probabilities for not selecting the null-set are not a function of the parameters over which the likelihood is maximized. Instead, they are defined as a function of the sample size  $n$  and are determined by the imputed value for  $\mathbf{A}_0(M)\mu$ . In practice we set  $\mathbf{A}_0(M)\mu = 0$ . This imputation method can be justified by the fact that a model is unlikely to be selected infinitely often if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}_0(M)\mu \neq 0$ .

For good behavior of the conditional MLE we made assumptions regarding the probabilities of selecting models of interest. Many previous works have investigated the properties that a data generating distribution must fulfill in order for the Lasso to identify a correct model with high probability. See for example Zhao and Yu (2006), and Meinshausen and Yu (2009). While we do not limit our attention to the selection of the correct model, this line of study sheds light on the conditions that any model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  must satisfy in order to be selected with sufficiently high probability. In the following we assume that the number of covariates  $p_n = p$  is kept fixed while the sample size  $n$  grows to infinity. We touch on high-dimensional settings briefly at the end of the section.

The set of models for which we are able to guarantee convergence depends on the scaling of the  $\ell_1$  penalization parameter. We consider two types of scalings:

$$\lambda_n \propto \sqrt{n}, \tag{28}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{n} = 0. \tag{29}$$

We begin by discussing the case where the  $\ell_1$  penalization parameter scales as in (28). In this setting, the model selection probabilities can be bounded in a satisfactory manner as long as the expected projection of the model residuals on the linear subspace spanned by the inactive variables is not too large.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that  $\lambda_n$  scales as in (28) and that  $y$  follows a normal distribution as defined in (26). Suppose further that for an arbitrary model of interest  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  there is a matrix  $\Sigma$  and a vector  $\beta_0^M$  such that following holds:*

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \Sigma, \quad (30)$$

$$(\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T \mu \rightarrow \beta_0^M, \quad \mathbf{A}_0(M) \mu \rightarrow 0, \quad a.s. \quad (31)$$

*Then there exists an asymptotic lower bound for the probability of selecting  $M$ :*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(M) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n, \beta^M}(M) = c > 0.$$

Next, we discuss the setting where  $\lambda_n$  grows faster than  $\sqrt{n}$ . Here we must impose stronger conditions on the selected model because the probability of selecting a model which contains covariates with zero coefficient values may decrease to zero at an exponential rate. Furthermore, we make assumptions similar to the Irrepresentable Conditions of Zhao and Yu (2006) on the selected model in order to make sure that the model selection conditions corresponding to the variables not included in the model are satisfied with high probability. We emphasize that we do not assume that the Irrepresentability Conditions hold in order to satisfy the selection of a true model, rather, we make these assumptions in order to identify models (correct or not) for which we can guarantee the consistency of our estimators.

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose that  $\lambda_n$  scales as in (29) and that conditions (26) and (31) hold. Furthermore, assume that:*

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M \rightarrow \Sigma_M, \quad a.s., \quad |\beta_{0j}^M| > 0, \quad \forall j \in M,$$

*and that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup | \mathbf{X}_{-M}^T \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} s | \leq \nu < 1, \quad \forall s \in \{0, 1\}^{|M|}, \quad (32)$$

for some constant  $\nu$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector of ones and the inequality holds element wise. Under these conditions the following limits hold:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta^M} P_{n, \beta^M}(M) e^n = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta^M \in U(\beta_0^M)} P_{n, \beta^M}(M) = 1.$$

The linear regression model trivially satisfies the modeling assumptions we made in the previous section. Thus, under the conditions given in the lemmas stated in this section, the conditional MLE for a model selected by the Lasso can be guaranteed to be well behaved.

**Corollary 1.** *Fix a model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  and suppose that the conditions of either Lemma 3 or Lemma 4 are satisfied. Then the conditional MLE (27) is consistent for  $\beta_0^M$ .*

**Remark 1** (High-Dimensional Problems). The Lasso is often used in cases where the number of covariates  $p$  is much larger than  $n$ . In order to make asymptotic analysis relevant to such cases it is common to assume that  $p$  grows with the sample size. While the theory developed here does not explicitly treat such a high-dimensional setting, none of our assumptions prevent us from allowing the model selection function  $S_n$  to consider a growing number of covariates as  $n$  grows. Specifically, if we assume that the  $\ell_1$  penalty scales at the rate of  $\lambda_n = O(\sqrt{n \log p_n})$  as prescribed e.g. by Hastie et al. (2015), then our theory applies as long as the assumptions of Lemma 4 are satisfied and  $\log p_n = o(n)$ .

**Remark 2** (Normality). While we made a simplifying normality assumption, we expect that for fixed dimension  $p$ , non-normal errors can be addressed using conditions similar to those outlined by Tibshirani et al. (2015). For theory for selective inference with non-normal errors in the high-dimensional case, see the work of Tian and Taylor (2015).

## 5 Simulation Study

In order to more thoroughly assess the performance of the proposed post-selection estimator for the Lasso, we perform a simulation study, which we pattern after that in Meinshausen (2007). We consider prediction and coefficient estimation using Lasso, our conditional estimator and refitted Lasso. We note already that while some existing theoretical works outline conditions under which the refitted Lasso should outperform the Lasso in prediction and estimation (Lederer, 2013), this does not occur in any of our simulation settings. For confidence intervals we compare our Wald confidence intervals to the confidence intervals of Lee et al. (2016) which we term *Polyhedral*. We find that both selection adjusted methods achieve close to nominal coverage rates.

We generate artificial data for our simulations in a similar manner as we have done for Example 5 in Section 3.3. We vary the sample size  $n = 100, 200, 400, 800$ , signal-to-noise ratio  $\text{snr} = 0.2, 0.8$ , and the sparsity level  $k = 2, 5, 10$ . For each combination of parameter values we generate data and fit models 400 times. We keep the amount of dependence fixed at  $\rho = 0.5$  and the number of candidate covariates fixed at  $p = 400$ .

In Figure 6 we plot the log relative estimation error of the refitted-Lasso estimates and the conditional estimates compared to the Lasso as defined by:

$$\frac{1}{|M|} \left( \sum_{j \in M} \log_2(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) - \log_2(\hat{\beta}_{Lasso_j} - \beta_j) \right). \quad (33)$$

This measure of error gives equal weights to all regression coefficients regardless of their absolute magnitude. In all simulation settings the refitted least-squares estimates are significantly less accurate than the Lasso or the conditional estimates. The conditional estimates tend to be more accurate than the Lasso estimates in all simulation settings. The conditional estimate tends to do better when there are at least some large regression coefficients in the true model.




Figure 6: The relative estimation error of the regression coefficients compared to the Lasso as defined in (33). The error of the conditional estimates (solid red line) is lower than that of the Lasso in all simulation settings and the error of the refitted least-squares estimates (dashed blue line) was worse than that of the Lasso in all simulations.

In Figure 7 we present the relative prediction error of the refitted least-squares Lasso estimates and the conditional estimates, as defined by:

$$\log_2 \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \mu\|_2^2 - \log_2 \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}_{\text{Lasso}} - \mu\|_2^2. \quad (34)$$

Here, the Lasso provides more accurate predictions when the true model has more non-zero coefficients and the conditional estimator tends to be more accurate when the true model is sparse.

In Figure 8 we plot the coverage rates obtained by the Conditional-Wald confidence intervals proposed here, the Polyhedral confidence intervals and the refitted ‘naive’ confidence intervals. Both of the selective methods obtain close to nominal coverage rates. The coverage rates of the refitted confidence intervals which were not adjusted for selection were far below the nominal levels in all simulation settings.






Figure 7: The log of the ratio between the prediction errors for the conditional (solid red line) and refitted least-squares regression estimates (dashed blue line) relative to the prediction error of the Lasso as defined in (34). The conditional MLE produces better prediction than the Lasso when the signal is spread over a smaller number of variables.

While the two types of selection adjusted confidence intervals seem to be roughly on par with respect to their coverage rate, they tend to differ in their size. For Figure 9 we generate the additional datasets with a smaller number of candidate covariates  $p = 200$ , a larger range of sample sizes-  $n = 40, 75, 150, 300, 600, 1250, 2500, 5000, 10000$ , a signal-to-noise ratio of  $\text{snr} = 0.2$  and  $k = 10$  non-zero regression coefficients.

We face some difficulty in assessing the average size of the Polyhedral confidence intervals, as these sometimes have an infinite length. a measure for the length of a typical confidence interval, we take the median confidence interval length in each simulation instance. In Figure 9 we plot boxplots describing the distribution of the log relative size of the selection adjusted confidence intervals to that of the unadjusted refitted confidence intervals which tend to be the shortest. We find that as the sample size increases, the sizes




Figure 8: Confidence interval coverage rate after model selection. Both the Conditional Wald CIs (solid red line) and the Polyhedral CIs (dashed blue line) achieve the target coverage rate of 95% (horizontal grey line). The coverage rate of the unadjusted Wald confidence intervals (dotted green line) is far below nominal.

of the Conditional-Wald confidence intervals are roughly twice the size the unadjusted confidence intervals, while the typical size of a Polyhedral interval is about twice the size of the Conditional-Wald confidence interval.

## 6 Conclusion

In this work we presented a computational framework which enables, for the first time, the computation of correct maximum likelihood estimates after model selection with a possibly large number of covariates. We applied the proposed framework to the computation of maximum likelihood estimates of selected multivariate normal means and regression models selected via the lasso.




Figure 9: Boxplots of the relative median sizes of the selection adjusted confidence intervals to the in relations to the unadjusted ones. The Conditional-Wald confidence are much shorter than the Polyhedral ones under all simulation settings and their size are far less variable.

Our methods take the arguably most ubiquitous approach to data analysis, that of computing maximum likelihood estimates and constructing Wald-like confidence intervals. Furthermore, we do not involve conditioning on information additional to the identity of the selected model. A practice which, as shown by Fithian et al. (2014), may lead to a loss in efficiency.

We experimented with the proposed estimators and confidence intervals in a comprehensive simulation study. The proposed conditional confidence intervals were shown to achieve conservative coverage rates and the point estimates were shown to be preferable to the refitted-least squares coefficients estimates in all simulation settings, and preferable to the Lasso coefficient estimates when there are large signals in the data.

While in this work we focused on inference in the linear regression method, our framework and theory are directly applicable to any exponential family distribution. Specifically,

it is immediately applicable to estimation of parameters of selected generalized linear models using the normal approximations proposed by Taylor and Tibshirani (2016).

## Supplementary Material

Proofs of theorems can be found in Appendix A. Some numerical examples for different plug-in methods for the Lasso MLE are in Appendix B. Analysis for maximum likelihood inference after one-sided testing is in Appendix C. Pseudo-code for the algorithms used in the paper is in Appendix D. A software package and example scripts can be found at: <https://github.com/ammeir2/selectiveMLE>.

## References

- Benjamini, Y. and Meir, A. (2014). Selective correlations-the conditional estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3242*.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2005). False discovery rate-adjusted multiple confidence intervals for selected parameters. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 100(469):71–93. With comments and a rejoinder by the authors.
- Berk, R., Brown, L., Buja, A., Zhang, K., Zhao, L., et al. (2013). Valid post-selection inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):802–837.
- Bertsekas, D. P. and Tsitsiklis, J. N. (2000). Gradient convergence in gradient methods with errors. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 10(3):627–642 (electronic).
- Chib, S. and Greenberg, E. (1995). Understanding the metropolis-hastings algorithm. *The American Statistician*, 49(4):327–335.

- Cureton, E. E. (1950). Validity, reliability, and baloney. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 10(1):94–96.
- del Castillo, J. (1994). The singly truncated normal distribution: a nonsteep exponential family. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 46(1):57–66.
- Fithian, W., Sun, D., and Taylor, J. (2014). Optimal inference after model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.2597*.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33(1):1–22.
- Genz, A., Bretz, F., Miwa, T., Mi, X., Leisch, F., Scheipl, F., and Hothorn, T. (2016). *mvtnorm: Multivariate Normal and t Distributions*. R package version 1.0-5.
- Geweke, J. (1991). Efficient simulation from the multivariate normal and student-t distributions subject to linear constraints and the evaluation of constraint probabilities. In *Computing science and statistics: Proceedings of the 23rd symposium on the interface*, pages 571–578. Citeseer.
- Griffiths, W. (2004). A gibbs’ sampler for the parameters of a truncated multivariate normal distribution. *Contemporary issues in economics and econometrics: Theory and application*, pages 75–91.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Wainwright, M. (2015). *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*. CRC Press.
- Hinton, G. E. (2002). Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural computation*, 14(8):1771–1800.

- Kotecha, J. H. and Djuric, P. M. (1999). Gibbs sampling approach for generation of truncated multivariate gaussian random variables. In *Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1999. Proceedings., 1999 IEEE International Conference on*, volume 3, pages 1757–1760. IEEE.
- Lederer, J. (2013). Trust, but verify: benefits and pitfalls of least-squares refitting in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.0113*.
- Lee, J. D., Sun, D. L., Sun, Y., and Taylor, J. E. (2016). Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 44(3):907–927.
- Lee, J. D. and Taylor, J. E. (2014). Exact post model selection inference for marginal screening. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 136–144.
- Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B. M. (2003). The finite-sample distribution of post-model-selection estimators and uniform versus nonuniform approximations. *Econometric Theory*, 19(1):100–142.
- Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B. M. (2005). Model selection and inference: facts and fiction. *Econometric Theory*, 21(1):21–59.
- Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B. M. (2006). Can one estimate the conditional distribution of post-model-selection estimators? *Ann. Statist.*, 34(5):2554–2591.
- Leeb, H., Pötscher, B. M., and Ewald, K. (2015). On various confidence intervals post-model-selection. *Statist. Sci.*, 30(2):216–227.
- Lockhart, R., Taylor, J., Tibshirani, R. J., and Tibshirani, R. (2014). A significance test for the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(2):413–468.

- Meinshausen, N. (2007). Relaxed Lasso. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, 52(1):374–393.
- Meinshausen, N. and Yu, B. (2009). Lasso-type recovery of sparse representations for high-dimensional data. *Ann. Statist.*, 37(1):246–270.
- Mira, A. (2001). On Metropolis-Hastings algorithms with delayed rejection. *Metron*, 59(3-4):231–241 (2002).
- Pakman, A. and Paninski, L. (2014). Exact Hamiltonian Monte Carlo for truncated multivariate Gaussians. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 23(2):518–542.
- Panigrahi, S., Taylor, J., and Weinstein, A. (2016). Bayesian post-selection inference in the linear model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08824*.
- Pötscher, B. M. (1991). Effects of model selection on inference. *Econometric Theory*, 7(2):163–185.
- Reid, S., Taylor, J., and Tibshirani, R. (2014). Post-selection point and interval estimation of signal sizes in gaussian samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.3340*.
- Reid, S., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2016). A study of error variance estimation in Lasso regression. *Statist. Sinica*, 26(1):35–67.
- Rosenblatt, J. D. and Benjamini, Y. (2014). Selective correlations; not voodoo. *Neuroimage*, 103:401–410.
- Routtenberg, T. and Tong, L. (2015). Estimation after parameter selection: Performance analysis and estimation methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02045*.
- Taylor, J., Lockhart, R., Tibshirani, R. J., and Tibshirani, R. (2014). Exact post-selection inference for forward stepwise and least angle regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.3889*.

- Taylor, J. and Tibshirani, R. (2016). Post-selection inference for  $l_1$ -penalized likelihood models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*.
- Tian, X. and Taylor, J. E. (2015). Selective inference with a randomized response. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.06739*.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 58(1):267–288.
- Tibshirani, R., Tibshirani, R., Taylor, J., Loftus, J., and Reid, S. (2016). *selectiveInference: Tools for Post-Selection Inference*. R package version 1.1.3.
- Tibshirani, R. J., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R., and Wasserman, L. (2015). Uniform asymptotic inference and the bootstrap after model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.06266*.
- Tierney, L. and Mira, A. (1999). Some adaptive monte carlo methods for bayesian inference. *Statistics in medicine*, 18(1718):2507–2515.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Weinstein, A., Fithian, W., and Benjamini, Y. (2013). Selection adjusted confidence intervals with more power to determine the sign. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 108(501):165–176.
- Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:2541–2563.



## A Proof of theorems

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

In their work on the convergence of stochastic gradient methods, Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis (2000) formulate a general stochastic gradient method as an iterative optimization method consisting of steps of the form:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t + \gamma_t(s_t + w_t),$$

where  $\gamma_t$  satisfies the condition from (6),  $s_t$  is a deterministic quantity related to the true gradient and  $w_t$  is a noise component. They outline conditions regarding  $s_t$  and  $w_t$  that ensure the convergence of the ascent algorithm to an optimum of a function  $f(x)$  which possesses a gradient  $\nabla f(x)$ . The conditions require that there exist positive scalars  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that for all  $t$ :

$$c_1 \|\nabla f(x_t)\|^2 \leq \nabla f(x_t)^T s_t, \quad \|s_t\| \leq c_2(1 + \|\nabla f(x_t)\|), \quad (35)$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}[w_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = 0, \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|w_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq A(1 + \|\nabla f(x_t)\|), \quad (37)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_t$  is the filtration at time  $t$ , representing all historical information available at time  $t$  regarding the sequence  $(w_t, s_t)_{i=1}^\infty$ .

In our case, the function of interest is the conditional log-likelihood  $f(x) = l(\mu) := \log \mathcal{L}(\mu)$ , where the coordinates of  $\mu$  which were not selected are imputed with the corresponding observed coordinates of  $y$ . The conditions regarding the deterministic component in (35) hold as  $s_t = \nabla l(\mu|M)$ , is the gradient itself. In Theorem 1 we assumed that we

are able to take independent draws from the truncated multivariate normal distribution, meaning that

$$\mathbb{E}[w_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}[y^t - \nabla l(\mu | M)] = 0.$$

In practice, we should make sure that we run the Markov chain for a sufficiently large number of iterations between gradient updates in order for (36) to hold in good approximation.

The remaining issue is to bound the variance of  $w_t$ . The first step is finding an upper bound for the variance of  $w_t$  as a function of  $\mu$ . In the following, we denote by  $f(y)$  the unconditional density of  $y$ , by  $f(y_j)$  the marginal (unconditional) density of  $y_j$  and by  $f(y_{-j}|y_j)$  the conditional distribution of  $y_{-j}$  given  $y_j$ . Since the mean minimizes an expected squared deviation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(y_j - \mathbb{E}(y_j | M))^2 | M] &\leq \mathbb{E}[(y_j - \mu_j)^2 | M] \\ &= \int (y_j - \mu_j)^2 f(y | M) dy \\ &= \int_M (y_j - \mu_j)^2 \frac{f(y)}{P(M)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $C(y_j) = \int_M f(y_{-j}|y_j) dy_{-j}$ , which satisfies  $0 \leq C(y_j) \leq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M (y_j - \mu_j)^2 \frac{f(y)}{P(M)} dy &= \int_M (y_j - \mu_j)^2 \frac{C(y_j)}{P(M)} f(y_j) dy_j \\ &\leq \int_M (y_j - \mu_j)^2 \frac{1}{P(M)} f(y_j) dy_j \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} (y_j - \mu_j)^2 \frac{1}{P(M)} f(y_j) dy_j = \frac{\sigma_j^2}{P(M)}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The next step in bounding the variance of  $w_t$  is bounding  $P(M)$  from below. The difficulty with finding a lower bound  $P(M)$  is that one may make it arbitrarily small by varying the coordinates of  $\mu$  for the non-selected coordinates. This is the motivation behind setting them to the observed values and only estimating the selected coordinates, resulting in the Z-estimator described in (8).

Assume without loss of generality that the first  $k$  coordinates of  $\mu$  were not selected and that the last  $p - k + 1$  were selected. We write

$$P(M) = \int_M f(y) dy = \int_M f(y_1|y_2, \dots, y_p) \times \dots \times f(y_p) dy.$$

We begin with the integration with respect to  $y_1$ :

$$\int_M f(y_1|y_2, \dots, y_p) dy_1 = 1 - \Phi(u_1; \mu_{1,-1}, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) + \Phi(l_1; \mu_{1,-1}, \sigma_{1,-1}^2).$$

Now, denote by  $m_j = (l_j + u_j)/2$  the mid-point between  $l_j$  and  $u_j$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Phi(u_1; \mu_{1,-1}, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) + \Phi(l_1; \mu_{1,-1}, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) &\geq 1 - \Phi(u_1; m_1, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) + \Phi(l_1; m_1, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) \\ &\geq \Phi(l_1; m_1, \sigma_{1,-1}^2) \geq \Phi(l_1; u_1, \sigma_{1,-1}^2). \end{aligned}$$

We can apply a similar lower bound to all selected coordinates to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} P(M) &\geq \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(l_j; u_j, \sigma_{j,-j}^2) \int_M f(y_{p-k+1}|y_{p-k+2}, \dots, y_p) \times \dots \times f(y_p) dy_{p-k+1} \dots dy_p \\ &= P(j \notin S(y) \forall j \notin M) \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(l_j; u_j, \sigma_{j,-j}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Taking (38) and (39) together, we obtain the desired bound:

$$\text{Var}(y_j) \leq \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma)}{P(\bigcap_{j \notin M} \{j \notin M\}) \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(l_j; u_j, \sigma_{j,-j}^2)}.$$

□

The proof of Theorem 2 follows in a similar fashion.

## A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

The proposal vectors defined in the lemma are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} r_1^{\rightarrow} &= (\eta_1^t, \dots, \eta_{j-1}^t, r_j, \eta_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, \eta_p^{t-1}, \xi^t), & r_2^{\rightarrow} &= (r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, r_j, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_p, \xi^t), \\ r_1^{\leftarrow} &= (r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, \eta_j^{t-1}, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_p, \xi^t), & r_2^{\leftarrow} &= (\eta_1^t, \dots, \eta_{j-1}^t, \eta_j^{t-1}, \eta_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, \eta_p^{t-1}, \xi^t). \end{aligned}$$

The proposed algorithm for sampling  $\eta|M, \xi$  is a two-step Delayed Rejection Metropolis-Hastings sampler. In our case the first step is to propose a sample from the full conditional distribution of  $\eta_j$  given  $\eta_{-j}$ . We denote the first proposal by  $r_1^\rightarrow$ . Note that at this stage only the  $j$ th coordinate has been changed. The acceptance probability for this step is given by:

$$\alpha(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\rightarrow) = \frac{f(r_{1,j}^\rightarrow|r_{1,-j}^\rightarrow) f(r_{2,j}^\leftarrow|r_{2,-j}^\leftarrow)}{f(r_{2,j}^\leftarrow|r_{2,-j}^\leftarrow) f(r_{1,j}^\rightarrow|r_{1,-j}^\rightarrow)} I\{S_n(X, r_1^\rightarrow) = M\} = I\{S_n(\mathbf{X}, r_1^\rightarrow) = M\}.$$

That is, the acceptance probability of the first proposal is either 1 or 0 depending on whether the proposal satisfies conditions (13) and (14).

If the first proposal is not accepted and (14) is satisfied, then we make a second proposal  $r_2^\rightarrow$ . The acceptance probability for the second proposal as defined by Mira (2001) is given by:

$$\alpha(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\leftarrow, r_2^\rightarrow) = \frac{f(r_2^\rightarrow)q_1(r_2^\rightarrow, r_1^\leftarrow)q_2(r_2^\rightarrow, r_1^\leftarrow, r_2^\leftarrow)(1 - \alpha(r_2^\rightarrow, r_1^\leftarrow))}{f(r_2^\leftarrow)q_1(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\rightarrow)q_2(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\rightarrow, r_2^\rightarrow)(1 - \alpha(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\rightarrow))},$$

where  $q_1(x, y)$  is the density of the first proposal and  $q_2(x, z, y)$  is the density of the second proposal. We only make a second proposal if  $\alpha(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\rightarrow) = 0$  and therefore the ratio is always zero if  $r_1^\leftarrow$  is a legal value. If both  $r_1^\leftarrow$  and  $r_1^\rightarrow$  are illegal then  $\alpha(r_2^\leftarrow, r_1^\leftarrow, r_2^\rightarrow)$  is non-zero and the proposal densities are given by:

$$q_1(x, y) = f(y_j | \{y_j < l_j\} \cup \{u_j < y_j\}, x_{-j}),$$

$$q_2(x, z, y) = \prod_{k \neq j} \frac{\varphi(y_k; x_k, \sigma_{k,-k}^2)}{P(y_k \in (a_k, b_k); x_k, \sigma_{k,-k}^2)}.$$

Put together, we get:

$$q(x, y) := q_1(x, y)q_2(x, z, y),$$

which yields the desired result. □

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Under the assumptions of Theorem 3 we show that the unadjusted MLE is consistent even in the presence of model selection, in the sense that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon | M) = 0.$$

We prove this result by showing that it holds for a model  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  that satisfies the conditions of the theorem. Assume without loss of generality that  $\theta^M \in \Theta^M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ . In the following we will use the shorthand  $I_n(M) = I_{\{S_n(y)=M\}}$ . The results follows from the fact that as long as the probability of model selection can be bounded from below, then the selection thresholds cannot be too far a way from the true parameters.

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon | M) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_n(M | \{\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon\}) P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_1 \geq \varepsilon)}{P_n(M)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon)}{P_n(M)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^p \{|\hat{\theta}_{nj}^M - \theta_{0j}^M| \geq \varepsilon\}\right)}{P_n(M)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{P(|\hat{\theta}_{nj}^M - \theta_{0j}^M| \geq \varepsilon)}{P_n(M)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{P(|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{nj}^M - \theta_{0j}^M)| \geq \sqrt{n}\varepsilon)}{P_n(M)} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{2e^{\frac{-n\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma_{Mj}}}}{P_n(M)} \stackrel{(**)}{=} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma_{Mj}^2$  is the  $j$ th diagonal element of  $\Sigma^M$  and  $(*)$  holds by subgaussian concentration. The equality  $(**)$  holds by our assumption regarding the rate at which  $P_n(M)$  is allowed to tend to zero.  $\square$

## A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Before we prove the theorem, we first state and prove a couple of Lemmas that will come in handy in the proof of Theorem 4. Lemma 5 to follow states that the conditional MLE is consistent for  $\theta_0^M$  even when used in the non-conditional setting (when the model to be estimated is pre-determined).

**Lemma 5.** *Set a family of distributions  $M$  and assume that no data-driven model selection has been performed. Then under the conditions of Theorem 4 the conditional MLE is consistent for  $\theta_0^M$ , that is,*

$$P(\|\hat{\theta}_n^M - \theta_0^M\|_\infty > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* Consider once again the conditional MLE

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_n^M &= \arg \max_{\theta^M} G_n^M = \arg \max_{\theta^M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \ell_{\theta^M}(y_i) - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\theta^M}(M) \right] \\ &:= \bar{\ell}_n(\theta^M) - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\theta^M}(M). \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell_{\theta^M}(y_i)$  is the unconditional log-likelihood of  $y_i$ . We are evaluating the properties of the conditional estimator in the unconditional setting where  $M$  is designated for inference before the data are observed. In this setting, the conditional MLE can be considered an M-estimator obtained from performing inference under a misspecified likelihood.

We now show that  $\hat{\theta}_n^M$  is consistent for the  $\theta_0^M$ . We have

$$\sup_{\theta^M} G_n^M(\theta^M) \geq G_n^M(\theta_0^M),$$

which implies that

$$\bar{\ell}_n(\hat{\theta}_n^M) \geq \bar{\ell}_n(\theta_0^M) - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\theta_0^M}(M) + \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\hat{\theta}_n^M}(M). \quad (40)$$

Equation (40) together with assumption (24) gives

$$\bar{\ell}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n^M) \geq \bar{\ell}_n(\theta_0^M) - o(1). \quad (41)$$

Thus, the conditions for consistency as given by van der Vaart (1998) (Theorem 5.14 p. 48) are satisfied. The implication of (41) is that in the unconditional setting the conditional M-estimator is a consistent estimator.  $\square$

Next, we show that the difference between the conditional expectation of the sufficient statistic  $\bar{T}_n$  converges to the unconditional expectation. This result will assist us later in proving a law-of-large number type statement for  $\bar{T}_n$  under the conditional distribution.

**Lemma 6.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4, for all  $\delta < 1/2$ ,*

$$n^\delta \|\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n|M)\| \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* According to Lemma 1, if  $y_i \sim f_{\theta^M}$  with  $f_{\theta^M}$  an exponential family distribution and  $P_{n,\theta^M}(M|\bar{T}_n) \in \{0, 1\}$  then the first derivative of the conditional log-likelihood is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^M} G_n(\theta^M) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T(y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta^M}(T(y_i)|M) := \bar{T}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\theta^M}(\bar{T}_n|M).$$

At the maximizer of  $G_n(\theta^M)$ , for any  $\delta < 1/2$ , we have:

$$n^\delta \left[ \bar{T}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(\bar{T}_n|M) \right] = 0,$$

which implies that

$$n^\delta (\bar{T}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n)) + n^\delta (\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n) - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(\bar{T}_n|M)) = 0.$$

Since  $n^\delta(\bar{T}_n - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}_n)) = o_p(1)$  by law of large numbers, we obtain that

$$n^\delta(\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}) - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(\bar{T}|M)) = o_p(1).$$

Finally in order to prove the desired results we must show that

$$E_{\theta_0^M}(\bar{T}|M) - E_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(\bar{T}|M) \rightarrow 0.$$

It is clear that since  $\theta_n^M \rightarrow \theta_0^M$ , a fixed continuous function of  $\hat{\theta}_n^M$  will converge as the sample size grows. However,  $E_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(\bar{T}|M)$  is a function of both  $\hat{\theta}_n^M$  and  $n$ , and we must make sure that it does not vary too much with  $n$  in order for the desired convergence to hold. Define  $t = a^T \bar{T}_n$ . By assumption (25) we have that for some sufficiently large  $n$ :

$$\sup_{\theta^M: \|\theta^M - \theta_0^M\| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} |\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(t|M) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta^M}(t|M)| \leq \sup_{\theta^M: \|\theta^M - \theta_0^M\| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} \frac{\text{Var}_{\theta^M}(t)}{P_{n,\theta^M}(M)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Because  $y$  is of an exponential distribution and  $t$  is an average we can bound the unconditional variance in the neighborhood of  $\theta_0^M$ . For a sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that,

$$\sup_{\theta^M: \|\theta^M - \theta_0^M\| \leq \varepsilon} \text{Var}_{\theta^M}(t) < \frac{C}{n}$$

because  $\text{Var}_{\theta^M}(t)$  is a continuous function and the supremum is taken over a compact set. Thus, by the  $\sqrt{n}$  consistency of  $\hat{\theta}_n^M$  for  $\theta_0^M$ , the difference satisfies  $n^\delta |\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0^M}(t|M) - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\theta}_n^M}(t|M)| = o(1)$  for any vector  $a$  as well as for  $\bar{T}_n$  itself and the claim follows.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4. The first step in the proof is showing that  $\bar{T}_n$  converges in probability conditionally on  $M$ . This result is a simple consequence of Markov's inequality and our assumption that  $P_n(M)^{-1} = o(n)$ . Set an arbitrary vector  $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and define  $t = a^T \bar{T}_n$ . By Markov's inequality,

$$P_n(|t - \mathbb{E}_n(t|M)| > \varepsilon|M) \leq \frac{\text{Var}_n(t|M)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{O(n^{-1})}{\varepsilon^2 P_n(M)} = o(1). \quad (42)$$



To see why (42) holds, write:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}_n(t|M) &= \int \frac{(t - \mathbb{E}(t))^2}{P_n(M)} I\{S_n(\bar{T}_n) = M\} f(t) d(t) - [\mathbb{E}(t) - \mathbb{E}_n(t|M)]^2 \\ &\leq \frac{a^T \text{Var}(T(y_i)) a}{nP_n(M)}.\end{aligned}$$

By the fact that (42) holds for any arbitrary vector  $a$ , together with Lemma 6, we can determine that conditionally on  $M$ ,  $\bar{T}_n \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E}(\bar{T}_n)$ .

By our assumption that the log-likelihood  $l_{\theta^M}(y)$  is a continuous mapping of  $T(y)$ , assumption (24) and Lemma 6, conditionally on the selection of  $M$  we have:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{\theta^M}(y_i) - \frac{1}{n} \log P_{n,\theta^M}(M) \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\theta^M}(y_i)].$$

The rest of the proof follows in a similar manner to the proof of Lemma 5 where the law of large numbers in the proof of Theorem 5.14 in van der Vaart (1998) is replaced by (42) and our assumption that  $\bar{\ell}_n(\theta^M)$  is a continuous function of  $\bar{T}_n$ .  $\square$

## A.5 Proof of Lemma 3

In the context of this proof we use the following notation:

$$A_0(M, s) := \{l_o(M, s) \leq \mathbf{A}_0(M, s)y < u_0(M, s)\},$$

$$A_1(M, s) := \{\mathbf{A}_1(M, s)y < u_1(M, s)\}.$$

For ease of exposition, we make a simplifying assumption that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \lambda^*.$$

We begin by bounding the probability of not selecting the null-set. By our assumption that  $n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$  converges, we have that the thresholds  $l_0(M, s)$  and  $u_0(M, s)$  also converge for all candidate models and sign permutations. Furthermore, by our assumption regarding the rate in which  $\lambda_n$  grows and the expectation of  $\mathbf{A}_0(M)y$ ,

$$\mathbf{A}_0(M)y \rightarrow^D N(0, \Sigma(\mathbf{A}_0)),$$

where,

$$\Sigma(\mathbf{A}_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_n^2} \mathbf{X}_{-M}^T (I - \mathbf{X}_M (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T) \mathbf{X}_{-M}.$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\mathbf{A}_0(M, s)) = c_0(M, s) > 0, \quad \forall M, s.$$

Since the probability of  $\mathbf{A}_0(M, s)$  can be bounded in a uniform manner, we can set

$$c_0(M) := \min_s c_0(M, s),$$

and obtain a lower bound for the probability of selecting  $M$  by bounding

$$P_n(M) \geq c_0(M) P_n(\cup_s \mathbf{A}_1(M, s)) := c_0(M) P_n(\mathbf{A}_1(M)).$$

We bound  $P_n(\mathbf{A}_1(M))$  next. Recall that the threshold a regression coefficient must cross is given by

$$u_1(M, s) = -\lambda_n \text{diag}(s) (\mathbf{X}_M^T \mathbf{X}_M)^{-1} s.$$

This threshold is a bit unwieldy, as it depends on the signs of the active set and an exact realization of  $\mathbf{X}_M$ . Since we are interested in asymptotic behavior of random quantities, it will be sufficient to work with the limiting value of the threshold:

$$u_1^*(M, s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} u_1(M, s) = -\lambda^* \text{diag}(s) \Sigma_M^{-1} s,$$

Now, in order to eliminate the dependence on the signs of the active set define:

$$u_1^*(M) := \sup_s \sup_j \left| (\lambda^* \text{diag}(s) \Sigma_M^{-1} s)_j \right|,$$

and define an event:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_1 := \{ \sqrt{n} |\eta_j| > u_1^*(M), \quad \forall j \in M \}.$$

In  $\tilde{A}_1$  we replaced all coordinate thresholds with the largest threshold, and so it is clear that:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{n, \beta^M}(\tilde{A}_1)}{P_{n, \beta^M}(A_1)} \leq 1.$$

Furthermore, we have the lower bound

$$P_{n, \beta^M}(\tilde{A}_1) \geq \prod_{j \in M} (\Phi(-u^*(M); 0, \sigma_{j, -j}^2) + 1 - \Phi(u^*(M); 0, \sigma_{j, -j}^2)), \quad \forall \beta^M \in \mathbb{R}^{|M|}, \quad (43)$$

where  $\sigma_{j, -j}^2 := \text{Var}(\sqrt{n} \eta_j | \eta_{-j})$ . See the proof of Theorem 1 for details on how this bound is derived. The rest follows by our normality assumption and the fact that (43) holds for all  $\beta^M$  including  $\beta_0^M$ .  $\square$

## A.6 Proof of Lemma 4

We begin by treating the probability of satisfying the conditions for not selecting the variables not in the model. Using the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 3, the following limit holds:

$$\Sigma(A_0) \rightarrow 0,$$

and consequently, by assumption (32):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\mathbf{A}_0(M, s)) = 1, \quad \forall s.$$

Next, we treat the probabilities of satisfying the conditions for selecting the variables included in the model. As before, we make a simplifying assumption that there exists a constant  $0 < \delta < 0.5$  such that:

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{n^{0.5+\delta}} = \lambda^*,$$

In the fast scaling case, a lower bound on  $P_{n,\beta^M}(\tilde{A}_1)$  no longer exists because the threshold  $u^*(M)$  grows with the sample size. However, we can show that a satisfactory bound exists at  $\beta_0^M$ . Since in this setting  $\lambda_n$  grows faster than  $\sqrt{n}$ , we redefine the limit of the selection threshold:

$$u_1^*(M, s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n^\delta} u_1(M, s) = -\lambda^* \text{diag}(s) \Sigma_M^{-1} s.$$

We can redefine  $u_1^*(M)$  in an analogous manner. Now, we rewrite the bound (43) at the point  $\beta^M = \beta_0^M$  and with  $u_1^*(M)$  properly scaled as

$$P_{n,\beta_0^M}(\tilde{A}_1) \geq \prod_{j \in M} (\Phi(-u^*(M)n^\delta; \sqrt{n}\beta_0^M, \sigma_{j,-j}^2) + 1 - \Phi(u^*(M)n^\delta; \sqrt{n}\beta_0^M, \sigma_{j,-j}^2))$$

With no loss of generality assume that  $\beta_0^M < 0$  to obtain the desired bound:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n,\beta_0^M}(\tilde{A}_1) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(-u^*(M)n^\delta; \sqrt{n}\beta_0^M, \sigma_{j,-j}^2) = 1,$$

where the limit holds because  $\delta < 0.5$ . A similar result holds in a small neighborhood  $U$  of  $\beta_0^M$  because the probability of selection is continuous in  $\beta^M$ .

In order to bound the infimum of  $P_{n,\beta^M}(A_1)$ , we again start from (43) to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{n,\beta^M}(\tilde{A}_1) &\geq \prod_{j \in M} (\Phi(-u^*(M)n^\delta; 0, \sigma_{j,-j}^2) + 1 - \Phi(u^*(M)n^\delta; 0, \sigma_{j,-j}^2)) \\
&\geq \prod_{j \in M} \Phi(-u^*(M)n^\delta; 0, \sigma_{j,-j}^2) \\
&\geq C \left( \frac{n^\delta u_1^*(M)/\sigma_{j,-j}}{1 + u_1^*(M)^2 n^{2\delta}/\sigma_{j,-j}^2} \right)^{|M|} \prod_{j \in M} e^{-\frac{u_1^*(M)^2 n^{2\delta}}{2\sigma_{j,-j}^2}} \\
&= O\left(\frac{e^{-n^{2\delta}}}{n^{\delta|M|/2}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

The lemma follows by our assumption that  $\delta < 0.5$ . In (44) we used the inequality:

$$\Phi(t; 0, \sigma^2) \geq C \frac{t/\sigma}{1 + t^2/\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}}.$$

□

## B Numerical examples for the Lasso MLE

In Section 3.1 we discuss the conditions that must hold in order for a specific model to be selected by the Lasso and propose to estimate the mean vector  $\mathbf{A}_0(M)E(y)$  by 0. Here, we propose some alternatives and seek to demonstrate that the proposed method is a reasonable one.

We generate data using the same process as described in Example 5 with parameter values  $\rho = 0.5$ ,  $n = p = 100$ ,  $k = 3$  and  $\text{snr} = 0.5$ . We selected a model with two active parameters of positive sign with observed values of 0.17 and 0.13. In order to compute the conditional log-likelihood for this example we must decide on appropriate estimates for  $E(\mathbf{A}_0(M)y)$ . We present results for three options. The first is to use the observed value,




Figure 10: Contour plots for the first numerical experiment described in Appendix B. The contour plots describe the log-likelihood of a model selected by the Lasso as a function of the values of the regression coefficients where the probability of not selecting the inactive set was computed in four different ways as described in the text.

$\mathbf{A}_0 y$  as an estimate for its expectation, we term this method ‘plug-in’. The second is to work under the assumption that  $E(\mathbf{A}_0 y) \approx 0$ , estimating the expectation with a vector of zeros, we term this method ‘zero’. A third option is to simply assume that  $P(l < \mathbf{A}_0 y < u) \approx 1$  for all signs sets, we term this method ‘none’. Finally, we also compute the likelihood under the truth, setting  $E(\mathbf{A}_0 y) = \mathbf{A}_0 E(y)$ .

We draw the contour plots for the two-dimensional log-likelihoods as a function of the selected regression coefficients in Figure 10. While the contour plots are visually similar, the values of the log-likelihoods differ slightly. For the ‘none’ and ‘zero’ methods the log-likelihood was maximized at 0.14, 0.02 at a log-likelihood value of 14.2. This is similar to the log-likelihood computed under the true expectation, where the maximum was also obtained at 0.14, 0.02 and at a slightly different value of 14.3. Finally, for the plug-in method the




Figure 11: Contour plots for the second numerical experiment described in Appendix B. The contour plots describe the log-likelihood of a model selected by the Lasso as a function of the values of the regression coefficients where the probability of not selecting the inactive set was computed in four different ways as described in the text.

maximum was obtained at 0.13, 0.02 with a value of 16.9. Thus, for this example, the maximum likelihood estimates computed using the different imputation methods yielded results that are essentially equivalent. In this example the true probability of  $P(l_0 < \mathbf{A}_0 y < u_0)$  was close to 1 for all sign permutations.

In a second example we generate data using parameter values  $\rho = 0.8$ ,  $n = 100$ ,  $p = 500$ ,  $k = 5$  and  $\text{snr} = 0.2$ . Here we selected a model with four variables where the observed refitted regression coefficients estimates were 0.13, 0.17, 0.21 and 0.15. For all estimation methods the maximum of the log-likelihood was obtained at approximately 0, -0.05, 0.1, 0. The values of the log-likelihood function at its maximum was 15.9 when no imputation was used, 19.9 for plugin imputation, 16.1 for the zero imputation and 16.7 when the true parameter value was used to compute the log-likelihood. The contour of the log-likelihood

function are plotted in Figure 11 for the second and third variables, keeping the values of the first and last coefficients fixed at zero.

## C Description of algorithms

---

**Algorithm 1:** Stochastic ascent algorithm for the normal means problem.

---

**input** :  $y, l, u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \Sigma^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ .

**output** :  $\hat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

**initialization:**  $y^0 \leftarrow y, \mu^0 \leftarrow y$ .

**for**  $i \in 1 : I$  **do**

Set  $z^0 \leftarrow y^{i-1}$ ;

**for**  $t \in 1 : T$  **do**

**for**  $j \in 1 : p$  **do**

Sample  $z_j^t \sim f_{\mu^i}(z_j | M, z_1^t, \dots, z_{j-1}^t, z_{j+1}^{t-1}, \dots, z_p^{t-1})$ ;

Set  $y^i \leftarrow z^T$ ;

**for**  $j \in M$  **do**

$\mu_j^i \leftarrow \mu_j^{i-1} + \gamma^i \Sigma_{j,\cdot}^{-1} (y - y^i)$ ;

**return**  $\mu^I$ ;

---



---

**Algorithm 2:** Sampler for the post-selection distribution under selection by Lasso.

---

**input** :  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{|M|}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

**output** : A sample point  $\eta$ .

**for**  $t \in 1 : T$  **do**

Sample  $\xi^t \sim f(\xi|M, \eta)$  ;

**for**  $j \in 1 : p$  **do**

Set  $r^\rightarrow \leftarrow \eta$  ;

Sample  $r_j^\rightarrow \sim f(\eta_j | \{\eta_j < l_j\} \cup \{\eta_j > u_j\}, \eta_{-j})$ ;

**if**  $l_0(M, \text{sign}(r^\rightarrow)) < \xi^t < u_0(M, \text{sign}(r^\rightarrow))$  **then**

**if**  $r^\rightarrow$  is in the set from (13) **then**

Set  $\eta \leftarrow r^\rightarrow$  ;

**else**

**for**  $k \neq j$  **do**

Sample  $r_k^\rightarrow \sim \text{TN}(a_k, b_k, \eta_k, \sigma_{k,-k}^2)$  ;

Set  $r^\leftarrow \leftarrow r^\rightarrow$  ;

Set  $r_j^\leftarrow \leftarrow \eta_j$  ;

**if**  $r^\leftarrow$  is not in the set from (13) **then**

Compute  $p_j^t$  as in (21) ;

Sample  $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ ;

**if**  $U < p_j^t$  **then**

Set  $\eta \leftarrow r^\rightarrow$ ;

**return**  $\eta$  ;

---

---

**Algorithm 3:** Stochastic ascent algorithm for the Lasso.

---

**input** :  $I \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda, \sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**output** :  $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**initialization:** Set  $\hat{\beta}^0, \eta^0 \leftarrow (X_M^T X_M)^{-1} X_M^T y$ .

**for**  $i \in 1 : I$  **do**

Sample  $\eta^i$  using Algorithm 2 ;

Set  $\hat{\beta}^i \leftarrow \hat{\beta}^{i-1} + \gamma_i (X_m^T y - (X_M^T X_M) \eta^i)$ ;

**for**  $j \in 1 : p$  **do**

Set  $\hat{\beta}_j^t \leftarrow \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_j^0) \max(0, \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_j^0) \hat{\beta}_j^i)$ ;

**return**  $\hat{\beta}^I$ ;

---